

Durham E-Theses

Zechariah and the Gospel off Matthew: the use of a biblical tradition

Moss, Charlene McAfee

How to cite:

Moss, Charlene McAfee (2002) *Zechariah and the Gospel off Matthew: the use of a biblical tradition*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online:
<http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/4220/>

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.

Abstract

This thesis examines the use of Zechariah traditions in Matthew's Gospel. It analyzes and interprets the ways Matthew transmits, alters or adds Zechariah traditions to his sources. Instead of looking at portions of the Gospel in light of Zechariah 9-14 only, this study addresses the entire Gospel and all of Zechariah.

In focusing on Zechariah tradition, the thesis has kept the following considerations in view. First, the content and function of Matthew's explicit uses of Zechariah are examined. Second, ways in which tradition derived from Zechariah may have exerted influence on portions of the gospel sub-structure are identified. Third, it explores the extent to which Matthew alludes to characteristic Zechariah themes. Together, these components illuminate how Matthew's Gospel incorporates its Zechariah material, whether alone or in combination with other prophetic traditions. Thus the methodological approach of the thesis is not only grounded in classical methods of biblical criticism but is also open to recent literary methods.

In addition to explicit citations, numerous allusions and echoes of Zechariah tradition are present in Matthew. They appear in Matthean materials and in traditions Matthew has taken from Mark and Q. Because the focus of this thesis is open to both the Gospel and the Zechariah traditions in their entirety, two important observations have been made. First, traces of Zechariah material are found in the Infancy and Gaililean healing Narratives as well as in the Passion Narrative. Not only is the impact of Zechariah 9-14 observed, but important sections of Zechariah 1-8 are also discerned in Matthew's narrative structure. Moreover, Matthew's Son of David Christology is enriched and partially defined by Zechariah's prophet-shepherd imagery, as well as by the royal messianic motif.

**Zechariah and the Gospel of Matthew:
The Use of a Biblical Tradition**

Charlene McAfee Moss

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



14 APR 2003

A Thesis Presented to the Department of Theology
of the University of Durham
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>CHAPTERS</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Introduction Matthew's Use of Scripture Traditions	6
1 Jesus, the Newborn King Davidic Branch, Savior, Emmanuel, Nazarene Matthew 1.18-25; 2.1-6, 23 Zechariah 6.12; 8.7, 11-13, 20-23; 9.16	20
2 Jesus' Ministry in Galilee The Healing Shepherd Matthew 9.36 Zechariah 10.2	51
3 Jesus' Entry into Jerusalem The Humble Messianic King Matthew 21.1-11 (11.25-30) Zechariah 9.9 (14.4-5)	76
Excursus: Wisdom Christology and Matthew 11.25-30	84
Excursus: The Palm Sunday Donkey	98
4 Jesus in the Temple The Prophet from Nazareth in Galilee Matthew 21.12-16 Zechariah 14.21	105
5 Jesus and Zechariah The Blood of Zechariah, son of Barachiah, in the Temple Matthew 23.35 Zechariah 1.1-7	122
6 Jesus as the Son of Man The Matthean Apocalypse Matthew 24.27, 30-31, 36-44; 25.31 Zechariah 2.6(10); 9.14; 12.10; 14.4-7	151
7 Jesus' Blood of the Covenant Forgiveness of Sins Matthew 26.28 Zechariah 9.11	179
8 Jesus, the Stricken Shepherd The Prophecy Fulfilled Matthew 26.31 Zechariah 13.7	185

9	Jesus and the Price of His Betrayal Judas Sells the Shepherd for Thirty Pieces of Silver Matthew 26.14-16; 27.3-10 Zechariah 11.4-13 Excursus: Jesus the Shepherd in Matthew's Gospel	201 218
10	Jesus and the Temple Charge Rebuilding the Temple Matthew 26.60-61 Zechariah 6.12	224
11	Jesus' Crucifixion The Eschatological Signs Matthew 27.51-53 Zechariah 14.4-5	233
12	Jesus on the Mount of Olives The Shepherd King Matthew 21.1-11; 24.3 ^{ff} ; 26.30-56 Zechariah 9.9; 13.7; 14.4-5	239
Conclusion	Matthew's Use of Zechariah	246
Appendix	Possible Zechariah Influence in Matthew's Gospel	252
Bibliography		262

No part of this thesis has previously been submitted by me for a degree in this or in any other University. If material has been generated through joint work, my independent contribution has been clearly indicated. In all other cases material from the work of others has been acknowledged and quotations and paraphrases suitably indicated.

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

ABBREVIATIONS

Most of the abbreviations in this thesis are those recommended by the Society of Biblical Literature, *The SBL Handbook of Style*, published by Hendrickson, 1999. The following abbreviations are used in the footnotes for commonly-cited works (see full citations in the Bibliography):

<i>Proceedings: EGL & MWBS</i>	<i>Proceedings of the Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Societies</i>
Davies & Allison I, II, and III	Vols. 1, 2, 3 of <i>A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew</i>
Hagner I, II	Vols. 1, 2 of <i>Matthew</i>
Meyers I Meyers II	<i>Haggai and Zechariah 1-8 Zechariah 9-14</i>

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is a privilege and a joy to express my gratitude to teachers and colleagues, to friends and family members who have contributed so much to this project. Among those without whom this thesis would not have come to light, I would like to acknowledge:

Dr Ulrich W. Mauser, for his inspiration through my Seminary years and beyond, and for his encouragement which enabled me to keep my eye on the prize.

Dr Loren T. Stuckenbruck, my doctoral supervisor, for being a model of scholarly excellence and unfailing kindness, and for his critical judgment and wise counsel which have been invaluable to me.

My parents, Charles and Dorothy McAfee, my sister, Phyllis Emick, and my brother, Craig McAfee, for all their love and support.

Our children, Stephen, Bryan, Hilary and Heidi, for being cheerful and constant in their love for a mother who has been "back in school" these many years!

Finally, my husband David, for the time, energy, resources, and confidence he invested in all my years of study, both at home and abroad. He alone knows how much his strength and love have meant to me, and so I dedicate this thesis to him, with my love.

INTRODUCTION

Matthew's Use of Scripture Traditions

...τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον γέγονεν ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαὶ τῶν προφητῶν.

Yet all of this happened in order that the writings of the prophets might be fulfilled --Matthew 26.56

Jesus' early followers understood his life, death, and resurrection to be a fulfillment of scripture. The present study is concerned with the use of the Jewish scriptures¹ in the Gospel of Matthew. That the First Evangelist was particularly interested in portraying significant events in Jesus' life as the fulfillment of scripture is fundamentally undisputed.

Scholars have approached Matthew's use of the scriptures in several ways.² For example, a scholar may survey and analyze the kinds of biblical texts that appear; another may focus on which parts of the Bible figure most often in Matthew's Gospel. Inasmuch as it incorporates so much of the Gospel of Mark, some scholars may examine the scriptural insertions into Matthew's Markan material in order to discern the First Gospel's particular theological interests. Other scholars may choose to compare the use of Q-materials in Matthew and Luke, with respect to specific biblical themes.³

Matthew's employment of biblical tradition is not limited to explicit citations alone; his Gospel is replete with the implicit or allusive use of scripture as well. In a study of the gospel's own use of scripture, that is, apart from source-critical or text-critical comparison alone, the *extent* to which Matthew has added or restored materials from biblical traditions

¹By the Jewish scriptures, I mean the traditions preserved in the Christian "Old Testament."

²See references to pertinent studies below.

³This thesis accepts Markan priority and assumes that Matthew drew upon Markan tradition as well as a "sayings source," such as Q. The designation "Matthew" assumes nothing about the identity of the First Evangelist, other than that he was most likely a Jewish Christian who had access to Jesus traditions, oral or written, in addition to Mark and Q.

to his source(s) yet remains to be ascertained. Within the confines of a thesis, it becomes possible to analyze implicit applications of scripture if one focuses on a particular biblical tradition.⁴ This is what is proposed here: one area, largely neglected until now and deserving of deeper investigation is the degree to which Zechariah material may have influenced Matthew's Gospel.⁵

In casting the spotlight on Zechariah tradition, the present thesis shall attempt to keep the following procedures in view. First, I will examine the content and function of Matthew's explicit uses of Zechariah. Second, I will seek to identify ways in which tradition derived from Zechariah may have exerted an influence on the sub-structure of certain portions of the gospel. Third, I will explore the extent to which Matthew alludes to themes and motifs that are characteristic of the Zechariah tradition.⁶ In these ways my

⁴Michael Knowles has fruitfully explored Matthew's use of Jeremiah traditions in *Jeremiah in Matthew's Gospel: The Rejected-Prophet Motif in Matthaean Redaction* (JSNTSup 68; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993).

⁵Some commentaries and other studies that focus on the book of Zechariah refer to the NT citations of Zech 9.9 (Mt 21.5; cf. Jn 12.15) and Zech 13.7 (Mt 26.31||Mk 14.27); some mention the attribution of Zech 11.12-13 to Jeremiah in Mt 27.9-10; others note possible influences of Zech 14 on apocalyptic material. (See body of thesis for pertinent references.) I am aware of no scholarly attempts to address the influence of Zechariah on the Gospel of Matthew. There are two works that study the impact of Zech 9-14 on the Passion Narratives of the Gospels: F. F. Bruce, "The Book of Zechariah and the Passion Narrative," *BJRL* 43 (1960), 336-53; and M. C. Black, "The Rejected and Slain Messiah Who is Coming with the Angels: The Messianic Exegesis of Zechariah 9-14 in the Passion Narratives," (Ph. D. diss. Emory University, 1990). In contrast with these, I include Zech 1-8 as well as 9-14; I concentrate my study on Matthew's Gospel, and I open up the field of enquiry to examine the whole gospel for possible Zechariah influence.

⁶This thesis will discuss the possible (inter)dependence between Zechariah and Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel only where it is pertinent, e.g., where overlapping biblical themes affect the interpretation of the First Gospel. The interdependence of prophetic themes (and texts) is a complex field of study, and this thesis has no aspirations of setting dates for any parts of Isa, Jer, Ezek, Zech, etc. One work related to this topic with respect to Zechariah is Janet E. Tollington, *Tradition and Innovation in Haggai and Zechariah 1-8* (JSOTSup 150; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 170, 237, in which she says, e.g., that Jer 33.15-16 postdates Zech 1-8, for it is not in LXX, and that Zech 8.20-22, 23 may be earlier than some Isa texts having similar themes. Of course, there is no way to know what the evangelist had in mind with regard to such issues; it is something to ponder as a caution against assuming that "minor prophet" automatically means less influence.

thesis will illuminate how Matthew's gospel as a whole has incorporated Zechariah materials, whether it is Zechariah alone or this prophetic tradition in combination with other scriptures and more contemporary Jewish sources.

THE RECENT STUDY OF MATTHEW'S "USE OF BIBLICAL TRADITION"

In their research into the New Testament's fulfillment of the Old, scholars have incorporated a broad spectrum of texts: some have limited their study to the canon, while others have included extra-canonical documents.⁷ In the arena of Gospel studies, some scholars have concentrated on the Passion Narrative in one or more of the Gospels.⁸ Several scholarly works on Matthew's Gospel have drawn on a wide range of methods in their analysis of its use of scripture.⁹ With special reference to the Old Testament in Matthew's Gospel, the studies of Robert Gundry and Krister Stendahl are notable for their

⁷See C. H. Dodd, *The Old Testament in the New* (London: Athlone, 1952); F. F. Bruce, *New Testament Development of Old Testament Themes* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968); Barnabas Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic* (London: Westminster, 1961); also see essays by Andrew Chester ("Citing the Old Testament"), and Max Wilcox ("Text Form"), in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture* (ed. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 141-69, 193-204.

⁸See Frank J. Matera, *Passion Narratives and Gospel Theologies: Interpreting the Synoptics Through Their Passion Stories* (New York and Mahwah: Paulist, 1986); and Donald P. Senior, *The Passion Narrative According to Matthew: A Redactional Study* (Leuven: University Press, 1975); D. J. Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives* (Sheffield: Almond, 1983).

⁹Scholars vary with respect to which other texts from early Judaism are pertinent to their topic. Some focus on one particular theme in Matthew; others limit their work to one OT book. In addition to Knowles, *Jeremiah in Matthew's Gospel*, see Dale C. Allison, Jr., *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993); Blaine Charette, *The Theme of Recompense in Matthew's Gospel* (JSNTSup 79; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992); Terence Donaldson, *Jesus on the Mountain: A Study in Matthean Theology* (JSNTSup 8; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985); David E. Garland, *The Intention of Matthew 23* (Leiden: Brill, 1979); M. D. Goulder, *Midrash and Lection in Matthew* (London: SPCK, 1974); Daniel Marguerat, *Le jugement dans l'Évangile de Matthieu*. (2^e édition augmentée; Genève: Labor et Fides, 1995); Brian M. Nolan, *The Royal Son of God: The Christology of Matthew 1-2 in the Setting of the Gospel* (OBO 23; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979); David E. Orton, *The Understanding Scribe: Matthew and the Apocalyptic Ideal* (JSNTSup 25; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989); David C. Sim, *Apocalyptic eschatology in the gospel of Matthew* (SNTS 88; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Donald J. Versput, *The Rejection of the Humble Messianic King: A Study of the Composition of Matthew 11-12* (New York/ Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1986); Dorothy Jean Weaver, *Matthew's Missionary Discourse: A Literary Critical Analysis* (JSNTSup 38; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990).

hypotheses regarding the mixed textual forms of the Matthean quotations.¹⁰ Matthew's so-called "formula quotations" have attracted much scholarly attention; in addition to specialized studies, many commentaries also address this topic.¹¹

In order to ground the study of Matthew's use of scriptural traditions, some care needs to be taken to locate the evangelist's exegetical methods within the context of first century Judaism. Before the advent of Jesus, the scriptures of Israel had been interpreted in creative ways adapted to meet the needs of different believing communities. Some early interpretations survive in writings now labeled the Old Testament "Apocrypha" and "Pseudepigrapha." The preserved writings of Josephus and Philo also contribute to an

¹⁰The scriptural materials in Matthew appear to come from both Septuagintal and Masoretic traditions in addition to variant traditions no longer extant, apart from their use in the First Gospel. See Robert H. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel* (NovTSup 18; Leiden: Brill, 1967); Krister Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew and its use of the Old Testament* (Ramsey, NJ: Sigler, 1990). A helpful overview of Matthew's use of the OT is in Donald Senior, *What are they saying about Matthew?* (New York: Paulist, 1983) 37-46; see also Graham Stanton, "Matthew's Use of the Old Testament," 346-63, in *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1992).

¹¹In addition to Stendahl, *School*, and Donaldson, *Jesus on the Mountain*, see George M. Soares Prabhu, *The Formula Quotations in the Infancy Narratives of Matthew: An Enquiry in to the Tradition History of Mt. 1-2* (AnBib, 63; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1976); R. T. France, "The Formula-Quotations of Matthew 2 and the Problem of Communication," *NTS* 27 (1981), 235-51; R. S. McConnell, *Law and Prophecy in Matthew's Gospel* (Basel: Friedrich Reinhardt, 1969). Also see discussions of the formulaic quotations and other uses of scripture in Matthew commentaries and monographs: those consulted for this thesis include Willoughby C. Allen, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Matthew* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1907); Francis Wright Beare, *The Gospel According to Matthew* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981); O.Lamar Cope, *Matthew: A Scribe Trained for the Kingdom of Heaven* (Washington, D. C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1976); Margaret Davies, *Matthew* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993); W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, Jr., *Matthew* (3 vols.; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988-97); J. C. Fenton, *The Gospel of St Matthew* (London: Penguin, 1973); R. T. France, *Matthew: Evangelist & Teacher* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1989); F. W. Green, *The Gospel according to Saint Matthew* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1936); Robert H. Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on His Handbook for a Mixed Church under Persecution* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984); Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew* (2 vols.; Dallas: Word, 1993-95); Daniel J. Harrington, *The Gospel of Matthew* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1991); Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 1-7: A Commentary* (trans. Wilhelm C. Linss; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989); idem., *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (Band I, II, III; Zuruck/Neukirchen-Vluyn: Benzinger/Neukirchner, 1985-97); Leon Morris, *The Gospel according to Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992); Daniel Patte, *The Gospel according to Matthew: Structural Commentary on Matthew's Faith* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987); Eduard Schweizer, *The Good News According to Matthew* (trans. David E. Green; London: SPCK, 1976); Graham Stanton, *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1992).

understanding of the diversity of Jewish biblical thought in the first century.

After their discovery, the importance of the Dead Sea Scrolls for the study of the biblical traditions of many early Jewish and Christian communities has also been recognized. As with the literature of other early Jewish groups, a variety of interpretive methods are evident at Qumran. Some Qumran documents paraphrase and interpret such already-accepted messianic “prophecies” as Gen 49.8-9, Num 24.17, Isa 11.1-10, and 2 Sam 7.¹² As an increasing body of evidence came to light, scholars began to devote considerable attention to the presence of *testimonia* found in the Judean desert; this brought back into focus the question whether collections of scriptures sharing a particular theme might have played an important role in the formation of the New Testament writings. Did the evangelists have access to such collections, based on previous juxtapositions or confluations of the scriptures, or, at a secondary stage, did they attempt to put such scriptures together in order to address more contemporary concerns? The strength of the study of *testimonia* consists in the appropriate recognition that biblical traditions had been read in tandem by Jewish communities prior to the common era. However, the presence of scripture collections at Qumran has not strengthened the hypothesis that portions of the Gospels may have drawn their quotations of the Old Testament from a collection of “messianic” or Christian apologetic texts *per se*.¹³

¹²Among scholars whose works trace early uses of scripture, see Geza Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies* (2nd rev. ed.; Leiden: Brill, 1973); some of the Targums also follow similar interpretive methods and contain similar “messianic” texts (see below on use of the Targums in this study). With reference to early Christian “messianic exegesis” of these texts, see Nils Alstrup Dahl, *Jesus the Christ: The Historical Origins of Christological Doctrine* (ed. Donald H. Juel; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 53-54; and Donald H. Juel, *Christological Interpretation of the Old Testament in Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1998).

¹³Donald Senior, *What are they saying about Matthew?*, 42-43, nicely summarizes Stendahl’s proposal that the “formula quotations” were the product of a Qumran-like school. In this overview of

Likewise, the suggestion that the gospel writers may have utilized a *peshet* method of exegesis similar to examples found at Qumran has also lost favor in some scholarly quarters, not least because of the ambiguity of the terminology. Moreover, the organizing principle of the *peshet* consists of a running commentary on a portion of the biblical text. Matthew's gospel is not structured around the sequential use of the biblical tradition, but rather it is a narrative on the life of Jesus which, in turn, is illuminated by the scriptures.

In this thesis, the ways in which early interpretive groups went about doing "messianic exegesis" will be compared with the exegetical strategies of the First Gospel, particularly where they may apply to Zechariah. This study will include pertinent materials from the Qumran scrolls, "apocryphal" and "pseudepigraphal" literature, from Philo and Josephus, and from targumic sources, in addition to the biblical texts. With these interpretive traditions in view, the following study has strengthened the conviction that Matthew uses the Old Testament in ways both continuous and discontinuous with his exegetical predecessors and contemporaries, for the "construction of a gospel...is a new technique."¹⁴

contemporary Matthean studies, Senior also rejects Strecker's view that the messianic *testimonia*, although unreflective of the evangelist's theology, were interjected into Matthew's text. See also Graham Stanton, "Matthew's Use of the OT," 346-53, for a helpful review and evaluation of research on Mt's use of OT textual traditions.

¹⁴O. Lamar Cope, in *Matthew: A Scribe Trained for the Kingdom of Heaven*, 125, concludes, "The requirements of writing a gospel have meant for Matthew the task of drawing together into a unit the disparate elements available to him as Jesus tradition. The string which he provides for these beads, is, in some significant cases, the OT citation or allusion and its subsequent connections with the gospel pericopes. It is apparent that this creative joining of the two traditions, the OT and the stories about Jesus, has been made by Matthew, whether or not he used Mark. The roots of Matthew's thought and technique may lie in first-century Judaism, but his creative skills are most evident in his inventive organization of the gospel."

THE FORM OF MATTHEW'S SOURCES

With reference to the *form* in which the First Evangelist found his biblical materials, there are two major issues. Generally speaking, some of his sources were written, others were oral, and on occasion, he may have had access to variants of the same tradition.¹⁵ In the case of a “conflated text,” like the mixed citation of Isa 62.11/Zech 9.9 in Mt 21.5, one cannot assume that Matthew found these already combined in a source; it is possible that he contributed a sizeable portion of scriptural material to his narrative, having put them together for his own purposes. If some scriptural allusions derive from memory, while others are carefully constructed from texts, the reader cannot assume how much of the “original” context of a citation or allusion is intended to be recalled. Hence the present study in the gospel attempts to remain open to a variety of explanations for Matthew’s use of biblical traditions.

More specifically, it is helpful to note the form of biblical texts of Zechariah and the use of Zechariah traditions around the turn of the common era. There is not a large body of material related specifically to Zechariah, but a few things may be said. R. E. Fuller’s doctoral work on the Minor Prophets manuscripts at Qumran¹⁶ concludes that the Hebrew text of 4QXII^e (4Q80) “is closely related to the Old Greek....” Of most interest to this thesis is the fragment corresponding to Zech 12.7-12, which confirms that a dalet/resh

¹⁵See James D. G. Dunn, “Matthew’s Awareness of Markan Redaction,” in *The Four Gospels 1992* (Vol. 2; ed. F. Van Segbroeck et al.; Leuven: Leuven University Press/Uitgeverij Peeters, 1992), 1349-59; this article caused me to think about whether Matthew may have known some (Markan) traditions which differed from the Markan gospel to which he had access. With regard to Matthew’s *changes* to Mark, perhaps some of them reflect an alternate (in Matthew’s view, a more original?) gospel tradition.

¹⁶R. E. Fuller, “The Minor Prophets manuscript from Qumrân, Cave 4” (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1988). Fragments of Zech in 4QXII^a (4Q76): 14.18?; in 4QXII^e (4Q80): 1.4-6, 9-10, 13-14; 2.10-14; 3.3-4.4; 5.8-6.5; 8.3-4, 6-7; 12.7-12; and in 4QXII^g (4Q82): 10.12-11.2.

confusion explains the origin of the Greek reading in Zech 12.10 (דקרו MT; “רקרו” LXX).¹⁷ It is also interesting to note that 4QXII^c (4Q80) contains textual fragments of passages corresponding to parts of both Zech 1-8 and 9-14. There is one fragment of Zech 1.1-4 in the text from Murabba^cat;¹⁸ it figures in the discussion of “Zechariah, the son of Berechiah, son of Iddo” with relation to Matthew’s identification of the Zechariah figure named in Mt 23.35. A third early Zechariah text comes from the Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr);¹⁹ it is of interest as another fragmentary source for Zech 1.1-4.²⁰ There are some short citations or allusions to Zechariah in other Qumran texts, but few overlap with Matthew’s use of Zechariah; the exception is the presence of a reference to Zech 13.7 in CD-B.²¹

In the study below, excerpts of Hebrew and Greek biblical texts are presented when they are deemed to illustrate Matthew’s use of Zechariah.²² Targum citations shall be cited for purposes of comparison, though no assumption is made that a particular text predates or

¹⁷*Ibid.*, 139. Zech 12.10 does figure in the study of Mt 24.30 in this thesis.

¹⁸P. Benoit, J. T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, *Les Grottes de Murabba^cat* (DJD II; Oxford: Clarendon, 1961), 205.

¹⁹Emanuel Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr)* (DJD VIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1990). Fragments of Zech: 1-4, 12-14; 2.2-4, 7-9, 11-12, 16-17*; 3.1-2, 4-7; 8.19-21,23; 9.1-5. Again note that the text contains fragments of Zech 1-8 and part of Zech 9. For Zech 1.14, see 66-67, (Column 28), and Plate XVI. This figures in the study of Mt 23.35 also.

²⁰For data on all three of these texts from the Judean Desert, see Russell Fuller, “The Form and Formulation of the Book of the Twelve: The Evidence from the Judean Desert,” in *Forming Prophetic Literature: Essays on Isaiah and the Twelve in Honor of John D. W. Watts* (JSOTSup 235; ed. James W. Watts and Paul R. House; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 86-101.

²¹See thesis section on Jesus as the Stricken Shepherd for a comparison of the gospel use with CD. For Zech material in the DSS and *T12P*, see R. T. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament* (Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity, 1971), 175-78, 183.

²²Textual variants will be cited where they are deemed to have an impact on the outcome of the exegetical study; a more general text-critical study on these MT and/or LXX traditions is outside the scope of this thesis.

derives from the first century. Bruce Chilton's caution about the use of the targums in New Testament scholarship should be heeded:

The history of interpretation is littered with instances of both citing Targumim, as if they were uniformly pre-Christian, and of ignoring them, as if they were utterly unreflective of that Judaism which is the milieu of the New Testament in its earliest phase.²³

METHODOLOGY

My approach to Matthew's use of Zechariah is grounded in classical methods of biblical criticism and is also open to more recent literary methods. Some attention has been given here to the areas of textual criticism, particularly when I compare some Hebrew and Greek textual traditions as they relate to Matthew's appropriation of Zechariah. In comparing the exegesis of Zechariah and other prophetic traditions from the interpretive communities of early Judaism, I also rely on some history-of-traditions analysis.

Beyond direct quotations of a text, recent research methods of study on "the use of the Old Testament in the New" have sought to clarify the concepts of allusions to, and echoes of, scripture as well as the means to distinguish themes. Because of the intertextual nature of this study, I have adapted some methodology from *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, by Richard Hays.²⁴ His concept of *allusive echo* is helpful:

Allusive echo functions to suggest to the reader that text B should be understood in light of a broad interplay with text A, encompassing aspects of A beyond those explicitly echoed. This sort of metaleptic figuration is the antithesis of the metaphysical conceit, in which the poet's imagination seizes a metaphor and explicitly wrings out of it all manner of unforeseeable significations. Metalepsis, by contrast, places the

²³Bruce Chilton, "Reference to the Targumim in the Exegesis of the New Testament," SBLSP 1995, 77. He writes, 80, "A Targum of a date later than the New Testament might, on occasion, represent a tradition which was current in the period of the New Testament, albeit not in a Targumic context." The best use of the Targums for the student of the NT "lies in their provision, not of antecedents, but analogies."

²⁴Richard Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989).

reader within a field of whispered or unstated correspondences.²⁵

The concept of allusion depends both on the notion of authorial intention and on the assumption that the reader will share with the author the requisite 'portable library' to recognize the source of the allusion; the notion of echo...finesses such questions; [for it] does not depend on conscious intention.²⁶

When I began to examine possible Zechariah influence in Matthew, I considered Hays' "seven tests" for hearing echoes. Would this method work for a non-epistolary genre like the Gospel? As a test case, I chose two texts from my list, one in which Matthew incorporates a citation from Zechariah (Mt 21.5/Zech 9.9), and one that, at the time, seemed fairly obscure--this second example became the basis for the thesis section on Jesus' Galilean ministry (chapter 2 below)! In both instances, and in subsequent textual analysis, the nature of my material did not allow a "wholesale" use of the "seven" tests proposed by Hays. However, when the "tests" have been abbreviated and adapted, they form one basis from which to approach Matthew's use of Zechariah. These modified "seven tests" are listed below in italics; each is then followed by comments or questions as they have emerged in relation to the present study.²⁷

(1) Availability. *Was the proposed source of the echo available to the author and/or readers?* For Matthew and his community, the availability of the scriptures is assumed. The issue becomes more complex when one asks whether Matthew had access to Hebrew and Greek traditions, oral or written.

(2) Volume. *To what degree is the explicit repetition of words or syntactical patterns present? How distinctive or prominent is the precursor text within scripture? How much rhetorical stress*

²⁵*Ibid.*, 20. Hays' book is the springboard for my method, but I do not adhere to it slavishly or uncritically. His tests for hearing echoes provide a way to bring a measure of control into a situation which could otherwise go off on a tangent of "parallelomania," (as Sandmel once cautioned). In this thesis, I do not follow Hays beyond what is outlined in this methodology section.

²⁶*Ibid.*, 29. Although Hays sees his terminology as flexible, he generally uses *allusion* to refer to "obvious intertextual references" and *echo* to "subtler ones." See below, where I bring terminology from another source into the discussion.

²⁷*Ibid.*, 29-32. I have abbreviated and adapted Hays' "seven tests" to reflect their use in Matthean study. Where appropriate, I indicate how a test may relate to Matthew's use of Zechariah.

does the echo receive in the discourse? There are two problems here: first, the task is to determine the extent to which Matthew uses Zechariah; therefore, one cannot assume the prominence of the precursor text; second, 'rhetorical stress' is problematic for a narrative, rather than epistolary, context.

(3) Recurrence. *How often does the author elsewhere cite or allude to the same scriptural passage, or to specific words or large portions of a given text? Proposed echoes from a known source or context receive added credence.* Again, looking at one gospel, in contrast with several epistles, requires some modification of this test. For example, in only a few places Matthew cites or alludes to specific verses of Zechariah more than once (although there are at least two places where this does apply: Zech 11.11-13; 14.4-5). In addition, for this test, the "same scriptural passage," or "larger portions of a given text," puts all of Zechariah into view. Since two of Matthew's explicit quotations are from Zech 9.9 and 13.7, and are recognizable as such, this should enhance the possibility of finding Zechariah allusions elsewhere. Another modification of this test might involve the way(s) the evangelist uses repetition of a word or theme; the impact is then perceived in an inner-gospel resonance set up by the repetition of the Zechariah motif.²⁸

(4) Thematic Coherence. *How well does the alleged echo fit into the line of argument? Is its meaning consonant with the author's use of other quotations from the text? Do the image and ideas in the precursor text illuminate the present text?* This might be a way to approach Matthew's use of Isa 62.11 to introduce Zech 9.9 in Mt 21.5, for example. Is there something Matthew *does not* want to say from the opening words of Zech 9.9, or is there something he wants to emphasize from Isaiah, which is related to the omitted expression from Zechariah? The second part of this test is more difficult to apply to Matthew; his understanding of the "fulfillment of scripture" is not bounded by a preconceived monochrome approach.

(5) Historical Plausibility. *Could the author have intended the alleged meaning effect? Could the readers have understood it? (We should also bear in mind that the author might have written things not readily intelligible to the actual readers.) This test...necessarily requires hypothetical constructs of what might have been intended and grasped by particular first century figures.* Hays demands that this criterion be met, that one must limit the interpretive scope to what would have been proper for a first century (Jewish) believer. Insofar as this is possible, this cautionary test is appropriate.

(6) History of Interpretation. *Have critical, or pre-critical, readers heard the same echoes? Yet, this kind of intertextual analysis is a "process of reclamation." This test is rarely to be used as a negative test when other tests yield positive answers.*

(7) Satisfaction. *Does the proposed reading make sense? Does it illuminate the surrounding textual material? Does it produce for the reader a satisfying account of the effect of the inter-*

²⁸Here I am thinking of the kinds of "interior allusion" that Francis Martin notes in "The Image of Shepherd in the Gospel of Sant [sic] Matthew," *ScEs* 27 (1975), 269-70; under "key words," Martin suggests "laos" and "[h]aima." In the thesis, I investigate the possibility of increasing resonance from Matthew's use of *παῦς* in Mt 5.5; 11.29; 21.5 (Zech 9.9); a second sort of "key word" resonance is set up with reference to the prophet Zechariah himself and his words (e.g., Mt 23.35); a third possibility here is the resonance set up in the Infancy Narrative with the meaning of Jesus' name (save from sins), and the words of institution (his blood saves from sins).

textual relation? This may be particularly helpful when a proposed echo helps resolve something in the text. For example, when seeking the degree to which Zechariah exerts influence, in combination with Jeremiah (cf. Mt 23.29-39; Mt 27.3-10), does one text shed light on the other, and on Matthew?

The application of Hays' "seven tests" can be a helpful way to begin the study of a particular passage in Matthew, although the outcome of such testing may yield only preliminary results that require further analysis before a conclusion can be reached. In two ways, at least, a positive diagnosis of Zechariah influence requires fine-tuning: (1) a comparison with traditions containing similar imagery may help to determine whether the Matthean expression is most like something from Zechariah, or whether it may be from a combination of sources, or from a broader "stock" expression (see on Schaefer below); and (2) the impact of some part of the Zechariah tradition upon the sub-structure of part of Matthew's gospel may not be determined merely by applying "tests" for *echoes* and *allusions*.

One helpful addition or correction to Hays' method is the distinction Konrad Schaefer brings to the study of inner-biblical exegesis. In this instance, Schaefer analyzes Zechariah 14 for its use of earlier prophetic traditions. His terminology may help to refine questions which arise with respect to Matthew's use of earlier prophetic traditions: Schaefer proposes that parallels with previous literature fall into two categories, *quotation* and *allusion*, of the latter there are two types, the *conscious* (direct/intentional) and the *echo*.

Allusions are limited to a word, a brief phrase, or an image that constitutes an indirect reference, but which can sometimes be traced to a source. An allusion may be intentional or it may be an echo. [The essence of the first] is the author's intention to recall previous oracles with their context; once the reader recognizes the reference, the horizons for comprehension are expanded...A single word or phrase can be an echo, often unintentional, which results from the use of stock language in common circulation. The author...may be unaware of the background source...²⁹

²⁹Konrad R. Schaefer, "Zechariah 14: A Study in Allusion," *CBQ* 57 (1995) 68-69.

Schaefer also looks for three types of parallels: (1) structural -- language and themes occur in a similar order; (2) thematic-- in which an entire section is based on a literary precedent or theological theme; and (3) verbal -- whenever at least two words of more than minor significance are parallel between a passage and its source, the significance of which increases with the word count.³⁰ There may be places in Matthew where these categories are more helpful than Hays' seven tests. While it cannot be denied that the author/editor of the First Gospel would have been aware of much of the Zechariah tradition, one needs to allow for the possibility, if not the likelihood, that he may not always have made conscious use of the tradition (see Schaefer above, on the unconscious use of "stock language").

This thesis is therefore not a "quest of the historical Matthew," nor in most instances does it seek to discern Matthew's "intentionality." Of primary interest is the task of discerning where Zechariah is at work in the text of Matthew's gospel. Which traditions from Zechariah are present and perceived in his sources (Mk, Q)? What do the added (or enhanced) Zechariah traditions contribute to the understanding of Matthew's text? Where does the First Gospel contain Zechariah themes or motifs that occur nowhere else? In this thesis, the Gospel of Matthew is read as the work of one author/editor, who used all the resources and methods available to him to demonstrate how Jesus was the Messiah foretold in the scriptures. In order best to determine where and how Zechariah traditions exert influence, it is important to take the entire Gospel of Matthew into account. Scholars have already established that the Gospel Passion Narratives derive much of their imagery from Zech 9-14,³¹ but is there more to be discovered by focusing on Matthew's Passion Narrative

³⁰*Ibid.*, 70-72.

³¹See references in note #5 above.

with *all* of Zechariah in view? Scholars have likewise recognized that Matthew's Passion Narrative recapitulates some themes from his Infancy Narrative (Matthew 1-2).³² If there are Zechariah traditions operating at any level in Matthew's Infancy Narrative, do they not also enhance the thematic resonances of the beginning of the gospel that occur when Jesus enters Jerusalem in chapter 21? The possibility of Zechariah material in the Galilean section of the gospel (Matthew 3-20) suggests that the importance of this prophetic tradition may be more thorough-going than scholars have previously observed.

The structure of this thesis will follow the order of Matthew's text, insofar as it is possible, in order to allow the highest degree of respect for the integrity of the structure of Matthew's narrative. Broadly speaking, then, the study will begin with the Infancy Narrative, with the questions noted above as the focal point. An investigation of the middle chapters of the gospel follows, with particular concentration on Jesus' healing ministry: is there potential Zechariah influence which would permit the Galilean ministry section to be a link, rather than a bridge, between Matthew's Infancy and Passion Narratives? Finally, Jesus' ministry in Jerusalem and the Passion Narrative will be examined in depth to mine for explicit and implicit Zechariah traditions.

Therefore, this thesis will organize its study around the three broad divisions of the Gospel: the Infancy Narrative, Jesus' ministry in Galilee, and the Passion Narrative. Its goal will be achieved if it opens up the understanding of how Zechariah traditions influenced Matthew's understanding and portrayal of Jesus as Messiah.

³²With reference to Mt 1.18-25, see Davies & Allison III, 111; for Mt 2.1-4, see Hagner I, 27-28.

CHAPTER ONE

Jesus, the Newborn King

Davidic Branch, Savior, Emmanuel, Nazarene

[Matthew 1.18-25; 2.1-6, 23/Zechariah 6.12; 8.7, 11-13, 20-23; 9.16]

Βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ υἱοῦ Δαυὶδ υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ (Mt1.1). In order to assess the possible significance of Zechariah traditions for Matthew 1-2 (the Infancy Narrative), it is necessary to consider the setting within which the story of Jesus is introduced. From the beginning, Matthew tells his reader that Jesus-Messiah is the Son of David. David is twice set apart from other biblical characters in the genealogy section (1.2-17): (1) David is the only person called *the king* (Mt 1.6) and (2) David's importance as a pivotal figure in Israel's history is stressed by Matthew's division of the genealogy into three groups of fourteen generations--Abraham to David, David to the captivity, and the captivity to the Messiah (1.17).¹ The Messiah-David-Abraham *inclusio* formed between Mt 1.1 and 17 secures this judgment. Nevertheless, the primacy of the Davidic framework of Matthew 1-2 can be missed if one chooses to read the story in the first chapter with a Moses-typology in mind.² Similarly, readers of the

¹Robert H. Gundry, *Matthew*, 19, agrees that the fourteen divisions may derive from the sum of the value of the Hebrew letters in David's name. Here is an early indicator that Matthew may have known Hebrew himself: "Readers limited to Greek may not have caught the point, but Matthew himself probably intended it and might well have expected Jewish addressees to understand. Otherwise the correspondence between the repetitious genealogical fourteen and David's name seems too unlikely."

²For the tendency to use a Moses template, see Davies & Allison I, *passim*. They say, 192, "The key to understanding Mt 1.18-2.23 is to be found in the haggadic traditions about Moses." I disagree with their tenet that Moses is the "key" to the Matthean infancy narrative; however, they do acknowledge, 194, that three particular elements remain after subtracting "redactional contributions, the certainly historical elements, and the items with parallels in the legends about Moses...--virginal conception by the Holy Spirit, birth in Bethlehem, and magi following a star. Significantly enough, each of these can be linked with a Davidic Christology." I am persuaded that the Davidic imagery is much more significant than Mosaic parallels in Matthew's portrayal of Jesus. See also John Mark Jones, "Subverting the Textuality of Davidic Messianism: Matthew's Presentation of the Genealogy and the Davidic Title," *CBQ* 56 (1994) 256-72, who affirms that "the genealogy gives primary attention to the relation between Jesus and David. [...This] relation is typological. David is the messianic type, Jesus the antitype. Matthew may underscore this typological motif more consistently than any typological motif in his gospel." Jones, 267, credits Matthew with some Mosaic typology, but writes, "it is not as well developed, either implicitly or explicitly, as the Davidic typology." Nolan, *Royal Son*, 60-61, looks at the possible significance of the number 14 here, in light of Qumran, as well as apocryphal and apocalyptic connotations.

chapter might overlook the centrality of Davidic motifs if they concentrate primarily on its geographical contours.³

Some messianic expectations that Matthew envisions as having been fulfilled in the birth and infancy of Jesus may be found in relation to echoes of Zechariah; several of these royal Davidic motifs will re-emerge in Matthew's Passion Narrative (Mt 21). In three places, the reader of Matthew's Infancy Narrative is informed that the Messiah,⁴ the Son of David, will be given a designation: he is to be *called* Ἰησοῦς (1.21), Ἐμμανουήλ (1.23), and Ναζωραῖος (2.23). On the first occasion, an angel of the Lord instructs Joseph to name the child Jesus; in the second and third instances, the appellations are proclaimed as divine fulfillments of prophecy.⁵ It is possible that Zechariah encompasses these three prophetic concepts in a way that may inform Matthew's christological theology at a very deep level.⁶

Matthew 1.18-25

Matthew's story of the birth of Jesus-Messiah is certainly cast in Davidic terms. Mary's husband Joseph has already been listed in the line of David in the messianic genealogy (1.16). Indeed, the angel of the Lord, who appears to Joseph in a dream,

³Krister Stendahl's influential article, "*Quis et Unde-- Who and Whence? Matthew's Christmas Gospel*," *Meanings: The Bible as Document and as Guide* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 71-84, can be read in a way that merely accepts the geographical proofs of Jesus' messiahship without retaining the Davidic emphasis in the references. For example, Stendahl himself, 80 (n. 16, 17), says that the Ναζωραῖος/Ναζαρηνός issue is "purely geographical" and that Nazareth is only important to justify Jesus' "Galilean point of departure." As I will argue, Stendahl is onto something in Matthew 1 (see Mt 1.18-25 as legend of divine name-giving, 75ff), but I think that *all three calling texts* (1.21, 23; 2.23) belong together in a much more integral way than Stendahl recognizes.

⁴I use *Messiah* rather than *Christ* in this thesis, assuming that χριστός refers to Jesus as the Messiah and is not a reference to his name (1.1, 16, 18).

⁵The present section will focus on the first two *names*, Jesus and Emmanuel. See the discussion of Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται, "He shall be called a Nazarene" (Mt 2.23), below.

⁶This argument will be especially valid if the three Matthean concepts of Jesus, Emmanuel, and Nazarene are found together only, or most clearly, in Zechariah.

addresses Joseph as *son of David*.⁷ The angel not only tells Joseph what the son is to be called but also explains to him the significance of the name Jesus. The angel tells Joseph to name the son *Jesus*, “for he will save his people from their sins” (Mt 1.21):⁸

Ἰωσήφ υἱὸς Δαυίδ, μὴ φοβηθῆς παραλαβεῖν Μαρίαν τὴν γυναῖκά σου· τὸ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθὲν ἐκ πνεύματος ἔστιν ἁγίου.⁹ τέξεται δὲ υἱόν, καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν· αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν.
-- Mt 1.20b-21

Matthew is not the first writer to associate the meaning of the name *Jesus*/Joshua¹⁰ with the person's character. Ben Sira evoked the etymology of the name when he wrote that Joshua, the son of Nun, became κατὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ μέγας ἐπὶ σωτηρία ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ. As Moses' successor, Joshua won great victories for the people of God and entered the promised land. Philo (*Mut* 121-22) employs similar etymology in reference to the same biblical Joshua, Ἰησοῦς δὲ σωτηρία κυρίου, ἕξως ὄνομα τῆς ἀρίστης.¹¹

⁷This is the only place in the Gospel where someone other than Jesus is called a *son of David*. Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 120, rightly says, “Matthew is concerned with explaining the engraving of the son of the virgin into the descendency of David.”

⁸Matthew is being careful to establish the fact that Jesus is legitimately a son of David. See Raymond E. Brown, *Birth of the Messiah* (New York: Doubleday, 1977), 138-39, for a succinct discussion of the issue of *legal* paternity. The fact that Joseph names Jesus, although he is not his biological father, is his legal acknowledgment of the child as his son. While Jesus becomes *Son of God* through Mary, he becomes *Son of David* through Joseph. In genealogical terms, the divine begetting takes place through the agency of the Holy Spirit, while the legal begetting involves Joseph naming the child, all of this according to God's will.

⁹The Holy Spirit was expected to be powerful in the life of the Messiah (e.g., Is 11.1-2; *Pss.Sol.* 17.37). See Davies & Allison I, 200-202, for more on the role of the Spirit in messianic expectations.

¹⁰The name Jesus itself might recall either of two prominent Joshuas from the Bible. There has been a modest amount of scholarship suggesting that the OT hero, Joshua, son of Nun, may have been a type of messiah. In the messianic speculations of Qumran and elsewhere, Joshua the high priest and Zerubbabel, the “two sons of oil” (Zech 4.14), were likely seen as types of the messiah(s) of Aaron and Israel. See the excellent discussion of this and other Zechariah passages as the most likely biblical sources for the concept of a diarchical or twin messianism, in S. Talmon, “The Concepts of MĀŠĪAH and Messianism in Early Judaism,” in *The Messiah* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 79-115, especially 104ff.

¹¹Sir 46.1. Sirach's name was also Jesus, or Joshua Ben Sira; see Sir Prologue, line 6 and 50.27. See also Lester L. Grabbe, *Etymology in Early Jewish Interpretation. The Hebrew Names in Philo* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 168, who cites Philo's derivation of Joshua in *Mut.* 121 as σωτηρία κυρίου “safety of the Lord.” He says, “In Philo this is correctly analyzed as Yah plus yesa”

Matthew, however, is telling his readers that Jesus is *savior* in a completely different way: he himself will save his people *from their sins*.¹² The name Jesus, Ἰησοῦς, is the Greek form of the name Joshua -- Yehoshua (יהושע), meaning “Yahweh saves,” or the shortened form, Yeshua (ישוע), which means “he will save.”¹³ As it is characterized in verse 21, with the emphatic αὐτός, clearly Matthew takes Jesus’ name to have been Yeshua, for it is he (*himself*) who will save his people. This etymology is assumed by the γάρ in the angel’s instructions to Joseph.¹⁴ The messenger’s announcement confirms that Jesus’ name prefigures his saving function. In Matthew, what is truly revelatory in the giving of the name *Jesus* to this Son of David is that his *messianic salvation of his people is from sin*.¹⁵

According to Matthew, the reality embodied in the events of Jesus’ birth and divine name-giving illustrates the beginning of God’s fulfillment of his messianic promises through the prophets. The angelic annunciation-appearance to Joseph is

‘salvation, safety.’ Most of the sources see ‘salvation’ in the name though not infrequently omitting ‘Lord’....” Davies & Allison I, 209, note that “Philo... proves that the etymology of ‘Joshua’ was recognized outside Palestine. Beyond this, even Hellenistic Christianity would certainly have preserved the significance of Jesus’ name....” W.C. Allen, *Matthew*, 9, also covers the etymological question in Mt 1.21 and relates it to Philo.

¹²Salvation of the people of God from their political enemies, as Sirach portrayed Joshua, was a more universal part of messianic expectation. Davies & Allison I, 210, note texts which link victory over sin/iniquity to a figure other than God (*T. Lev.* 18.9, *Tg. Isa.* 53.4,6-7 are two references to a messianic figure).

¹³From the verb שׁוּעַ, meaning save, help.

¹⁴Matthew expects his readers know the derivation of Jesus’ name, or will infer it from the angel’s words.

¹⁵Davies & Allison I, 210, note that Mt 1.21 brings Jesus’ passion into the picture already in the Infancy Narrative, “for it is at the crucifixion that Jesus pours out his lifeblood εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν (26.28). Thus the entire gospel is to be read in the light of its end.” Benno Przybylski, *Righteousness in Matthew and his world of thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 106, adds, “Compared to Mk 14:24, Mt 26:28... makes it absolutely clear that the blood of the covenant which is poured out for many is indeed poured out ‘for the forgiveness of sins.’”

authenticated by the Gospel's first scripture quotation.¹⁶ The Isaianic biblical setting of Isa 7.13-14 suits the First Evangelist's purposes.¹⁷ The citation itself, ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἔξει καὶ τέξεται υἱόν...(Isa 7.14a), is located in the context of a divine word directed to the *house of David*.¹⁸

At the beginning of Isaiah 7, King Ahaz was facing an attack upon Jerusalem by the combined forces of the king of Syria and the king of Israel. When the *house of David* heard the news of the imminent attack, Ahaz was shaken (Isa 7.2). Isaiah went out to meet the king with the message not to fear, that God would give Judah the victory (Isa 7.3_{ff}). In spite of Ahaz' refusal to *ask a sign* from God, Isaiah spoke to the *house of David* concerning the "radical change for the better in Judah's political situation" which would occur in the infancy period of the yet unborn child of the pregnant young woman. This was to be a sign from the Lord himself, that the child should be named *Immanuel* (Isa 7.13-17).¹⁹

¹⁶This thesis is not dependent upon any particular theory about Matthew's so-called *formula quotations* or *fulfillment citations*, as distinct from the first Gospel's other uses of direct quotations, allusions to, or echoes of, scripture.

¹⁷Matthew 1.18 has already claimed that the child conceived is of the Holy Spirit, and 1.24-25 states that Joseph did not have sexual relations with Mary until Jesus was born. Davies & Allison I, 200, agree that εὐρέθη ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου "anticipates the quotation of Isa 7.14 in 1.23 (ἐν γαστρὶ ἔξει)." Matthew has already reported that Mary was expecting a child; therefore, he waits until after the angel introduces the child's name to mention the circumstances, incorporating these in the fulfillment citation.

¹⁸Stendahl, "*Quis et Unde*," 77, states that, "while Isa. 7:14 was not--as far as we know--used as a messianic prophecy in Judaism, it stands within the Davidic line." Shemaryahu Talmon gives a more satisfying explanation of the *Immanuel* material than merely its placement in a Davidic context. He does not mention Isa 7.14 in connection with Mt 1.18-25, however; see discussion below.

¹⁹S. Talmon, "Concepts," 95, argues that the implied promise of the prophetic message epitomized in the name *Immanuel* "is underpinned in an ensuing pericope which speaks of a son born to the prophet....[whose] name, 'Speedy-Spoiling-Prompt-Plundering'...(Isa 8.3-4)...epitomizes the utter destruction of...the foes of Judah. It thus complements the propitious message encapsulated in the name '*Immanuel*.'" Talmon, 94, continues to investigate the pericope "in the framework of the collection of predominantly pro-Davidic oracles in Isaiah 7-11," and characterizes Is 7.14 as "a first royal version of the above-mentioned annunciation type-scene" [e.g., Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Samson, and Samuel]. Also, 96, the situation in Isaiah is different in at least three other ways: (1) the expectant woman was not like the "barren" wives in other narratives, (2) none of those mentioned above were ever anointed, and (3) the prophet took the place of the announcing angel.

In the context of Isaiah 7-11, the *Immanuel* tradition begins with the announcement of the imminent royal heir's birth. As the concept of *Immanuel* develops, it joins a "string of titles" for the Davidic *son* born in Isa 9.6-7, and culminates in his identification with the *shoot from the stump of Jesse* (Isa 11.1). As Shemaryahu Talmon has rightly contended, the Isaianic announcement imagery, the *Geburtsmotif*, "is recurrently taken up in an ever expanding visionary scope..." from an imminent childbirth to the vision of a future *son*. Talmon argues that the "theophoric name Immanuel must be taken as a royal epithet which belongs to the category of the *Hoheitstitel* affiliated with the Davidic anointed."²⁰

It could be said that...the three Isaiah oracles reflect in their juxtaposition the posited three stages in the development of the biblical *māšīaḥ* theme: historicity (Isa 7:14-16); ideation (Isa 9:5-6); idealization (Isa 11:1-10). That progressive dehistoricization of the *māšīaḥ* notion appears in the oracles of the postexilic prophets Haggai and Zechariah concerning Zerubbabel,²¹ the last anointed of the Davidic line in the biblical era.²²

Matthew's fulfillment quotation begins, "*All this* took place in order that the *saying of the Lord* through the prophet might be fulfilled" (Mt 1.22). The words the angel speaks in Mt 1.21 and the citation in Mt 1.23 are nearly identical to the wording in

²⁰*Ibid.*, 96. Therefore, while Stendahl, *op. cit.*, 77, is technically correct that Isa 7.14 was not used as a "messianic prophecy in Judaism," I am persuaded that Talmon's work, 96, confirms the place of the *Immanuel* tradition's "incipient messianic soteriology."

²¹Zerubbabel is listed in the genealogy of the Davidic line (1 Chr 3), and in a sense, represents an example of an "almost-realized messianism" after the return from the Babylonian exile. However, he seems to have faded from the scene, and no post-exilic prophet mentions his descendants. See Talmon, "Concepts," 97-98, 108. As Talmon asserts, scholars are baffled by Zerubbabel's "sudden and unexplained disappearance from the historical scene." The biblical texts are "totally silent." [note that a Zerubbabel is listed in the Davidic genealogy in Mt 1.12-13.]

²²Talmon, "Concepts," 97. Talmon's article treats several Zech passages that bear upon the development of the concepts of messianism. Much of Daniel Schibler, "Messianism and Messianic Prophecy in Isaiah 1-12 and 28-33," in *The Lord's Anointed. Interpretation of Old Testament Messianic Texts* (ed. Philip E. Satterthwaite, Richard S. Hess, and Gordon J. Wenham; Carlisle: Paternoster, 1995), 87-104, follows Talmon's article cited above. Schibler, 99-100, writes, "The truth encapsulated in the name Immanuel is emphasized in Isaiah 8:8, 10 and has for that reason probably led to the belief that it is more than just a promise made to Ahaz; it is a... foreshadowing of additional things...to come...." On 101-2, he also notes the importance of Isa 9.1, 11.1 in Matthew: Isa 9.1/Mt 4.14-16; Isa 11.1/Mt 2.23.

Isaiah 7.14 LXX.²³

Mt 1.21

τέξεται δὲ υἱόν,
καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ
Ἰησοῦν....

Mt 1.23

ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἔξει
καὶ τέξεται υἱόν,
καὶ καλέσουσιν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ
Ἐμμανουήλ....

Is 7.14

ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἔξει
καὶ τέξεται υἱόν,
καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ
Ἐμμανουήλ.

There is no alteration after τέξεται...υἱόν, καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ,²⁴ except for the change of the name Emmanuel from Isa 7.14 to Jesus (Mt 1.21). This reflects no confusion over Jesus' real *name*; rather, Matthew is highlighting the significance of the title Emmanuel.²⁵ While Matthew assumes the reader will recognize the etymology of the name Jesus from the angel's announcement in 1.21b (...καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν· αὐτὸς γάρ σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν), he explicitly translates the meaning of Emmanuel --*God with us*-- in 1.23.²⁶ In this way the nature and source of messianic ministry come together.

Matthew's concept of Emmanuel is innovative--God is uniquely *with his people* in Jesus, who will save *his people* from their sins. Jesus is the *savior* who will come to be known by his people as Emmanuel. The Mt 1.18-25 pericope begins and ends with the identification of the Messiah as Jesus. The Emmanuel *Geburtsmotif*, embedded in the Matthean infancy annunciation, stresses that this Son of David has come to fulfill

²³From the perspective of Talmon's model (note 19 above), I think it is significant that Matthew has re-inserted the *angel of the Lord* into the annunciation-type scene in 1.20_{ff}, but as narrator, he has cited the fulfillment quotation of Isa 7.14 in the form of a *prophetic* annunciation-type scene.

²⁴Hagner I, 21, is right to attribute the minor change from καλέσεις to καλέσουσιν (1.23) to Matthew's desire to avoid a conflict between Jesus' given name (and its corresponding etymological meaning) and his appellation as Emmanuel (which signals Jesus' function as *God with us*).

²⁵*Immanuel*, which first occurs in Isa 7.14, also appears in Isa 8. 8, 10; Matthew must be aware of this.

²⁶Brown, *Birth*, 150-52. In a footnote, 153, Brown puts to rest any qualms about word order in Mt 1.23b, by pointing out the same inverted order of the Greek words ('with us God') in Isa 8.10; cf. Davies & Allison I, 217.

God's promises in a unique way: Jesus is the long-awaited Messiah.²⁷

Emmanuel, as a name or title, occurs only in Isa 7.14; 8.8, 10; and Mt 1.23. Other biblical traditions affirm that God was *with* his people in the past (e.g., Num 23.21; Deut 2.7). Jewish hopes also focused on God being *with* his people in the eschatological future (e.g., Isa 43.5; Ezek 34.30; 37.27; Zech 8.23; Jub 1.17; 11QTemple 29.7-10; Rev 21.3).²⁸ Granting that Matthew attributes the fulfillment του δε Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡ γένεσις (Mt 1.18) to Isa 7.14, one yet suspects that the Matthean angelic annunciation to Joseph is informed by something more than Isaiah alone, for the Isaiah setting sheds little light on the command to name the Davidic son Jesus.

In the quest for a comparable concept of Emmanuel as also one who *saves*, Zech 8.23 is very promising, both in its setting and for linguistic reasons. As chapter 8 opens, the word of the Lord comes to Zechariah: God will return to dwell in the midst of Jerusalem; life in the streets will once again be safe and peaceful (8.3-4, 11-12), and God promises to save his people:

τάδε λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀνασώζω τὸν λαόν μου ἀπὸ γῆς ἀνατολῶν καὶ ἀπὸ γῆς δυσμῶν.... --Zech 8.7

καὶ νῦν...λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ...δείξω εἰρήνην...καὶ κατακληρονομήσω τοῖς καταλοίποις τοῦ λαοῦ μου πάντα ταῦτα. καὶ ... οἶκος Ιουδα καὶ οἶκος Ἰσραηλ, οὕτως διασώσω ὑμᾶς καὶ ἔσεσθε ἐν εὐλογίᾳ. --Zech 8.11-13a

²⁷In spite of the acknowledged recapitulation of the Emmanuel motif of Mt 1.23 in 28.20, Luz, *op. cit.*, 121, goes too far in saying that the title Emmanuel is the "dominant motif of the whole prologue." Matthew's emphasis on the name *Jesus*, who is Son of David, is evident by the *inclusio* formed by 1.18 and 1.25. Stendahl, "*Quis et Unde*," 75, rightly perceives that the angelic revelation and Joseph's obedience are the nucleus of the pericope, "As a divine giving of the name, 1:18-25 has its genuine Matthean point of climax in its last words...."

²⁸Davies & Allison I, 218, mention these texts as examples of Jewish traditions but do not suggest a relationship between any of them and Isa 7-8 or Mt 1. Isaiah 43 is a promise to be with the redeemed in trouble; the Ezekiel texts mention God's presence when his peaceful covenant is made; 11QTemple is in the context of God accepting the people's sacrifices, Jubilees talks of the people returning to God, when God will dwell with them, and in Rev 21.3 the heavenly voice proclaims that God's dwelling is with his people. Zech 2.11 also refers to the nations coming to the Lord, when God will dwell in their midst. See below for the importance of Zech 8.23.

In both passages of the LXX, God refers to his people (τόν λαόν μου) and promises to save them.²⁹ Another passage in the sequence of *words of the Lord* to Zechariah in chapter 8 continues the vision of the future:

Thus says the Lord of hosts: Peoples shall yet come, even the inhabitants of many cities; the inhabitants of one city shall go to another, saying, 'Let us go at once to entreat the favor of the Lord, and to seek the Lord of hosts; I am going.' Many peoples and strong nations shall come to seek the Lord of hosts in Jerusalem, and to entreat the favor of the Lord. In those days, ten men from the nations of every tongue shall take hold of the robe of a Jew, saying, 'Let us go with you, for we have heard that *God is with you*' (Πορευσόμεθα μετὰ σοῦ, διότι ἀκηκόαμεν ὅτι ὁ θεὸς μεθ' ὑμῶν ἐστίν).³⁰ -- Zech 8.20-23 (RSV)

Although there may be no direct link between Zechariah 8 and Matthew 1.18-25, it is intriguing to observe that Zechariah 8 is the one place where the two things Matthew intertwines in the *Geburtsmotif* are found together. In Mt 1.21 the angel commands Joseph to name the son Jesus, for *he will save his people* [derived from "Yahweh will save"]; in Zech 8.7, 11-13a, God promises to *save his people*.³¹ Furthermore, after the double promise of salvation, Zech 8 foresees peoples and nations (λαοί πολλοί καὶ ἔθνη πολλά) wishing to go before the Lord in Jerusalem because they have heard that *God is with the 'Ioudaioi*. God has renewed his promises to save those who have *heard the words ...of the prophets* (Zech 8.9) and he will be *with them*.

On no occasion does Isaiah 1-11 use any of the forms of σώζω or שׁוּ; in fact, there are no listings for "save" in this sense listed in concordances of the MT or the LXX before Isaiah 25.9 (cf. 33.22; 35.4; 37.35; 43.3; 45.17; 59.1; 60.16). These latter texts do not include the concept of Emmanuel, nor do they explicitly mention that God

²⁹A variant text of Zech 8.7 uses σώζω instead of ἀνασώζω; while Zech 8.13 employs διασώζω; however, all three -σώζω words translate the Hebrew hiphil of שׁוּ (save, help, rescue) of the MT.

³⁰The last clause in the MT reads, כִּי שְׂמַעְנוּ אֱלֹהִים עִמָּכֶם. Is 7.14 and 8.8 have the identical form, כִּי עִמָּנוּ אֱלֹהִים; Is 8.10 reads, כִּי עִמָּנוּ אֱלֹהִים.

³¹As note 29 explains, the Greek translates the same Hebrew word from which Jesus/Joshua is derived. In this sense, Jesus means *savior*; additionally, the object of salvation is also *his people*. Note also that in Zech 8.7 LXX the ἐγώ is emphatic, as is αὐτός in Mt 1.21.

is saving *his people*. On the other hand, there are several Zechariah texts that use σώζω for σω; Zech 9.16 is especially notable (cf. Zech 2.7 (11); 9.9; 10.6; 12.7): Καὶ σώσει αὐτοὺς Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ, ὡς πρόβατα λαὸν αὐτοῦ...³²

The First Evangelist has transferred the salvific presence of God, at least in part, to Messiah Jesus, who will be called *Emmanuel* and who will *save his people* (from their sins).³³ On the surface level of the Matthean text, the connection between these two attributes is not immediately apparent; however, Zechariah may help to explain Matthew's juxtaposition of the *savior* and *Emmanuel* motifs. The recognition that these two key components of the messianic tradition are found together in Zechariah (but not in Isaiah), permits the hypothesis that Zechariah may contribute to a Davidic messianic macro-structure upon which Matthew could have drawn, even if unconsciously.³⁴

Matthew 2.1-2

Matthew 2.1 announces that “wise men from the East” (μάγοι ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν) appeared in Jerusalem inquiring about the one born king of the Jews. They had seen his “star at its *rising*” (τὸν ἀστέρα ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ) and had come to pay him homage (Mt 2.2). Reverberations of the Balaam story from Numbers 24 can almost certainly be detected in the Magi portion of the Matthean infancy narrative.³⁵ The issue is whether a convergence of traditions that included Zechariah may have added to the significance of

³²Zech 9.16 figures in the discussion of Mt 2.6 below; also see excursus on Jesus as Shepherd.

³³Rudolf Pesch, “‘He will be called a Nazorean’: Messianic Exegesis in Matthew 1-2,” in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel* (trans. Spencer Stadler; ed. Craig A. Evans and Richard Stegner; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 133, comes to a similar conclusion, but via Ps 130.8, and without reference to Zechariah. He says, “the messiah, the Immanuel, acts in place of God.”

³⁴The fact that Matthew quotes from and alludes to Zechariah in the Passion Narrative, often in thematic recapitulations from the Infancy Narrative, allows the reader to discern probable Zechariah influence here and elsewhere in the Gospel. See thesis chapters on the Passion Narrative, especially references to Zech 9.9 (ch 3), 9.11 (ch 7), 9.14 (ch 6); also see Zech 10.2 (ch 2).

³⁵Brown, *Birth*, 194-96. Also Nolan, *Royal Son*, 37, 44, 74; Hagner I, 25; Davies & Allison I, 230ff.

the allusion for Matthew. Zechariah 6.12 is the text in question:

הַנְּבִיאִים שֶׁצָּמַח שָׂמוֹ וּמִתְחַתּוֹ יִצְמַח וּבְנָה אֶת־הַיְיָכָל יְהוָה --Zech 6.12 MT

...Ἴδου ἀνὴρ, Ἐνατολή ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὑποκάτωθεν αὐτοῦ ἀνατελεῖ,
καὶ οἰκοδομήσει τὸν οἶκον κυρίου --Zech 6.12 LXX

Both versions of the biblical verse concern the *man*³⁶ who will build the house (temple) of the Lord, but in place of the Hebrew צָמַח (*Branch*),³⁷ Zechariah 6.12 LXX reads Ἐνατολή.³⁸

In some Hebrew exegetical traditions Zechariah 6.12 may have been read in association with other prophetic passages that pertain to the figure of the *Branch*. One characteristic of the messianic expectations of some early Jewish interpretive communities is that *Branch* imagery is intertwined with other Davidic motifs. For example, although the term צָמַח does not appear, Isaiah 11.1 incorporates other words which would have been read messianically, including “the *shoot* from the stump of Jesse, the *Branch* from his roots” -- here *Branch* is defined as the נֶצֶר.³⁹

³⁶My assertion is that Matthew may have read Zechariah 6.12 in light of the Balaam prophecies. The “*man* who will rise” from Zech 6.12 was read messianically, as were the *man* from Num 24.7 and the *star* and *sceptre* (or *man* who will arise in LXX) from Num 24.17.

³⁷צָמַח also occurs in Zech 3.8 and Jer 23.5, both of which are rendered Ἐνατολή in LXX. צָמַח also appears in Jer 33.15 but the text is not in the Septuagint (in Theod ἄνατολή does appear in Jer 33(40).15). In Zech 3.8 the angel of the LORD tells Joshua the high priest, “Behold, I will bring my servant the *Branch*.” For the significance of the shift from צָמַח to Ἐνατολή, and its pertinence for Matthew 2, see the discussion below on the Balaam material and the Magi.

³⁸Extant variants in Greek texts of Zech 6.12 occur, which reflect the sense of צָמַח as sprout or bud: ἀναφυή and σ and εβρ' βλαστημα [Aquila, Symacchus, Origen (Heb)]. In Hebrew this verse is a pun on the word *Branch*: “the shoot will shoot up from beneath.” See Joyce G. Baldwin, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi* (Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press, 1972) 134-37. Note that LXX preserves the word-play of the Hebrew text by using cognates: Ἐνατολή ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὑποκάτωθεν αὐτοῦ ἀνατελεῖ best reads, “His name is *Rising* and he will *rise* from beneath him/it.”

³⁹At least four works from Qumran -- 4Q161 [4QIsaiah Peshers], 4Q174 [4QFlorilegium], 4Q252 [4Q Genesis Peshers/4QPatriarchal Blessings], and 4Q285 [4QM⁸ ?; 4QWar Scroll⁸] -- refer to the Davidic *Branch* in eschatological terms. See Florentino García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English* (2nd ed; trans. Wilfred G. E. Watson; Leiden: Brill Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 123-24, 136-37, 185-86, 213-15. In 4Q161, Frags 8-10, col III, the Isa 11.1-5 material is interpreted as the [branch/shoot/sprout] “of David which will sprout....” 4Q174 interprets 2 Sam 7.10-14 to refer to the *Branch of David* “who will arise with the Interpreter of the law...in the last days....” 4Q252 interprets the elusive *sceptre/Shiloh* passage from Gen 49.10 by making reference to the “*Messiah* of justice, the *Branch of David*.” The fifth fragment of 4Q285 (see

Interpretations of Isaiah 11.1-10 and Jeremiah 23.5⁴⁰ may have accorded messianic significance to the servant-*Branch* in Zechariah 3.8 and the *Branch* who would build the temple (Zech 6.12).⁴¹ Certainly by the time the targumic traditions were written down, it seems to have made no significant difference whether these Isaiah, Jeremiah or Zechariah texts utilized the word נִצְרָה or צִמְחָה.⁴² The figure of the *Branch* was interpreted messianically, that is, as Davidic king-Messiah; Davidic Anointed One; servant-Messiah, in every one, as if the terms נִצְרָה and צִמְחָה were synonymous:

And a king shall come forth from the sons of Jesse, and the Messiah shall be exalted from the sons of his sons. --Tg. Isa. 11.1

Behold, the days are coming, says the Lord, when I shall raise up for David an Anointed One of righteousness, and he shall reign as king.... --Tg. Jer. 23.5

García Martínez, 124) cites Isa 11.1 and after a blank space reads “the *Branch of David*...” Also see the chapter, “A Shoot from the Stump of Jesse,” in John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (New York: Doubleday, 1995), especially 56-65. [Collins uses earlier designations for the scrolls 4Q161 and 4Q285 and different numbering of the fragments of 4Q161.] Reference or allusions to Davidic messianic figures can also be found in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, *Psalms of Solomon*, other Qumran texts and the *Damascus Document*, as well as the Targums and the New Testament. Pertinent examples will be cited below.

⁴⁰Jeremiah 23.5, set in the context of God’s promise to supply the flock with good shepherds, already links the *Branch* directly to the expectation of a righteous king. An early portion of the 4Q174 passage cited in Note #39 above concerns the houses of David and of the Lord, and the (re)building of the temple. The only place a biblical prophet refers to the *Branch* building the temple is Zech 6.12. Further along the interpretive trajectory, Tg. Isa. 53.5 states that the *Messiah* will build the *sanctuary*, which echoes Tg. Zech. 6.12, “...Behold, the man whose name is Anointed will be revealed, and he shall be raised up, and shall build the temple of the Lord.” See Passion Narrative thesis section on Jesus and the Temple Charge (Mt 26.60-61/Zech 6.12).

⁴¹See J. J. M. Roberts, “The Old Testament’s Contribution to Messianic Expectations,” in *The Messiah* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 39-51, in which Roberts traces the expectations of a “new David.” The oracle of the *Sprout* of David in Jeremiah was influenced by Is 11.1, 10. [Roberts uses the term *Sprout* where others use *Branch*.] A related cluster of Ezekiel texts also envisioned a future Davidic king. The same theme is picked up by the postexilic Haggai and Zechariah, whose servant-*Sprout* and the *Sprout* who would build the Temple, was derived from the older Jeremiah prophecies. See also the discussion below on the *Branch of David* and the Balaam oracles.

⁴²צִמְחָה also occurs in Is 4.2, and its targum identifies the *Branch* as *Messiah of the Lord*. The LXX, on the other hand, assigns different Greek terms for these two Hebrew words meaning branch. The continuum of messianic exegesis in early Judaism thus demonstrates an allowance for variation in one place and identification in the other. See also Nolan, *Royal Son*, 212-14, where he discusses the “constellation of terms for the Messiah...grouped around the Davidic Branch of Isaiah 11:1...” which “is associated with ...צִמְחָה...” in the passages listed above.

In the cities.....and in the environs of Jerusalem, in the cities of the house of Judah, the people shall yet eagerly pursue the words of the Messiah, says the Lord. In those days and at that time I will raise for David an anointed one of righteousness, and he shall perform true justice and righteousness in the land....There shall not cease for David a man sitting on the throne of the kingdom of the house of Israel. --Tg. Jer. 33. 13, 15, 17⁴³

Hear now, Joshua the high priest, you and your companions who sit before you, for they are men who are worthy that a sign be performed for them; for behold, I will bring my servant the anointed One, and he shall be revealed. --Tg. Zech. 3.8

... 'Thus speaks the Lord of hosts, saying, Behold the man whose name is Anointed will be revealed, and he shall be raised up, and shall build the temple of the Lord. He shall build the temple of the Lord and he shall assume majesty and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and there shall be a high priest beside his throne, and there shall be peaceful understanding between the two of them.' --Tg. Zech. 6.12-13

The *Branch* has been combined with imagery from other biblical texts among which no such direct linguistic relationship is discerned. For example, 4Q252 interprets the elusive *sceptre/Shiloh* text of Genesis 49.10 by referring to the "*Messiah of Righteousness, the Branch of David.*" Possibly because of the interpretive connection between Genesis 49 and Numbers 24, an affinity between the Davidic *Branch* and the figure foretold in the third and fourth Balaam oracles may also be discerned.⁴⁴ There is a wealth of evidence that the character envisioned in Numbers 24 also appeared in some Jewish messianic speculations.⁴⁵

⁴³This portion of the Jeremiah targum bears some resemblance to Zech 6.12-13 (cf. Zech 4.11-14). Tg. Jer. 33.18 refers to the priestly office, "And of the priests the Levites there shall not cease a man from before me offering up burnt offerings and sacrificing sacrifices...." Verses 20-22 connects the covenant between God and David, that there should always be a "son ruling on his throne," with the continuity of "Levitical priests who minister before me...."

⁴⁴If traces of the third and fourth Balaam oracles are found in the Magi episode in Mt 2.1, and if that imagery could have been already connected with the Davidic *Branch* before the gospels were written, the thesis that Zech 6.12 is echoed in Mt 2.2 is more plausible. One example where the *Branch* from Isa 11 is followed by echoes from Num 24.17 and Gen 49.10 is the blessing of the Prince of the Congregation, 1Q28b, col. 5; lines 25-26 follow Isa 11, and line 27 reintroduces the *sceptre* imagery of line 24. [Note: lines 23-25 also bear a strong resemblance to PsSol 17.35_B.] For more about the Num 24/ Gen 49 connection, see note #51 below.

⁴⁵Messianic interpretations of Num 24.17 occur in several texts of early Judaism, though not all interpret the messiah as a Davidic figure, nor do all see a single figure presaged by the star and scepter. See the Num 24.17 LXX, CD 7.18-26, IQM 11.6, 4Q 175, T. Levi 18.3, T. Jud. 24.1, possibly Josephus, War 6.5.4(312_r), and the targumim on Num 24.17. In CD, the star is the Interpreter of the Law and the scepter is the Prince of the Whole Congregation; in the War Rule, the star and scepter seems to refer to a single person, and in context he appears to be a Davidic king; 4Q 175 includes the Num text but makes no commentary; after the (anointed) priesthood of T. Levi 17 lapses, in T. Levi 18 a new priest is raised up, "and his star shall rise in heaven like a king;" T. Jud. 24 is a *mosaic* of

In place of the very difficult Num 24.7 MT, the Septuagint interprets the third Balaam oracle to refer to a *man* whose kingdom will be exalted.

ἐξελεύσεται ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτοῦ
καὶ κυριεύσει ἐθνῶν πολλῶν,
καὶ ὑψωθήσεται ἡ Γωγ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ,
καὶ αὐξηθήσεται ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ. --Num 24.7 LXX

A man will come forth from his seed and he will rule the gentiles;
and he will be exalted above the kingdom of Gog; and his kingdom will increase.

Num 24.17b is a well-known extract from the fourth oracle prophecy of the *star and sceptre*:

דָּרָךְ כּוֹכַב מִיַּעֲקֹב וְקֶדֶם שֶׁבֶט מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל --Num 24.17 MT

A star shall come forth out of Jacob, and a sceptre shall arise out of Israel.

In its canonical setting, this oracle was most likely read as a prophecy of the “future” Davidic monarchy from the perspective of “Moses.”⁴⁶ By the first century, however, the *sceptre* and *star* terminology had already been applied to the messianic age, and in more than one place it referred to the Davidic messiah.⁴⁷

The most notable difference between the Hebrew and the Septuagintal texts of Num 24.17 is the substitution of *man* (ἄνθρωπος) for *sceptre* (שֶׁבֶט).

ἀνατελεῖ ἄστρον ἐξ Ἰακωβ,
καὶ ἀναστήσεται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ Ἰσραηλ. --Num 24.17 LXX

A star will rise out of Jacob, and a man will arise out of Israel.

eschatological expectations which include Num 24.17 and other Davidic messianic texts. (See note #51 below.) *Tg Ps.-J.* reads, “When the strong king from those of the house of Jacob shall rule and the Messiah and the strong rod from Israel shall be anointed...” *Tg Nf.* reads, “A king is to arise from those of the house of Jacob, and a redeemer and ruler from those of the house of Israel...” In the 2nd century Rabbi Aquiba hailed Simon ben Kosibah as “son of the star,” Bar Kochba.

⁴⁶Roberts, “OT Contributions,” 41. Balaam’s prophecy of the *star* of Jacob and the *staff* of Israel (Num 24.17) and Jacob’s comment that the “scepter or staff would never depart from Judah (Gen 49:10)” probably came from the early monarchic period and refer to the Davidic dynasty. In addition to the linking of the Gen 49 and Num 24 motifs of the scepter, Roberts, 42, also notes the “close linguistic ties to the oracles of Balaam” which can be seen in the “last words of David” (2 Sam 23.1-7).

⁴⁷See note # 45 above.

There is evidence from various strands of early Jewish traditions that Num 24.7 and 17 were sometimes read together -- the occurrence of *man* in both verses of the Septuagint would appear not to be accidental.⁴⁸ *T. Jud.* 24 also begins with the *star-man* parallelism:

Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἀνατελεῖ ὑμῖν ἄστρον ἐξ Ἰακώβ ἐν εἰρήνῃ,
καὶ ἀναστήσεται ἄνθρωπος [ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματός μου]
ὡς ἥλιος δικαιοσύνης, συμπορευόμενος τοῖς ἀνθρώποις
ἐν πραότητι καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ.... --*T. Jud.* 24.1 ⁴⁹

And after this a star out of Jacob will rise in peace, for you,
and a man will arise [from my offspring]
as a sun of righteousness, walking with the people
in humility and righteousness...

The phrase in brackets resembles the first line of Num 24.7, ἐξελεύσεται ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτοῦ, which is part of the blessing Balaam pronounces over Jacob and Israel. The status of *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* as a Jewish document is uncertain. If, for the sake of argument, one agrees it was originally a (Jewish) Christian composition, it may still be thought to have drawn on Jewish traditions that can be projected back to a time from which it might have exerted some influence on the

⁴⁸As early as the translation of the Hebrew into Greek, the interpretation seems to be embedded in the LXX. Indeed, Num 24.7 “was paraphrased messianically in all ancient versions with the exception of the Vulgate,” (Martin McNamara, “Early Exegesis in the Palestinian Targum (Neofiti 1) Numbers Chapter 24,” *P.I.B.A.* No 16, 1993, 62-63.) See also Geza Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition: Haggadic Studies* (2nd rev. ed.; Leiden: Brill, 1973), 58-60, 159-61. The targums use the terms “anointed king” (*Tg. Onq.*), “king...and redeemer” (*Tg. Ps.-J.* and *Tg. Neof.* 1). As noted above, the targums also interpret the *star* and *sceptre* from Num 24.17 as “king” and “messiah” (*Tg. Onq.*); as “strong king” and “anointed strong rod” (*Tg. Ps.-J.*); or as “king” and “redeemer and ruler” (*Tg. Nf.* 1).

⁴⁹Greek text taken from R. H. Charles, *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1908), 101. In his text notes, Charles attributes the bracketed phrase to Greek and Slavonic (α, β, and S) mss, but not to A (the Armenian recension). Although Charles did not think the insertion of the phrase merits its rejection as a specifically Christian interpolation, this kind of textual issue is hotly contested in contemporary scholarship. For H. C. Kee’s general overview of *T. 12 Patr.*, including a discussion of Charles’ text labeling, see the section in OTP1, 775-81; see 801 for Kee’s translation of *T. Jud.* 24. Among more recent works, see Robert Kugler, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001); also, M. de Jonge, *Jewish Eschatology, Early Christian Christology, and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Collected Essays of Marinus de Jonge* (Leiden: Brill, 1991); and idem., *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Study of Their Text, Composition and Origin* (2nd ed.; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1975).

Gospels.⁵⁰ It would be difficult to deny that the text in view (*T. Jud.* 24.1) has drawn significantly on Jewish traditional imagery. These words in *T. Jud.* 24.1 are also reminiscent of the blessings Jacob bestows on his sons, especially the mention of “sceptre” in Judah’s blessing (*Gen* 49.10).⁵¹

Not only may *T. Jud.* 24 combine *Num* 24.7 and 17, but the text may splice together allusions from Isaiah and Zechariah. The terminology of humility and righteousness (ἐν πραότητι καὶ δικαιοσύνη, *T. Jud.* 24.1) may recall *Zech* 9.9, which portrays the Davidic king riding into Jerusalem δίκαιος καὶ...πραῦς.⁵² *T. Jud.* 24.2 may evoke the pouring of the Spirit on the ideal king of *Isa* 11.1-5; *T. Jud.* 24. 4-6 incorporates strands of *Branch*-language reflective of Isaiah, Jeremiah and Zechariah:

⁵⁰The combination of “star” and “man” in *T. Jud.* 24 is not an isolated occurrence; *Num* 24 LXX is an early witness, as are the targums and Qumran examples. My main point is to show that the star-man interpretation comes from a period early enough to have exerted some impact on Matthew’s gospel.

⁵¹The connection between *Num* 24 and *Gen* 49.8-12 is well attested. The interpretive principle of *gezerah shawah* may account for the synoptic messianic reading of the two texts which mention a *sceptre* from Judah-Jacob, in the Genesis targum. Indeed, Mary Douglas has advanced the hypothesis that Numbers itself is a “Commentary on Genesis,” which has the “special role in the Pentateuch ...to draw out the theme of prophecy fulfilled.” See *In The Wilderness: The Doctrine of Defilement in the Book of Numbers* (JSOT Sup 158; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 98-101, where Douglas proposes, “As Numbers works forward from its beginning at Sinai to its ending in the Plains of Moab, it unfurls in reverse order the scroll of God’s promises in Genesis. The beginning of Numbers starts with the end of Genesis and the ending of Numbers arrives by an inverted parallel at the beginning of Genesis....” She terms this a “synoptic reading of the book of Numbers.” Douglas devotes an entire chapter of her book to the Balaam story, in part highlighting its relationship to *Gen* 49, 222-224, and by extension, to Zechariah, 224-25. Balaam’s blessings either repeat God’s promises to Abraham and Jacob or echo Jacob’s blessings, making the change so as to combine the blessings on the two houses in the messianic prophecy to Judah (*Gen* 49.10; cf. *Num* 23.7). Douglas says this is not a “slip” on Balaam’s part but is “one of his rhetorical turns,” so that he never uses the word Israel in contrast with Judah. Zechariah, on the other hand, “prayed for a joint triumph to include both Judah and Joseph, but always distinguished them: whenever he said one name he followed with the name of the other....” Yet, while Zechariah kept “Judah and Joseph in balanced apposition” [see *Zech* 9.10, 10.6], the pair were for him “as complementary as bow and arrow” [*Zech* 9.13]. As Douglas says, 225, “Zechariah looked forward to the day when all the nations that came against Jerusalem ‘would even go up from year to year to worship the King, the Lord of hosts, and to keep the feast of tabernacles’ (*Zech* 14.16). All the nations! Numbers has enough to do to keep the door open for the twelve sons of Jacob.” I am indebted to this scholar’s observations, which enrich my understanding of the texts under consideration.

⁵²The importance of *Zech* 9.9 for Jesus’ entry into Jerusalem is covered in thesis section on Mt 21. The kingly figure in *Zech* 9.9 is humble (πραῦς), as well as righteous (δίκαιος), which distinguishes him from the righteous-Branch figure of Jeremiah.

Οὗτος ὁ βλαστὸς ⁵³ Θεοῦ ὑψίστου ...
 Τότε ἀναλάμψει σκῆπτρον βασιλείας μου
 καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ρίζης ὑμῶν γειήσεται ⁵⁴ πυθμὴν,
 Καὶ ἐξ αὐτῆς βλαστήσει ῥαβδος δικαιοσύνης τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ⁵⁵
 κρῖναι καὶ σῶσαι ⁵⁶ πάντας τοὺς ἐπικαλουμένους τὸν Κύριον.

T. Jud. 24, therefore, fits the *Branch, man* and *sceptre* into its “mosaic of eschatological expectations based on Num 24:17” ⁵⁷ and seems to fuse their characteristics together. ⁵⁸

In Philo there is further evidence that the Balaam oracles and Zech 6.12 may have been read together. In the first instance, Philo clearly draws upon Num 24.7 twice:

<u>Num 24.7LXX</u>	<u>Vita Mos 1.290</u>	<u>Praem 95</u>
ἐξελεύσεται ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτοῦ καὶ κυριεύσει ἐθνῶν πολλῶν	ἐξελεύσεται πότε ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ὑμῶν καὶ ἐπικρατήσῃ πολλῶν ἐθνῶν	ἐξελεύσεται γὰρ ἄνθρωπος... ...καὶ στραταρχῶν καὶ πολεμῶν ἐθνη μεγάλα καὶ πολυάνθρωπα χειρώσεται....
καὶ ὑψωθήσεται ἡ Γωγ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀυξηθήσεται ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ.	καὶ ἐπιβαίνουσα ἡ τοῦδε βασιλεία καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν πρὸς ὑψος ἀρθήσεται.	

⁵³*T. Jud.* 24 does not follow the LXX (Ἀνατολή) of Jer 23.5 or Zech 3.8; 6.12; it utilizes another term for *Branch*, Βλάστος, which is equivalent to one variant in Zech 6.12 (βλάστημα, σ', εβρ' = Symmachus, Origen's Heb). Gen 49.9 LXX also departs from the Hebrew, where Judah like a lion's whelp has “gone up from the prey” (ἐκ βλαστοῦ...ἀνέβης). *T. Jud.* 24.6 (σκῆπτρον) does not follow Gen 49.10 LXX (ἄρχων) in its choice of words for sceptre.

⁵⁴A has ἀναστήσεται (Charles, 102, Armenian text).

⁵⁵See Isa 11.10 LXX.

⁵⁶Zech 9.9 LXX also describes the king as σῶζων. See also note #52 above.

⁵⁷See Kee's note 24 a. in OTP 1, 801. Kee also draws the allusions to Isa 11.2 and to the *Branch* texts of Jer 23.5; 33.15 and Zech 3.8; 6.12, but does not note the inclusion of the Num 24.7 phraseology, or connections to Gen 49 or Zech 9.9. Lindars, *NT Apologetic*, 277, notes only the allusions to Ps. 45 and Zech. 9.9 in *T. Jud.* 24.1-3.

⁵⁸The targums of Isa 4.2, 11.1, and Jer 23.5 and 33.15, and of Zech 3.8 and 6.12 have been compared; see note #42 above. William Horbury, *Jewish Messianism and the Cult of Christ* (London: SCM, 1998), 93, refers to the similarities of language and interpretation in the targums of Isa 11.1 and Num 24.17, where “king...messiah” represent “shoot...branch” of Isaiah, and “star...sceptre” of Numbers; the verb “there shall grow up” renders “shall grow” in Isaiah, “but is much freer as a translation of ‘shall rise’ in Numbers.” Horbury continues, “It seems likely that in the targumic tradition these verses from Isaiah and Numbers have been mutually influential, the Pentateuchal versions accepting “shall grow” from Isaiah, and Isaiah receiving the formulaic interpretation “king...messiah” from the Pentateuch.” It might be interesting to ask whether any influence from Zech 6.12 MT “shall branch out” or “shall rise” of LXX could be present in the targumic tradition here. In his notes on the Isaiah Targum, Bruce Chilton, *The Isaiah Targum* (Vol. 11 of *The Aramaic Bible*; ed. Kevin Cathcart, Michael Maher and Martin McNamara; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1987), 29, also draws the comparison between the “*Branch*” and king-messiah language and the just rule expected in *Pss.Sol.*, especially *Tg. Isa.* 11.4 and *Pss. Sol.* 17.35.

These key passages are located in Philo's *On the Life of Moses* and the *Exposition of the Law*.⁵⁹ In this connection, Philo first interprets the Balaam oracle of the "man who one day will come forth to rule over many nations" in terms of fulfilling Moses' role as warrior-king of the Hebrew nation.⁶⁰ In the second instance, in Philo's view, the eschatological war ought to be a peaceful ideological one, but if necessary, the *man* will conquer the nations militarily.⁶¹ Without using the word *messiah* anywhere, Philo has portrayed the character of the *man* in terms consistent with other messianic expectations, for instance, those found in *Pss. Sol.* 17.⁶²

⁵⁹*On the Life of Moses (Vita Mos I and II); Exposition of the Law (Op, Abr, Jos, Decal, Spec, Virt, Praem)*. Philo uses parts of the Balak/Balaam cycle in several places; P. Borgen, " 'There Shall Come Forth a Man': Reflections on Messianic Ideas in Philo," in *The Messiah* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 351 (note 12), lists ten other Philonic writings which contain Balaam material. Although he never cites Num 24.17, Philo does quote from Num 24.16 in *Mut.* 202, referring to Balaam as "hearing the oracles of God and knowing knowledge from the Most High." Borgen does not mention Zechariah in this article, however.

⁶⁰E.g., Moses is called "god and king" in *Vita Mos* I.158, and "king," "lawgiver," "high priest," and "prophet" in *Vita Mos* II.292. Borgen, 346, says that Philo "pictures a Hebrew emperor who will bring to its full realization the universal charge of Moses and the Hebrew nation," and that "the central role of the Jewish nation as the head (and ruler) of all nations is a fundamental element of Philo's eschatological hope." I think Borgen's reading of Philo's eschatology is more persuasive than that of Hecht, who tries to draw an analogy between Philo and modern Hasidism's substitution of personal mysticism for messianic redemption, viz. that Philo took popular messianic ideas and neutralized them into a *spiritualized and thoroughly dehistoricized* Messianic Era. See Richard D. Hecht, "Philo and Messiah," in *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* (eds. Jacob Neusner, William S. Green and Ernest Frerichs; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 139-168, especially 159-163.

⁶¹Borgen, *ibid.*, 342, emphasizes, "Philo was an exegete whose aim was to interpret the Laws of Moses." In such a context, the "messianic prophecy about 'a man' thus is a natural and integral element in Philo's interpretation of the Law of Moses, but the central and basic idea is the eschatological role of the Jewish nation as being the head of all nations." Blessings will come to those who obey the Law; those who overcome the passions, and embrace virtue, arrive at the vision of God, and thus share Israel's character, will share in the final hymn of victory. By a different route, Robert Hayward, "Balaam's Prophecies as Interpreted by Philo and the Aramaic Targums of the Pentateuch," in *New Heaven and New Earth: Prophecy and the Millenium* (eds. P. J. Harland and C. T. R. Hayward; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 19-36, has arrived at a conclusion similar to Borgen's, that "Philo believed this last victory would come about through the 'man' of Balaam's prophecy." Hayward, 31 (note 28), agrees with the position of this thesis, that Hecht's emphasis on internal transformation by the Logos (*op. cit.*, 162) does not comprise the whole story with regard to Philo's understanding of the Balaam oracles.

⁶²The remainder of *Praem* 95 mentions that God has sent, as reinforcement to the *man*, such attributes as are befitting; namely, dauntless courage of soul and all-powerful strength of body, which together will overcome the enemy. These characteristics bear a strong resemblance to *Pss.Sol.* 17.36-40.

Although he never actually cites Numbers 24.17, Philo may have read the figures of the *man* in Numbers as a unity. In fact, a case can be made that Philo fused the oracles of Num 24.7 and 17 in order to reduce the total number of Balaam's oracles to three, which would have signified perfection and completion, and which would have suited his triadic view of Israel's history as past, present and future.⁶³ Furthermore, in a manner similar to the Targumists, Philo seems to have read Balaam's blessing of Jacob and Israel in light of the Jacob-Israel blessings of Gen 49. The similar vocabulary and wording of the respective blessings, the references in both texts to the *sceptre*, and the use of lion imagery lend themselves to such an interpretive combination. Philo reveals his own intertextual reading of Numbers 24 and Genesis 49 by exchanging the verb ἐγείρω in Gen 49.9 for ἀνίστημι in his rendering of Num 24.9 in *Vita Mos* I.291.⁶⁴

Gen 49.9 LXX

σκύμνος λέοντας Ιουδα·
ἐκ βλαστοῦ, ὕψι μου, ἀνέβης
ἀναπεσῶν ἐκοιμήθης
ὡς λέων καὶ ὡς σκύμνος

τίς ἐγείρει αὐτόν;

Judah is a lion's cub: from the
shoot you have come up, my son;
leaning back you have slept
as a lion (and) as a cub;

Num 24.9LXX

κατακλιθῆς ἀνεπαύσατο
ὡς λέων καὶ ὡς σκύμνος

τίς ἀναστήσει αὐτόν;

Having reclined, he rested
as a lion (and) as a cub;

Vita Mos I.291b

ἀναπαύσεται κατακλιθεὶς
ὡς λέων ἢ σκύμνος λέοντος,
μᾶλα καταφρονητικῶς δεδιῶς
οὐδένα, φόβον τοῖς ἄλλοις
ἐνειργασμένος·
ἄθλιος ὃς ἂν αὐτὸν παρακινήσας
ἐγείρη·

Having reclined, he will rest
as a lion or a lion's cub;

⁶³Hayward, *op cit.*, 19-24. I am indebted to Hayward for pointing out Philo's "love of arithmology" as a rationale for his combined reading of the third and fourth Balaam oracles. Three is a perfect number; the triad is complete, "having beginning, middle, and end, which are equal" (*Qu. Gen.* II.5, cf. *Leg. All.* I.3; *Qu. Gen.* III.3). Hayward, 20, also refers to places in *Vita Mos* where "Philo refers the oracles to Israel's beginnings in the past..., her present status as divinely blessed..., and her future victorious destiny....Signifying completeness, the number three used to formulate Balaam's oracles invites the reader to regard the seer's words as a full expression of Israel's significance."

⁶⁴The conclusions of Hayward, *ibid.*, 24, with regard to this comparison confirm my own work on these texts. He writes, "It seems likely that LXX had already established a lexical connection between the fourth Balaam oracle and Jacob's blessing of Judah, which later interpreters might exploit." If this is so, then it is a small matter to read the oracles in Num 24 in combination: the *man* of 24.7 is the same figure as the *man* in 24.17. It is interesting that Hayward arrives at a conclusion based on the LXX that is similar to the one Mary Douglas drew based on the MT (see note #51 above).

who will rouse him?

who will raise him?

very contemptuous, fearing nothing,
creating fear in others;
wretched whoever would rouse and
disturb him.

Although the Septuagint never credits Balaam with the status of προφήτης, Philo says that his first oracle was spoken by one as *possessed by the prophetic spirit* (προφητικοῦ πνεύματος, *Vita Mos* I.277), that he spoke *prophetic words* (ἐξελάλει προφητεύων, *Vita Mos* I. 283), and that he spoke ἔνθους (*Vita Mos* I.277,288).⁶⁵ Moreover, in his version of the introduction to Balaam's final oracle, Philo reworked Balaam's self-description as the man who truly sees (ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ ἀληθινῶς ὁρῶν, Num 24.3, 15) into the man who in sleep saw a clear presentation of God with the unsleeping eyes of the soul (ὅστις καθ' ὕπνον ἐναργῆ φαντασίαν εἶδε θεοῦ τοῖς τῆς ψυχῆς ἀκοιμήτοις ὄμμασιν, *Vita Mos* I.289). In recognition that Philo invested the names of biblical characters with great symbolic meaning, Hayward argues that Philo has made this text emphasize Balaam's *sight* of God, to the exclusion of other ways of knowing. The result of casting the Gentile prophet as one *who saw God* clearly is Philo's identification of Balaam with Jacob, who was renamed Israel, *the one who sees God*.⁶⁶

Momentarily leaving to one side Philo's interpretation of the *man* in Numbers 24 as the one who will gain mastery over many nations (*Vita Mos* I.290) and who will

⁶⁵See Hayward, *ibid.*, 20. Yet, with the exception of his treatment of the Balaam oracles as divinely-inspired and Balaam as ἔνθους (*Vita Mos* I.288_{ff}, cf. *Praem* 95), Philo regards Balaam as a villain; for example, see *Conf* 159, *Quod Deus* 183, *Migr* 113, *Mut* 202. Philo even refers to Balaam as a μάγος in *Vita Mos* I.276. See discussion of *Conf* 62-64 and its context and comparisons with the Magi below.

⁶⁶Hayward, *ibid.*, 20-22 (note 8), on Philo's etymologies of Hebrew names. [See note #11 above on Mt 1.18-25, for Philo's etymology of Joshua.] If Hayward is correct, and I find his arguments persuasive, the interpretive link between the prophecies of Gen 49 and Num 24 is strengthened. Hayward contends that Philo's knowledge of early targumic traditions about "hidden mysteries," which were taken from Jacob-Israel and which were "revealed" to Balaam, is behind Philo's understanding of the biblical text. Balaam is thereby elevated to the position of prophesying *in persona Israel*; his oracles are "prophecy of the highest order... presented as three oracles, thereby signifying its completeness and perfection as it speaks of Israel's past, present, and future."

subdue great and populous nations (*Praem* 95), it may be instructive to turn to Philo's representation of the *man* in Zech 6.12 LXX; this topic appears in *De Confusione Linguarum*. Zechariah 6.12 is taken up by Philo in the immediate context of his exegesis of Genesis 11.2 LXX, the larger context of which is bounded by references to the Numbers stories (chapters 23-25, 31). In *Conf* 60, Philo states that those who conspired to commit wrongdoing (ἐπ' ἀδικήμασιν) set out from the East (ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν) and settled in the land of Shinar. These remarks set up Philo's discussion of the two kinds of *rising* in the soul, the better and the worse. An example of the better kind of *rising* is the Garden of Eden, where not plants but heavenly virtues were raised by God out of his own incorporeal light:

καὶ ἐφύτευσεν ὁ θεὸς παράδεισον ἐν Ἐδέμ κατὰ ἀνατολάς, οὐ χερσαίων φυτῶν, ἀλλ' οὐρανόθεν ἀρετῶν, ἃς ἐξ ἀσώματου τοῦ παρ' ἑαυτῷ φωτὸς ἀσβέστους εἰσαεὶ γενησομένης ὁ φυτουργὸς ἀνέτειλεν. --*Conf* 61

Immediately after this, Philo introduces a second reference to the better kind of *rising*:

Zech 6.12 LXX

...Τάδε λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ

Ἴδου ἀνὴρ, Ἐνατολή ὄνομα αὐτῷ,

καὶ ὑποκάτωθεν αὐτοῦ ἀνατελεῖ,

καὶ οἰκοδομήσει τὸν οἶκον κυρίου. ⁶⁷

Conf 62-63

ἤκουσα μέντοι καὶ τῶν Μωυσέως ἐταίρων
τίνος ἀποφθεγξαμένου τοιούδε λόγιον·
ἴδου ἄνθρωπος ὃ ὄνομα ἀνατολή·

καινοτάτη γε πρόσρησις, εἴαν γε τὸν ἐκ σώματος καὶ ψυχῆς συνεστῶτα λέγεσθαι νομίσης· εἴαν δὲ τὸν ἀσώματον ἐκείνον, θείας ἀδιαφοροῦντα εἰκόνας, ὁμολογήσεις ὅτι εὐθυβολώτατον ὄνομα ἐπεφημίσθη τὸ ἀνατολῆς αὐτῷ· τοῦτον μὲν γὰρ πρεσβύτατον υἱὸν ὁ τῶν ὅλων ἀνέτειλε πατῆρ, ὃν ἐτέρωθι πρωτόγονον ὠνόμασε, καὶ ὁ γεννηθεὶς μέντοι, μιμούμενος τὰς τοῦ πατρὸς ὁδοῦς, πρὸς παραδείγματα ἀρχέτυπα ἐκείνου βλέπων ἐμόρφου τὰ εἶδη.

I have indeed heard of a certain one of Moses' companions who boldly pronounced an oracle such as this, "Behold a man whose name is Ἐνατολή (*Rising*)" -- indeed a most remarkable designation, if you expect that he will consist of body and soul. If, however, you should suppose him to be an incorporeal image, a divine

⁶⁷For ἀνατολή and ἀνατέλλω see note # 38 above. On the Messiah building the temple, see thesis section on Jesus and the Temple Charge. The underlined excerpt is for the sake of comparison between Philo and Zech 6.12 LXX.

incorruptible image, then you will grant that the name promised to him, *Rising* (Ἀνατολή), is right on the mark. For the Father of all raised up this eldest son, whom he has named elsewhere, *Firstborn* (πρωτόγονος). To be sure, the *Begotten One* (ὁ γεννηθεὶς) exactly copying the ways of his Father, looking at the visible model patterns, gave them shape.

Philo's version of Zech 6.12a is virtually identical to LXX, with the exception that it reads ἄνθρωπος in place of ἀνήρ:

The Father of all *raised up* this eldest son, here named *Rising*, and elsewhere named *Firstborn*.⁶⁸

As with the Septuagint, Philo also makes use of the cognates ἀνατολή - ἀνατέλλω:⁶⁹

This passage in *Conf* 62-64 is consistent with Philo's description of how the *Logos* works, by "bringing into creation the discrete elements of the sensible world by following the ideas" of the divine mind.⁷⁰

⁶⁸The terms Philo uses here to describe the eldest son, as "Firstborn" and "Begotten One" evoke the question of resemblance to Zech 12.10 (They will weep and mourn over him as over an *only child*, or a *firstborn*), although LXX does not have πρεσβύτατος, πρωτόγονος, or ὁ γεννηθεὶς. Instead it employs ἀγαπητός and πρωτότοκος. See possible links of Zech 12.10 with Matthew elsewhere in this thesis (especially ch 6).

⁶⁹In its normal transitive use, ἀνατέλλω is causative: to make or let spring up (as of a tree), or rise (sun, star), to bring forth or bring to light. The intransitive range of meanings includes "rise up, come to light, rise (as sun, moon or star), blaze forth, dawn," and, in a weakened form, "spring forth" (πηγαί). In the singular, Ἀνατολή usually means *a rising*, especially of the sun, moon, and stars. In the plural ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν, the meaning is usually *from the East*; κατὰ ἀνατολὰς is *toward the sunrise*. See BAGD 62; also see note # 38 above.

Stendahl, *School*, 136, points out that in the LXX, ἀνατέλλω in place of קָוָה in Num 24.17 is *hapax legomenon*. See Hedwige Rouillard's discussion of this question in *La Pericope de Balaam (Nombres 22-24): La Prose et les "Oracles"*, Études Bibliques (Nouvelle série. N° 4; Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, J. Gabalda, 1985), 418-25, especially 425, on the translation of *drk*: "Il y a en effet deux sens principaux: a) s'avancer, fouler aux pieds, piétiner; b) bander un arc. Les deux sens conviennent à *drk kwkb*. Si l'on choisit *le roi*, on retient le premier....Si l'on garde *l'étoile*, il faut préférer le second sens.... car une étoile passe comme une flèche...." [$\langle \diamond \rangle$ removed, and italics substituted] Rouillard sees a relationship between the star-king imagery in Num 24.17 and Mt 2. See below.

⁷⁰See Hecht, "Philo and Messiah," 150. Before his comments on how the *Logos* works, he makes reference to Philo's quotation of Zechariah in *Conf* 62 and states, "Here, Philo clearly takes the messianic title of Zech 6:12, *semah* in the Masoretic text and *anatole* in the Septuagint (LXX), as the *Logos*...." From my reading of Philo, it is not clear that he has the Hebrew text in mind; there is nothing here which suggests other than that Philo is using singular and plural forms of ἀνατολή in this exegesis. If Philo had access only to the Greek Bible, he would still have had enough to make a messianic connection with Jer 23.5 (and 33.15), and Zech 3.8. The Zech 6.12 LXX text alone could have given him the cognate word-play in Greek.

Immediately following his best example of *rising*, the *man* whom God named *Rising*, Philo introduces Balaam, of the worst kind of *rising*, whom Balak sent for ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν and who lived πρὸς ἀνατολαῖς. Balaam is here described as someone who wished to curse one whom God praised (*Conf* 64-65a).

Τοῦ δὲ χείρονος ἀνατολῆς εἴδους ὑπόδειγμα τὸ λεχθὲν ἐπὶ τοῦ βουλομένου τὸν ἐπαινούμενον ὑπὸ θεοῦ καταράσασθαι· πρὸς γὰρ ἀνατολαῖς εἰσάγεται κάκεινος οἰκῶν, αἴτινες ὁμωνυμοῦσαι ταῖς προτέραις ἐναντιότητα καὶ μάχην πρὸς αὐτὰς ἔχουσιν· “ἐκ Μεσοποταμίας” γάρ φησι “μετεπέμψατό με Βαλάκ, ἐξ ὁρέων ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν, λέγων· δεῦρο ἄρασαί μοι ὃν μὴ ἀράται ὁ θεός.”⁷¹

Of the worst kind of *rising* is the example in the figure about whom it was said that he wished to curse the one praised by God: for he, who bears the same name as those previously mentioned, was imported from and lived also at *the risings*, is most in opposition to them. For he said, “Balak sent for me from Mesopotamia, from the mountains of the East, saying, ‘Come here and curse for me the one God does not curse.’”

These are the only two personal examples of antithetical *risings* here: Philo appears to have set the *man* of Zech 6.12 and Balaam in opposition here as type and anti-type.

Even though Philo does not make the connection explicit, the eschatological ruler of the nations from Num 24.7, who is the “incontestably messianic” *man* in 24.17, may be identified with the *man* named *Rising*, also a messianic figure. In this sense, J. de Savignac rightly contends that Philo's exposition of Zechariah 6.12 in *De Confusione Linguarum* 62-64 is an “assimilation of the Logos and Messiah.”⁷²

⁷¹Note that this citation concludes with a paraphrase of Num 23.7-8, the beginning of Balaam's first oracle. At least for his exegetical purposes here, Philo does not seem to distinguish between ἀνατολή and ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν. Another place where Philo includes the term ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν in a reference to Balaam, is *Vita Mos* I.276-278: Balak took Balaam to a place where he showed the camp of the Hebrews τῷ μάγῳ. After Balaam ordered Balak to make sacrifices, he went to inquire of God, and ἔξω δὲ προελθὼν ἔνθους αὐτίκα γίνεται, προφητικοῦ πνεύματος ἐπιφοιτήσαντος, ὃ πᾶσαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἔντεχρον μαντικὴν ὑπερόριον τῆς ψυχῆς ἤλασε· θέμις γὰρ οὐκ ἦν ἱερωτάτη κατοκωχῆ συνδιαλατᾶσθαι μαγικὴν σοφιστείαν (as he went forward, immediately he became inspired, visited by a prophetic spirit, which drove away all of his mantic art: for it was not right that a possession by the Holiest live together with a possession by mastery of the craft of a magos). In this context, Philo also has Balaam identify himself as having been called from Mesopotamia, ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν, but here Balaam says he is not able to curse whom God does not curse. This is a complex portrayal of the villainous man sometimes endued by God to utter the highest prophecies. Balaam as a μάγος ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν may be one contact between this kind of tradition and the Matthean Magi narrative.

⁷²See J. de Savignac, “Le Messianisme de Philon d’Alexandrie,” *NovT* 4 (1960) 319-24. Savignac also states, 319, that “le Messie personnel n’est mentionné explicitement que par un seul texte philonien, dans le *de praemiis* (95),” by which he means the Num 24.7 citation. According to Savignac,

A comparison of Philo's citations of Num 24.7 (*Vita Mos* I.290 and *Praem* 95) and Zechariah 6.12 (*Conf* 62-63), assuming that Philo also knew Num 24.17, reveals that the key overlapping words are ἄνθρωπος and ἀνατέλλω:

ἐξελεύσεται ἄνθρωπος....	--Num 24.7; <i>Vita Mos</i> I.290; <i>Praem</i> 95
ἀνατελεῖ ἄστρον ἐξ Ἰακωβ, καὶ ἀναστήσεται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ Ἰσραήλ....	--Num 24.17 LXX
Ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ, Ἄνατολή ὄνομα αὐτῷ, καὶ....ἀνατελεῖ....	--Zech 6.12 LXX
ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος ᾧ ὄνομα ἀνατολή...τοῦτον...ὁ ὅλων ἀνέτειλε πατήρ....	-- <i>Conf</i> 62, 64

Since these divine promises of the coming messianic *man*⁷³ had been preserved by Moses or “one of his companions” (*Conf* 62), Philo confidently expected their fulfillment.⁷⁴ The only two biblical texts which Philo reads in a purportedly messianic way are Zech 6.12 and Num 24.7 (and by extension, 24.17). Philo is certainly to be included with the Qumran scribes and other early exegetes of the scriptures, whose

320-321, Philo understands the *man* from Num 24.17 to be none other than the *man* of 24.7, yet the second ἄνθρωπος is “easily assimilated to ἀνατολή (un aurore).” Savignac supports his view that Philo found it easy to make the leap from the *star* rising to the *man* rising, with a citation (from *De Opificio Mundi* 31) that the Logos has been named “Supercelestial Star.” With reference to Philo’s application of Zech 6.12 to the Logos, Savignac writes, “Le texte biblique ici appliqué par Philon au Logos est si manifestement messianique...que Philon n’a pas pu ne pas se rendre compte que par l’application qu’il en faisait au Logos, il identifiait le Logos et le Messie....Ainsi, non seulement l’application au Logos du texte messianique de Zacharie (vi 12) établit l’assimilation philonienne du Logos et du Messie, mais le seul texte où Philon traite d’un Messie personnel, loin d’exclure cette assimilation, paraît plutôt la supposer; c’est elle qui, semble-t-il, nous en livre le sens. On notera en outre que la designation du Messie par le terme ‘homme’ devait être séduisante pour Philon car, dans le même traité que celui où il y fait allusion, il soutient que la perfection consiste à devenir ‘homme’ (cf. *de praemiis*, 13, 14...et *quod deter.* 22-24...)” Although Savignac’s article looks at Philo’s messianism from a different vantage point, it is most interesting that the conclusions about Num 24.7, 17 and Zech 6.12 confirm this present study.

⁷³The fact that Philo did look for a human figure, the *man*, in his Numbers 24 exposition, prevents his interpreters from assuming that the *man* in Zech 6 is “completely spiritualized;” see Savignac, *ibid.*, 320. Pace Hecht.

⁷⁴Borgen, “There shall come forth a man,” 352-53, makes this point, drawing upon *Vita Mos* I.290-91; II.288. “God’s leadership of the Hebrew army in the Exodus of the past is the guarantee for the people’s military success in the future encounter with many nations. This line of reasoning is in accordance with Moses’ words at the time of his death..., ‘Then, indeed, we find him [Moses] possessed by the spirit, no longer uttering general truths to the whole nation but prophesying to each tribe in particular the things which were to be and hereafter must come to pass. Some of these have already taken place, others are still looked for, since confidence in the future is assured by fulfillment in the past.’” Borgen, 353 (note 17), also refers to *Virt* 77, and to Josephus, who reasons similarly in *Ant* 4.125, “And from these prophecies having received the fulfillment which he predicted one may infer what the future also has in store;” (cf. *Ant* 10.210).

messianic exegesis merged the figures in Numbers 24 and Zechariah 6.12.⁷⁵

In sum, a combined messianic reading of the *man* from the Balaam oracles in Num 24.7, 17 and the *man* from Zech 6.12 has been demonstrated as early as the first century. Zech 6.12 is therefore an inextricable component of the *Branch*-Ἀνατολή-*man-star-sceptre* complex of messianic terminology around the turn of the common era. It is thus possible that Matthew could have encountered some form of this conflated messianic figure -- the *man* of Num 24 and Zech 6.12 -- in his traditional material. Whether consciously or unconsciously, the First Gospel has built on this combined messianic imagery in its Infancy Narrative.

Matthew 2.3-6

Certain features derived from reading Num 24.7, 17 in light of Zech 6.12 may help to understand how Matthew has constructed the magi narrative; for example, the μάγοι ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν (2.1) who came looking for a *king* whose *star* they had seen ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ (2.2) reflects the exegetical processes already in place in the first century.⁷⁶ The presence of gentile seers who interpret correctly the prophetic sign of the newborn *king of the Jews* bears some similarity with the gentile magus who was possessed by the divine spirit to utter the *star*-prophecy of this *king*.

The magus Balaam came *from the East*, speaking words that frustrated King Balak in his effort to destroy his enemy; the Magi, who also came also *from the East*, frustrated King Herod in his effort to destroy his enemy.⁷⁷ At the end of the story, Matthew 2.12 reports that the

⁷⁵See above on the *Branch* and Num 24.7, 17. Philo's messianism is situated on the trajectory that leads in one direction to the Targums and in another to the early Church Fathers, via the Gospels.

⁷⁶Extrapolating back from the fathers, who delighted to apply Ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ, Ἀνατολή ὄνομα αὐτῷ to the Incarnation, Barnabas Lindars, *NT Apologetic*, 70, says that it is "possible that Matthew alluded to this in Matt. 2.2, τὸν ἀστέρα ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ, besides the principal reference to Num. 24.17." Although Lindars does not develop the point, his reading of the wider text in Zech 6 leads him to see other links in Matthew, which would help strengthen the point made here.

⁷⁷See Brown, *Birth*, 193-95; in summary, he writes, "Thus, beside similarities between the magus Balaam and the Matthean magi in title, origin, and role, we have the similarity whereby Balaam foretold that a star symbolizing the Messiah would rise (LXX) and Matthew's magi saw the star symbolizing the Messiah (2:4) at its rising." Davies & Allison I, 230-236, however, are uncertain

magi, having been warned in a dream not to return to Herod, left for their region by another route. Num 24.25 concludes the Balaam episode with his departure for his own place.⁷⁸

The tradition that the arrival of the Messiah (“king of the Jews,” Mt 2.2-4) might be heralded by his *rising star* is implicit in Matthew’s narrative world: in Jerusalem the priestly hierarchy, the scribes, and even Herod, *know* this much. The messianic discussion provoked by the magi’s account of the *star* proceeds without further explanation,⁷⁹ including the interpretive leap Herod makes (from “newborn king of the Jews”) when he asks where the Messiah is to be born:

Τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ γεννηθέντος ἐν Βηθλέεμ τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἐν ἡμέραις Ἡρώδου τοῦ βασιλέως, ἰδοὺ μάγοι ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν παρεγένοντο εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα λέγοντες· ποῦ ἐστὶν ὁ τεχθεὶς βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων; εἶδομεν γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀστὴρα ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ καὶ ἦλθομεν προσκυνῆσαι αὐτῷ. ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρώδης ἐταράχθη καὶ πᾶσα Ἱεροσόλυμα μετ’ αὐτοῦ, καὶ συναγαγὼν πάντας τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ γραμματεῖς τοῦ λαοῦ ἐπιτιθάνετο παρ’ αὐτῶν ποῦ ὁ χριστὸς γεννᾶται. --Mt 2.1-4

In Matthew’s narrative, it does not matter whether Herod is genuinely ignorant of this

whether to interpret ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ messianically; they appear not to perceive the connection between Zech 6.12 and the Matthean infancy narrative.

⁷⁸The overlap is perceived more in the sense of a conclusion than of verbal correspondence.

⁷⁹Such an interpretive stance, in which the *star-sceptre-man* became identified with the *Branch*-*Ἀνατολή-man*, the expected *king-messiah*, was already evident in some Jewish traditions, and its association continued into the Targums and in at least one Rabbinic circle was applied to a named individual, Bar Kochba. Gilles Dorival, *La Bible D’Alexandrie: Les Nombres* (Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1994), 452, recognizes that Mt 2 holds, in common with early Jewish writers, Rabbis, and Church Fathers, the interpretation of the star-symbolism for Davidic royalty and the scepter for the messianic era. Of Num 24.17, he writes with respect to Mt 2.2 and Rev 22.16, that the word for star was exchanged and that the verb “to rise” became the substantive “rising” in the magi-Herod text: L’astre [ἀστρὸν] devient une étoile [ἀστὴρ] dans les deux textes; le verbe se lever [ἀνατελλεῖν] est transformé dans le substantif levant [ἀνατολή] chez Mt, où les mages demandent à Herode où se trouve le roi des Juifs qui vient de naître: nous avons vu son étoile au levant; Ap atteste une autre transformation: Jésus s’applique à lui-même le titre d’étoile brillante du matin.” [<< >> quotation marks omitted.] Dorival then discusses the Church Fathers’ citations and discussion of Num 24.17. Taking a somewhat different approach, Rouillard, *La Pericope de Balaam*, 419-25, examines the only two MT passages which contain *kwkb* in the singular (Num 24.17; Am 5.26) [without mention of CD] and compares them with royal imagery in Isa 14.12, Ezek 32.7, Gen 49, Ps 2.7, and others. Rouillard, 423, with reference to Mt 2.2, writes that, from a strictly literary point of view, the text has a double sense, the homiletical perspective notwithstanding: it is at the same time a reference to an astronomical event and a royal metaphor, hence the mention of *king of the Jews*. Rouillard’s concern whether this was a sign or reality [kwkb et sbt: *le signe ou la realite?*] for Balaam and/or the Magi is outside the scope of this thesis. Nolan, *Royal Son*, 74, however, is right to say in his discussion of the same question, “The fact that Jewish tradition associates the star with the person of the Messiah of David, and not with any heavenly phenomenon, does not exclude an implicit reference of Matthew 2 to Numbers 24:17. From the standpoint of its literary antecedents, the basic meaning of the star is that King Messiah has come on the scene.”

tradition about the messiah's birthplace-- what is crucial is that the biblical experts advance Bethlehem, David's city, as the Messiah's expected birthplace; this is certified by a mixed citation from Micah 5.1, 3 LXX and 2 Sam 5.2 LXX.⁸⁰

οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷ · ἐν Βηθλέεμ τῆς Ἰουδαίας · γὰρ γέγραπται διὰ τοῦ προφήτου ·
καὶ σὺ Βηθλέεμ, γῆ Ἰούδα, οὐδαμῶς ἐλαχίστη εἶ ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν Ἰούδα ·
ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ ἔξελεύσεται ἡγούμενος, ὅστις ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαόν μου τὸν Ἰσραήλ.
 --Mt 2.5-6

καὶ σὺ Βηθλέεμ οἶκος τοῦ Εφραθα, ὀλιγοστὸς εἶ τοῦ εἶναι ἐν χιλιάσιν Ἰουδα·
ἐκ σοῦ μοι ἔξελεύσεται τοῦ εἶναι εἰς ἄρχοντα ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ,...
 καὶ στήσεται καὶ ὄψεται καὶ ποιμανεῖ τὸ ποίμνιον αὐτοῦ ἐν ἰσχύι κυρίου...
 --Mic 5.1,3 LXX

...Σὺ ποιμανεῖς τὸν λαόν μου τὸν Ἰσραήλ, καὶ σὺ ἔσει εἰς ἡγούμενον
ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραήλ.
 --2 Sam 5.2 LXX

Matthew's strategic use of this citation-within-a-citation of messianic *prophecy* reminds the reader of the "Son of David" imagery in Mt 1 and adduces more strongly that Jesus is indeed the Son of David, the royal Messiah, the legitimate "king of the Jews." The reference to *shepherding* in the quotation is very important; even though no specific content of how Jesus is to be the *shepherd-king* is given here, the imagery reappears throughout the rest of the Gospel (Mt 9.36; 26.31; 26.14-16; 27.3-10; see below). However, there may be some motifs from Mt 1 that are recovered by the announcement that one of the Davidic Messiah's functions is to *shepherd* his people. Matthew stresses the importance of Jesus' name, for it is *he* who "*will save his people from their sins.*"⁸¹ Zech 9.16, which has previously figured in this study (see page 29_r)

⁸⁰Detailed study of this mixed citation is outside the scope of this thesis; underlined excerpts in Mt 2.1-6; Mic 5.1, 3; 2 Sam 5.2 LXX highlight the expectations of a Davidic shepherd figure. See excursus on Jesus as Shepherd (ch 9).

⁸¹See David R. Bauer, "The Kingship of Jesus in the Matthean Infancy Narrative: A Literary Analysis," *CBQ* 57 (1995) 306-23. Bauer, 311-12, proposes that the shepherding reference in Mt 2.6 points back to 1.18-25 and illuminates one of Jesus' shepherding functions as "saving his people from sin." The means by which Jesus accomplishes this is by his death, "precisely in his role as 'shepherd' (ποιμένα, 26:31)." Bauer's article also looks at Jesus as a *humble king*; although his focus here is on Jesus as "the child," one is reminded by this terminology that Jesus is also portrayed as the *humble Davidic king* when he enters Jerusalem, deliberately enacting the prophecy of Zech 9.9; see below on Mt 21.5/Zech 9.9 (ch 3). Bauer does not discuss the quotation of Zech 13.7 in Mt 26.31. See Passion Narrative section of this thesis (especially chs 7-8) and the excursus on Jesus as Shepherd (ch 9).

may exert some influence on the composition of Matthew's narrative; this seems especially to pertain to Mt 1.21 and 2.6 when read together. Zech 9.16 may refer to the eschatological *day*, when the Lord *will save his people*, who are "like sheep" (Καὶ σώσει αὐτοὺς Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ, ὡς πρόβατα λαὸν αὐτοῦ....). There is no conceptual break between this and the citation of Mt 2.6, where the Davidic Messiah will *shepherd* God's *people*. In Matthew's narrative section on Jesus' Galilean ministry, Jesus is reported to have had compassion for the crowds, "for they were harassed and helpless, like *sheep without a shepherd*" (Mt 9.36; cf. Zech 10.2).⁸²

Matthew 2.23

At the close of the Infancy Narrative, Joseph and Mary take the child Jesus to live in Nazareth.⁸³ According to Matthew, the Messiah is to be identified as Ναζωραῖος:

καὶ ἐλθὼν κατώκησεν εἰς πόλιν λεγομένην Ναζαρέτ· ὅπως πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν ὅτι Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται. --Mt 2.23

And he went and settled in a city called Nazareth, that the word through the prophets might be fulfilled, "He will be called a Nazarene."

This text is widely acknowledged to be some sort of word-play involving Jesus' hometown of Nazareth. Nazareth, variously spelled Ναζαρά, Ναζαρέτ, and Ναζαρέθ, does not appear in the OT; it is mentioned only in the Gospels and Acts. Jesus is identified as the one from Nazareth (ὁ ἀπὸ Ναζαρέθ, or ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ) in Mt 21.11.⁸⁴ The significance of Nazareth/Nazarene in Matthew 2.23 must go beyond mere

⁸²In the thesis section below on Jesus' Galilean ministry, the case is presented that the "sheep without a shepherd" reference in Mt 9.36 is most directly influenced by Zech 10.2 MT/LXX. The Infancy Narrative introduces the imagery from which later motifs are derived and expanded.

⁸³Stendahl, "*Quis et Unde*," 73-75, contends that "Matthew 2 is dominated by geographical names;" the use of these place names "draws on the similar motif in Exodus." Yet in all the travels from Bethlehem, to Egypt, back to Israel, bypassing Judea, on to Nazareth in Galilee, the major focus is "the apologetic tension between 'Bethlehem as expected' and 'Nazareth as revealed.'"

⁸⁴Also in Mk 1.9, Jn 1.45, and Acts 10.38. Mark and Luke refer to Jesus as Ναζαρηνός; Luke, John and Acts also employ Ναζωραῖος, but neither appears in the LXX.

geography. Scholars generally interpret it either (1) as a reference to Jesus as one set apart to God as a Nazirite (נַזִּירִי), or (2) as a reference to the messianic imagery of the Davidic Branch, Nezer (נֶזֶר).⁸⁵

On the one hand, from the biblical texts themselves, there are no compelling reasons to adopt a “Nazirite” interpretation. First, nowhere in the LXX is Nazirite rendered Ναζωραῖος. Second, the Nazirite interpretation simply does not fit the Matthean Infancy narrative in its own context, nor is it supported by the picture of Jesus elsewhere in Matthew, especially 11.18-19:

ἦλθεν γάρ Ἰωάννης μήτε ἐσθίειν μήτε πίνειν, καὶ λέγουσιν· δαιμόνιον ἔχει.
ἦλθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐσθίειν καὶ πίνειν, καὶ λέγουσιν· ἴδου ἄνθρωπος
φάγος καὶ οἴνοπότης, τελωνῶν φίλος καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν.

For John came neither eating nor drinking, and they say, “He has a demon.”
The Son of Man came (both) eating and drinking, and they say, “Look, a glutton and drunkard, a friend of tax collectors and sinners.”

On the other hand, Davidic *Branch*-Ανατολή connections, which complement the Davidic messianic themes prominent in Matthew’s first chapter, have also been discerned in Matthew’s second chapter. Furthermore, the prophetic *plurality* of Isaiah, Jeremiah and Zechariah, from which the unified concept of נַזִּירִי and כַּמָּצָח as interchangeable Messianic *Branch* terms, may also account for the unusual fulfillment formula in Mt 2.23, in which the indirect speech citation, ὅτι Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται, fulfills τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν.⁸⁶ The prevalence of Davidic imagery, and the

⁸⁵Among those who find the primary sense of Matthew’s biblical allusion to refer to Jesus’ being set apart from birth as a *holy one* or Nazirite, are Brown, *Birth*, 207-13, 218-19, 223-24; Davies & Allison I, 275-81; and see James A. Sanders, “Nazoraios in Matthew 2:23,” in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel* (ed. Craig A. Evans and Richard Stegner; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 116-28. Those who give priority to the Branch of Isaiah 11.1, alone or in combination with the other messianic Branch texts, include Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 148-50; Lindars, *NT Apologetic*, 194-96; he also proposes Isa 49.6 in combination with Is 11.1; Stendahl, *School*, 103-4, Gundry, *Matthew*, 39-40, and Use, 97-104; and Hagner I, *Matthew*, 39-42; and Pesch, *op. cit.* Note that W. F. Albright and C. S. Mann, *Matthew* (AB; Garden City: Doubleday, 1971), 20-22, suggest Jer 31.6.

⁸⁶So also Pesch, *op. cit.*, 174-75. He writes, on 176, “The prophets have announced that Jesus of Nazareth, the messiah, the messianic shoot, will be called a Nazorean.”

lack of convincing Nazirite material, confirms that the Nazareth-Ναζωραῖος wordplay in Mt 2.23 must refer to Jesus as the Davidic *Branch*, the צֶדֶק who came from Nazareth.

In sum, the primacy of the Davidic framework of Matthew's Infancy narrative may be supported in deep structural layers in part by themes only found together in Zechariah. This hypothesis has been strengthened by a close study of the three messianic appellations found in Mt 1.21, 23, and 2.23. The three texts are found to be related to each other in mutually-reinforcing ways.

Matthew places the first two *calling texts* (1.21, 23) in close proximity: ...καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν...καὶ καλέσουσιν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουήλ.... His innovative combination of Jesus as *savior from sin* and as *Emmanuel* cannot have derived from a reading of Isaiah alone. A promising source for such a double reading has been proposed in Zechariah 8, where God's promises *to be with his people* and *to save them* are intertwined.⁸⁷

The royal Davidic messianic titles from Isaiah 7-11, notably Immanuel and צֶדֶק, the *shoot from the stump of Jesse*,⁸⁸ permit a connection to be made between the messianic appellations Emmanuel (καλέσουσιν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουήλ, Mt 1.23) and Nazarene (Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται, Mt 2.23). Especially in the plurality of the prophetic fulfillment here, and because the צֶדֶק - צֶדֶק - Ἀνατολή connection has proved to be so influential in Matthew 2.1-6, Zechariah 6.12 can be adduced as further support for the same *Branch*⁸⁹ terminology reappearing in

⁸⁷We have also seen God's promise to *save his people who are like sheep* in Zech 9.16, which may have an impact on two Infancy Narrative texts which are not usually linked — Mt 1.21 and 2.6. In this respect Zech 9.16 can only technically be related to one of the "he shall be called" themes in Matthew, i.e., Jesus (who saves his people).

⁸⁸See the discussion above, pages 5_{ff}, where Talmon's work is applied to Mt 1.21.

⁸⁹Isa 11.1-10; Jer 23.5; Zech 3.8, 6.12.

Mt 2.23.⁹⁰ This analysis of “*Jesus, Emmanuel and Nazarene*” in Matthew 1-2, therefore, establishes the possibility that Matthew’s Davidic Christology in the Infancy Narrative is informed and animated in part by Zechariah 6.12, Zechariah 8, and Zechariah 9.16.

⁹⁰Pesch, *op. cit.*, 175, writes, “In any case, Matthew 1-2 remembers Jesus as the ‘shoot’ when he is named for the third time (Jesus, Emmanuel, Nazorean). This ties together the textual unit, beginning with the genealogy, in such a way that the questions ‘who?’ and ‘from where?’ truly seem fitting.” Pesch mentions no Zechariah connections in his article. He derives the entire Infancy Narrative from Matthew’s community’s reflections on its origins, which would be extrapolated back into Jesus’ own origins.

CHAPTER TWO
Jesus' Ministry in Galilee
The Healing Shepherd
 [Matthew 9.36/Zechariah 10.2]

According to Matthew 9.36 (RSV), when Jesus saw the crowds, "he had compassion on them, because they were harassed and helpless, like sheep without a shepherd." The discussion that follows will investigate the possible influence of Zechariah 10.2_{ff} upon Matthew 9.36 and, more broadly, upon the structure and content of Matthew 9.36-11.6.¹

In the Matthean context, 9.36 is located in a transitional passage which forms a narrative bridge between Jesus' ministry and the mission of the twelve (Mt 10). Mt 9.35 summarizes Jesus' Galilean ministry of teaching and preaching and healing.² Verses 37-38 present the need for additional workers on behalf of the Lord of the harvest. In 10.5-8, Jesus charges the twelve to minister to the "lost sheep of the house of Israel," to preach and to heal in the same ways he has done. In order to trace the possible Zechariah influence upon Matthew's use of the "sheep without a shepherd" imagery, it is necessary first to look at Mark's use of the expression in some detail, and to suggest reasons why Matthew puts it into a different setting.

A source-critical comparison suggests that Mt 9.36 has its origin in Mk 6.34, where the reference to "sheep without a shepherd" occurs in the context of the feeding of the five

¹There are at least two reasons to read 9.36-11.6 as a section. The term "works of the Messiah" in 11.2 recalls both the substance of Jesus' ministry between the two summary passages (4.23 and 9.35) and the commission of the twelve in chapter 10 to continue the same works. In 10.1 Jesus gives the twelve authority to heal (θεραπεύειν πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν), a phrase repeated from 4.23 and 9.35. The call and instruction of "the twelve disciples" (10.1) and the completion of Jesus' instruction to "the twelve disciples" (11.1) create an *inclusio*. (See Davies & Allison II, 150-53, 238-40.) A further reason to read Mt 9.36-11.6 in this way is the reappearance of John the baptizer in the narrative. The Galilean ministry of Jesus began after John had been arrested (4.12); and now (11.2) John is reported to have heard from prison about the "works of the Messiah." Other links within the text and the significance of 11.4-5 are discussed below.

²See Mt 4.23 for the same kind of summary statement at the beginning of Jesus' Galilean ministry.

thousand (Mk 6.30-44). If this is the case, then Matthew has removed the expression from the Markan context and has placed it within a summary of Jesus' activity (9.35-36). The First Gospel does, however, retain part of Mark's expression, "and he had compassion on them," in its account of the feeding miracle (Mt 14.13-21), but whereas Mark highlights Jesus' *teaching* on that occasion (Mk 6.34), Matthew alters his source to emphasize Jesus' *healing* (Mt 14.14).³ In order to ascertain more precisely the use of tradition in Matthew, it is first necessary to consider the matter in relation to Mark.

In Mark, the feeding in the "lonely place" (Mk 6.30-44) is located after the mission of the twelve (6.7-13) and the Baptist's death (6.14-29), just after the apostles return to Jesus and report the results of their work and teaching (6.30). Jesus invites them to retreat to a deserted place, but their hopes for rest are dashed when the people see where their boat is sailing and run ahead to meet them onshore. Scripture tradition is brought to the foreground of the story with Mark's description of the crowd as "sheep without a shepherd":

εἶδεν πολὺν ὄχλον καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπ' αὐτούς,
ὅτι ἦσαν ὡς πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα --Mk 6.34

[When Jesus disembarked,] "he saw a large crowd and he had compassion on them, because they were like sheep without a shepherd...."

Precisely which scripture tradition Mark has adopted here is difficult to determine, for there are several passages in earlier biblical writings where "sheep without a shepherd" imagery occurs: Numbers 27.17, 1 Kings 22.17, 2 Chronicles 18.16, Judith 11.19, Ezekiel 34.5 (cf. 34.8) and Zechariah 10.2.⁴ It is necessary to examine these texts in order to

³The Greek texts of Mk 6.34 and Mt 14.14 will be studied in more detail below.

⁴Among other texts which contain shepherd-sheep imagery, Jeremiah 23.1-6 and 50.6-7 [27.6LXX] will also figure below in the discussion of "lost sheep," "scattered sheep," and shepherd figures (both good

identify the most likely source(s) behind Mark's description of the crowds.⁵

In Numbers 27.17, when Moses learns he will soon die, he asks God to provide a successor for him, to lead the people, so that “the congregation of the Lord will not be as sheep for whom there is not a shepherd”:

...καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ἡ συναγωγὴ κυρίου ὡσεὶ πρόβατα,
οἷς οὐκ ἔστιν ποιμήν.

--Num 27.17 LXX

In this setting, the new shepherd figure for the people of Israel becomes Joshua.

In 1 Kings 22.17, Jehoshaphat and Ahab inquire of the prophets about going into battle. After many other prophets predict victory, Micaiah ben Imlah's vision prophesies doom:

...έώρακα πάντα τὸν Ἰσραὴλ διεσπαρμένον ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν
ὡς ποίμνιον, ᾧ οὐκ ἔστιν ποιμήν....

--1 Kgs 22.17 LXX

I saw all Israel scattered on the mountains, as a *flock* for whom there is not a shepherd.

The wording of Micaiah's vision in the 2 Chronicles account is similar:

...εἶδον τὸν Ἰσραὴλ διεσπαρμένους ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν
ὡς πρόβατα οἷς οὐκ ἔστιν ποιμήν....

--2 Chr 18.16 LXX

I saw Israel scattered on the mountains, as sheep for whom there is not a shepherd.

The shepherd figure is the king. The scattering of the people is a reflection of their lack of a master (κύριος) after the battle.

The setting of Judith 11.19 is the tent of Holofernes, where Judith intends to deceive him and ultimately to destroy him. In this scene she says that God will grant him victory

and bad), as will Zechariah 11.4-17 and 13.7. See the excursus on Jesus as shepherd elsewhere in this thesis.

⁵Not one of the OT texts is a perfect match for either the Matthean or Markan setting of the expression “sheep not having a shepherd.” Although the Greek texts of Numbers, Chronicles and Judith agree almost verbatim in their wording of “sheep for whom there is not a shepherd,” a close verbal agreement is not the only criterion to consider in situations of intertextual influence. The prophetic passages may suggest contexts better suited to these gospel readings.

over Jerusalem and that he will lead them as “sheep for whom there is not a shepherd”⁶:

...καὶ ἄξεις αὐτοὺς ὡς πρόβατα, οἷς οὐκ ἔστιν ποιμήν... --Judith 11.19 LXX

The context of Ezekiel 34.5-8 is a prophecy against the *shepherds*⁷ of Israel, the kings who are to blame for the exile and dispersion of the sheep:

καὶ διεσπάρη τὰ πρόβατά μου διὰ τὸ μὴ εἶναι ποιμένας
καὶ ἐγενήθη εἰς κατάβρωμα πᾶσι τοῖς θηρίοις τοῦ ἀγροῦ. --Ezek 34.5 LXX

My sheep have been scattered because there are no *shepherds*,
and they have become food for all the wild animals.

Ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει κύριος κύριος, εἰ μὴν ἀντι τοῦ γενέσθαι τὰ πρόβατά
μου εἰς προνομήν καὶ γενέσθαι τὰ πρόβατά μου εἰς κατάβρωμα πᾶσι
τοῖς θηρίοις τοῦ πεδίου παρὰ τὸ μὴ εἶναι ποιμένας.... --Ezek 34.8 LXX

As I live, says the Lord (God), since my sheep have become fodder and
(since) my sheep have become food for all the wild animals of
the field, because there are no *shepherds*, ...

Zechariah 10.2 is the final OT biblical text where the motif of “sheep without a shepherd” appears. Because there is a significant difference between the Hebrew and Greek traditions of Zechariah 10.2b, both texts will be analyzed:

עַל־כֵּן נִסְעוּצֹאֵן יַעֲנֻ כִּי־אֵין רֹעֵה --Zech 10.2b MT

...therefore they wander like sheep; they are afflicted because of the lack of a *shepherd*.⁸

The Septuagint renders a different meaning for Zechariah 10.2b:

διὰ τοῦτο ἐξήρθησαν ὡς πρόβατα καὶ ἐκακώθησαν,
διότι οὐκ ἦν ἰασις.⁹ --Zech 10.2b LXX

⁶Does the shepherd refer to Israel’s military (11.18) or religious leaders (11.11-15)? Judith’s reference to Holofernes being seated in Jerusalem when she leads him there may signal a lack of Israel’s own political leaders.

⁷Of all these texts, the two verses from Ezek 34 are the only ones with shepherd in the plural.

⁸In the Hebrew, the participle is used; hence a more accurate translation would be “...therefore they wander like sheep because of the absence of *shepherding*.” So also the other texts under study.

⁹According to Hatch and Redpath, words from the MT translated ἰασις (in LXX) which most resemble רעה are רפואה and מרפה. In the words surrounding רעה in Zech 10.2 MT no letters are present which would suggest the possibility of a copyist’s error. To date, I have not found any scholarly discussion of this matter. My conclusion is that the Masoretic and Septuagintal versions reflect different traditions or

...therefore they were driven as sheep and distressed because there was no *healing*.

In both the Hebrew and Greek, the context of Zechariah 10.2 is the same: those leaders who are supposed to give spiritual guidance to the people of Israel have been speaking falsely.¹⁰

It may be helpful at this point to review the texts mentioned above as possible sources for Mark's use of the figure "sheep without a shepherd" in his account of the feeding miracle. In every passage, those described as *sheep* are the people of Israel. In Numbers, the shepherd figure is Joshua, Moses' successor, who leads the people to the promised land. In the Kings-Chronicles story, the shepherd is the king of Israel, and the context is a military war. Judith's shepherd is a powerless leader; therefore, a foreigner will march into Jerusalem to lead the shepherdless sheep. Ezekiel's setting is the exile; the kings have been unfaithful shepherds. The spiritual leaders, according to Zechariah 10.2, have spoken falsely, and the people are disabled and wander like sheep.

On the basis of their settings of pending military conflict and violence and because of the ironic nature of their predictions, the texts in Kings-Chronicles and Judith may be

Vorlagen and that it is unlikely that ἴασις reflects a scribal error. If it can be established that Matthew may have had access to both Greek and Hebrew texts, then the issue of whether there may have been an earlier scribal error recedes. For some Greek text-critical issues, see further below.

¹⁰Raymond F. Person, *Second Zechariah and the Deuteronomistic School* (JSOTSup 167; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 120, sees evidence of inner-biblical exegesis in Zech 10.1-2 and 1 Kgs 22.13-23 in the juxtaposition of the themes of false prophecy and the "sheep without a shepherd" imagery. Whether or not Person's point is valid, it is not pertinent to the quest for Mark's and Matthew's source(s) of "sheep without a shepherd" in their respective gospels. The shepherd figure in 1 Kgs 22 is not a prophet, but in Zech 10.1-2 the shepherd figures are prophets or others who mislead the people (...οἱ μάντιες ὀράσεις ψευδεῖς, καὶ τὰ ἐνύπνια ψευδῆ ἐλάλουν...). However, the motif of "false prophecy" in Zech 10.2 (cf. 13.2-6) may have a bearing on Matthew's interest in the subject of false prophets who lead the people astray (Mt 7.15; 24.11, 24; Lk 6.26 [cf. Mt 5.12]). The significance of the differences between the Greek and Hebrew texts of Zech 10.2 do figure prominently in the discussion of Matthew's possible allusion to this verse.

eliminated from further comparison with the Markan pastoral setting.¹¹ In Numbers 27, the choice of Joshua to be the successor of Moses commends itself, particularly if Mark's intention is to focus on Jesus as leader in the feeding narrative. The fact that the scene is described as a "lonely place" also highlights the possibility that the wilderness context of Numbers is meant to be recalled.¹² In the wider context of the Markan narrative, however, there are indicators that suggest Num 27.17 may not have been the most influential source. Although Zech 10.2 could have possibly been a formative tradition, on the grounds that Jesus was a true (rather than false) shepherd (cf. 10.2a), it lacks any reference to hunger or food that would have served to reinforce the theme of miraculous feeding in Mark 6.30-44.

According to Mark 6.34, following the comparison of the people as "sheep without a shepherd," Jesus begins to *teach* the people many things. When the hour becomes late, the disciples come to Jesus and voice their concern that there is nothing to *eat* in that deserted place (6.35). Jesus' response is that the disciples are to give the people something to *eat* (6.37). The people's need for a *shepherd* (6.34) and their need for *food* (6.35) raises the question whether Mark might have found a similar connection in his sources. In this

¹¹Mk 6.30-44 concerns the need of the crowd for food: they need a *shepherd* who *feeds* his flock.

¹²J. Duncan M. Derrett, *The Making of Mark: The Scriptural Bases of the Earliest Gospel* (Warwickshire: P. Drinkwater, 1985), 121-24, reads both Moses and Joshua typology into the background of Mark's sources. He connects Pss 103.27-28 and 144.15 LXX with God giving people food in due season...which they gather up. As to Num 27.17, Mark portrays Jesus as the final shepherd who will come at the End Time. Derrett also sees allusions to Is 55.1-3, where the people are to 'buy' without money [with reference to 200 denarii worth of bread in Mk 6.37]. Finally, he draws parallels from the Joshua story: when the provisions of manna stopped at the Jordan, the people collected the last manna and some quails and did some *fishing*! The number 5000 he takes from Joshua 8.12. I do not think Derrett makes his case with his references to the book of Joshua. Sherman E. Johnson, *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Mark* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1960), 122-24, refers to rabbinic beliefs that manna and other miraculous Exodus events would be repeated in the Coming Age. His point is well-taken that the form of this gospel story suggests the influence of the miracle feedings by Elijah (1 Kgs 17) and especially by Elisha (2 Kgs 4.42-44). However, likening the fish in the Markan narrative to the Messianic banquet, where the sea-monster Leviathan would be fed to the people [he reads this in Ps 4.14], is not persuasive. The miracle of the manna in the wilderness is certainly a possible association with this feeding miracle, but outside the Numbers citation above, it does not relate directly to the "sheep without a shepherd" imagery.

light, one may observe that Ezekiel 34 is entirely occupied with the metaphor of shepherding: with respect to their position, shepherds are to take good care of their flocks — to seek the lost, to strengthen the weak, and to *feed the sheep*.¹³

Ezekiel 34.1-10 contrasts the bad shepherds, who *feed* themselves instead of *feeding* the *sheep*, with God, the shepherd who will gather, heal and *feed* the flock (34.11-16). Lastly, the shepherd imagery in Ezek 34 is extended to the coming Davidic servant, who will *shepherd* the sheep (34.23-24). If Mark's tradition relies upon one particular biblical passage as background for the "sheep without a shepherd" metaphor in his introduction to the first *feeding* miracle, then the combination of *feeding* and shepherding imagery in Ezekiel 34 is most suggestive.

The Markan Jesus responds to the crowds as "sheep without a shepherd" and shows his compassion by *teaching* (and then *feeding*) them:

Καὶ ἐξελθὼν εἶδεν πολὺν ὄχλον καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπ' αὐτούς, ὅτι ἦσαν ὡς πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα, καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτούς πολλά. --Mk 6.34

And disembarking he saw a large crowd and he was moved with compassion for them because they were like *sheep without a shepherd*, and he began to teach them many things.¹⁴

¹³Ps 23, Isa 40.11, and other shepherd motifs, may also echo in the Markan Feeding of the 5000. Note, however, that there are about twenty references to *food*, *feeding*, *eating*, and *hunger* in Ezek 34 LXX: βόσκω (34.2[bis], 3, 8[bis], 10, 13, 14[bis], 15, 16); κατάρρωμα (34.5, 8, 10); νέμω (34.18, 19); στόμα (34.10); κατεσθίω (34.3); λιμός (--ἀπολλύμενοι λιμῶ. 34.29). Ezek 34 MT uses the verb פָּגַע frequently; in Ezek 34 LXX ποιμαίνω appears only twice.

¹⁴The relationship Mark wishes to draw between Jesus' compassion for the crowd, as "sheep without a shepherd," and his teaching in this setting of a feeding miracle is not immediately apparent. Joachim Gnllka, *Das Evangelium nach Markus*, (Band 1, Mk 1-8,26. Benziger: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978), 259, notes that the compassion of Jesus, which was motivated in Mk 8.2 by the people's hunger, compares with God's compassion in the OT. The general background of the references to the shepherd and the flock is manifold; he mentions Ezek 34.5; 1 Kgs 22.17; Zech 13.7; Num 27.17. Here Gnllka writes, "Da aber kein Zitat, sondern nur das verbreitete Bild vorliegt, bedeutet dies, daß Jesus der Hirt und dabei ist, das eschatologische Gottesvolk zu konstituieren. Nicht ist Jesus als zweiter Mose vorgestellt. Die markinische Bemerkung, daß er das Volk zu lehren beginnt, deutet an, worin vor allem seine Hirtentätigkeit zu sehen ist. Damit ist das folgende Wunder in ein bestimmtes Licht gerückt und das Wunder der Lehre untergeordnet und eingefügt." Edwin K. Broadhead, *Teaching with Authority: Miracles and Christology in the Gospel of Mark*, (JSNTSup 74; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), 118-19,

In contrast to Mark, the First Gospel appears to have split Mark's *shepherding-feeding* metaphor apart:

Καὶ ἐξελθὼν εἶδεν πολλὸν ὄχλον καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπ' αὐτοῖς
καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν τοὺς ἀρρώστους αὐτῶν. --Mt 14.14

And disembarking he saw a large crowd and he was moved with compassion for them,
and *he healed their sick.*"

In comparison, one observes that, beginning when Jesus disembarks, the wording in Mk 6.34 and in Mt 14.14 (καὶ ἐξελθὼν εἶδεν πολλὸν ὄχλον καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπ' αὐτούς) is virtually identical, the only difference being Matthew's use of αὐτοῖς in place of αὐτούς. Matthew retains the term ἐσπλαγχνίσθη¹⁵ to describe Jesus' compassion for the crowds, although he reserves the expression "sheep without a shepherd" for use elsewhere. Unlike Mark 6.34, where Jesus' compassion for the crowd results in teaching and then feeding them, Matthew 14.14 associates the compassion of Jesus with healing the sick before he feeds the multitude. Matthew's redaction of Mark 6.34_{ff} completely removes the *teaching* emphasis and sets the scene firmly in a context of *healing* (cf. Mk 6.30, 34).¹⁶

agrees that Mark portrays Jesus' *shepherding* as *teaching*. "The presentation of the need is unusual...The crowd stands in the place usually occupied by a sick one, a demoniac or a threatened one. Nevertheless, it is they who stand in need, for Jesus is moved with compassion upon them." Because the reason for Jesus' compassion is not as evident for the crowd as for those who need healing or exorcism, the Markan narrative employs the OT imagery of sheep who need a shepherd. Jesus' response to the need of the crowd is narrated in an unexpected way -- 'the miracle worker *teaches*.' "By replacing the expected miracle activity with emphasis on Jesus' *teaching*, the import of the story becomes clear: it is the *teaching* of Jesus which properly satisfied the need of these shepherdless people. [Broadhead says that the "second-level need of the crowd is for food."] Thus the configuration of the unit around the *teaching* once again subsumes the miracles of Jesus within a crucial interpretive context: they are demonstrations of the power and mercy of *Jesus the teacher*." [emphasis added]

¹⁵In the NT, σπλαγχνίζομαι occurs only in the Synoptics (Mt 9.36, 14.14, 15.32, 18.27, 20.34; Mk 1.41, 6.34, 8.2, 9.22; Lk 7.13, 10.33, 15.20). Outside the Lukan parables, the term describes Jesus, or occurs in an appeal to him for healing.

¹⁶Mark 6.30 already sets the scene for teaching, when the apostles report to Jesus "all that they had done and *taught* (cf. Lk 9.10)." Luke 9 agrees with Mark by locating the feeding miracle immediately

When Matthew takes up the remaining words from Mark 6.34 (ὅτι ἦσαν ὡς πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα) he transposes them to the completely different narrative setting; the correlation between Jesus' compassion and the image of the crowds as "sheep without a shepherd" is featured in a summary of Jesus' *healing* ministry (Mt 9.35-36). Matthew's use of the "sheep without a shepherd" imagery in juxtaposition with σπλαγχνίζομαι and *healing* in Mt 9.36, and his integration of σπλαγχνίζομαι and *healing* in 14.14 warrants further study.¹⁷

Matthew and Mark are the only gospels that report two of Jesus' feeding miracles (Mt 14.14; 15.32||Mk 6.34; 8.2). In his second account, when Jesus feeds four thousand people, Matthew speaks again of his compassion for the crowds (15.32; cf. 9.36; 14.14). In both Matthew and Mark, the word σπλαγχνίζομαι is this time found on Jesus' lips with respect to the crowd's need for *food*:

Σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ τὸν ὄχλον, ὅτι ἤδη ἡμέραι τρεῖς
προσμένουσίν μοι καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσιν τί φάγωσιν.

--Mt 15.32||Mk 8.2

[Jesus said] I have compassion on the crowd, because they have been with me for three days and they do not have anything to eat.

In contrast with his report on the first feeding miracle, Matthew follows Mark very closely in his account of the second feeding miracle; in fact, in this crucial verse, Matthew 15.32 follows Mark 8.2 verbatim.¹⁸ This makes it all the more intriguing that Matthew alters the

after the sending out of the twelve and the death of John; Matthew inserts chapters 11-13 between these two events but also locates the feeding immediately after John's death. Nowhere in Matthew do the disciples report on their mission, which is significant for the interpretation of Mt 10.23. The expression "sheep without a shepherd" appears nowhere in Luke or John, although both evangelists employ other pastoral imagery.

¹⁷Such a study is outside the scope of this thesis; however, see reference below to Peter M. Head, note# 25. For a study on Matthew's tendency to emphasize Jesus' healing over the Markan Jesus' teaching, see the reference below to Kim Paffenroth's article in note #23.

¹⁸The setting just before the feeding of the 4000 is already one of healing in Mt 15.29-31 ||Mk 7.31-37.

Feeding of the 5000 and relocates the focus on “sheep without a shepherd” to the context of Mt 9.36.

In order to grasp the significance of the changes Matthew has made to the tradition, it is helpful to locate Mt 9.36 within its literary context.

After the baptism of Jesus and John’s arrest, Matthew’s narrative focuses upon three things -- Jesus’ preaching (chapters 5-7), his healing ministry, and the call to discipleship (cf. 4.12-22). Before even one such incident is reported in the text, Matthew announces in a *summary passage* that Jesus “went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues and preaching the gospel of the kingdom and healing every disease and every infirmity among the people” (4.23-25).

When reading through Matthew 8 and 9, one is impressed by the intensity of the narrative: the range and magnitude of the healings increase, the demands of discipleship are magnified, and the opposition to Jesus escalates.

After the Sermon on the Mount, the crowds continue to follow Jesus (7.28-8.1). He heals a leper (8.2-4), a centurion’s servant (8.5-13), and then Peter’s mother-in-law (8.14-15). Following these healings, Matthew 8.16-17 provides a review of Jesus’ ministry of exorcism and healing, interpreted here as a fulfillment of Isaiah 53.4.¹⁹ Matthew 8.18-22 intensifies the demands of discipleship; the next pericopes display Jesus’ authority over the wind and sea (8.23-27), and even over the demons at Gadara (8.28-34). The healing of a paralytic engenders praise to God by the crowds, but some of the scribes call this act “blasphemy” (9.1-8). Jesus’ table fellowship with such disreputable people as tax collectors angers the Pharisees (9.9-13). In Mt 9.14-17 questions about fasting arise. Jesus next heals the woman with the hemorrhage and raises a girl who died (9.18-26) then he heals two blind men²⁰ (9.27-31). An exorcism provokes the Pharisees’ accusation that Jesus cast out demons “by the prince of demons” (9.32-34).

Toward the end of chapter 9, Matthew inserts the second *summary* of Jesus’ activity in the gospel, “And Jesus went about all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues and preaching the good news of the kingdom and healing every disease and every infirmity” (Mt 9.35). In this sustained portrayal of Jesus’ healing ministry and the emphasis on discipleship, Matthew now introduces the reference to “sheep without a shepherd”:

¹⁹A complete analysis of this fulfillment citation falls outside the scope of this thesis; however, with regard to Jesus as healer in the First Gospel, it is addressed briefly in note # 40 below.

²⁰After the Infancy Narrative (Mt 1.1, 20) this is the first occurrence of *Son of David* terminology. See note # 47 below.

Ἰδὼν δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους ἐσπλαγχνίσθη περὶ αὐτῶν, ὅτι ἦσαν ἐσκυλμένοι²¹
καὶ ἐρριμμένοι²² ὡσεὶ πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα.

--Mt 9.36

Seeing the crowds, he was moved with compassion for them, for they were mangled
and exposed, like sheep without a shepherd.

Now it becomes apparent that Matthew did split the *shepherding-feeding* metaphor he found in Mark 6. When he tells the miraculous story of feeding five thousand people, Jesus' compassion is noted, but the context is no longer one of teaching. The Matthean Shepherd who has compassion for the "sheep without a shepherd," is not identified as such at the site of a miraculous feeding; rather, he is the synagogue teacher and preacher of the Gospel, who *heals* every disease and every infirmity (9.35-36).

The change from Mark's stress on *teaching* to Matthew's emphasis on *healing* is not limited to the miracle of Jesus feeding the five thousand (Mt 14.14||Mk 6.34). Another example is found when Jesus leaves Galilee for the region of Judea;²³ Mark writes:

...καὶ συμπορεύονται πάλιν ὄχλοι πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ ὡς εἰώθει πάλιν
ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς.

--Mk 10.1b

...and again crowds gathered to him, and again, as was his custom, he *taught* them.

²¹From σκύλλω, originally meaning flay, mangle. The monster Scylla (Σκύλλα) tore her prey to pieces. Metaphorically, the word came to mean trouble, annoy, vex. In the NT it occurs also at Mk 5.35, Lk 7.6, 8.49. It is not found in the LXX.

²²From ῥίπτω, meaning thrown away or cast out; also used of newborns who were exposed. It can have neutral meanings, as to put down, or of animals lying on the ground. In the NT it also occurs at Mt 15.30, 27.5; Lk 4.35, 17.2; Acts 22.23, 27.19, 29. Highly significant for translating Mt 9.36 is the fact that, almost without exception, the *perfect passive* of ῥίπτω in LXX refers to corpses or those left for dead [see Jd 4.22, 15.15; 3 Kgs 13.24,25, 28; Tob 1.17; Ju 6.13, 14.15; Ps 87(88).5; Is 33.12; Je 14.16, 43(36).30; Ep Je 71; Da 11.4].

²³I am indebted to Kim Paffenroth, "Jesus as Anointed and Healing Son of David," *Bib* 80 (1999), 549-50, for this example and for pointing out another important example of Matthew's redaction of a teaching scene to one of healing: "both Mark and Luke have Jesus teach in the temple after casting out the money-changers there (Mark 11,17//Luke 19,47). Matthew, on the other hand, omits any reference to Jesus' teaching and instead says that 'the blind and lame came to him in the temple, and he healed them' (Matt 21,14)... Jesus' time in the temple has been transformed by Matthew into the climax of Jesus' healing ministry." Paffenroth's article gives other examples of ways Matthew redacts Mark to depict Jesus more as a healer. This figures in the excursus on Jesus the Shepherd.

Matthew reports this transition from Galilee to Judea differently:

...καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί, καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτοὺς ἐκεῖ. --Mt 19.2

...and large crowds followed him, and he *healed* them there.

As the focus now shifts from Mark's gospel to Matthew's, the question arises whether it is right to assume that Matthew's use of the expression "sheep without a shepherd" is necessarily founded upon the same source as Mark's. Since Matthew has relocated the expression to a context of healing, the fact that Zech 10.2 LXX also refers to healing (ἰασις) merits careful attention. A survey of the secondary literature reveals that some scholars completely omit Zech 10.2 in their lists of passages to be considered with respect to the expression "sheep without a shepherd."²⁴ Perhaps Zech 10.2 is overlooked because the LXX mentions healing rather than shepherding.

Peter M. Head is perhaps representative of those who note Zech 10.2 in passing. In his study of σπλαγχνίζομαι in Mt 9.36, he mentions Zech 10.2 briefly. His main point is that Jesus' compassionate response to the "sheep without a shepherd" is a *messianic* characteristic and not a depiction of Jesus' emotional state.²⁵

Francis Martin does note Zech 10.2 in his lengthy article on "the image of shepherd" in Matthew's gospel; however, Martin attempts to use it primarily in support of his view that the principal source for Matthew's use of "sheep without a shepherd" is

²⁴Among those whose commentaries omit mention of Zech 10.2 with reference to Mt 9.36 are Luz, Harrington, Gundry, and Davies & Allison.

²⁵Peter M. Head, *Christology and the Synoptic Problem: An Argument for Markan Priority* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 110, lists Zech 10.2 and 11.4-17 among the passages having to do with "sheep without a shepherd," but he does not give reasons for the presence of Zech 11 in his list. By using the expression in Mt 9.36, the evangelist is implicitly claiming that Jesus is the messianic shepherd (of Ezek 34.23; 37.24, according to Head). In his study, Head's concern is to draw together the expressions of compassion and mercy, σπλαγχνίζομαι and ἐλεέω, in Matthew's characterization of Jesus as Son of David.

Ezekiel 34.1-6.²⁶ He explores in some detail the shepherd motif in Matthew as it relates to Jesus' healing ministry, but his main contention is that Ezekiel 34 is the source for the healing shepherd.²⁷

At first glance, Zechariah 10.2 does not stand out as Matthew's most likely source for the "sheep without a shepherd" imagery. However, two factors connected with his use of "sheep without a shepherd" urge the reconsideration of Zech 10.2 as having played a formative role in Matthew's allusion: (1) not only has it been removed from the Markan

²⁶Francis Martin, "The Image of Shepherd," 261-301. Part of this article, 275-77, does explore in some detail the connection in Matthew between the shepherd motif and Jesus' healing ministry. Yet Martin offers no explanation for Matthew's meaning of "sheep without a shepherd," nor does he suggest any reason for Matthew's placement of the expression somewhere other than in his parallel to Mark's setting; rather, he simply reads Matt 14.14 in light of 9.36, and deduces that Matthew expected his readers to recall the former when they read the latter. Possibly Martin's premise, 274, that Mt 9.36 and 10.6 are to be treated together, "as modifying one another in developing the shepherd theme of the gospel," blinds him to possible separate influences upon the "lost sheep of the house of Israel" and upon "sheep without a shepherd." Martin, 298, seems to attribute the shepherd imagery in Mt 2.6 (Mic 5.2) to Ezek 34; he likewise, 275, derives Zech 10.2 LXX from the "whole tone" of Ezek 34, which prepared the way "for seeing the shepherd as a healer" in Mt 9.36. When Martin, 292, revisits Zech 10.2, he recalls it as an "allusion" in Mt 9.36! This is not the only confusion in this lengthy article, but it is especially unhelpful in a work devoted to the image of shepherd in Matthew. Hagner II, 738, includes Martin's article in his bibliographic references for Matt 25.31_{ff} but on Mt 9.36 he says that "what causes Jesus' deep compassion at this point is *not* the abundance of sickness he has seen but rather the great spiritual need of the people...." [emphasis added] Hagner I, 259, links the compassion of Jesus for the crowds in Mt 9.35-38, with "the quotation of Num 17:17." He places Zech 10.2 in parentheses at the end of his list of texts on "sheep who have no shepherd" then highlights the 2 Chronicles passage as "suggestive in its reference to those who 'have no master'" and adds that "Ezek 34:6 may be in view" as well. Donald J. Versepnt, "The Davidic Messiah and Matthew's Jewish Christianity," *SBLSP* (1995), 111-12, reads the "sheep without shepherd" and the "lost sheep of the house of Israel" as a "composite picture... unmistakably reminiscent of the prophetic imagery used in Ezek 34 and Jer 23:1-3 to describe the destruction of the exile." One article which concentrates on the Shepherd and Sheep in the First Gospel is by John Paul Heil ("Ezekiel 34 and the Narrative Strategy of the Shepherd and Sheep Metaphor in Matthew," *CBQ* 55 [1993], 698-708). Heil, 708, concludes that the "narrative strategy of Matthew's shepherd metaphor is *guided* and unified by Ezekiel 34, which supplies the reader with *some* of its terms and with *all* of its concepts and images." [emphasis added] Heil, 700-1, connects the summary of Mt 9.35-36 with the fulfillment of God's promise in Ezek 34.30; i.e., Heil reads Jesus' healing as shepherd to the promises of Mt 1.23 (Emmanuel) and Mt 2.6. None of the other "sheep without a shepherd" texts are mentioned in the article. For a rebuttal of those who favor Ezek 34 exclusively, see excursus on Jesus as Shepherd near the end of this thesis.

²⁷Martin, *op. cit.*, 275, figuratively juxtaposes the LXX and the MT of Zech 10.2 in a single sentence. After noting the presence of *ἰασις* in place of "shepherd," and making mention of minor textual issues, Martin never returns to consider the implications of the variant Septuagintal and Masoretic traditions of Zech 10.2.

feeding-miracle context, but (2) the expression in Mt 9.36 has also been augmented in the transition with terms that describe the condition of the “sheep without a shepherd.” The Masoretic and Septuagintal versions of Zech 10.2 both present very descriptive pictures²⁸ of the wretched condition of the shepherdless sheep, using words like *aimless* and *afflicted*.²⁹ While the MT attributes their sorry condition to the lack of *shepherding*, the LXX gives another *reason* for the deplorable state of the sheep:

...διὰ τοῦτο ἐξήρθησαν³⁰ ὡς πρόβατα καὶ ἐκακώθησαν,³¹
 διότι οὐκ ἦν ἰασις.³²

--Zech 10.2b LXX

...therefore, [the people] were driven as sheep, and they were distressed,
 because there was no *healing*.

²⁸Recall that the “sheep without a shepherd” reference in Mk 6.34 is unmodified; in contrast, Mt 9.36 includes two vivid descriptive terms; so Zech 10.2 MT and LXX. R. T. France is the only scholar I have found who notes a correspondence between the descriptive elements of Zech 10.2 and Mt 9.36. In a section on Zech 13.7, France, *Jesus and the Old Testament* (Downer's Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity, 1971), 208-9, looks at Jesus' use of “the shepherd theme” and notes that, although not the only part of the OT where it is found, the theme of “shepherd and flock” is particularly prominent in Zech 9-13. In the midst of this discussion, France writes (in parentheses) that the description of the sheep in Matthew 9.36 is “very likely based on what Jesus himself had said, and quite possibly derived from the similar description in Zc. 10:2.” France does not note the MT and LXX variants of Zech 10.2 and makes no further mention of their possible influence on Mt 9.36.

²⁹There are no modifiers of the shepherdless sheep in Judith 11.19; Num 27.17 anticipates a future leaderless congregation, who would become like sheep without a shepherd; 1 Kgs 22.17 and 2 Chr 18.16 both envision Israel scattered on the mountains as sheep without a shepherd; Ezek 34.5-6,8 sees the people *scattered* because of the lack of shepherd(s) [pl. LXX]; they have become *food* for wild animals, with no one to seek for them; they have become fodder for the wild animals because there are no shepherds; Jer 23.1-2 and 50.6 (27.6) describe the people as *lost* sheep led astray on the mountains by their shepherds, or as sheep *destroyed* and *scattered* by their shepherds. Of these texts which have both extant MT and LXX traditions, their Greek and Hebrew versions are similar. The only exception is Zech 10.2: its MT text appears above on p # 54; LXX follows.

³⁰ἐξήρθησαν (S^cL), from ἐξαίρω, meaning excited, agitated, driven away. The variant ἐξηραυθήσαν (BS^aAQWC), from ξηραίνω (dried up, withered) does not fit as well in the Zech 10.2 context of being compared to sheep (ὡς πρόβατα).

³¹From κακός, meaning mistreated, distressed, suffering, disfigured. Those who were “like sheep” in Zech 10.2 refers back to “the flock of his people,” whom God promises to save “on that day” (Zech 9.16).

³²ἰασις, meaning care, remedy, healing. In later literature, it could mean forgiveness, as the *cure* of sin; see BAGD, 368.

Since the Greek and Hebrew traditions of Zechariah 10.2b vary so widely,³³ the question arises whether the Targum might be illuminating for the purposes of this discussion:

*For the worshippers of idols speak deceit in their deceitful prophesying: they afford no comfort at all; therefore they have been scattered like the scattering of a flock, they went into exile because there was no king.*³⁴

Reflective of its tendency to historicize, *Tg. Zech.* 10.2 interprets the scattering of the flock in light of the exile, which does not illuminate the shepherding-healing question. Although the Targum sheds little light upon Matthew's use of Zechariah 10.2, it does indicate that the substitution of *king* in place of *shepherd* in Zech 10.2 reflects a Jewish interpretation not limited to the gospels. This becomes clearer in *Tg. Zech.* 10.4: "From them will be *their king*, from them *their anointed One*...."³⁵ This targumic evidence is also important because it relates the term *shepherd* (Zech 10.2 MT) both to *king* (*Tg. Zech.* 10.2, 4) and to the *Messiah* (*Tg. Zech.* 10.4).³⁶

In review, none of the biblical texts related to the expression "sheep without a shepherd" presents an exact match for either Mark 6.34 or Matthew 9.36. With respect to the Markan context, the thematic combination of feeding and shepherding suggests Ezek 34 as its most likely source. Because Matthew relocates the "sheep without a shepherd"

³³The meanings of the Greek adjectives in Zech 10.2 LXX seem more intense than their corresponding Hebrew counterparts. For example, wandering about (πνι), as in pulling up tent stakes, does not produce the same impression as being agitated or driven about (ἐξαιρω). There is the sense of agency implicit in the Greek that I do not find in the Hebrew. In both, however, the "visionaries" are leading the people astray rather than back to God.

³⁴Translation from Robert P. Gordon, *The Targum of the Minor Prophets* (Vol. 14 of *The Aramaic Bible*; ed. by K. J. Cathcart, M. Maher and M. McNamara; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1989), 208. [Italics in the text are from the translator; they indicate differences from MT.]

³⁵*Ibid.*, 209.

³⁶In Zechariah, the *king* of 9.9 also takes on messianic significance (cf. Mt 21.5's use of Zech 9.9). The constellation of *shepherd-king-messiah* terminology in Zechariah strongly figures in Matthew's Christology. See the excursus on Jesus as Shepherd in Matthew below.

terminology to a very different setting, the feeding motif of Ezekiel 34 and Mark 6 has disappeared.

A closer analysis of Zechariah 10.2b in the Greek and Hebrew traditions is now in order. In each case, the text divides into two parts: the first clause describes the condition of the sheep; the second clause gives the reason for their condition in terms of what the sheep lack.

	<u>MT</u>	<u>LXX</u>
Condition	wandering as sheep נסעו כמרצאן	driven as sheep ἐξήρθησαν ὡς πρόβατα
	afflicted/wretched/bent down humbled/pitiful/mortified יענני	distressed/mistreated/ suffering/disfigured ἐκακώθησαν
Lacking	shepherding רעה	healing ἰασις

It is striking that Zechariah 10.2b attributes the pitiful condition of the sheep to their lack of *shepherding* in the Hebrew, but to a lack of *healing* in the Greek. As for the conditions of the sheep, the MT and LXX readings are roughly equivalent; if the second clauses are now read together, one may interpret that the sheep need *shepherding* in the form of *healing*. If Mt 9.36 is read in its context, with such a combined reading of Zech 10.2 in view, it appears that the expression “sheep without a shepherd” is understood from the Hebrew but that the “exegesis” of their need for *healing* comes from the Greek. Could Matthew have been aware of both traditions of the Hebrew and Greek of Zech 10.2, and if so, might he have used them together to undergird his portrayal of Jesus as the healing shepherd in this part of the first gospel?

The use of two text traditions at once is neither impossible nor unlikely. In the first instance, there is evidence of the co-existence of a plurality of textual traditions of the same

biblical texts at Qumran.³⁷ Three Jeremiah manuscripts were found in Cave 4, two of which follow the longer Masoretic tradition, while the third attests the shorter Septuagintal type. There is also the attestation of a fragment from Numbers (4QNum^b) which displays Samaritan Pentateuchal characteristics against both Masoretic and Septuagint readings. This kind of plurality of texts could be explained by supposing that different scribes were involved, or that the manuscripts derived from different periods. A second kind of textual duality is somewhat more relevant to the present question: a fragment of Deuteronomy from Cave 5 has been found containing supralinear corrections that bring the Hebrew more closely in line with the tradition preserved in the Septuagint.

The third Qumran precedent is more significant with respect to the Matthew-Zechariah textual question. The Habakkuk Commentary (1QpHab) contains passages in which MT and LXX text types are used simultaneously. For example, the commentary quotes the biblical text at Hab 2.16 using a “Septuagint-type text” (1QpHab XI, 9), while the exegesis reflects a Masoretic reading (1QpHab XI,13).³⁸ Not only, then, is there precedence for a plurality of biblical traditions present in a library roughly contemporary with the gospels, but there is also evidence of reading the variants of the same biblical verse

³⁷These examples can be found in Geza Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective* (London: Collins, 1977), 204-6.

³⁸Maurya P. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* (Washington, D. C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979), 50, gives a more cautious reference to the Hab 2.16 citation: “The appearance of this word [*whr^c l*, the MT variant] in the commentary on Hab 2:16 could indicate that the Qumran author was aware of the textual tradition reflected in the form *wh^c rl* in the MT.” Vermes, *Perspective*, 205, writes, “The point to be made here is that the Habakkuk Commentary from Cave 1 has revealed that a tendency to reconcile such deviant records goes back to at least as far as the inter-Testamental era itself. The commentator, quoting Habakkuk 2:16 follows a Septuagint-type text, ‘Drink and stagger (*hera^dl*)’; but he shows in his exegesis that he is well aware of the Masoretic reading, ‘Drink and show your foreskin (*he^carel*),’ since he writes: For he (the Wicked Priest) did not circumcise the *foreskin* of his heart and walked in the ways of *drunkenness* (1QpHab 11:9-14....).” Michael A. Knibb, *The Qumran Community* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 244, has written along the same lines in his discussion of this passage from the Habakkuk Peshar.

together in one manuscript.

The proposal that Matthew may have been aware of traditions preserved in both Greek and Hebrew readings of Zech 10.2 and that he may have read them together is consistent with the evidence of similar exegetical practices at Qumran. It is therefore quite possible that both textual traditions of Zech 10.2 have provided some of the background for Matthew 9.35-36.³⁹ If so, then Matthew associates, at least in part, the *shepherding* response of the compassionate Jesus for the “sheep without a shepherd” with his *healing* ministry.

Before addressing the possible influence of Zechariah 10.2 on the larger Matthean context, it is important to consider whether the expectation of a *healing shepherd* figure is attested elsewhere in early Judaism. Apart from biblical texts,⁴⁰ three others that merit serious attention come to mind. From *Psalms of Solomon 17* emerges the vision of a royal *shepherd*, one of whose roles it is to keep sickness and infirmity from the people.

Ἴδέ, κύριε, καὶ ἀνάστησον αὐτοῖς τὸν βασιλέα αὐτῶν υἱὸν Δαυιδ....
 ...καὶ βασιλεὺς αὐτῶν χριστὸς κυρίου.
 ποιμαίνων τὸ ποίμνιον κυρίου ἐν πίστει καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ
 καὶ οὐκ ἀφήσει ἀσθενῆσαι ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ νομῇ αὐτῶν. --Pss. Sol. 17.21, 32, 40⁴¹

Behold, Lord, and raise up for them their king, the son of David....
 ...and their king (will be) the Lord Messiah.
 With faith(fulness) and righteousness he will shepherd the Lord's flock
 and he will not permit sickness/infirmity⁴² to be among them in their pasture.

³⁹See section on Jesus' entry into Jerusalem (Mt 21.5/Zech 9.9; and excursus) for Matthew's knowledge of Hebrew and Greek. See also thesis section on Judas' betrayal (Mt 26.14-16; 27.3-10/ Zech 11.4-17) for evidence that Matthew knew and used the variants “potter” and “treasury” (Zech 11.13).

⁴⁰Matthew's unique reading of Is 53.4, “He took our sicknesses and bore our diseases,” in Mt 8.16-17 comes to mind. The word translated “sicknesses” here is ἀσθενείας. The cognate ἀσθενῆσαι occurs in Pss.Sol.17.40 [see below]. Matthew interprets Jesus' healing ministry as fulfillment of this *Servant* text.

⁴¹The Greek text of Pss. Sol. 17 is taken from Rahlfs' *Septuaginta*, 488.

⁴²I believe my translation of ἀσθενῆσαι here suits the context better than R. B. Wright's “he will not let any of them stumble in their pasture,” in OTP2, 668. The sense of bodily sickness noted

The *healing shepherd-king* is identified as the Lord Messiah, *χριστός κυρίου* (17.32; cf. *Pss. Sol.* 18.7).

One passage from the *Damascus Document* concerns an expectation of a figure who is like a shepherd:

...He shall love them as a father loves his children and shall carry them in all their distress like a shepherd his sheep. He shall loosen all the fetters which bind them, that in his congregation there may be none that are oppressed or broken. --CD 13.9-10⁴³

4Q521 also describes hopes of things expected to happen in the messianic age:

¹[for the heav]ens and the earth will listen to his anointed one,⁴⁴
²[and all th]at is in them will not turn away from the precepts of the holy ones.
³Strengthen yourselves, you who are seeking the Lord, in his service! Blank
⁴Will you not in this encounter the Lord, all those who hope in their heart?
⁵For the Lord will consider the pious, and call the righteous by name,
⁶and his spirit will hover upon the poor, and he will he renew the faithful with his strength.
⁷For he will honour the pious upon the throne of an eternal kingdom,
⁸freeing prisoners, giving sight to the blind, straightening out the twis[t.ed.]
⁹And for[e]ver shall I cling [to those who h]ope, and in his mercy [...]
¹⁰and the fru[it of...] ...not be delayed.
¹¹And the Lord will perform marvellous acts such as have not existed, just as he sa[id,]
¹²[for]he will heal the badly wounded and will make the dead live, he will proclaim good news to the poor¹³ and [...] ... [...]he will lead the [...] ... and enrich the hungry ones.⁴⁵
¹⁴[...] and all ... [...]⁴⁶

in Mt 8.17 [see previous note] is also to be read in Jesus' commission for the disciples to heal, ἀσθενοῦντας θεραπεύετε (Mt 10.8).

⁴³Translation of text from Geza Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. (rev. and ext. 4th ed.; London: Penguin, 1995), 111-12. Whether the Guardian/Inspector of the Camp is a messianic figure is a matter of debate; however, this thesis is primarily interested in the expectation of a shepherd who heals. The terms "broken" and "oppressed" [Eng. trans.] seem familiar, but these words in CD-A and Zech 10.2 are not identical.

⁴⁴Translation of the text from *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (vol. 2; ed. Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 1045. See also É. Puech, "Une apocalypse messianique (4Q521)," *RevQ* 15 (1992) 475-522; idem., *DJD XXV* (1998), 1-38 (Plates I-III).

⁴⁵Two earlier alternate translations for line 13 include "he will give lavishly [to the need]y, lead the exiles and enrich the hungry" (Puech); and "he will lead the [hol]y ones; he will shepherd [th]em..." (Tabor/Wise). The connection of healing with the messianic era remains, even if *shepherding* is absent from the text.

⁴⁶Wise-Tabor translation reads Messiah into the lacunae of lines 10-11, omitted here for lack of evidence. See also Florentino García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, 394-95; and Geza Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (4th ed.; London: Penguin, 1995), 244-45.

Whether the one who *frees prisoners, makes the blind see, heals the sick, raises the dead, and preaches good news to the poor* is God or his agent is not clear from the text. These activities are suggestive of other biblical texts in which God's agent acts (see Isaiah texts below), and they are mirrored in some gospel accounts.⁴⁷ In order to compare some of these (possibly) messianic expectations, concepts taken from the pertinent texts (*Pss. Sol.* 17.40, 4Q521, Isa 26.19; 29.14, 18-19; 35.5-6; 61.1) are tabulated with representative terms from Mt 8-9, one from Q (Mt 11.2-5/ Lk 7.18_f), and Zech 10.2:

<u>Isaiah</u>	<u>Zech 10.2</u>	<u>4Q521</u>	<u>PsSol 17</u>	<u>Mt 8-9</u>	<u>Q Matt 11/Lk 7</u>
<i>anointed</i> MT - <i>shepherding</i> (Servant) (prophet)		<i>Messiah</i> the Lord	<i>Lord Messiah</i> <i>shepherds</i> flock	Jesus	<i>works of Messiah</i> (Matt only)
	LXX- <i>healing</i>	sick healed	permits no sickness (ἀσθενῆσαι)	every disease (ἀσθενείας)	(Lk -diseases)
blind see deaf hear lame walk brokenhearted healed mute sing		blind see downtrodden raised		every infirmity exorcisms blind see paralyzed healed	(Lk -exorcisms) blind see deaf hear lame walk
				lepers cleansed fever cured flow of blood staunched	lepers cleansed
captives freed dead shall live poor hear good news		captives freed dead raised poor hear good news		dead raised	dead raised poor hear good news

⁴⁷According to Mt 9.18-26, Jesus raises a girl from the dead. Immediately following in the narrative, two blind men call out to Jesus, "Have mercy on us, Son of David" (Matt 9.27). This is the first place since the Infancy Narrative that Matthew recalls the title *Son of David*. Of what literary significance is the fact that these words are spoken immediately after the dead girl is raised? Is it possible that lines 8 and 12 also illuminate the enigmatic "works of the Messiah" in Matt 11.2-5? See comparison with Isaiah "messianic" expectations below.

The fulfillment citation in Matthew 2.6,⁴⁸ and a reading of chapters 8-9 in light of Mt 9.35-36, confirm that the ministry of the Davidic Messiah who will *shepherd* God's people Israel is an important theme in the First Gospel. In light of these texts, one may conclude that the expectations of some early Jewish traditions included a shepherd figure who would preach good news to the poor, release captives, heal all kinds of sicknesses, and even raise the dead. Mt 8-9 demonstrates that Jesus has done all of these things. If a dual reading of Zech 10.2 contributed to the evangelist's understanding of the Davidic messiah as a *healing shepherd*, reflected in the summary of Jesus' messianic works (Mt 9.36), one may advance the question whether Zech 10.2 possibly undergirds a broader narrative segment of the First Gospel. The structure of the text may render clues to substantiate such a claim.

The wording in the summary texts of Matthew 4.23 and 9.35 are nearly identical, which immediately suggests the possibility of them forming an *inclusio*:

καὶ περιῆγεν ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ διδάσκων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν
καὶ κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας
καὶ θεραπεύων πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν ἐν τῷ λαῷ. --Matt 4.23

καὶ περιῆγεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὰς πόλεις καὶ τὰς κώμας διδάσκων ἐν ταῖς
συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν
καὶ κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας
καὶ θεραπεύων πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν. --Matt 9.35

Except for the underlined words which describe the geographical location of Jesus' ministry and the mention of the people, which makes implicit in the first case what is implicit in the second, the two verses are identical. The ministry activities recorded between these two summary passages are divided into teaching/preaching (chapters 5-7) and healing (chapters 8-9), with issues about discipleship interspersed in both parts. These

⁴⁸See thesis section on the Infancy Narrative above; Mt 2.6 (ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαόν μου τὸν Ἰσραήλ).

summary passages also recall the expectations of the messianic age outlined above. The influence of Zech 10.2/Mt 9.36 may thus be extended to include the entire narrative from Matthew 4.23 - 9.36.

Is it possible that the influence of Matthew 9.36 projects not only backward but also forward in the Matthean narrative? Davies and Allison rightly regard Mt 9.35 -10.4 as a transitional text, or hinge, between what has gone before and what comes in chapter 10-- it serves both to conclude chapters 8-9 and to introduce the missionary discourse of chapter 10. Their comments begin with the *inclusio* formed by Mt 4.23 and 9.35:

The two verses together create a sort of *inclusio*: between them Jesus first teaches (5-7) and then heals (8-9). Afterwards, in chapter 10 — and *this constitutes a climax in the narrative* — Jesus instructs and sends out the disciples for mission. The logic behind the arrangement should not be missed. When Jesus instructs his missionaries, *he is telling them to do exactly what he has done, for they too are to teach and heal*. This accounts for the parallelism between 4.17 and 10.6 as well as between 4.24 and 10.1....⁴⁹

In this light, the possibility of a relationship between Zech 10.2/Mt 9.36 and the underlying structure of Matthew 4.23 - 10.8 looks promising.

The pivotal passage of Mt 9.35-36 brings together the summary of the ministry of Jesus with the commission of the disciples to do what Jesus has done. Just before the summary passage of Mt 4.23, Jesus has called Peter, Andrew, James and John to become fishers of people, and they follow him as disciples (4.18-22, 5.1). After the mini-summary passage in Mt 8.16-17, following Jesus becomes more demanding and involves taking some risks (8.19-27). The status of discipleship decreases when Jesus calls unsavory characters to follow him (9.9-13). As the narrative continues, the nature of people's response to Jesus has shifted from a positive acknowledgment (8.16-17) to a mixed reception (8.34; 9.2-3, 8, 11, 24), and finally to outright hostility from the Pharisees (9.34). At the height of conflict, when the healings and exorcisms have intensified to the point of raising the dead, Jesus brings his disciples into a more active role in his ministry.

Matthew 9.37-38 interjects harvest-language between the *summary* of 9.35-36 and the *sending* of the Twelve. The concepts, if not the terminology, of shepherding and

⁴⁹See Davies & Allison I, 411-12, on Mt 4.23. [emphasis added] Strictly speaking, the commission in Mt 10 is to *preach* and *heal*; the commission to baptize and to *teach* does not appear until Mt 28.19-20.

harvesting intersect briefly.⁵⁰ The presence of eschatological metaphors may look awkward to twenty-first century eyes, but the reader is thereby alerted to understand that the discourse which follows is bound up with eschatological expectation.⁵¹

In Matthew 10.1 Jesus calls “his twelve disciples” and gives them “authority over unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal every disease and every infirmity.” After listing the names of the twelve, Matthew reports that “Jesus sent them out, charging them, ‘Go nowhere among the Gentiles, and enter no town of the Samaritans, but go rather to the *lost sheep*⁵² of the house of Israel’” (10.5-6). Jesus’ disciples are to model their ministry upon his: “And preach as you go, saying, ‘The kingdom of heaven is at hand.’ Heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse lepers, cast out demons...” (10.7-8).

In these verses, the *shepherding* motif is recast: Jesus authorizes the disciples to fulfill something of his ministry to the *lost sheep* of the house of Israel (cf. Matt 15.24).

⁵⁰In some contexts the two metaphors may have the imagery of *scattering and gathering* in common. Blaine Charette, *The Theme of Recompense*, 55, 72-73, cites Jeremias’ conclusion that gathering and scattering are technical terms in shepherding as well as in harvesting. He makes the same connection with Mt 12.30b, “The one who does not gather (συνάγω) with me scatters (σκορπίζω).” Charette states his case in a slightly different way in his earlier article, “A Harvest for the People? An Interpretation of Matthew 9.37f,” *JSNT* 38 (1990), 29-35. There Charette reads the harvest in terms of eschatological blessing, not judgment; he therefore concludes, 32, that the commission to the disciples to go to the lost sheep of the house of Israel is the concomitant eschatological gathering of Israel. Charette, in his study of possible meanings for the harvest metaphor, 30, warns that scholars ought not to transfer meanings of metaphors from one setting to another automatically, “for it is not uncommon for Matthew to use a single metaphor to refer to two very different things [--e.g.,] ...compare...the use of ‘sheep’ in 10.6 and 10.16....” Charette appears to make the same mistake when he reads Jesus’ compassion for the “sheep without a shepherd” as having the same metaphorical sense as the mission to the “lost sheep of the house of Israel.” As I state elsewhere in thesis sections on Mt 25.31-46 and 26.31-32, I am not so sure that scattering/gathering imagery is closely related to shepherding in the First Gospel; in many cases, the weight of evidence favors harvest imagery. One example of “gathering” imagery that recalls neither the harvest nor shepherding is found on Jesus’ lips in Mt 23. 37, “O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, killing the prophets and stoning those who are sent to you! How often would I have gathered your children together as a *hen gathers her brood under her wings*, and you would not!” Both times in this verse the verb is ἐπισυνάγω (cf. Mt 24.31).

⁵¹Davies & Allison II, 148-49, 158, also make a careful distinction here between the “standard eschatological *topos*, the harvest” and the reference to “sheep without a shepherd,” which “should, within the broader Matthean context, probably be given eschatological content: Israel is waiting for her messianic leader.” On page 148, they make a stronger statement, “Probably implicit in 9.36 is the notion that Israel is waiting for her true shepherd, Messiah Jesus.”

⁵²Here Matthew reinforces shepherding imagery with other allusions: Ezek 34.3-6, 11-16, and Jer 23.1-6, 50(27).6 speak of God’s provision for the future shepherding of the lost and scattered sheep. Mark does not use the term *lost sheep*; in fact the only two references to sheep in Mark are 6.34 and 14.27. Luke mentions (lost) sheep only in the parable in 15.3-7. The Jer, Ezek and other Zech texts which concern shepherds and sheep are treated in the excursus on Jesus the Shepherd later in this thesis.

The disciples are sent as *sheep* among wolves (Matt 10.16) and are given a vivid description of the risks of discipleship (10.17_{ff}). They may expect to be treated (10.24-25) as Jesus has been treated (9.34). The call to discipleship moves from the possibility of enduring verbal abuse to the likelihood of complete rejection by their families, as well as the social and religious establishment (10.34-37). To follow Jesus as his disciple may ultimately lead to violent death (10.21), or even to crucifixion (10.38-39; cf. 16.24-25).⁵³ The cost of discipleship has been raised to the level of *imitatio Christi*.

All of the things the disciples are commissioned to do would appear on a composite list of expectations for the messianic era. A similar list of *messianic works* is given in answer to John's disciples, who ask whether Jesus is the "one who is to come" in Mt 11.2-5. Just before the Baptist's question is raised, there is a transitional sentence in the Matthew text (11.1). After Jesus sent out his disciples on their mission, he went to teach and preach in their cities. In recalling Mt 10.1, 11.1 also sets the narrative stage for the "pronouncement story" in Mt 11.2-6, another review of Jesus' ministry to date.⁵⁴

Now when John heard in prison about the *works of the Messiah*, he sent word by his disciples and said to him, "Are you the coming one, or shall we look for another?" And Jesus answered them, "Go and tell John the things you hear and see: the blind receive their sight and the lame walk, lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised and the poor have good news preached to them. And blessed is the one who is not scandalized by me."⁵⁵

The key phrase "works of the Messiah" occurs only in Matthew (cf. Luke 7.18_{ff}). These words on Jesus' lips are clues to his identity: he claims to do works that fulfill messianic expectations (Mt 11.2-5). Matthew identifies the preaching and healing ministry of Jesus as "works of the Messiah."

⁵³See Dorothy Weaver's extensive analysis of Matt 9.35-11.1 in *Matthew's Missionary Discourse. A Literary Critical Analysis*. (JSNTSup 38; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 71-126.

⁵⁴Davies & Allison II, 238. Matthew 11.1 "simultaneously concludes the preceding discourse and resubmerges the reader in the narrative flow."

⁵⁵At Mt 11.6, the final *beatitude* of the first gospel is given by Jesus, "Blessed is the one who is not scandalized by me." This beatitude looks back upon all of Jesus' ministry through ch. 10, and forward to responses people will make to Jesus in the future. Will they recognize him, and if so, will they follow as his disciples, even when the demands of *imitatio Christi* increase to include a cross? By extension, the response to Jesus' disciples, who minister under his authority, will also be judged; this becomes explicit in Mt 10.11-15, 40-42.

In summary there is good reason to maintain that the shift of the “sheep without a shepherd” reference from the feeding miracle in Mk 6.30-44 to Mt 9.36 reflects, at least in part, the impact of Matthew’s dual reading of Zech 10.2 in Hebrew and Greek. By extension, that influence of the *healing shepherd* motif derived from Zechariah 10.2 may be perceived within the sub-structure of Matthew 4.23-11.6.

CHAPTER THREE
Jesus' Entry into Jerusalem
The Humble Messianic King
 [Matthew 21.5 (11.25-30) /Zechariah 9.9 (14.4-5)]

All four Gospels place Jesus' entrance into Jerusalem¹ shortly before his betrayal and arrest (Mt 21.1-9, Mk 11.1-10, Lk 19.28-40, Jn 12.12-19). Luke follows Mark closely with regard to the animal, a "colt on which no one has ... sat" (πῶλον δεδεμένον ἐφ' ὃν οὐδεὶς ... ἀνθρώπων ἐκάθισεν). Matthew does not mention the unriden nature of the colt. His otherwise abbreviated account of Jesus' instructions to the two disciples mentions a she-ass and her colt (21.2-3; cf. Mk 11.2-6).² Matthew accentuates the messianic significance of Jesus' royal entry with an explicit fulfillment citation of Zech 9.9:³

εἶπατε τῇ θυγατρὶ Σιών·
 ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεὺς σου ἔρχεται σοι
 πραῦς καὶ ἐπιβεβηκῶς ἐπὶ ὄνον
 καὶ ἐπὶ πῶλον υἱὸν ὑποζυγίου. --Mt 21.5

Matthew follows neither the Hebrew MT nor the Greek LXX text of Zech 9.9 entirely:⁴

גִּילִי מְאֹד בַּת-צִיּוֹן הֲרִיעִי בַת יְרוּשָׁלַם
 הִנֵּה מֶלֶכְךָ יְבוֹא לְךָ צְדִיק וְנוֹשֵׁעַ הוּא
 עֲנִי וְרֹכֵב עַל-חֲמֹר וְעַל-עִיר בְּתַאֲתָנוּת: --Zech 9.9 MT

Χαῖρε σφόδρα, θύγατερ Σιων·
 κήρυσσε, θύγατερ Ιερουσαλημ·
 ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεὺς σου ἔρχεται σοι,
 δίκαιος καὶ σώζων αὐτός,

¹Neither Luke nor John actually describes Jesus' *entry* into Jerusalem: Lk is occupied with events on the descent of the Mount of Olives and Jesus' entry to the Temple; in Jn the people of Jerusalem go out to meet Jesus.

²The description of the animal(s) does not affect this part of the exegesis; however, see Excursus on the Palm Sunday Donkey below.

³For an overview of Zech 9.9 in context, see Carol L. and Eric M. Meyers, *Zechariah 9-14* (New York: Doubleday, 1993) 123-31. See discussion below and note #9, on the messianic significance of *melek* in Zech 9.

⁴John 12.15's use of Zech 9.9 (μή φοβοῦ, θυγάτηρ Σιών· ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεὺς σου ἔρχεται καθήμενος ἐπὶ πῶλον ὄνου) and Zeph 3.14-15 is not of immediate concern here. For a possible influence of Zeph 3.14-15 in Mt 21, see note #20 below. See also the Charette reference, note #58 below.

πραῦς καὶ ἐπιβεβηκῶς ἐπὶ ὑποζύγιον
καὶ πῶλον νέον.

--Zech 9.9 LXX

Matthew 21.5 does not open with Zechariah's salutation to Daughter Zion/Daughter Jerusalem; instead, the opening words, "Say to Daughter Zion" (εἶπατε τῇ θυγατρὶ Σιων), probably come from Isaiah 62.11b.⁵ However, the next clause, ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεύς σου ἔρχεταιί σοι, follows the LXX exactly, in agreement with the MT. As he enters Jerusalem, the Matthean Jesus is portrayed as a royal figure: the image of Jesus as Davidic *king*, which first appeared in the Infancy Narrative, is suddenly reintroduced by means of the Zechariah fulfillment citation.

In Matthew 2.2 the Magi come to Jerusalem and ask where they might find the newborn *king of the Jews*. In this setting Herod is made to infer that the infant *king* (whose star was seen by the Magi) could be the *Messiah* (2.4). In his narrative of Jesus' Galilean ministry, Matthew has not once employed royal terminology to characterize Jesus.⁶ But now, as Jesus is about to enter Jerusalem, royal messianic language reemerges

⁵The substitution of Isa 62.11b for the salutation from for Zech 9.9 (*say to*, rather than *rejoice*) may have been because of Jerusalem's hostile reception of Jesus; see Gundry, *Matthew*, 408, Davies & Allison III, 118-19. Although Jerusalem did not rejoice when Jesus entered the city, the magi, upon seeing the star, "rejoiced exceedingly with great joy" (ἐχάρησαν χαρὰν μεγάλην σφόδρα); Craig S. Keener, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 104, suggests that "Matthew might then be alluding to the good news to Israel in the first line of Zechariah 9:9 [χαῖρε σφόδρα, θυγατερ Σιων], although he omits this in 21:5...." If not an allusion *per se*, there seems to be irony in the Gentile joy as contrasted with the seismic reactions by Jerusalem (Mt 2.3; 21.10). For other interpretations of Matthew's alteration of Zech 9.9, see also Gundry, *Use*, 120-22; Lindars, *NT Apologetic*, 111-15; Stendahl, *School*, 119; and Gerhard Barth, "Matthew's Understanding of the Law," in *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew* (trans. Percy Scott; ed. Günther Bornkamm, Gerhard Barth and Heinz Joachim Held; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963), 129-31; D.J. Moo, *OT in Passion Narratives*, 178-82. Max Wilcox, "Text Form," 199-201, gives a detailed comparison of the wording in Matthew and the textual variants of the Greek OT.

⁶In addition to the Messianic-Davidic ruler imagery, the Infancy Narrative refers to David *the King* twice, and to Herod as *king* three times, in addition to the Magi's question about the newborn *king of the Jews* (2.2). Mt 3-20 uses the word *king* only at 5.35, 14.9, and 18.23, and none of these refers to Jesus as king. After the Zech 9.9 citation in 21.5, where the messianic *king* enters Jerusalem, however, the issue of Jesus' kingship (*King of the Jews/Israel*) reappears in Jesus' trial and passion (Mt 27.11, 29, 37, 42).

(Mt 20.29_{ff}).⁷ Matthew therefore describes the event in detail, with accompanying scriptural overtones. Jesus is about to enter the city as the *Son of David*, the true *King of the Jews*.⁸

Zechariah 9.9, with its righteous king riding on a beast of burden, bringing salvation and peace, was widely accepted as a prophecy of the coming messianic figure and Matthew's portrayal of Jesus in 21.1-10 builds on that expectation.⁹ Its use as a *fulfillment quotation* at the beginning of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem exerts a powerful influence on Matthew's narration; however, one surprising thing about this particular Matthean quotation is its omission of two attributes ascribed to the kingly figure in Zech 9.9-- δίκαιος καὶ σώζων αὐτός. The inclusion of these terms in the fulfillment citation would have strengthened Matthew's characterization of Jesus as righteous savior (cf. Mt 1.21, 3.15). The most persuasive argument for a deliberate Matthean *lacuna* here is proposed by Gerhard Barth: Matthew's careful reshaping of the Zechariah text puts the

⁷Donald J. Versepunt, "The Davidic Messiah and Matthew's Jewish Christianity," *SBL Seminar Papers* 1995, 113, writes, "The Davidic preoccupation of the evangelist reemerges with new intensity in the story of Jesus' final approach to Jerusalem. The narrative unit effectively begins already in 20:29-34 with the healing of the two blind men on the road leading up from Jericho. Crying out to Jesus as the 'Son of David,' the men receive their sightBy means of this brief incident Matthew recalls the significance of Jesus' earlier deeds and uses the attendant Davidic tones as a prelude to what happens next."

⁸For a brief overview of the significance of the branches and garments, and shouts of Hosanna, see Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 136-40. Before ch. 21, Mt never reports an occasion when Jesus goes to Jerusalem; the passion predictions of 16.21 and 20.18 indicate that Jerusalem will be the place of his suffering and death.

⁹See Meyers II, 123, "The term *melek*...itself is a loaded one in the present context, which is unmistakably eschatological and which foreshadows the emergence of messianic language in inter-testamental literature and the New Testament." A king riding into a city on an ass was an indication of his *peaceful* intentions; the context of Zech 9.10 supports this conclusion. It is well not to forget, however, that when a king entered his city, the expected response would be one of jubilation. See also Gundry, *Use of OT*, 205-34, on "Matthean Hermeneutics and the Messianic Hope," especially 223-26 and 233-34, where he addresses the issue of the transfer of god-language to the Messiah, and for references to some Zech texts. Rudolf Pesch, "Nazorean," 133, without any mention of Zecharian influence, comes to the conclusion that "the messiah...acts in place of God." [See note #33 in ch. 1 above]

emphasis on the *πραύτης* of Jesus:

Through this deletion *πραύς* stands in the middle point, dominating the quotation. The only possible point in the omission is the emphasising of *πραύς*. By Matthew's abbreviation of the account of the finding of the animal that is to be ridden (Mark 11.4 f.) the motive of the wonderful prediction of Jesus about the finding of the animal falls into the background. In this way the thought of the *βασιλεὺς πραύς* steps in a dominating way into the centre. It now shapes the whole account of the entry....The decisive thing for Matthew in reproducing Zech. 9.9 is that Jesus is *πραύς*, he is the *βασιλεὺς πραύς*.¹⁰

Granted that Matthew consciously deletes the felicitous terms *δίκαιος καὶ σῶζων* from Zechariah 9.9, one must therefore conclude that the carefully-resaped citation in Mt 21.5 is meant to demonstrate how Jesus, as *πραύς*, fulfills scripture in the circumstances of his entry to Jerusalem.¹¹ If the Matthean citation of Zech 9.9 emphasizes this one particular messianic trait, then the way *πραύς* is used elsewhere may also be significant for the interpretation of Matthew's Christology.

In the Septuagint the term *πραύς* occurs upwards of fifteen times in the translation of some closely-related Hebrew words: *עָנָו*¹², *עָנִי*¹³, and *עָנִי*.¹⁴ In contrast, *πραύς* appears just four times in the NT: three times in Matthew (5.5; 11.29; 21.5) and once in

¹⁰G. Barth, *op cit.*, 130. See Stendahl, *School*, 118-19, who agrees that the omission of *δίκαιος καὶ σῶζων* is meant to emphasize "poor and riding on an ass." Yet I do not subscribe to Stendahl's reasoning behind this, i.e., that Matthew is relying on a tradition that manifests itself in the [later] rabbinic uses of Zech 9.9. I think Barth is closer to the truth: it is not only the term *πραύς* but the expression *βασιλεὺς πραύς*, particularly in view of conflict in Jerusalem over Jesus (Mt 2 and 21_{ff}), which drives Matthew's citation.

¹¹It certainly cannot be the major point of the citation to clarify the *kind* of animal Jesus was riding. The quotation is too carefully constructed to function in that way; e.g., the change of salutation from Zech 9.9 to Isa 62.11 has no effect on the animal issue. Again, *how many* animals Jesus rode is not affected by the Matthean editing. [See more on this issue in the Excursus on the Donkey.] Mt's reworked Zech 9.9 citation does fit his description of the reception Jesus received in Jerusalem (21.10, 15_p, 23_{ff}).

¹²One who is low, humble, gentle (before God); e.g., see Ps 36.11 (37.11MT), Ps 75.10: ...τοῦ σῶσαι πάντας τοὺς πραεῖς τῆς γῆς (var. πραεῖς τῆ καρδίᾳ); Num 12.3 var.

¹³Synonymous with *עָנָו*; e.g., Moses was *πραύς σφόδρα*, Num 12.3.

¹⁴1) poor, wretched, unfortunate; 2) humble - e.g., Is 49.13, Zech 9.9. The verb *עָנָו*, *qal* (bend down, be wretched, pitiful) occurs in Zech 10.2, the sheep without a shepherd; and the pual (be humbled) occurs in Isa 53.4.

1 Pet 3.4.¹⁵ Matthew employs *πραῦς* twice prior to the citation of Zech 9.9 in Mt 21.5:

(a) in the third beatitude (Mt 5.5), Jesus teaches that the *πραεῖς* “will inherit the earth”

(μακάριοι οἱ πραεῖς, ὅτι αὐτοὶ κληρονομήσουσιν τὴν γῆν); and (b) in 11.29

Matthew’s Jesus describes himself as *πραῦς*.

The question arises whether Matthew’s two other uses of *πραῦς* (5.5, 11.29) are associated in any way which would suggest further influence of Zech 9.9. At first glance, the answer appears to be negative. While the overarching scriptural inspiration for the Matthean Beatitudes may, in fact, come from Isaiah 61.1-3,¹⁶ the biblical source for Matthew 5.5 is surely Psalm 37(36).11-- οἱ δὲ πραεῖς κληρονομήσουσιν γῆν....¹⁷ Therefore, had the only other appearance of a form of *πραῦς* in the First Gospel been in Mt 5.5, no secondary influence from Zech 9.9 would seem likely. As for the presence of *πραῦς* in Mt 11.29, neither Zech 9.9 nor any other biblical use of the term suggests direct influence.¹⁸

In its context, Matthew 11.25-30 is framed by issues of identity and conflict. For the imprisoned Baptist the question is whether Jesus is ὁ ἐρχόμενος (11.2-3; cf. 3.11-12);

¹⁵The use of *πραῦς* in 1 Peter 3.4 is not especially pertinent to its use in Mt. The related term *πραύτης* is found eleven times in the NT, but never in the Gospels, and refers to Jesus only in 2 Cor 10.1. See 1 Cor 4.21; 2 Cor 10.1; Gal 5.23, 6.1; Eph 4.2; Col 3.12; 2 Tim 2.25; Jas 1.21, 3.13; 1 Pet 3.16.

¹⁶Among those who support the claim that Isa 61 has influenced the Matthean beatitudes are Hagner I, 91-93; and Gundry, *Matthew*, 51. Also Versepunt, “Davidic Messiah,” 111. Davies & Allison I, 431-45, are less certain about a proposed connection.

¹⁷See Gundry, *Use*, 132-33.

¹⁸Dale Allison, “Two Notes on a Key Text: Matthew 11:25-30,” *JTS* 39 (1988), 481-83, claims that Jesus’ meekness in Mt 11.29 is a direct reference to Moses (Num 12.3); he traces Mt 11.27-28 also to Moses (Exod 33.12-14; Deut 34.10). This is not persuasive, for at least two reasons: (1) Zech 9.9 is the source for *πραῦς* in direct reference to Jesus in Mt 21.5; the *πραύτης* of Moses is not mentioned in Mt; and (2) the promise to give rest in Exod comes from God, not from Moses. Mt’s emphasis here is on the Davidic messiah, not on a new Moses.

indeed the identity of John also comes into question (11.7-19). The thematic rejection of the ministries of both Jesus and John (11.2-19) immediately precedes Jesus' rebuke of three Galilean cities (Mt 11.20-24). The tone abruptly changes at 11.25-27: here Jesus makes the startling claim to be the Son of God who is known only by God, and who knows God exclusively. In 11.28-30, this authoritative figure, the sole revealer of God, who is *πραῦς καὶ ταπεινός*¹⁹ τῇ καρδίᾳ, issues his call to discipleship and an invitation to take up his yoke (11.29).

Ταπεινός occurs in Septuagintal translations of twelve Hebrew root words, including *עָנָה* and *עָנָה*, making it at times virtually synonymous with *πραῦς* (cf. Ps 17.28 LXX/18.27 MT, Zeph 2.3, Is 11.4, and Isa 61.1var). The terms *ταπεινός* and *πραῦς* occur in alternate verses in Sir 3.17-20, 10.14-15, and occur together in Zeph 3.12, where God promises to leave a remnant, *καὶ ὑπολείψομαι ἐν σοὶ λαὸν πραῦν καὶ ταπεινόν*. Even though it contains *πραῦς καὶ ταπεινός*, the Zephaniah text is not an obvious source for the use of *πραῦς* in Matthew 11.29.²⁰ In sum, Ps 37(36).11 stands behind Mt 5.5, Zech 9.9 is cited in Mt 21.5, but no apparent biblical source for Mt 11.29 has come to the fore. If these three texts are somehow connected in Matthew, by virtue of their incorporation of *πραῦς*, then the significance of *πραῦς* must lie in Mt's own theology. How important is

¹⁹In the NT, *ταπεινός* is applied to Jesus only here.

²⁰In the LXX the two terms *ταπεινός* and *πραῦς* also occur in Isa 26.6 (the foot of the *poor and needy* trample the city), which bears no relation to Zech or Matt. The context of Zeph 3.11_{ff} bears strong resemblance to Zech 9.8_{ff}. Although the MT of Zeph 3.14 and Zech 9.9 differ slightly, the LXX salutations are identical: *χαῖρε σφόδρα, θύγατερ Σιων... κήρυσσε, θύγατερ Ιερουσαλημ*. It is outside the scope of this thesis to ask whether the First Gospel portrays Jesus anywhere as "the remnant," since that designation has no bearing on Mt 11.25-30: Jesus is not portrayed as the *remnant* here, so a *πραῦς* remnant is not an issue. Francis Martin, "Shepherd in Matthew," 287-88, sees a combined influence of Zeph 3 and Zech 9 on Mt 21.1-12 by virtue of Is 62, "Say to Daughter Zion, 'Behold, your salvation comes; behold, his reward is with him and his recompense before him.'" Martin's remarks here are sketchy and seem to be based on an assumption that the reader of Mt would already associate a large part of Isa 62 with Zech 9 and Zeph 3 and would, therefore, conclude that all these prophetic passages underlay Mt's use of Zech 9.9 in 21.5.

πραῦς to Matthew? Perhaps another investigative approach will reveal some plausible theological insights.

When coming to Jesus' declaration that he is πραῦς (11.29), Matthew's reader might recall that Jesus commended the πραεῖς in the third Beatitude (5.5). A connection between Mt 5.5 and 11.29 could then be made by inferring that disciples are to be πραεῖς like Jesus. One interpretive strategy which leads to this conclusion is to understand the Matthean Beatitudes as a *pattern of discipleship*; then the corresponding portrayal of Jesus becomes the ideal *model for discipleship*. Indeed, Gerhard Barth traces the Matthean requirement of "lowly discipleship" from the πραύτης of Jesus in 11.29:

It is characteristic of Matthew to give prominence to the meekness...of Jesus. But meekness is also demanded of the disciples (emphatically!); thus 5.5; 18.1-10; 19.13-15; 20.20-29; 23.8-12. The editorial intervention of the evangelist can be seen especially in 5.5 and 18.1-10. The link between the two is seen in 11.28-30, when Jesus as the πραῦς καὶ ταπεινὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ calls men to himself and invites them to take his yoke upon them. It is hardly likely that an ideal of meekness already in the evangelist's mind led him to portray Jesus according to it....The reverse is more probable: the demand for lowliness in the disciples was influenced by the lowliness of the Son of Man.²¹

Because Jesus is identified as πραῦς in the NT only in Mt 11.29 and 21.5, one may reasonably ask whether the two texts are related. In 11.29 the Matthean Jesus, who has just claimed to be the exclusive revealer of God, calls people to himself, as the one who is

²¹ Gerhard Barth, *op. cit.*, 104. Leon Morris, *Matthew*, 295, agrees with Luke T. Johnson, *The Writings of the New Testament* (Philadelphia: 1986), 190, who connects Mt 11.29 and 5.3-5. "First because he is gentle and lowly, Jesus personifies membership in God's kingdom (cf. 5:3-5)...." Johnson previously states, 186, that the Beatitudes (Mt 5.3-12) establish the "conditions of entry into the kingdom proclaimed by Jesus." Hagner I, 324, cites H.D.Betz, "The Logion of the Easy Yoke and of Rest (Matthew 11:28-30)," *JBL* 86(1967), 10-24, in his conclusion that the rest promised in 11.28-30 is "salvation": As Betz, 24, puts it, "the logion of 11:28-30 is therefore theologically identical with the macarisms of the Sermon on the Mount." Although he approaches our texts with a different agenda [he interprets that the first three Beatitudes commend attitudes toward God, and proposes that the second three are toward others, so that 5.5 πραῦς stresses nonviolence, rather than humility], Michel Gourgues, "Sur l'articulation des béatitudes Matthéennes (Mt 5.3-12): une proposition," *NTS* 44 (1998), 351, still understands that the three πραῦς texts are related in Mt. Without making the connection between Mt 5.5 and 11.29, David Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew* (London: Oliphants, 1978), 208, says of 11.29, "This self-description echoes the description of the Servant of the Lord in Isa. 42.2f. and 53.1ff., and especially of the messiah of Zech. 9.9...."

πραῦς καὶ ταπεινός. In 21.5 Jesus enters Jerusalem as the πραῦς messianic king. In both scenes this authoritative yet πραῦς figure is confronted by opposition and hostility. Does the depiction of Jesus as πραῦς in 11.29 set the stage for Jesus as βασιλεὺς πραῦς in 21.5_{ff}? If so, has Matthew extended πραῦς-Christology of 21.5 backward to 11.29, bringing it to bear in a conflict situation prior to the culmination of conflict in the Passion Narrative? Does πραῦς signify a particular form of Christology/Messianology advanced by Matthew?

Christology in Matthew 11.25-30.

Other theories of the Christology in Mt 11.29 demand attention before the πραῦς issue can be fully addressed. In the study of Matthew 11.25-30, one recent scholarly trend has been to adduce evidence, because of similarities between Mt 11.28-30 and some passages in Sirach (e.g., Sir 6.18-37, or 24.19-22, and 51.13-30), that Matthew has here adopted some form of *Wisdom* Christology.²² Such a reading generally assumes that Matthew intensifies the importance of Wisdom, both by putting together two Q passages that are separate in Luke (Mt 11.25-27||Lk 10.21-22; Mt 11.16-19||Lk 7.31-35) and by adding Mt 11.28-30. There is a range of opinion as to whether the wisdom speculation in Q merely saw both John the Baptist and Jesus as *envoys* of Wisdom, or whether Q had already identified Jesus with Sophia.²³

²²Judging the merits of Wisdom Christology, or the presence of wisdom themes in Matthew, is outside the scope of this thesis and is addressed only where it may affect the evaluation of Zechariah influence.

²³Those who read Lk 7.35 as more authentically Q than Mt 11.19, claim that Mt 11.19 is reworked, and that καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῆς forms a deliberate inclusio with Mt 11.2, τὰ ἔργα τοῦ χριστοῦ, making the works of Wisdom to be the works of Christ. Therefore, Wisdom has become personified, or hypostasized, and Jesus has become Wisdom in Matthew's appropriation of the Q material. See M. Jack Suggs, *Wisdom, Christology, and Law in Matthew's Gospel* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970); James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit* (London: SCM, 1975), 31; idem, *Christology in the Making: An Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*

Excursus. Wisdom Christology and Mt 11.25-30

To address the topic of Wisdom Christology in Matthew's gospel, in any way other than cursory, is far beyond the scope of this thesis. However, because so much of current scholarship assumes its influence is great, perhaps it is well to look briefly at some of the various scholarly approaches to the subject as it relates to Matthew 11.25-30.

Celia Deutsch is perhaps representative of scholars whose recent work supports the presence of Wisdom Christology in Matthew 11.25-30.²⁴ In *Hidden Wisdom and the Easy Yoke*, she says that the scholarly discussion of the previous fifty years (on the issues of the text's unity, form, relationship to comparative literature, e.g., Wisdom, Hellenistic, Nag Hammadi, Qumran, apocryphal and pseudepigraphic) has led to the consensus²⁵ that 11.25-30 has its background in Wisdom speculation.

Most pertinent to the present thesis is what Deutsch derives from her study of 11.28-30, especially as it relates to *πρωτός* and Christology. Not surprisingly, she concludes that the *yoke* in Matthew's Gospel is "an image for Torah analogous to the use of the image for wisdom or Torah in Jewish sources," yet Jesus is not Torah incarnate but Wisdom incarnate. He is not only Wisdom, but he also has the authority to interpret Torah and to teach it, so he is both Teacher of Wisdom, or *sage*, and Wisdom itself.

It is difficult to find much about *πρωτός* in *Hidden Wisdom and the Easy Yoke*. Deutsch compares Jesus' role in 11.25-30, and 11.2-13.58, with the Qumran Teacher: "Particularly the use of *anawim* language (*πρωτός*, *ταπεινός*) recalls the use of such ideas in the Qumran literature and in certain tannaitic texts."²⁶ The book's most concentrated discussion of *πρωτός* affirms that Mt uses the term redactionally in

(London: SCM, 1980), 198. For a thorough critique of Matthean Wisdom-Christology, see Marshall Johnson, "Reflections on a Wisdom Approach to Matthew's Christology," *CBQ* 36 (1974), 44-64; he attacks the "crucial point" for Suggs' thesis, which is the assumption that the Wisdom-myth is understood to sustain the concept that in every generation Wisdom sends forth envoys. The more one gets into the literature on Wisdom in Matthew [or Luke, or Q] the more one notices that those who support Suggs' Wisdom thesis often say substantially the same things he says; likewise, those who criticize work supportive of Suggs' conclusions often couch their objections in terms of Johnson's categories. My interpretation of Matthew 11 comes to different conclusions with reference to the role of Wisdom in the chapter; e.g., I read the "works of Wisdom" in Mt 11 to include the ministry of John the Baptist as well as of Jesus.

²⁴Celia Deutsch, *Hidden Wisdom and the Easy Yoke: Wisdom, Torah and Discipleship in Matthew 11. 25-30* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987). As is the case with many who favor Wisdom Christology in Matthew, Deutsch's work builds on the foundation Suggs brought to light. Doctoral theses favorable to Wisdom Christology in Matthew, published between the works of Suggs and Deutsch, include Fred W. Burnett, *The Testament of Jesus-Sophia. A Redaction-Critical Study of the Eschatological Discourse in Matthew*. (Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1979) and Brian Roderick Doyle, *Matthew's Wisdom: A Redaction-Critical Study of Matthew 11.1-14.3a*. Ph.D. Thesis, Department of Middle Eastern Studies, University of Melbourne, Australia, 1984. Doyle, 2, writes that Wisdom is the integrating element in Mt 11.1- 14.3a; he refers to Jesus as Jesus Wisdom, 202-3, so that Wisdom seems to be Jesus' surname [cf. Jesus Christ]. This thesis will not examine these works. An excellent and balanced survey of research on wisdom in Matthew can be found in Frances Taylor Gench, *Wisdom in the Christology of Matthew* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1997); see her sections, 2-12, on the history of scholarship before Suggs, and, 12-23, on research after 1970.

²⁵Deutsch, 14, writes, "Despite the variety of approaches, however, contemporary scholarship is agreed that 11.25-30 has a background in Wisdom speculation." This assumption is not uncontested. Even Deutsch follows this statement with a reference to Marshall Johnson's article, cited above in note #24.

²⁶*Ibid.*, 138; also see discussion on 132-33.

5.5, 11.29 and 21.5.²⁷

What is missing in Deutsch's study of Mt 11.25-30 is an analysis of the juxtaposition of the Matthean Jesus as an authoritative *Son of God* figure (11.27) who also describes himself as *πραῦς* (11.29). In the Sabbath controversies of Mt 12.1-14, Jesus withdraws from the scene of conflict but continues to heal; this healing is interpreted by Matthew as a fulfillment of the Isaianic Servant Song (Mt 12.15-21).²⁸ Jesus' humility as healer must, therefore, also figure in Matthew's portrayal of the authoritative Jesus. Yet the humility of Jesus by itself would hardly provoke the Pharisees to take counsel to destroy him -- rather, it is his authority over the Sabbath (and Torah), which includes healing, which incites the Pharisees to anger. Even though she rightly construes the context of Mt 11.25-30 (in Mt 1-12) as one of rejection and opposition, Deutsch fails to mount a case that Jesus has been rejected in Mt 12 as *Wisdom*, or for doing the *works of Wisdom*, which might be the reasonable conclusion of her study. Moreover, she does not address the simultaneous, hypothetical contrasting Matthean portrayals of Jesus as *πραῦς Σοφία*, which her conclusions require.²⁹

There is by no means a scholarly consensus on the role of *Wisdom*, or the degree of *Wisdom* Christology present, in Matthew. For example, Davies and Allison read Mt 11.25-30 in a dual sense: with their characteristic *New Moses* template in place, they also acknowledge a wisdom influence from Mt 11.19 and the *Wisdom* texts commonly cited. Although they say that Matthew "identified Jesus with *Wisdom*" in 11.19, they do not agree that 11.25-30 is primarily a *Wisdom* text but read it instead in light of Jewish

²⁷*Ibid.*, 44. April D. De Conick, "The Yoke Saying in the *Gospel of Thomas* 90." *VC* 44 (1990) 280-94, approaches Mt 11.28-30 from a perspective neglected by Deutsch. One of her main interests is to reconstruct the "aphoristic core" of the logion behind Mt 11.28-30 and Logion 90 of the *Gospel of Thomas*. Her study confirms that most of Mt 11.29 is a Matthean interjection, concerned about Jesus' fulfillment of scripture. De Conick also recognizes a connection between the Matthean beatitude (5.5) and the description of Jesus in 11.29 as *πραῦς*; more importantly, she recognizes that Matthew's "modified proof texts" (Isa 62.11 and Zech 9.9) understand Jesus centrally as "king" coming to Jerusalem "humble" and mounted on an ass.

²⁸*Ibid.*, 132-33. Deutsch writes that Jesus, as healer, is (both for Isa 42 and Mt 12) "a poor or meek Teacher who is also God's Servant." Mt 11.25-30 is "in part polemic against the Pharisees as Matthew portrays them. In the broader context of Matthew's Gospel, Jesus' teaching is validated by his meekness -- in contrast with the Pharisees who are not humble... The way in which Jesus interprets the religious tradition in contradistinction to the stance of the scribes and Pharisees sets up the tension Matthew wishes to portray between the teaching of Jesus as the meek one and that of the scribes and Pharisees." It is not clear how Deutsch means the material in Mt 12 to constitute "a further similarity between Matthew's portrayal of Jesus and the Qumran Teacher...." How does the healing Servant material in Mt 12 validate a *Wisdom* focus in Mt 11.25-30?

²⁹In 11.29, as in 21.5, Jesus is the humble *Messiah*, not humble *Wisdom*! To telescope my objection, I have not seen here a mention, much less a defense, of the concept of *πραῦς Σοφία*. In the context of Mt 11-12, 13, the identity and role of Jesus is one of the major issues: both his and the Baptist's lifestyles, their calls to repent, ministries, and works are from the *Wisdom* of God (11.16-19). Such an interpretation does not necessitate the derivation of a (full-blown) *Wisdom* Christology from Mt 11.25-30. Furthermore, although she says, 132, the invitation of Jesus "highlights the fact that Jesus is transmitting to his disciples knowledge of the Father and an understanding of the eschatological significance of his own teaching and mighty works," Deutsch moves immediately to interpret that knowledge as a "new understanding of wisdom or Torah," rather than a relational discipleship. In other words, even when she acknowledges the relational dimension to Jesus' invitation to discipleship, her interpretation is in danger of making the relational discipleship Jesus offers different in degree only, rather than in substance, from the relationship between other teachers, or *Wisdom*, and their disciples.

traditions about Moses. The mention of *πραῦς* both at 5.5 and 11.29 is “yet one more clue that...Jesus is being compared and contrasted with Moses.”³⁰

Robert Gundry places more distance between the Matthean picture of Jesus and possible influence from ben Sira, concluding, “At most...the passage in Sirach exercised an indirect and vague influence on Matthew.” Gundry finds that, apart from typical Matthean vocabulary and “allusive quotations of the OT, a common practice of his which accounts for most remaining words of importance [in Mt 11.28-30],” that only the words *yoke*, *easy* and *light* are unaccounted for.³¹

Graham Stanton rightly observes that repeated scholarly attempts to link the sayings in Matthew 11.25-30 with Sir 51 are “probably misguided.”³² He points out that the Sirach text lacks parallels in Mt 11.28-30 both with the addressees (all who toil and are heavy laden) and with the main speaker, who is meek and lowly in heart. Stanton does not dispute the use of some Wisdom themes in 11.28-30, but he interprets 11.29b, “for I am meek and lowly in heart,” to be Matthew’s redactional addition to the parallelism formed by 11.28 and 29a,c. In contrast to the Matthean picture of Jesus here, Sophia lifts up her voice proudly and cries aloud (Sir 24.1, Pro 1.20_{ff}).³³ The meekness of Jesus is out of

³⁰Davies & Allison II, 272, 295. Their argument here is not compelling: although Moses is known by God, and prays to be shown God’s ways, nothing in Exod 33.14 suggests that Moses will be the exclusive revealer of God, nor does Moses bestow rest upon anyone. Rather, it is God who says, “My presence will go with you, and I will give you rest.” In a different approach, J. M. Gibbs, “The Son of God as Torah Incarnate in Matthew,” *SE 4/TU* 102 (1968), 38-46, is critical of an earlier work by W.D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964), for its *New Moses* speculation. According to Gibbs, 39, “Matthew’s typology is not that of a new Moses but rather that of Israel as the Son of God” (Mt 2.15/Hos 11.1). This OT sonship theme of 11.27 is an older concept than the wisdom influence on Mt 11.25-30. Finally, Gibbs makes the intriguing point that when Jesus goes up to the mountain and sits down to preach the Sermon on the Mount, it is the disciples who come to him and are taught by him; the last time they go up the mountain (28.16_{ff}), they worship him: if there is any Moses typology here, it refers to the disciples who go up to learn from Jesus as Moses went up to learn from God.

³¹Gundry, *Matthew*, 213, however, reads Mt 11.19 as an identification of Jesus with Wisdom. With reference to Mt 5.5, Gundry, 69, also draws the comparison between Moses and Jesus on the basis of the application of *πραῦς*; however, at 219-20, although he compares Jesus with Moses, as *πραῦς*, and acknowledges the “indirect and vague” influence of Sirach on Mt, Gundry does not agree that the *rest* that is offered is related to *Wisdom*. He also proposes that Jesus’ call *δεῦτε* in Mt 11.28 comes not from ben Sira’s “Draw near to me,” but rather from Jesus’ earlier call to discipleship in Mt 4.19. Gundry, 220, opposes comparisons between Mt 11.28-30 and Sirach 5: “...there is a big difference between ben Sira’s finding rest *for himself* and Jesus’ offering rest *to others*. Furthermore laboring little hardly corresponds to laboring to the point of weariness [Mt 11.28]....”

³²Graham Stanton, “Matthew 11. 28-30: Comfortable Words?,” in *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992), 364-77.

³³*Ibid.*, 369. The examples Stanton uses here of Wisdom’s temperament appear to be picked up by De Conick, “Yoke Saying,” 284. DeConick illustrates that the result clause in Mt 11.29 opposes the Wisdom theology of the surrounding text, because Sophia “when ‘inviting’ people to herself, does so with pride and often in the brazen manner of a prostitute (cf. Sir 24)” and she “cries aloud in the streets...and often in the guise of a harlot.” [see Pro 1,20-21; 8,3-4]. De Conick, nonetheless, in the face of this “clearly Matthean, not Sophianological” theology, still refers to the one offering his yoke in Mt 11.29 as “Wisdom/Jesus.” Granting that Mt 11.29 is not De Conick’s primary subject of study, it is unfortunate that she fails to account for her conclusion that a Matthean addition which runs counter to Wisdom speculation nonetheless justifies calling the speaker “Wisdom/Jesus.”

character with the Sophia of the Wisdom writings, but it tallies well with Matthew's redaction of Zech 9.9 at Mt 21.5, a deliberate modification which allows "the paradox of Jesus the *humble* one who is king to stand at the very centre of the fulfillment citation...." ³⁴

As an alternate to Jesus speaking as Sophia in 11.25-30, Stanton refers to the imagery of the Matthean fulfillment citations, particularly to Zech 9.9/Mt 21.5 and to Isa 42.1_{ff}/Mt 12.15_{ff}. Read together, they point to Jesus as both the humble Servant of God and the Messianic king. The dissonance of the humble king "is prominent not only in Matthew's Passion narrative, but also right through the gospel." Those whom Jesus heals, in fulfillment of Isa 53.4/Mt 8.17, those who previously "sat in darkness" (Isa 9.1-2/Mt 4.16), may be none other than those on whom Jesus had compassion "because they were harrassed and helpless, like sheep without a shepherd" --Mt 9.36 -- these may also be the "weary and heavy laden" in 11.28. ³⁵

Unlike scholars who compare the yoke of Jesus with the yoke of the law, Stanton asserts that the yoke Jesus offers is the yoke of discipleship -- disciples are to teach, preach, and heal as Jesus did. ³⁶ Those who toil and are heavy laden are those involved in costly discipleship. The promised rest comes from the knowledge that the Risen Christ is present with his disciples (Mt 28.20). ³⁷

Blaine Charette interprets Matthew 11.28-30 apart from Wisdom literature. He draws attention to a "neglected feature in the discussion," the relation of the logion to certain OT prophetic themes and expectations, especially in connection with the eschatological expectation of restoration, portrayed "as a time when the 'yoke' of foreign domination is broken and the returned captives enjoy 'rest' in their own land." ³⁸ The prophetic promise of true rest is conditional upon faithfulness to God; the "throwing off of Yahweh's yoke leads to the imposition of another yoke and with it the attendant loss of rest." ³⁹ It is consistent that Matthew would portray the yoke of Jesus, the messianic figure in whom the restoration of the nation is realized, as none other than Yahweh's yoke. ⁴⁰

³⁴Stanton, *op. cit.*, 369-70, 71. De Conick, *op. cit.*, 285, also takes up these points: "Take my yoke upon you and learn from me that I am gentle and lowly in heart..." is a Matthean interjection which is concerned about the fulfillment of scripture [she includes Sir 51.26 here] and which reflects Matthean theology. This Matthean addition also "echoes the description of the Suffering Servant in Isaiah 42, 2-4 and chapter 53."

³⁵*Ibid.*, 371-73. Stanton here assumes the connection between Jesus the *πραῦς* in 11.29 and 21.5.

³⁶The call to discipleship which is "modelled precisely on the actions and words of Jesus himself" is commensurate with the interpretive model identified above (see page # 82 above) with reading the Beatitudes as Christological statements and as requirements for discipleship.

³⁷*Ibid.*, 374-77. Stanton is not alone in reading, "Come to me" (11.28) alongside "Go, make disciples" (28.19) and "Learn from me" (11.29) with "Teach them" (28.20). Here Stanton seems to depart from the concept of the promised rest as eschatological. Although I can see that point of view, I am persuaded that the balance is tipped in favor of the eschatological Sabbath, in light of the immediate proximity of Matthew 12 to 11.25-30.

³⁸Blaine Charette, "To Proclaim Liberty to the Captives: Matthew 11:28-30 in the Light of OT Prophetic Expectation," *NTS* 38 (1992), 290-97.

³⁹*Ibid.*, 292.

⁴⁰Charette departs from those who argue for a Torah reading of the *yoke* of Jesus: he argues for neither a Torah yoke in the sense of Jesus offering his yoke as Wisdom and/or Torah, nor as a new Moses

Charette discerns a strong link between Jesus as *πραῦς καὶ ταπεινός* and the meekness and humility demanded in disciples, and furthermore, he interprets the promised inheritance in the third beatitude (5.5) in relation to eschatological rest.⁴¹ According to Charette, the audience implied by Jesus' call to the *weary and burdened* (11.28) is best described as people who are still captives, servants under another yoke. The *meek and humble* (11.29) thus describes not only Jesus, but also those who become his disciples: because they serve Yahweh through Jesus, their yoke is easy and their burden is light. Charette justifies the absence of any reference to Sirach in his study of Mt 11.28-30:

In fact, such reference obscures the true intention of the evangelist. Jesus appears in these verses not as Wisdom incarnate, promoting his interpretation of the law, but as the messianic figure in whom Israel's hopes are fulfilled. He beckons the nation to return from captivity to Yahweh's yoke and therein to find the eschatological blessing of rest that Yahweh has prepared for his servants. Indeed, as the anointed one of Isa 61, Jesus proclaims liberty to the captives.⁴²

J. Gerald Janzen approaches the Mt 11.25-30 text from another biblical perspective.⁴³ He describes his reading of biblical theology as an ellipse whose two foci are Sinai and Zion, which represent *Torah* and *transformed monarchy*. Janzen applies the ideal of the nation Israel as God's firstborn son (as covenant people who reflect God's image in and to the world [Ex 4.22; cf. Hos 11.1]), to Matthew's Jesus, who is the Torah-informed Messiah, the Son of David and Son of God. Jesus knows and lives the royal power of the kingdom of God; he receives "all authority in heaven and on earth (Mt 28.18)" through the power of suffering love. His claim to such authority also occurs together with Jesus' call to discipleship in Mt 11.25-30. Janzen concludes,

What has been hidden from the "wise and understanding" but revealed to "babes" is that this Torah-informed Messiah embodies God's rule....The evidence for that rule [i.e., that Jesus is the Messiah, see Mt 11.2ff] is that the blind see, the lame walk, lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, the poor hear good news, and -- most important --blessed are those who take no offense at such a Torah-Messiah. Such is the "yoke"under which Messiah Jesus rules and to which he calls disciples. It is a yoke that gives rest....⁴⁴

Janzen takes no scholarly refuge in Wisdom speculation when tracing the heritage of Jesus' lofty

figure who offers an interpretation of Torah different from that of the scribes and Pharisees. Rather he equates Jesus' yoke with the yoke of Yahweh as he reads the prophetic scriptures.

⁴¹*Ibid.*, 295-96. Charette reads the ὅτι in 11.29 as expegetical -- what the disciples must learn is precisely Jesus' meekness and humility; in fact, that is what is demanded of them.

⁴²*Ibid.*, 297. This excellent article, 293-95, in a way different from Stanton's approach, also relates the call of 11.28 to the audience described by Mt 9.36, in the shepherding motif of restoration in the First Gospel.

⁴³J. Gerald Janzen, "The Yoke That Gives Rest," *Int* 41 (1987), 256-68. Janzen devotes the majority of his paper tracing the "two covenantal poles, Sinai and Zion, around which biblical theology must move in an ellipse." The monarchy of Israel, as contrasted with the nations, could be transformed by the covenant relation if the king would fear nothing -- and trust nothing -- but Yahweh. The vocation of people in covenant with God is to image God, to embody the principles of the Exodus, to care for the oppressed and powerless. Although the term is not used, the *yoke* of the covenant is one that does not burden but gives rest, as shown by the great provision of the Sabbath. At his baptism, the heavenly voice proclaims that Messiah Jesus, the Son of David, is the beloved Son.

⁴⁴*Ibid.*, 268.

words in Mt 11.25-30. The Matthean Jesus speaks as Son of God, as the transformed Davidic Messiah, who is humble. To be king, to be meek and gentle at the same time, required transformation. By withstanding the temptations of untransformed monarchy, Jesus proves himself to be the Son of God. The biblical assertion that Jesus is βασιλεύς πραύς therefore assumes that Jesus has been “transformed” by his relationship to God. Discipleship under his yoke also promises to be a transforming experience.⁴⁵

One of the most cogent and complete studies of Matthew 11.25-30 in the context of chapters 11-12 is the work of Donald Verseput, who rejects the *Wisdom*-Christology hypothesis.⁴⁶ He contends that the narrative section of Mt 11-12, framed by units of discourse in Mt 10 and 13, is characterized by a “solid thematic unity dealing with the tragic fact of Jesus’ rejection....” Verseput rightly notes that Mt 11-12 is occupied with the first serious opposition encountered by Jesus and that Mt 21-23 portrays the later hardened opposition to Jesus at the end of his ministry. Far from being an “off-handed conglomeration of conflict stories,” chapters 11 and 12 are a “meticulous representation of the great ‘surprise’ of the messianic mission....”⁴⁷

Mt 11.1-19 vividly compares Israel’s rejection of both John the Baptist and Jesus; the dire consequences of rejecting Jesus follow in 11.20-24. The true mission and humble character of Jesus (11.25-30) comes as a sudden jolt for the reader who has just encountered the harsh rebuke of the preceding verses. The judgment on those who reject him is set in bold relief by Jesus’ compassionate call to the weary and struggling. He extends his invitation on the basis that God has seen fit to reveal -- exclusively through him -- “hidden things” to babes, having kept them from the “wise and understanding.”⁴⁸

⁴⁵*Ibid.*, 266-68. In Janzen’s reading, the temptations (Mt 4) are those of monarchy (cf. Dt 17.16-17), and Jesus, by his words from Deut, “embodies the Deuteronomic ideal of kingship transformed through Torah.” In Mt 16, when Peter tempts Jesus to untransformed notions of royal power, Jesus once more holds true to his messianic course. Not least of what is attractive in Janzen’s proposal is that he recognizes the dissonance of a humble monarch and resolves how the Matthean Jesus could make such a claim and be, in the biblical sense, an integrated person.

⁴⁶Donald J. Verseput, *The Rejection of the Humble Messianic King: A Study of the Composition of Matthew 11-12* (New York/Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1986). I find this work in its broad outline to be a convincing attempt to read Mt 11-12 as a whole, and I find Verseput’s study of the Matthean Jesus to be very sound. This is not to say that I follow Verseput everywhere; e.g., his characterization of the disciples, the crowds, the Pharisaic opposition, and the audience for Jesus’ words, in some instances, vary from my readings. As to the claim that Wisdom is what binds Mt 11-12 together, I agree with Verseput that Mt’s emphasis is more on Jesus as Davidic Messiah -- a royal, yet humble, figure. I have outlined Verseput’s book in more detail than I would ordinarily do for other scholarly works: this is largely because I find it missing from most of the current discussion.

⁴⁷*Ibid.*, 1-2. Ulrich Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus II*, 162, agrees that Matthew’s narrative art brings the Q material in chapter 11 together into more than a collection of random sayings, and that the *Jubelruf* is one of Matthew’s primary Christological texts. I would add to Verseput’s remarks above, that part of the surprise in Mt 11 is the kind of question the Baptist asks, and Jesus’ response. For those expecting an all-powerful messiah, Jesus’ meekness and withdrawal from combat was not expected. The Isaianic “themes of salvation” (Verseput, 68f) -- the healings, the preaching of good news to the poor -- were the “works of the Messiah,” but the concomitant Isaianic theme of judgment which John preached is not included in Jesus’ response, “Go tell John what you hear and see.” As Mt 11 and 12 unfold, however, Jesus does acknowledge the reality of judgment; his offer in 11.28-30 presents a promise in contrast with the harsh alternative for those who deny him.

⁴⁸For discussion of Verseput’s contribution to Matthean christology, especially of 11.28-30, see below.

Verseput's analysis of Matthew's and Luke's different uses of the *Jubelruf* concludes that, even if the source of the saying in Mt 11.25-27/Lk 10.21-22 had an interest in *Wisdom*, Matthew's use of it does not justify an alleged *Wisdom Christology* in the first gospel:

In scholarly circles today it is often fashionable to conceive of these verses as being rooted in Jewish Wisdom speculation. And yet the notion of truth being hidden from the "wise" and revealed to the "simple" is diametrically opposed to such a supposition. This curious inversion is completely unparalleled. Moreover, Matthew's formative interest is not in a Wisdom christology, but in the reality of a humble and rejected Messiah. Whatever the original background of these words may have been, it is clear that for Matthew the difficult struggle over the nature of the messianic mission is sufficient explanation for their present position.⁴⁹

In opposition to the theory that Jesus is the hypostasized Wisdom of God (based upon passages such as Sir 24:19-22 and 51:23-27), which supposes that Jesus-as-Wisdom calls and offers his yoke, Verseput claims that points of contact between Matt 11.28-30 and proposed Wisdom parallels are too scant to support such a notion. Far from giving clues that Matthew employs Wisdom christology here, both the context and the content of Mt 11.25-30 present Jesus as *Son*. Both the male *Sonship* image and the "humble and lowly" language are "utterly foreign to personified Wisdom speculation."⁵⁰ Consequently, it is more natural to suppose that Jesus is speaking, not as the personified Wisdom of God, but as the *Messiah, God's Son* (11:2, 27).⁵¹

In his study of the *yoke* metaphor, Verseput reads the invitation, "Come unto me," with most scholars, as a call to discipleship. Jesus' second imperative, "Take my yoke upon you," is a plea to submit to his authority, to recognize he is the *authoritative One* of 11.25-27. The central point of "...and learn from me..." is that Jesus is the *source* of learning. The importance of *πραῦς καὶ ταπεινός* here is twofold: it is a requirement for membership in the kingdom of heaven (5.3-10), and it signals an amazing reversal of expectations. Claiming to speak as the authoritative Son of God, Jesus uproots all sorts of stereotypes of the messianic king. He promises that revelation will come through him, not to the wise and understanding, but to the babes. This Matthean messianic image is not limited to 11.29 but also occurs at 21.5, with the citation of Zech 9.9, which is tailored to accentuate the royalty and majesty, and at the same time, the humility and weakness, of Jesus. Verseput writes that the purpose of the Zech 9.9 fulfillment citation is "not merely ethical, to accentuate the exemplary character of Jesus' conduct; it is part and particle of Matthew's portrayal of the strange character of the messianic mission.... Jesus who comes to the babes, is himself a figure of humiliation."⁵²

⁴⁹*Ibid.*, 139.

⁵⁰See also Hubert Frankemölle, *Matthäus: Kommentar 2.* (Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1997). Even though he allows for a radical shift in "Wisdom-and-Revelation Christology" by virtue of its combination here with "lowly-Messianology/Christology" 128, Frankemölle would probably agree with Verseput's assessment of the foreign nature of speaking of Wisdom as "humble and lowly in heart." He writes, 127, "Dieser christologischen Neukzentuierung der Weisheits-Tradition entspricht die Beobachtung, daß der Satz in 29b, 'Ich bin sanftmütig und demütig von Herzen' nicht aus der biblischen Weisheitsliteratur abgeleitet werden kann, da die Weisheit nirgends so genannt wird.... Daß die Weisheit in den biblischen Traditionen gedemütigt wird, macht sie nicht selbst demütig."

⁵¹Verseput, *op. cit.*, 145; [emphasis mine].

⁵²Verseput, 146-50.

Russell Pregeant, in a reader-response analysis of the “wisdom passages” in Matthew sees how alternate readings are equally possible: a reader might “hear the text calling for an identification of Jesus with personified Wisdom,” but it is equally possible “to read the Wisdom passages in context without identifying Jesus as Wisdom incarnate.” The figure of Wisdom “remains in one sense tangential to the reader’s concern.”⁵³ In Mt 11.25-30, Jesus, as Son of God, can offer the “yoke of Torah” as his own; he is the Messiah of Israel who performs the very “deeds of Wisdom.” Jesus “occupies a vantage point that is as close as possible to God’s own.”⁵⁴ However, the Matthean text does not invite the reader to speculate at all about Jesus’ possible relationship to Wisdom. The importance for Matthew is its similarity with the plot of Jesus’ story; the character of wisdom texts reflects the “dual theme of Israel’s rejection of Jesus and God’s subsequent abandonment of Israel.” Pregeant says that the clusters of wisdom passages occur at junctures where Matthew develops the rejection theme:

It would thus appear that the redactor was indeed expressing a central concern in using and reshaping the wisdom passages. This concern, however, had everything to do with the earthly career of Jesus as the rejected Messiah....but apparently had nothing to do with a desire to encourage the reader to speculate about Jesus’ pre-existence or identify him with Wisdom incarnate. The pattern of Wisdom’s rejection and subsequent withdrawal must have seemed the perfect “model” for grasping the paradox of a crucified Messiah, but it was apparently not to the figure of personified Wisdom herself that Matthew turned in order to articulate who Jesus was.⁵⁵

With respect to the question of Matthew’s Christology in 11.25-30, one finds that Wisdom claims are not overwhelmingly persuasive. For example, in contrast with Sirach, Jesus does not explicitly exhort (potential) disciples to strive to gain wisdom; rather, he exhorts them to become as children (cf. Mt 18.1-4). The Matthean Jesus never refers to his disciples as σοφοί; he uses terms like νηπίοι. The context of Mt 11.25-27 militates against the understanding that *revelation by God* is here anything other than the *revelation of Jesus himself as the Revealer of God*; this is certainly not to be understood in a limited sense that Jesus is Wisdom Incarnate or a Teacher of Torah. God’s will is that “all things” have been

⁵³Russell Pregeant, “The Wisdom Passages in Matthew’s Story,” in *Treasures New and Old: Recent Contributions to Matthean Studies* (ed. David R. Bauer and Mark Allan Powell; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 197-232. Here, 225, 228.

⁵⁴*Ibid.*, 226-28. Part of Pregeant’s discussion extends to Jesus speaking in Mt 23.34: here Jesus “can speak for God, who has sent emissaries to intransigent Israel throughout the years.”

⁵⁵*Ibid.*, 229. Pregeant summarizes, 230, that “Matthew employs the story of Wisdom primarily to interpret the plot of the story of Jesus. To that extent, it serves the theological purpose of articulating the cause and meaning of Jesus’ death. It does not serve directly to elaborate on the identity of Jesus.” Pregeant, 231, does not find a “genuine Wisdom christology” in the First Gospel. I am impressed with his argument and see it as a way to foster richer scholarly dialogue with regard to Wisdom in Matthew.

delivered to Jesus (11.26-27); the invitation, the call, is to *come to Jesus*, not to seek Wisdom. Furthermore, if some form of *Wisdom Christology* is the motivation behind Matthew's use of 11.28-30, if Matthew's intention is to heighten the implicit Wisdom Christology of Q and to make it explicit in this section of the Gospel, then why the unexplained stark juxtaposition of *humble and lowly one* in 11.29 with the *exalted Son of the Father* in 11.27? ⁵⁶ No one has yet proposed an adequate justification for reading here an allusion to the altogether foreign and hypothetical concept of *humble Wisdom*.

Scholars who claim that Wisdom Christology is strongly present in Mt 11.25-30 do not always address adequately the exclusivity of Jesus' claim to be the revelation of God; indeed, some rather hurriedly move on to discipleship, defined in relationship to Wisdom, as "obedience to the Law as interpreted by Jesus" and "an understanding of the mysteries of the Kingdom as disclosed by him," ⁵⁷ or something similar. By contrast, the invitation from Jesus in Matthew 11.25-30 is not primarily to learn a new interpretation of the Torah: the yoke and rest he promises, and the revelation of God he alone can grant, go far beyond a definition of the yoke of Wisdom or Torah. What Matthew's reader is invited to learn from Jesus is not a new school of thought; rather, one is invited to enter a transforming relationship with God, to be yoked with Jesus the humble Messiah.

If Wisdom is thought to be a major component of Matthew's Christology in this text because one assumes that the underlying source of the yoke imagery in Matthew must

⁵⁶Verseput, 376 (n. 70), rightly notes the danger of reading here a Matthean emphasis on the contrast between Jesus' humility and the "hardheartedness" of the Pharisees -- one thereby loses Matthew's real stress on the contrast between Jesus' lowliness and his "royal mission." The reader, the exegete, has enough to do to interpret the multifaceted portrayal of Jesus in these verses, without reading polemical motives into the text here. The deeper issue here concerns what effect this text has on Matthew's Christology. Is it a primary christological text in this gospel?

⁵⁷Deutsch, *Hidden Wisdom*, 135.

be from Wisdom literature, then the *sonship* imagery of Jesus in Mt 11.25-30 can be misinterpreted. Since Luke betrays no equivalent of Mt 11.28-30, it is reasonable to imagine that Matthew has refashioned the Q Wisdom material (Mt 11.25-27/Lk 10.21-22) so that the identity of Jesus as Son of God in Mt 11.25-27 is enhanced by his identity as the humble Davidic Messiah of Mt 11.28-30.

It is not necessary to resort to Wisdom literature to find a concept of the *yoke* of Jesus in Mt 11.29. There is a Second Temple Jewish text that may indicate other traditions which might have served as background for Matthew's use of *yoke* imagery in reference to Jesus. The text in view has the advantage that it does not oblige one to attempt to reconcile the βασιλεύς πραύς of Mt 21.5 with the hypothetical Σοφία πραύς required by a Wisdom model of Mt 11.28-30.

He will judge peoples and nations in the wisdom of his righteousness. (Pause).
 And he will have gentile nations serving him under his yoke, and he will glorify the Lord
 in (a place) prominent (above) the whole earth. And he will purge Jerusalem (and make it)
 holy as it was even from the beginning... --Pss. Sol. 17.29-30

Pss. Sol. 17 refers to the *yoke* of the *king*, the Son of David (cf. 17.21).⁵⁸ Nothing in this psalm suggests a connection with Wisdom or Torah in the interpretation of the yoke.⁵⁹ The text does establish a precedent for conceptualizing the Messiah's *yoke*: the king to be raised

⁵⁸*Pss. Sol. 7.9* refers to God's yoke. Davies & Allison II, 289-90, mention both *Pss. Sol. 7.9* and 17.30 in a footnote, listing them jointly, and without further comment, as "the yoke of the Messiah," but they focus on how Jesus' yoke is another example of how Jesus as Wisdom is greater than Moses because the law he gives is his own. Charette, "To Proclaim Liberty to the Captives," 283 *et passim*, identifies the yoke of Jesus with Yahweh's yoke; his approach complements the one taken in this thesis. However, he does not mention *Pss. Sol.*

⁵⁹*Pss. Sol. 17.29-30*, taken from OTP 2, 667. Although the word wisdom appears here, it is certainly not in the context of Sophia; the emphasis is on the Davidic Messiah's own righteousness. As it stands in the psalm, the yoke may be interpreted in more than one way; my point is to demonstrate that there is a Second Temple text which refers to the yoke of the Messiah, not to suggest that Matthew takes his theological perspective from this text.

up, who will have a yoke, is the Son of David, the Lord Messiah (17.32).⁶⁰ The allusion in *Pss. Sol.* 17 to the *yoke* of the Son of David is compatible with Matthew's Son of David Christology.

If the *yoke* of Jesus is read as the *yoke* of the Davidic Messiah, then the theological implications of Mt 11.25-30 bear a striking similarity to those of Mt. 21.5. Both texts embrace the paradox of an exalted figure who is *πραῦς*. In the only two places in the Gospels where Jesus is described to as *πραῦς*, his identity as Messiah in the face of rejection is at stake.⁶¹

A question which has emerged from Jesus' self-description as *πραῦς* (Mt 11.29) is whether this text is meant to prepare the reader for the portrait of Jesus as βασιλεύς *πραῦς* in Mt 21.5? Especially because Jesus is described in these two places (and nowhere else in the NT) as *πραῦς*,⁶² it is possible that there is a cumulative intra-gospel effect of the word *πραῦς* in Matthew. The contrast Matthew draws between the expected royal messianic figure and the humble Son of God, who came to reveal God to the *νηπίοι*,⁶³ can be reinforced if the reader returns to read 11.29 in light of 21.5, but could Matthew have intended this effect?

When the Gospel is read linearly, subsequent passages can help fill out the author's

⁶⁰It has already been established elsewhere in this thesis that *Pss. Sol.* 17.40 may contribute to the shepherding image of the Messiah in Matthew (see chapter on Mt 9.36/Zech 10.2).

⁶¹In Mt 11.25-30, Jesus identifies himself as *Son of God* and in Mt 21.1-10,15-16, he is praised as *Son of David*. It is also interesting to note that in both Mt 11 and 21, Jesus sets his authority and identity in proximity to the issue of the Baptist's mission and authority (see 11.2-19, 21.23-27; cf. 22.41-46 -- whose *son* is the messiah?).

⁶²In 2 Cor 10.1 the *πραύτης* of Jesus is mentioned.

⁶³Is there a possible connection to the praise of the *νηπίου* in Mt 21.16?

earlier picture. A linear reading of the three *πραῦς* texts in Matthew yields the following connections: (a) Mt 5.5 affirms that the *πραεῖς* will inherit the earth; (b) Jesus' claim to be *πραῦς* in Mt 11.27-30 can be read back into Mt 5.5 -- Jesus, as *πραῦς*, is qualified to receive all the blessings of the Beatitudes (his claim that all things were given to him, that he knows the Father, and that he is *πραῦς*, justifies this kind of reading); and (c) the Matthean account of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem as the *βασιλεύς πραῦς* remains paradoxical, yet paradigmatic.⁶⁴

Because the expectation of a Messiah who is *πραῦς*⁶⁵ is found only in Zech 9.9, then the appearance of this prophetic text as a *fulfillment citation* reveals that it has been formative in shaping Matthew's Christology. On this basis, therefore, one can defend reading Mt 21.5 back into Mt 11.29 (and perhaps even into Mt 5.5).⁶⁶ By this means, the

⁶⁴This kind of reading is similar to what Martin, "Shepherd in Matthew," does with his reading of the gospel, 268-69. His method assumes that "Within the work of any given author there are allusions to other parts of his work." These he calls *interior allusions*, some of which are quite obvious, and others of which are more subtle. In this terminology, tracing the *πραῦς* imagery is relatively uncomplicated, but drawing out the christological implications is more involved. On the whole, I think this part of Martin's method can be fruitful if applied judiciously. In such a model, the influence of Moses or Wisdom typology, or texts from Zeph, Isa, Jer would be labeled as peripheral or as *exterior* allusions, but the *βασιλεύς πραῦς* is *interior*, and thus central and pivotal.

⁶⁵So far I have been unable to find any other references to the expectation of a humble Messiah-king outside Zechariah 9.9, with or without the specific use of the word *πραῦς* or an equivalent expression.

⁶⁶The influence of Zech 9.9 is more prominent in 11.29 and 21.5, and perhaps more residual in 5.5. Frankemölle, 127-8, certainly believes such a parallel can be drawn, between the instructions in the Sermon on the Mount and the "easy yoke" of 11.29a, 30, and Jesus himself (11.29b). Apparently for Frankemölle, the reader can also go backward from 21.5 to catch the significance of 11.29: "Spätestens mit der wörtlichen Einspielung von Jes 62,11 und Sach 9.9 in 21,5 beim Einzug des mt Jesus in Jerusalem weiß der Leser, daß er bereits 29b von diesen Vorstellungen her, die den weisheitlichen Horizont sprengen, verstehen kann. Dabei kann er wahrnehmen, daß in 11,25-30 eine hohe Weisheits- und Offenbarungs-Christologie eine Verbindung eingeht mit der ebenfalls biblisch vorgegebenen Niedrigkeits-Messianologie/-Christologie. Von diesem Kontext her ist diese Stelle für das Christus-Bild des Matthäus konstitutiv." Frankemölle wants to connect this Matthean portrait of Jesus also to the Isaiah Servant Songs, which is legitimate when reading Mt 11.25-30 in context with Mt 12, as Verseput (*Rejection of Humble Messianic King*) and others also do. Frankemölle is not alone when he reaches back to the concept of Emmanuel in Mt 1, but I think this kind of exegetical move puts more weight on the text than it can bear.

impact of Zechariah 9.9 -- in its juxtaposition of the exalted, yet humble, messianic figure-- upon Matthew's *πραῦς* texts, and upon Matthew's Christology, is substantial. Especially in the context of conflict over the identity of Jesus as the Messianic king, the quality Matthew insists upon is that Jesus is *Βασιλεύς πραῦς*.

In sum, Zechariah 9.9 has a strong impact on both Mt 11.25-30 and in Mt 21.5. In chapter 11, antagonism toward Jesus becomes so severe that he issues a challenge -- whoever accepts him and his ministry will be blessed; whoever rejects him will face judgment (11.20-24). Into this setting, Matthew introduces Jesus' invitation of 11.25-30. The narrative resumes in chapter 12, however, with more ambiguity, misunderstanding, and conflict over Jesus' identity, which continues throughout the Galilean ministry and even his entry into Jerusalem (for example, Mt 16.13-20,21-28; 17.1-8;17).

As Jesus enters the city (Mt 21.1-10), Jerusalem's hostility to him is portrayed as an intensified recapitulation of the Infancy Narrative (for example, 2.2; 21.10, 15-16). Until this point in the Gospel, there has seemed to be some ambiguity in the places where Jesus is revealed as the Messiah. For example, when Peter confesses him to be "the Messiah, the Son of the living God," Jesus says, almost in the next breath, that he must be killed in Jerusalem (Mt 16.16, 21). In the next chapter, Jesus is transfigured before the eyes of Peter, James and John, who hear a voice from the cloud, "This is my beloved Son...listen to him" (Mt 17.1-6); immediately Jesus talks about his coming death and resurrection (17.9-12). These scenes alternate between the highest exaltation and the lowest despair.

One could draw upon many different biblical traditions to portray the concept of either a kingly Messiah or a humble, suffering figure, but the language of Zech 9.9 has provided Matthew the means to put the motifs of *exaltation* and *humility* together. In two

places, Matthew describes Jesus as *πραῦς*: in the first, the Matthean Jesus refers to himself as the (only) one who knows, and who can reveal God, who offers true eschatological rest, yet who is humble (11.25-30); in the second, Matthew depicts Jesus as the royal Davidic king who is at the same time humble -- he will ride into Jerusalem on “an ass, a colt the son of a beast of burden” (21.5). The two images of *exalted Messiah* and *humble king* are intertwined in Zech 9.9, which crystallizes in the Matthean portrait of Jesus as he enters Jerusalem. This powerful fulfillment citation of Zechariah 9.9 in Matthew 21.5 sets the stage for the Passion Narrative; its portrayal of Jesus as *ὁ βασιλεύς πραῦς* begins to prepare the reader for all the events of Holy Week, even for the death of the Messiah.

Excursus. The Palm Sunday Donkey

Where Luke 19.31 follows Mark 11.2 with respect to Jesus' instruction to his disciples (εὐρήσετε πῶλον δεδεμένον ἐφ' ὃν οὐδεὶς οὕτω ἀνθρώπων ἐκάθισεν),¹ the parallel passage in Mt 21.2 describes two animals --they will find an ass tied and her colt with her (εὐρήσετε ὄνον δεδεμένην καὶ πῶλον μετ' αὐτῆς). Mk and Lk contain no reference to fulfillment of scripture in this part of their narratives; however, an echo of Genesis 49.11a² may be discerned in the expression, "a colt tied" (πῶλον δεσμεύων).³

אֶרְרִי לְנֶפֶן עֵרְבָה וְלִשְׂרָקָה בְּנֵי אִמִּי

Binding his young ass to a vine, (MT)
namely, the son of a she-ass to a choice vine...

δεσμεύων πρὸς ἄμπελον τὸν πῶλον αὐτοῦ
καὶ τῆ ἔλικι τὸν πῶλον τῆς ὄνου αὐτοῦ.

Binding his colt to a vine, (LXX)
namely, the colt of his she-ass to the tendril⁴...

Gen 49.11 LXX employs πῶλον alone in line 1, and πῶλον τῆς ὄνου (colt of a female ass) in line 2, to render the Hebrew terms עֵרֶב (a young, vigorous ass)⁵ and בְּנֵי אִמִּי (son of a she-ass).

Two animals continue to figure in the Matthean account of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem, in the fulfillment citation of Mt. 21.5 and beyond. The textual excerpt pertinent to this discussion is ...αὐτος...

¹Luke puts πῶποτε in place of οὕτω. In John 12.14, Jesus himself finds the young ass; this is followed directly by the Johannine fulfillment quotation: εὐρών δε Ἰησοῦς ὄναριον ἐκάθισεν ἐπ' αὐτό, καθὼς γεγραμμένον· μὴ φοβοῦ, θυγάτηρ Σιών· ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεὺς σου ἔρχεται, καθήμενος ἐπὶ πῶλον ὄνου. See Maarten J. J. Menken, "'Do Not Fear, Daughter Zion...'" (John 12:15)," in *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996), 79-97.

²Early messianic interpretation of Gen 49, sometimes in combination with the Balaam oracles, has been noted above [see notes # 43, 44, 49 in the Infancy Narrative section above]. See Martin McNamara, "Early Exegesis in the Palestinian Targum (Neofiti 1) Numbers Chapter 24," *P.I.B.A.* 16 (1993) 57-79, especially 75 (n. 11). For the targumic version of Gen 49.11 and its intricate messianic interpretation, see Eng. trans. of *Tg. Onq. Gen. 49.11* (Vol. 6 of *The Aramaic Bible: The Targums*; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1992), 158, and notes, 162-64 (which may suggest a reading of Gen 49.11a in association with Zech 9.9). Of particular interest is the interpretation that the task of the Messiah was thus to lead the Israelites to the city -- Jerusalem; also a Midrashic association of the "foal" and "donkey" with the main entrance of the Temple.; for translation and notes, see also Moses Aberbach and Bernard Grossfeld, *Targum Onqelos on Genesis 49* (Missoula: Scholars Press, c1976), 12-21. *Tg. Ps.-J.* and *Tg. Neof. I* also give messianic interpretations of Gen 49. 10_{fr}. See also J. Blenkinsopp, "The Oracle of Judah and the Messianic Entry," *JBL* 80 (1961), 55-64.

³δεσμεύω - tie (up), bind; δέω - bind, tie. Davies & Allison III, 116, propose that "the otherwise superfluous 'tied' (which in Mark modifies πῶλον) probably alludes to Gen 49.11." They also note that 4QPBBless, as well as Gen 49 LXX, had already given this biblical text a messianic interpretation.

⁴ἔλιξ - anything twisted or spiral, such as the tendril of the vine, or ivy. I read the καὶ and the waw here as hendiadys and waw copulativum. Note that the Greek (Gen 49.11) also indicates "colt of his female ass."

⁵Meyers II, 130-131, for עֵרֶב in Zech 9.9; Holladay's *Concise Lexicon*, 272, similarly translates "(stallion of) ass," citing Gen 49.11. Note the similarity of the animal terminology in Gen 49.11 and Zech 9.9.

ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὄνον καὶ ἐπὶ πῶλον υἷον ὑποζυγίου (Mt 21.5b; cf. Zech 9.9c). How does Matthew understand the function of the two animals he first places in the narrative at 21.2? This question arises, not strictly from Matthew 21.1-5, but more from the ambiguous expression in verses 6 and 7:

πορευθέντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ καὶ ποιήσαντες καθὼς συνέταξεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἤγαγον τὴν ὄνον καὶ τὸν πῶλον καὶ ἐπέθηκαν ἐπ' αὐτῶν τὰ ἱμάτια, καὶ ἐπεκάθισεν ἐπάνω αὐτῶν.

The disciples, having gone and done just as Jesus instructed them, brought the ass and the colt and placed upon them garments, and he sat upon them.

Does Matthew misunderstand Zech 9.9? Does he mean to say that Jesus sat upon both animals?⁶

Before the question can be addressed, it seems expedient to investigate the question underlying the claim that Matthew misunderstood the parallelism in Zech 9.9. If Matthew was working from a text, was he necessarily limited to the Greek?⁷ or was he familiar with Hebrew? Does Mt 21.5 support either of these positions? Pertinent portions of Zech 9.9 MT and LXX can be compared with the Mt 21.5 citation:

[Zech 9.9 MT]	הִנֵּה מֶלֶכְךָ יָבוֹא לְךָ	Behold, your king comes to you,
	[...]	
	עַנְי וְרֹכֵב עַל-חֲמֹר	humble and riding upon an ass,
	וְעַל-עִיר בֶּן-אֲתָנוֹת	namely, upon a young ass, a son of she-asses. ⁸

⁶One extreme in the range of critical commentary is that Matthew misunderstood the synonymous parallelism in Zech 9.9 for synthetic parallelism, that he introduced a second animal into the story because of his mistaken understanding of the prophecy. Gundry, *Use*, 197, reminds us of the critiques of O. Michel (*TWNT* VI, 961) and D.F. Strauss (*The Life of Jesus* [London, 1913], 553_r), both of whom wrote that Matthew *did* intend to say that Jesus rode on both animals simultaneously. Another extreme critique of Mt's adaptation of Mk comes from S. Vernon McCasland, "Matthew Twists the Scriptures," *JBL* 80 (1961), 144-45, who says that Matthew's "unfamiliarity with the nature of Hebrew poetry caused him to alter Mark's statement so as to fit Mark's narrative into his twisted understanding of the poem," i.e., that Mt changed Mk's "simple, dignified narrative of this historic event into something like a circus spectacle." Representative of a middle critical position is the idea that Matthew was employing some form of rabbinic exegesis; e.g., in their summary of different explanations for the presence of two animals in Mt, Davies & Allison III, 120-21, adduce the citation of a rabbinic combination of Zech 9.9 and Exod 4.19 to illustrate their view that Jesus is the new Moses. Other interpreters believe that Mt either found the two animals in his non-Markan traditional material, or that the newness of the unriden colt implies that the mother was still present; e.g., see Gundry, *Matthew*, 407, Hagner II, 594. Schweizer, *Matthew*, 404, suggests that "and" in LXX is a reflection of the LXX's misunderstanding of how many animals are spoken of in Zech 9.9; according to Schweizer, Matthew gets two animals from the Septuagint. On the second αὐτῶν, see Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 151-54, who evaluates the discussion of ἐπὶ and ἐπάνω (with the assumption that Matthew misunderstands the Zech 9.9 parallelism). The issue of the second αὐτῶν as reference to animals or garments is secondary. This excursus is not intended to address all the problems of Mt 21.1-7, but to contribute to Mt's understanding of Zech 9.9 MT.

⁷Some scholars who acknowledge that Mt 21.5 renders Zech 9.9 MT better than the LXX, claim that the later Gk versions which agree with Mt [e.g., in using ὄνος] demonstrate that Mt had access to a better Greek urtext; e.g., see Davies & Allison III, 119 (n. 47), for reference to such an assumption, which they do not challenge.

⁸For this translation and extensive discussion, see Meyers II, 127-31. The three expressions, "ass," "young ass," and "son of she-asses," are used to describe the precise kind of animal upon which the king of

[Zech 9.9 LXX] ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεὺς σου ἔρχεται σοι,
[.....]
πραῦς καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὑποζύγιον
καὶ⁹ πῶλον νέον.¹⁰

Behold, your king comes to you,
[.....]
humble and mounted upon a beast of burden,
namely, a new colt.

[Mt 21.5] ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεὺς σου ἔρχεται σοι
πραῦς καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὄνον
καὶ ἐπὶ πῶλον υἱὸν ὑποζυγίου.

Behold, your king comes to you
humble and mounted upon an ass,
namely, upon a colt, a son of a beast of burden.

By examining these three texts in isolation, it is evident that Matthew's text translates the Hebrew better than the Septuagintal version does; in fact, the other extant Greek versions, all later than the LXX, also reflect the animal terminology more accurately than the LXX. However, one need not conclude from the existence of these more accurate Greek versions¹¹ of Zech 9.9c that Matthew necessarily had access to a Greek recension of Zechariah no longer extant.¹² In fact, if such were the case -- if Matthew had access to

Zech 9.9 rides. Meyers II, 131, notes that "the plural 'she-asses' perhaps better conveys the notion of a lowly beast of burden that underlies all three words associated with the royal mount." Gundry, *Use of OT*, 120-1, confirms that Mt's ὑποζύγιον (lit, under a yoke) fits "a son of she-asses." Mt accurately uses ὄνος for מורר and πῶλον for ער. R. P. Gordon's notes to the translation of *Tg. Zech. 9.9, op. cit.*, 205, suggest that the "Tg. has the singular for MT plural (lit. 'she-asses'), probably for idiomatic reasons." He translates *Tg. Zech. 9.9b*: Behold, your king is coming *into your midst*. He is righteous and *brings deliverance*, meek and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of a she-ass [italics are his, to indicate where the Aramaic varies from the MT]. Gordon mentions no problem with the "and" in the description of the single animal of the text of the targum.

⁹The καί here could also be translated "also, even, and." It depends upon whether the translator understands the Greek to reflect the hendiadys (*waw copulativum*) of the Hebrew. Schweizer, 404, takes the καί (LXX of both Zech 9.9 and Gen 49.11) to read "and" instead of the hendiadys of the Hebrew. I disagree.

¹⁰Greek variants include the following [cf. John 12.14: καθήμενος ἐπὶ πῶλον οἴνου]:

- α' - πραύς καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ οἴνου καὶ (ἐπὶ) πῶλου υἱοῦ οἴνου
- σ' - πτωχὸς καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ οἴνον καὶ πῶλον υἱὸν οἴνου
- θ' - ἐπακουῶν καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ οἴνον καὶ πῶλον υἱὸν οἴνου
- ε' - πτωχὸς καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὑποζύγιον καὶ πῶλον υἱὸν οἴνου

¹¹I use the expression *more accurate* just with respect to the animal(s) in Zech 9.9.

¹²See note #10 above. Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and Quinta, in Zech 9.9, all use ὄνος, as does Mt 21. Maarten J.J. Menken, "The Quotations from Zech 9,9 in Mt 21,5 and in Jn 12,15," in *John and the Synoptics* (BETL 101; ed. A. Denaux; Leuven: Leuven University-Peeters, 1992), 573-74, writes that "Matthew derived his translation of Zech 9,9 from an existing recension of the LXX" which was available in the first century C. E. He thinks Matthew derived the she-donkey from the Greek. Menken does think that Matthew understood the parallelism in Zech 9.9, however; his explanation of the two animals is derived from Mt's interest in Jesus' entry to Jerusalem as "the Son of David." Menken draws the parallel from 2 Sam 16, where Ziba offers David "a couple of donkeys," as he flees from Absalom. Max Wilcox, "Text Forms," 200, remarks that Matthew's "is the only Greek text (apart perhaps from John's) to reflect the repeated (w)ʿl ('and upon') of the Hebrew." Yet Wilcox also seems to think that Matthew did not make his own translation of Zech 9.9; he concludes, 201, "Overall, then, the text of Zech 9:9 presented in Matt. 21:5 must be taken as a valuable addition to our knowledge of the text form of the Greek OT in the period before Jamnia...." D.J. Moo, *OT in NTPNs*, 178-79, represents a different scholarly position. He notes that most scholars see a mixed textual background in Mt 21.5, the "LXX being followed in the first part and the MT in the second....," in which case the Matthean rendering (even where it follows the LXX)

more than one Greek tradition (LXX and another), and if he reproduced a translation closer to the Hebrew than the LXX, then it is debatable whether a claim that he had little or no knowledge of Hebrew could be sustained.¹³ In either case, whether he chose among alternate Greek translations or penned 21.2-5 independently, Matthew might have had some working knowledge of the Hebrew.

If it is plausible that Matthew knew Hebrew, it is certainly reasonable to read Mt 21.5 with the understanding that Matthew intended the second *καί* to be read as a hendiadys, corresponding to the *waw copulativum* he found in Zech 9.9. In that case, he would have understood that the king in Zech 9 would come riding on one animal, one particular kind of donkey appropriate to be used as a royal mount. This does not solve the problem of the ambiguous second *αὐτῶν* in Mt 21.7, but it does eliminate the *necessity* to suppose that the Matthean Jesus was somehow riding on two animals as he approached Jerusalem.

There may be a way to test the hypothesis that Matthew understood the Hebrew (and Greek) parallelism found in Zechariah 9.9. If a similar grammatical construction, which deliberately uses *καί* in a similar fashion, were to be discovered elsewhere in Matthew, it would strengthen the argument that he really understood the *waw copulativum* and/or hendiadys examined above. Mt 4.15-16 may be proposed as a test case; it is another Matthean fulfillment quotation, taken from Isa 8.23-9.1 (ET= Is 9.1-2). Mk 1.14-15 states that Jesus began his ministry in Galilee after he heard that the Baptist was arrested; Mt 4.12-13 fills in the details. Jesus' move from Nazareth to "Capernaum by the sea, in the territory of Zebulun and Naphtali," is supported by Matthew's citation of Isaiah in order to show that Jesus' Galilean ministerial headquarters were divinely ordained. The focus of this test case is on Matthew's use of *καί* in Mt 4.16.¹⁴

γῆ Ζαβουλῶν καὶ γῆ Νεφθαλίμ,
 ὁδὸν θαλάσσης, πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου,
 Γαλιλαία τῶν ἐθνῶν,
 ὁ λαὸς ὁ καθήμενος ἐν σκότει
 φῶς εἶδεν μέγα,
 καὶ τοῖς καθημένοις ἐν χώρα καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου
 φῶς ἀνέτειλεν αὐτοῖς. --Mt 4.15-16

In this instance there is no doubt that Matthew has altered his source(s) to make his point:

[.]
 ארצה זבלון וארצה נפתלי
 והאחרון הכביר הדרך הים
 עבר הירדן גליל הגוים
 העם החלכים בחשך ראו אור גדול
 ישבי בארץ צלמות אור נגה עליהם --Isa 8.23b- 9.1 MT

is also in agreement with the Hebrew. If one assumes that Matthew had access to a Greek version other than LXX, it would be very difficult to maintain that he had no access to an LXX-type tradition with which to compare Zech 9.9 translations. It would be extremely difficult to assert that Matthew chose a Greek translation closer to the Hebrew without also imagining that he had some knowledge of Hebrew.

¹³Pace Luz, *The Theology of the Gospel of Matthew* (trans. J. Bradford Robinson; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), who believes that Matthew was "familiar with the Septuagint but did not have any biblical scrolls at hand while writing out his Gospel--with the possible exception of Isaiah." Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 147, 159, doubts Matthew knew Hebrew, and concludes (on the basis of the quotations of Zech in 21.14f. and 27.9), "that no copy of the Minor Prophets was in the library of the Matthean community for consultation." Gundry, *Use of OT*, 120, assumes Matthew did have a Hebrew text; Stendahl, *School*, 104-6, also assumes that Mt worked with the Hebrew, as well as with the Greek.

¹⁴The underlined *καί* is the focus of the text case, but Mt's use of the italicized *καὶ* also figures in the discussion..



Τοῦτο πρῶτον ποίει, ταχὺ ποίει,
 χώρα Ζαβουλων, ἡ γῆ Νεφθαλιμ
 ὁδὸν θαλάσσης καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ οἱ τὴν παραλίαν κατοικοῦντες
 καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου,
 Γαλιλαία τῶν ἐθνῶν, τὰ μέρη τῆς Ἰουδαίας.
 ὁ λαὸς ὁ πορευόμενος ἐν σκότει,
 ἴδετε φῶς μέγα·
 οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν χώρᾳ καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου
 φῶς λάμπει ἐφ' ὑμᾶς.

--Isa 8.23-9.1 LXX¹⁵

Gundry's study of this text makes several important points.¹⁶ The MT has placed the geographic terms in an accusative relationship with the preceding parts of the verse:

In the former time he brought into contempt the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali, but in the latter time he will make glorious the way of the sea, the land beyond the Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles.

The LXX makes the geographic terms into vocatives, but Matthew puts them in an absolute construction¹⁷ and restricts them to Galilee.¹⁸ Two of Gundry's further remarks on the grammar and translation of the Isaiah passage may suffice to establish that Matthew had access to the Hebrew:¹⁹ (1) *καθημένοις* is a more literal rendition of *בְּיָדָם* than *κατοικοῦντες* (9.1); and (2) *καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου* (for which *καί* the MT has no equivalent) looks at first like "certain dependence on the LXX..." but closer examination shows that the Hebrew *Vorlage* of Mt and the LXX possibly read *מִמֶּנֶם בְּלֵיל*, "from which a fusion of the two words was made and the *waw* dropped of necessity..." In this case, the Greek hendiadys renders the Hebrew construct (in the region of the shadow of death) accurately.²⁰

If *καί* in the expression, *ἐν χώρᾳ καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου*, from both LXX and Mt 4.16 is understood to be part of a hendiadys, what about the first *καὶ* in Mt 4.16? It does not occur in LXX²¹ nor is there a

¹⁵No extant version of Isa 9.1, other than Mt 4.16, contains the *καί* in question.

¹⁶Gundry, *Use*, 105-8; his study of Isa 8.23-9.1 is isolated and unrelated to the approach I take in this test case. So also with Stendahl, *School*, 104-6; Soares Prabhu, *Formula*, 129-35; Davies & Allison I, 381-86.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, 105.

¹⁸Lindars, *NT Apologetic*, 197, rightly observes that the omission of verbs and temporal adverbs from Isa 8.23 "makes the string of names, which had been their subject, equivalent to *λαός* in the next verse, and grammatically in apposition to it."

¹⁹Stendahl's study of Mt 4.15-16, *School*, 106, concludes, "Thus when working with the Hebrew text, Matthew depends on different Greek interpretations, but also gives his own interpretation from the point of view of the fulfilment by Jesus. This renders it impossible to presuppose that he quoted one consistent Greek -- or Semitic --text."

²⁰Gundry, *Use of OT*, 107. Also see Gundry, *Matthew*, 60, where he looks at the Greek hendiadys *ἐν χώρᾳ καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου*. Davies & Allison I, 385, agree that Gundry's proposal may be right. However, my argument here does not depend on the correctness of Gundry's proposed "fusion." Note that Strong's *Concordance*, 99, derives *מִמֶּנֶם בְּלֵיל* from *בֵּל* (shade, shadow) and *מָוֶת* (death), although Holladay, *Concise Lexicon*, just gives "darkness."

²¹Gundry, *Use*, 105, makes no mention of the appearance of this *καί*, but Davies & Allison I, 385, report its presence in "A." Assuming that they refer to Codex Alexandrinus (LXX^A), they are in error. The

precedent for it in MT. For Matthew's purposes does this *καί* increase the significance of the Isaiah text as a *fulfillment quotation*? His careful reconfiguration of the geographical terms, in part by eliminating τὰ μέρη τῆς Ιουδαίας, certainly narrows the focus to Galilee as the location for the dawning of Jesus' ministry. Matthew has also excised οἱ λοιποὶ... κατοικοῦντες... from the quotation, in order to compress the reference to the people, as well as the region, to whom the fulfillment of the Isaiah promise came.

It is also possible that Matthew has inserted this unprecedented *καί* not to broaden, but rather to narrow, the scope of ὁ λαός. If this *καί* is read as either exegetical or as making another hendiadys, then the reader is meant to understand that ὁ λαός ὁ καθήμενος ἐν σκότει are further described as οἱ καθήμενοι ἐν χώρᾳ καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου -- the people who sat in darkness, the ones who sat in the region of the shadow of death, are those who dwell in Galilee, where the light of the Gospel has dawned.²² In order to increase the parallelism in his text, Matthew employs κάθημαι in place of both πορεύομαι and κατοικέω in the LXX.²³ An English translation which incorporates these insights might read,

The people who were sitting in darkness have seen a great light;
that is to say, light has dawned upon those sitting in the region of death's shadow.

This reading of Matthew 4.16 (in contrast with the LXX, which is much further afield from the MT here than at Zech 9.9) is not far from the meaning ascertained in Isaiah 9.1 MT. If Matthew could have composed 4.16 to be this close to the Hebrew, and yet have the sophistication to compose his citation of Isa 9.1 to include an additional *καί* to serve his purpose, then the burden falls upon those who contend that the evangelist misunderstood Hebrew, especially its forms of parallelism, to demonstrate that Matthew broke up the parallelism with respect to the donkey in Mt 21.1-10 (cf. Zech 9.9).

Questions about Matthew's introduction of two animals into the narrative remain: Why is the female ass brought into the story? and upon which animal(s) did the Matthean Jesus ride? With respect to the first question, it seems reasonable to say, at the outset, that Mt 21.2-7, does not derive the female ass from the text of Zech 9.9 (or of Gen 49.11). As this study has shown, nothing in Zech 9.9 MT or LXX

Facsimile of Alexandrinus (*Codex Alexandrinus: Facsimile of the Old Testament*. Vol. II. Hosea - 4 Maccabees; London: The British Museum, 1883), Recto 306a, on Isa 9(1) shows only the *καί* before σκία θανάτου; *καί* does not occur before οἱ κατοικοῦντες in Isa 9.1 in LXX^A. In their discussion, Davies and Allison rightly label the *καί* σκιᾷ θανάτου as exegetical or hendiadys. They make no further mention of the *καί* under focus in this present study. I am proposing that the other *καί* in Mt 14.16 functions in much the same way, that Matthew has placed it deliberately in his carefully-crafted citation of Isa 9.1, and that he employs it here much as he does the disputed *καί* of Zech 9.9 in Mt 21.5.

²²Blaine Charette, *Recompense*, 73-74, noting that "it is fitting that the restoration should have its beginnings in the region of Zebulun and Naphtali, since they were among the first tribes taken into exile," also writes, "There is no reason to contend that Matthew is interpreting the Isaiah passage without reference to its original meaning." Most of Charette's interesting study is outside the scope of this thesis.

²³Wim Weren, "Quotations from Isaiah and Matthew's Christology (Mt 1,23 and 4,15-16)," in *Studies in the Book of Isaiah* (BETL 132; ed. J. Van Ruiten and M. Vervenne; Leuven: Leuven University Press/Uitgeverij Peeters, 1997), 459, notes "the parallelism expressed by the twofold use of the participle form of κάθημαι...and by the two aorists," the use of which corresponds to the Hebrew rather than with the LXX. The prominent placement of φῶς in Mt 4.16a contributes to increased parallelism with 4.16b; and the hendiadys ἐν χώρᾳ καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου agrees with LXX against MT. Weren concludes, "It is possible [for this citation that] Matthew goes back to a text, the origin of which we can no longer exactly trace. However... a more obvious explanation is that Matthew was familiar with the Hebrew as well as with the Greek version and that he revised the quotation thoroughly with a view to fitting it into his story about Jesus." Weren does not discuss the first *καί*, however.

requires it, nor does Matthew's fulfillment citation. The burden of proof that a grammatically-mistaken Matthew "twists" the scriptures (or his narrative to fit the scriptures) is on those who make the claim, for it has been demonstrated that Matthew has the facility to understand and to translate the *waw copulativum* and to compose a text using its corresponding Greek equivalent (hendiadys/epexegetical καί).²⁴

If one refuses to accept uncritically the suggestion that Matthew derived the female ass from the text(s), or that he "invented the female ass," the way is open to look elsewhere for the source of the mother of the "colt." The most reasonable possibility of the source for the two animals is Mark's gospel and/or some other tradition(s) to which Matthew had access. Even though Mk 11.2-7 clearly refers to one animal, "upon whom no one had ever sat," this is not to forbid the possibility that in the culture, it would be understood that this was a young animal, and/or that if still tied with its mother, the animal was proven to be a suitable mount for the humble king.²⁵

The answer to the second question is that the Matthean Jesus rode on the young male ass, ἐπὶ πῶλον υἱοῦ ὑποζυγίου; there is nothing in the citation of Zech 9.9 in Mt 21.5 which points to confusion on this point, given the more accurate translation provided: Behold, your king comes to you humble and mounted upon an ass, namely, upon a colt, a son of a beast of burden.

In sum, this analysis urges that simply attributing to Matthew that he thought Jesus simultaneously rode on two animals does not say enough about what this text is trying to do; moreover, such a reading cannot be taken for granted. Even if the text gives an impression that Jesus was on two animals, Matthew has produced such ambiguity unwittingly -- his fulfillment citation has other purposes. Nothing in the details of much of the speculation on this text hold any priority for Mt 21. What the Zech 9.9 citation emphasizes - what no other text can supply - is the prophecy that the King of Israel would come to Jerusalem as a humble Messiah. In light of this overarching concern, one concludes that Matthew did not mention two animals because he misunderstood Hebrew parallelism. If unanimity is not reached on this minor question, there must at least be another reason why two donkeys appears in the Matthean narrative.

²⁴We have seen elsewhere in this thesis that Matthew does not slavishly follow the text in his citations, that his exegesis is creative. Therefore, it would be impossible to prove that he was *bound* to put two animals in his text, even if he had thus read Zech 9.9.

²⁵The literature on this subject is voluminous. See Davies & Allison III, 116-21, and Gundry, *Use of OT*, 120, for representative references and interpretive options. If it was crucial that the "colt" was one "on which no one has ever sat" (Mk 11.2), it may have been natural to assume, or to infer from Mark, that the animal was still tied "with its mother." It is not the focus here to give a definitive answer to this question, just to open it up. What must not be assumed is that Matthew misunderstood Zech 9.9 and thereby "found" two animals there, and that he therefore insisted there must be two animals upon which Jesus rode. Mt 21.7 does not require such a reading.

CHAPTER FOUR

Jesus in the Temple

The Prophet from Nazareth in Galilee
[Matthew 21.12-16/Zechariah 14.21]

A number of scholars have assumed that Zechariah tradition has wielded influence on this passage; most notably Zech 14.21 has been adduced as the scriptural motivation for Jesus' act in the temple, although it is nowhere cited in the Synoptic accounts.¹ When the Matthean Jesus enters Jerusalem, he goes directly to the temple, drives out all who are selling and buying, overturns tables and chairs, and then quotes from Isaiah 56.7 and Jeremiah 7.11. Matthew has altered the Markan structure in two ways:² (1) The Markan Jesus enters Jerusalem, looks around the temple, then returns to Bethany overnight; the next day he curses the fig tree and then enters the temple, where the disturbance occurs (Mk 11.11-19); in Matthew, the narrative time of the entry to the city and the symbolic act in the temple is compressed into one day. (2) In Mark, the temple act is intercalated in the lesson of the fig tree, which is then stretched over two days; in Matthew the entire fig tree incident is transposed to the day after the temple event -- the withering occurs and is observed immediately (Mt 22.18-22; cf. Mk 11.12-14, 20-25).

Matthew makes other changes to his narrative: he omits Mark's reference to Jesus forbidding vessels to be carried through the temple (Mk 11.16) and deletes the phrase "for all the nations" from the citation of Isa 56.7. A uniquely Matthean incident in the temple

¹Hagner II, 600, and Davies & Allison III, 136, e.g., attribute this motivation to the *historical Jesus*; Gundry, *Matthew*, 413, while acknowledging that this may be so, reminds his readers that Isa 56.7 and Jer 7.11 are cited in the gospel text. John locates the temple action at the beginning of Jesus' ministry (Jn 2.13-19); in v. 16 the Johannine Jesus seems to allude to Zech 14.21, but in v. 17 the disciples are said to have remembered the incident in light of Ps 69.10.

²Luke takes a different tack when departing from the Markan outline here: he places the Pharisees' rebuke of Jesus before the temple scene (Lk 19.39-44); in fact Luke never explicitly reports the entry of the entourage into Jerusalem. When the Lukan Jesus does enter the temple, he drives out only the sellers. The abbreviated citation of Isa 56.7 in Lk 19.45-46 is nearly identical to Matthew's.

follows, as the chief priests and scribes both witness Jesus healing blind and lame people (Mt 21.14) and hear children in the temple shouting “Hosanna to the Son of David.” The Matthean scene concludes with Jesus’ quotation of Psalm 8.2 (Mt 21.14-16) in response to criticism by the chief priests and scribes. Unlike Mark, Matthew reports that Jesus drove out *all* who sold and bought in the temple.³

As noted above, although Zechariah is not cited in the Synoptic accounts of this incident in the temple, some scholars have suggested that Zech 14.21b may have influenced the preservation or transmission of the event in the temple at a pre-gospel level of the Passion tradition.⁴ Is there any evidence that Matthew was especially cognizant of Zechariah influence here? Is there a possible connection between the texts cited by the Synoptic Jesus (Isa 56.7; Jer 7.11) and any Zechariah text?

The task of analysis begins with a study of Zech 14.21b. There is no agreement on the meaning of the term כְּנַעֲנִי (literally “Canaanite”) in the last sentence of the Book of Zechariah:

³There are other differences among the Gospel accounts of this story: Mt and Jn use the aorist ἐξέβαλεν, where Mk and Lk use ἤρξατο ἐκβάλλειν. In their citations of Isa 56.7, Mt keeps κληθήσεται, but Lk omits it; in their citations of Jer 7.11, Mk uses the perfect πεποιήκατε, Lk has the aorist ἐποιήσατε, and Mt uses the present ποιείτε. Mt and Lk also change Mk’s interrogative to a declarative sentence, possibly to stress the emphatic or accusing tone of Jesus’ citation; e.g., see Gundry, *Matthew*, 412-13, who says that Mt and Lk both omit Mark’s mention of “teaching” in order to sharpen the accusation. (For a different opinion on this omission, see ch. 2 above (note # 23); cf. Paffenroth’s article on Mt’s emphasis on Jesus as healer). John includes oxen and sheep among the animals sold; Jesus drives out *all* the sellers and moneychangers, while specifically addressing the sellers of pigeons (Jn 2.16). The identity of those who hear Jesus’ citation of scripture is not clear in the Synoptics. Especially if the reader of Mt is meant to understand that *all* sellers and buyers have been driven out, then who is left in the narrative as Jesus’ audience? Priests and Levites, a group of Zealots or zealot-sympathizers, etc.?

⁴It is somewhat surprising to note the paucity of reasoning given in Matthean scholarship for a connection between Zech 14.21b and Mt 21.12-13; it may just be mentioned with no supporting commentary. Is it assumed for Mark, therefore also for Matthew? Or is it the citation in the parallel Johannine account (Jn 2.16) which points to Zech 14.21b in the underlying tradition?

וְלֹא־יִהְיֶה כְּנֻעֲנֵי עוֹד בְּבֵית־יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא --Zech 14.21b MT

καὶ οὐκ ἔσται Χανααῖος οὐκέτι ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ κυρίου
παντοκράτορος ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ. --Zech 14.21b LXX

In the OT, “Canaanites” can refer to any group of non-Israelites who inhabited Palestine (for example, Gen 12.6, Obad 20); sometimes the term is appropriately interpreted as a reference to tradespeople (e.g., Prov 31.24, Isa 23.8, Hos 12.8 (7); cf. Zeph 1.11).⁵ For the two passages where the expression occurs in Zechariah, there are complications. The first, Zech 11.4-17, has the reputation for being one of the most obscure and difficult passages in the Hebrew Bible. The Septuagint reads the expression לִכְן עֲנִי in Zech 11.7, and כִּן עֲנִי in Zech 11.11, as one word rather than as two words, thereby rendering the resulting terms, לְכֻנְעָנִי and כְּנֻעֲנִי, as εἰς τὴν Χαναανίτιν⁶ (11.7) and οἱ Χανααῖοι (11.11), respectively. Some scholars also adopt the decision of the LXX to translate the terms in Zech 11.7 and 11 (in/at Canaan, and to the Canaanites/merchants) as “those who trafficked in the sheep” (RSV) or “sheep dealers” (Hanson), rather than something like “afflicted/poor ones of the flock.”⁷ The Targum of Zech 11 and the B-manuscript of the *Damascus Document*, however, read the Hebrew here as two words, thus giving the sense of “impoverishment of the flock” or “humble/poor among the people.”⁸

⁵See discussion of these issues in Baldwin, *Zechariah*, 179-84 and Meyers II, 255-62.

⁶Variants, for Zech 11.7 (γην Χ, την γην Χανααν, etc.) reflect the general problems with the Hebrew and Greek, but the variants have no bearing on the thrust of the present inquiry.

⁷Among those who concur with a translation like the RSV are the Baldwin and Meyers commentaries; see also Paul D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* (rev. ed.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 340. See also an outline of scholarly reasons given for preferring the MT or the LXX “emendation” in Mike Butterworth, *Structure and the Book of Zechariah* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 208-10; Butterworth concludes that the emendation is the better choice.

⁸As often happens, the Targum takes liberties with the biblical text; e.g., Zech 11.4 MT may be translated, “Thus said the Lord my God: ‘Become shepherd of the flock doomed to slaughter.’” *Tg. Zech.* 11.4 renders the citation, “Prophesy against the leaders who were appointed to lead the people

One possible link between Zech 14 and the gospel tradition may be derived from Paul Hanson's proposal to read Zechariah 14.21b in light of Zech 11.4-17. This is especially suggestive, not only because the unusual term "Canaanite" appears in the latter and is emended in the former, but also because it may affect the reading of at least two Matthean texts.⁹ Hanson reads Zech 14.20-21 in light of Zech 11; he proposes that these texts reflect the polemic between the prophet's group and the "hierocratic" Zadokite group who controlled the temple. Their "narrow exclusiveness" and control would be overcome and purged after the destruction of Jerusalem, as described earlier in Zechariah 14.

The link Hanson makes between Zech 11 and 14, and their references to *traders*, forms part of his larger discussion of the continuity between the prophetic group of Zechariah and the earlier Isaianic prophetic tradition. Specifically, he asserts that Zech 14 is connected to the "restoration hopes of second Isaiah and his disciples" (Isa 49.6b, 60.3), and that the "universalism inchoate in those early formulations is stated boldly in what was perhaps one of the latest parts of Third Isaiah (56:1-8)." In other words, Hanson sees the gentiles/nations who go up to worship Yahweh in Zech 14.16_{fr} as the foreigners whom Yahweh himself will bring to his holy mountain, whom he will make joyful in his house

but who ruled over them as if they were a flock for the slaughter." Compare Zech 11.7 MT ("So I became the shepherd of the flock doomed to be slain for those who trafficked in the sheep") with *Tg. Zech. 11.7* ("And I appointed rulers over the people and they ruled over them as if they were a flock for the slaughter; they impoverished and drove my people astray..."). Lines 7-9 of the Damascus Document (CD^Bxix.7-9) have been translated, "...when there comes the word which is written by the hand of Zechariah, the prophet: 'Wake up, sword, against my shepherd, and against the male who is my companion -- oracle of God -- wound the shepherd and scatter the flock and I shall return my hand upon the little ones.' Those who are faithful to him are the poor ones of the flock." CD^B xix. 9 appears to be inspired by Zech 11.11; xix. 7-8 follows Zech 13.7; see García Martínez, *DSS Translated*, 45.

⁹Hanson, *Dawn*, 337-54, 381-97, reads "Canaanite" in Zech 14.21 and "dealer" in Zech 11; he thinks Mt may have read Jesus' betrayal as fulfilling God's purposes revealed in Zech 11. Because Zech 11.12-13 is widely acknowledged to be Mt's source for the story of Judas' payment of thirty pieces of silver (Mt 26.14-16, 27.3-10), any claim that an adjacent group of verses from Zech 11 may influence the same gospel must be considered.

of prayer (Isa 56.7).¹⁰

If a first-century reader understood Zechariah 14 in light of Isaiah 56.1-8, there could at least have been a conceptual link between the temple as *house of prayer* and the holiness of all who worship in the temple at the eschaton. If this is so, then there is the possibility that an exegetical connection may have existed between the citation of Isa 56.8 and Zech 14.21.¹¹ However, not all scholars who read “traffickers” or “sheep dealers” as those persons for whom the prophet became a shepherd in Zech 11 choose to read כְּנַעֲנִי (Χανααναίος) in Zech 14.21b as the equivalent of “trader;” rather, some retain the term “Canaanite” in the more general sense of Gentile.¹² In the context of Zechariah 14, verse 21 points to that eschatological time when boundaries between sacred and secular are no longer pertinent, for “on that day” every pot will be sacred, in the temple and in ordinary households. Not people only, but animals also will be “holy to Yahweh.” The prophecy of Zech 14 envisions a time when Gentiles come to Jerusalem to worship Israel's God (cf. Zech 8.20-23; 14.16ff). “There will no longer be a Canaanite in the house of Yahweh

¹⁰Hanson, *Dawn*, 384-89. His concern here is not to draw any connection with NT texts but to see a close relationship between the visionary traditions of Zech 14 and Third Isaiah, of which 56.1-8 and 66.17-24 are his primary examples. It is my suggestion that, if these traditions may have been associated by ancient readers, one cannot now discount a potential theological association between Isa 56.7, Zech 11.4-17 and Zech 14.21.

¹¹This is not to suggest that any evangelist actually followed this hypothetical thought process to the conclusion that the incident in the temple is related to these scripture texts! In fact, Paul Hanson, 338-52, does not mention the temple incident in his work on Zech 11 and 14; rather he pursues their relationship in his search for an alternate explanation of the Matthean use of the thirty pieces of silver from Zech 11.12-13 and Judas' betrayal of Jesus in Mt 27.3-10. There is no doubt that Matthew uses the Zech 11 material on the thirty pieces of silver. See the discussion in thesis section on Mt 26.14-16; 27.3-10, “The Price of Betrayal.” What makes it worth mentioning here is the fact that, if Mt has undoubtedly used Zech 11.12-13, he may have been familiar with Zech 11.11 where the sheep dealers/traders are mentioned. This merits further investigation, in order to follow the seven rules proposed by Richard Hays, *Echoes*, for determining whether a NT text echoes an OT text. [see methodology at beginning of this thesis]

¹²The only references to the land of Canaan (Χαναάν) in the NT occur in Acts 7.11 and 13.19; the term which describes the woman in Mt 15.22 (γυνή Χανααία) is a NT *hapax legomenon*.

of hosts on that day” is susceptible of more than one legitimate interpretation. It may indicate that (1) there will be no need for buying and selling in the temple, for all people and all things in Judah, in Jerusalem, and in the temple will be holy (Zech 14.20-21);¹³ or (2) there will no longer be a distinction between worshipers of Yahweh on ethnic grounds -- cultural and religious tensions will not be an issue when all people who come up to worship have been transformed -- in this sense “there will not be a Canaanite...on that day” reflects the eschatological vision of universalized worship of Yahweh (Zech 14.16ff; cf. 8.20-23); or (3) no gentiles will be permitted in the temple; as representative of Israel’s enemy *par excellence*, Canaanites will finally be banished or eliminated.¹⁴

More pressing than a probe for authorial intention, however, is the question of how subsequent generations may have understood Zech 14.21b. In the first century, when Roman soldiers were garrisoned near the temple and the high-priestly vestments were in Roman custody, religious and political sentiment against Gentiles (and those in power who collaborated with Rome) would be understandably strong.¹⁵ One suspects that each of the

¹³Whether this envisions changes in the cultic sacrificial or priestly system is a matter for speculation. The New Oxford Annotated RSV (2nd ed; ed. Herbert G. May and Bruce M. Metzger; NY: Oxford University Press, 1977), 1159, notes to 14.21 suggest the possibility that there will be nothing in the eschatological temple which could defile the purity of worship; therefore, there would be no need for a trader [to certify the sacrifice or to provide proper coinage, presumably, since the RSV cross-reference is to John 2.16].

¹⁴See the discussions in Meyers II, 485-92. They favor a view like (2) above for the original sense of the text, “Canaanite” being understood to represent the complex mosaic of gentile ethnic groups in Palestine; but Konrad R. Schaefer, “Zechariah 14: A Study in Allusion,” *CBQ* 57 (1995), 85-87, allows a range of meanings, from trader to unclean/foreigner, depending upon which biblical text is the predominant source for Zech 14.21.

¹⁵The gospels portray enough conflict over religious authority, including some concerns of the temple leaders, to know that Jesus presented a serious challenge to those in power. The memory of the desecration of the temple in Maccabean times would have provoked comparisons with Rome. In the gospels and in Josephus, a valuable source of information about first-century armed struggles, sometimes to the point of murder in the temple, (e.g., the Zealots, the *Sicarii*...), Roman control of Judea and Jerusalem is never far from the surface of the text (cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 18.1.8-9). Some Qumran texts also portray their critical attitude toward the temple at that time (e.g., 1QS viii.4-5, 8-9, ix.4-6); there is evidence that the

three variant readings of “Canaanite” noted above could have been favored by different interpretive groups at the beginning of the common era.¹⁶

All four gospel accounts of Jesus’ action in the temple necessitate the conclusion that, if there is any Zechariah allusion to *Χαναναῖοι* here, it must be read primarily as a reference to *traders* and not to *Gentiles*.¹⁷ The fact that Matthew and Luke eliminate the Markan phrase “for all the gentiles/nations” has no bearing on this part of the question.¹⁸ The issue is in what sense an allusion to *traders* would be understood. Was Jesus protesting against the existence of *any* business operating there, or against some other form of corrupt practice in the temple? Is the reader expected to interpret the protest more generally, for example, as against the temple leadership (perhaps as collaborators with

Qumran Community considered themselves to be “the Temple” until the Jerusalem temple would be cleansed (cf. Vermes, *DSS*, 56-57; see also 1QpHab xii. 1-9).

¹⁶It may be that no major *group*, possibly apart from some post-resurrection followers of Jesus, expected a large-scale inclusion of Gentiles into the faith community in the near future. For the majority of first-century Jews, then, the most likely interpretation of Zech 14.21b would be either that of “*no traders*” or “*no Gentiles*” in the temple; both of these visionary scenes would reflect a kind of eschatological “purification” of temple practices; cf. *Pss. Sol.* 17.21-36. The interpretation in Cecil Roth’s article, “The Cleansing of the Temple and Zechariah xiv 21,” *NovT* 4 (1960), 174-81, that Jesus is speaking to his own followers, or to “people at large” who have zealot leanings, is more apt for Mark, who includes “for all gentiles” in the house of prayer citation. In his reading, then, Jesus is demonstrating the correct interpretation of Zech 14.21, that traders will not be in the temple.

¹⁷I am unaware of any interpretation that those whom Jesus drove out of the temple were gentiles.

¹⁸Some have suggested that Mt and Lk eliminate “for all gentiles” because they were written after the events of 66-70 C.E., for which reason this part of the Isa prophecy could no longer be fulfilled. See Garland, *Reading Matthew*, 213, who also explains that the fig tree in Mt was immediately withered because the temple was already in ruins by the time Matthew was written. We do not have a clear picture when the situation in the temple began to be like the picture Josephus paints of the years immediately preceding the destruction of the temple by Rome. George Wesley Buchanan, “Mark 11.15-19: Brigands in the Temple,” *HUCA* 30 (1959), 176, cites Lk 13.1-2 (Pilate mingled blood of Galileans with their sacrifices), and Mk 15.7 (Barabbas was an insurrectionist) to demonstrate that the Temple as “zealot stronghold (σπήλαιον ληστών)” could have been possible during Jesus’ ministry, but that such reference was more likely about the time of the First Revolt or after. Buchanan proposes that Mk 11.16 could have been a later insertion in the “composite” pericope. If true, Mt, Lk, and Jn may not have known it. On the other hand, Buchanan suggests that Jn may preserve the earlier tradition of the temple event and that Mk appended the composite Isa-Jer citation, which reflected the period after the fall of Jerusalem and which would reflect Gentile Christianity.

Rome)? Or are there others in the temple who are not mentioned in the text? By his actions, is Jesus attacking illegitimacy on more than one front?

There are two Gospel texts which may affirm the possibility that Zech 14.20-21 had some influence on the transmission of a tradition that Jesus expelled traders from the Temple. The stronger allusion or echo is in John 2.16. As justification for his action, the Johannine Jesus tells the sellers of pigeons, “Remove these things; stop making my father’s house a house of trade (οἶκον ἐμπορίου).”¹⁹ The case for a Zech 14.20b-21a allusion in Mark 11.16 is less clear.²⁰ It is not obvious that the reference that Jesus “did not permit anyone to carry a vessel through the temple” (καὶ οὐκ ἤφλεν ἵνα τις διενέγκῃ σκεῦος διὰ τοῦ ἱεροῦ) is derived from Zech 14:

And the pots in the house of the Lord shall be as the bowls before the altar;
and every pot in Jerusalem and Judah shall be sacred to the Lord of hosts,
so that all who sacrifice may come and take of them and boil the flesh of
the sacrifice in them. --Zech 14.20b - 21a RSV

If Matthew had access to Markan traditions derived from Zechariah, it might be difficult to explain their omission in Mt 21.12-13, but there is far from universal recognition

¹⁹ In the subsequent controversy in the temple, the Johannine Jesus uses temple-language in response to the question of his authority, “Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up” (Jn 2.18-24; cf. Zech 6.12-13). This report is strikingly similar to the accusations of the “false witnesses” in the Markan and Matthean trial accounts (Mk 14.57-58 and Mt 26.60-61), but it does not appear in the Lukan or Johannine trial scenes. Later in the gospel, Jn 12.14 contributes a fulfillment-citation of Zech 9.9 to the narrative of Jesus’ entry to Jerusalem.

²⁰The most ardent supporter of the thesis that Zech 14.20-21 is behind Mark 11.16, is Cecil Roth, *op. cit.*, 177-78, who writes that in “Messianic times...ordinary domestic utensils in Jerusalem were to be assimilated to the holy vessels... Mark seems to imply...that all utensils brought casually into the Temple area should be designated for use in the cultus, as a further token that Messianic times had begun: hence any vessel brought in was not allowed to be taken out again, as the verse states. The fact that Mark seems to go out of his way to add this point...confirms the impression that this was for him part of the ideal Messianic picture.” This last statement may be true, but it does not prove a connection to Zech 14. Although an intriguing suggestion, I think Roth makes too many leaps in his reasoning to be sure that Zech 14.20-21 is behind Mk 11.16. It could be that Zech 14.21b has some influence on other parts of the temple incident, but that is different from suggesting that Mt omits or misses a reference to Zechariah when he omits Mk 11.16 and/or its reference to Zech 14.20.

of Zechariah influence in Mk 11.16.²¹ Therefore, a suggestion that Matthew discarded a Zechariah reference when he omitted Mk 11.16 is unwarranted. With regard to John 2.16, the question remains whether Matthew would have known any Zechariah tradition connected with Jesus' actions or words in the temple incident.²² Assuming that John 2.16 does reflect Zech 14.21b, it is possible that this dominical saying was not known in Matthew's traditions. If Matthew did have Zech 14.21b in front of him, he may have omitted it because of his theology of the temple.²³

The Johannine account of the temple incident includes another intriguing potential allusion to Zechariah, for it also mentions sheep dealers, τοὺς πωλοῦντας (τᾶς) βόας καὶ πρόβατα, characters who also appear in Zech 11.4-5, οἱ πωλοῦντας αὐτὰ [τὰ πρόβατα].²⁴ Whether the fourth evangelist found the Zechariah material, both the allusion to *sheep dealers* and an echo of Zech 14.21b in Jesus' citation, in his tradition or introduced

²¹For example, the reliably exhaustive treatment of Davies and Allison does not even mention Zech 14.20 as a possible source for Mk 11.16; they, somewhat hesitatingly, suggest "Neh 13.8?" See previous notes on Roth.

²²This question is problematic for several reasons. Here, particularly, scholars come face to face with issues about the historical Jesus, as well as questions concerning the existence of a (hypothetical) pre-gospel Passion Narrative. In the past, scholarly studies of the Passion Narrative have not always attempted to separate these questions. Studies such as those by C. H. Dodd, F. F. Bruce and Barnabas Lindars, for example, were focused more upon the use of *testimonia* in the early Church than upon the exegesis of individual evangelists. The influence of Zechariah for pre-gospel traditions is not an issue for this thesis, nor is the question of what may have motivated the historical Jesus to his action in the temple. In the case of the temple event, therefore, one must not assume special sensitivity to Zechariah in Matthew before examining the evidence.

²³This thesis makes no attempt to formulate an overview of Matthew's temple theology; it comes into focus only where Matthew's use of Zechariah is in view.

²⁴Another pair of related words occurs in Zech 11.7,14 and in Jn 2.15: in Zech 11 LXX, the prophet-shepherd figure names his second ῥάβδος Σχοίσιμα and the Johannine Jesus makes a φραγέλιον ἐκ σχοινίων. Meyers II, 262-64, considers the LXX Σχοίσιμα an acceptable translation of מִלִּיָּה, [σχοινίον= line or rope], in Zech 11, and they translate it as "Bonds." However, the Meyers do not read Zech 11 with 14, even with respect to Canaanites, nor do they see any relationship between Zech 14.21b and Mt 21.12-13 and parallels (see p. 489).

them is difficult to ascertain. John mentions only the sellers, but both *buyers* and *sellers* are mentioned in Mark and Matthew, as in Zechariah 11.²⁵ That Zech 11.4-17 and Zech 14.21 could have been read together suggests that Jesus' prophetic action of driving the buyers and sellers (of sheep) from the temple could be interpreted as a figurative protest against the illegitimacy of the temple establishment itself, or at least its contemporary leadership. If one were looking in Zech 11 for parallels, *sheep dealers* -- those who *traffic in sheep*-- could serve the purpose, literally or figuratively.²⁶

The Johannine incident in the temple certainly seems to support the tradition that Jesus said something which was heard as a threat against the temple. "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up" (Jn 2.19, cf. 2.17-22), in fact, is more related to Jesus' perception that his opponents would 'destroy' him. The Synoptic gospels mention the destruction of the temple elsewhere: Jesus predicts the fall of the temple sometime after the temple act recorded in Mt 21.12-13 (cf. Mt 24.1-3; Mk 13.1-4; Lk 21.5-7). At his trial, "false witnesses" testify that Jesus claimed he could destroy the temple (Mt 26.62, Mk 14.57-58); and at the cross, Jesus is mocked, "You who would destroy the temple and build it in three days, save yourself" (Mt 27.40, Mk 15.29).²⁷

²⁵In Luke and John, only the sellers are driven out. Neither Matthew nor Mark mentions oxen or sheep, and Luke does not specify what was sold. However, John, like Matthew, does mention that *all [the sellers of oxen, sheep and pigeons, presumably]* were driven out. In John, the sellers of pigeons hear Jesus' echo of Zech 14.21b, although others seem to have witnessed the occasion (cf. Jn 2.18). In Mt 21.12, the nearest antecedent is also "those who were selling pigeons," but Mt is more vague here than John.

²⁶I am not aware of any interpretive reading like this in Johannine, Synoptic or historical-Jesus studies. The closest suggestion to this kind of thought might be Hanson's work on Zech 11 (see note # 9 above).

²⁷See Zech 3.8-9; 6.12-13 MT, LXX, and Targum. There were some expectations that the Messiah, or God, would (re)build the temple; see thesis section on Jesus and the Temple Charge. Keener, *Matthew*, 495-501, raises the questions of purification of the temple, of challenges by messianic figures, of the eschatological judgment or expectation of a new temple. Some scholars have interpreted Jesus' action in the temple as a perceived threat against the treasury system of the temple, in light of the banking/

Up to this point, only a tentative association of Zech 11 and 14 with the Isa 56.7 portion of the composite citation of the Synoptic Jesus has been proposed. How was the reader of the Matthean text to understand the temple as failure to be “a house of prayer”? Was it with regard to the sacrificial system? Was the trading activity corrupt? Was the temple’s function as a banking center of the national economy problematic? Or was Jesus protesting against something else? This question is a real challenge, not least because it is difficult to know who are meant to be the audience in the narrative. The issue becomes more clouded when the two halves of the citation in Mt 21.13 are brought together. Where is the emphasis? On the failure of the temple to be a “house of prayer,” or that it is being made into a “cave of brigands”?

In the context of Jeremiah 7, the prophet is told to go to the gates of the temple and to proclaim that, because they have not acted justly with one another and because they have gone after other gods, their worship in the temple will not save them or it from destruction. The use of σπήλαιον ληστών in Jer 7.11 is intriguing, but the use of ληστής in the LXX does not particularly help point to its meaning in the Synoptic temple scenes because Jer 7.11 is the only place where the LXX translates פְּרָצִים (violent men, robbers) with ληστών.²⁸ In Classical times, ληστεία had to do with plundering, robbery, or piracy, and,

economic system maintained by temple treasuries in the ancient world (e.g., Neill Q. Hamilton, “Temple Cleansing and Temple Bank,” *JBL* 83 (1964), 365-72. In this kind of argument, what Jesus did by suspending banking operations in the temple would have been interpreted as a direct claim to be the king, challenging the right of the temple authorities, Sanhedrin, and the Procurator to oversee the transactions in the temple.) The treasury in the temple does figure in the story of Judas, the 30 pieces of silver, and the reaction of the priests who paid him, when he attempted to return the money to the temple treasury (Mt 26.14-16; 27. 3-10; see on the price of betrayal below).

²⁸LXX uses ληστής but a few times to translate something from MT (Hos 7.1, Jer 7.11, Jer 18.22, Obad 1.5, and possibly Jer 12.9). See Gundry, *Use*, 19-20. He believes the NT use does indicate that robbery was taking place in the temple, which was “worse” than what happened in Jeremiah’s time. I do not agree that his reading is necessarily correct. The context of Jer allows for the assumption that unethical behavior took place both outside and inside the temple (cf. Jer 7.5-6, 9).

by the common era, it referred not only to robbery, banditry, or brigandage, but also to revolutionary or insurrectionist activity.²⁹ Many scholars have noted that Josephus often used the term λησταιί to refer to insurrectionists, or zealots, especially when he was laying blame for the destruction of the temple and of Jerusalem in the war against Rome. Even with reference to the time of Herod's accession to the throne, Josephus mentions the presence of such people who hid out in caves (*Ant* 15.5.421).³⁰

In the Synoptic gospels, the term ληστής appears here (Mt 21.13; Mk 11.17; Lk 19.46), in Jesus' question at his arrest: "Have you come out as against a ληστήν, with swords and clubs to capture me?" (Mt 26.55; Mk 14.48; Lk 22.52), and in Mt 27.38 and Mk 15.27, where Jesus is reported to be crucified between two λησταιί, who mocked him (Mt 27.44). The term also occurs in the Lukan Parable of the Good Samaritan (10. 30, 37) and in the sayings about the Good Shepherd in John 10.1, 8. John 18.40 specifically labels

²⁹See Liddell & Scott, *Abridged Lexicon*, 412. BAGD, 473 gives σικάριος, μετα τῶν στασιαστών as synonyms for ληστής, and cites Buchanan's "cave of brigands" (see citations in note #30 below).

³⁰It is not the task of this thesis to establish whether there was any continuity between Judas the Galilean and his counterparts in the later uprisings, nor is it necessary to establish when these kinds of brigands began to be involved in bloodshed in the temple. For an exhaustive treatment of the issue, see Martin Hengel, *The Zealots: Investigations into the Jewish Freedom Movement in the Period from Herod I until 70 A.D.* (trans. David Smith; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997). Joel Marcus, "The Jewish War and the *Sitz im Leben* of Mark," *JBL* 111 (1992), 441-62, reads Mk 11.17 as a probable expansion of an "original core resembling John 2:16." The overlap here may reflect a dominical origin, but at least reflects the pre-Markan stage of the temple tradition. Marcus, 450, writes, "Although ληστής does not always denote a revolutionary brigand, it is probable that in this case it does." The "implied contrast" in Mk 11.17...fits this meaning well: "God intended this place for international prayer; you have made it a nationalist stronghold." Mk 11.17, according to Marcus, 451, "can be plausibly viewed as the superimposition upon the tradition about Jesus' cleansing of the Temple of some features of an event that occurred during the Jewish War." This is not to say that the incident is a Markan fiction, but rather, that Mark's shaping of the event alerts his readers to the contemporary extension of the meaning of Jesus' action in the temple. This thesis agrees that ληστής should be differentiated from κλέπτης (thief), and that that Jesus did not accuse the moneychangers of robbery. See G.W. Buchanan, "Brigands in the Temple," 169-77; idem., "An Additional Note to 'Mark 11.15-19: Brigands in the Temple,'" *HUCA* 31 (1960), 103-5, for the difference in usage between *thief* and *brigand* in the NT.

Barabbas as ληστής.³¹

In calling the temple a σπήλαιον ληστῶν, it is not necessary to assume that particularly evil deeds were taking place there. Technically speaking, the brigands' den was not the place where criminals committed their crimes but the place of security and refuge where they retreated afterward.³² In the context of Jer 7.5-10, some people were oppressing aliens, widows and orphans, and dealing unjustly with one another, then coming to the temple saying, "We are safe." Yet others were practicing idolatry and breaking different commandments, even shedding innocent blood in the temple. Whom does Jesus accuse of making the temple a σπήλαιον ληστῶν? ³³ Is the answer to this question the same for all of the Synoptic gospels, or does it depend on the identification of Jesus' audience in different narrative worlds of the gospels? ³⁴

Leaving the other gospels aside, how is Matthew's reader meant to understand the

³¹Barabbas is called a "notorious prisoner" (δέσμιον ἐπίσημον) in Mt 27.16; in Mk 15.7, Barabbas is a rebel prisoner who committed murder in the insurrection, Βαραββᾶς μετὰ τῶν στασιαστῶν δεδεμένος οἷτινες ἐν τῇ στάσει φόνον πεποιήκεισαν. Similarly, in Lk 23.19, Barabbas ἦν διὰ στάσιν τινὰ γενομένην ἐν τῇ πόλει καὶ φόνον βληθεὶς ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ. In Lk 23.32, Jesus was reportedly crucified with two criminals, κακοῦργοι δύο.

³²David E. Garland, *Reading Matthew*, 212, in making these points, interprets Jesus to be railing against the temple itself, for having become a sanctuary for "religious knaves" instead of a locus of salvation. In Garland's reading, the protest is not against any abuse of selling or buying sacrificial animals or of money-changing, but an abrogation of the sacrificial system itself. A major contribution to the discussion, however, is Garland's reminder that the "den of brigands" is not where they commit their crimes but where they retreat and regroup. In this light, the audience who have made the temple into such a place must be both those who worship there and those in charge of worship, which also seems consistent with the Jeremiah context.

³³Does reading both halves of the citation together, rather than treating them separately, suggest an audience that is configured differently?

³⁴John says that Jesus addressed the sellers of pigeons (Jn 2.19), but the Johannine Jesus cites neither Isa 56.7 nor Jer 7.11. Mark and Luke are more ambiguous; in both, Jesus *began to drive out* some people (Mk 11.15; Lk 19.45). Mark puts the words of Jesus in the context of teaching: is he teaching disciples in the temple, or a mixed crowd? Mark and Luke read differently here, since the citation in Mark is part of the teaching; in Luke the accusation against the sellers comes before the teaching ministry resumes. For Matthew, something else seems to be happening.

statement that Jesus drove out *all* who were selling and buying in the temple? Matthew's language sharpens the saying into an accusation with present implications: "It is written, 'My house shall be called a house of prayer,' but you are making it a 'den of brigands.'" In this narrative, who are present to hear Jesus' scripture citation?³⁵ Is it the temple officials, the priests and/or other leaders of the people?³⁶ After Jesus' quotation (Mt 21.13; cf. Mk 11.17; Lk 19.46) where Mark and Luke report that temple leaders were seeking to destroy him (Mk 11.18; Lk 19.47), Matthew instead reports that Jesus healed the blind and lame in the temple (which the chief priests and scribes saw) and accepted the children's praises (which they heard). Did the chief priests and scribes also witness the events described in Mt 21.12-13, as well as those of 21.14-15? Is Matthew's narrative audience identifiable?

Perhaps the use of ληστής here helps to sharpen the focus on this audience. It seems unwise, for example, to conclude that the Matthean Jesus, who omits "for all the gentiles" from the citation of Isaiah 56.7, is confronting a full-fledged nationalist band of zealots, and no one else, in the temple.³⁷ It seems wiser to assume that λησταί in Mt 21.13 can indicate a wide range of culprits who commit offenses similar to those mentioned in

³⁵If Matthew is giving a different emphasis here than his Markan source, the aorist verb and the statement that all who were trading were driven out, ἐξέβαλεν πάντας τοὺς πωλοῦντας καὶ ἀγοράζοντας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, becomes more than a stylistic change.

³⁶In Mt 21.12, the nearest antecedent is "those who were selling pigeons," but they are not clearly singled out, as they are in Jn 2.16. In Mark, the chief priests and scribes hear this teaching (Mk 11.17-18). In Lk 19.45-46, Jesus addresses the sellers, and the chief priests, scribes and leaders of the people seemed to have witnessed this teaching.

³⁷On the question of zealots in the temple, it is not out of the question to apply the term σπήλιον ληστῶν literally as well as figuratively, perhaps seeing layers of interpretation by the time Matthew was written. At least one of the Twelve was a zealot, Σίμων ὁ Καναναῖος (Mt 10.4; Mk 3.18). If the saying incorporates wordplay, or if a possible confusion between Χαναναῖος and Καναναῖος plays some part in the tradition, is difficult to determine; I think both explanations are possible. See note #40 below.

Jer 7, that some people were coming to the temple trusting in the structure itself, assuming that God would preserve it, as they had done in Jeremiah's time. This reading fits the immediate context of Matthew 21, the subsequent conflict between Jesus and the scribes and Pharisees, and Jesus' eventual prediction of the destruction of the temple (Mt 24.1-3). Perhaps those who are meant to hear Jesus' words in Mt 21.13 are all those who have any "business" being in the temple.³⁸

There is another way that the σπήλαιον ληστῶν in the citation could have been linked to Zechariah. As scholars have noted, it would be surprising if the reference to traders in the temple in Zechariah 14.21b were completely absent from the gospel tradition.³⁹ It may be that the reader of Zech 14.21b made an association between כְּנַעֲנִי and כְּנַעֲנִי, or between Χανααναῖος and Καναναῖος. Neither Κανανίτης nor Καναναῖος appears in the LXX. These terms were confused in the textus receptus,⁴⁰ and potentially could also have been confused with Χαναναῖος.⁴¹ C. K. Barrett suggests that the early association of the Zechariah text to the temple incident may have played a role in forming

³⁸Davies & Allison III, 132-40, discuss various scholarly proposals and conclude that the action in the temple might be both a protest against temple practice and a prediction of its destruction, especially as it is read with the cursing of the fig tree. They take the view that [the historical] Jesus may have had Zech 14.21 in mind in protesting against the business practices there, but they do not substantiate their claim, nor do they separate the gospel accounts with respect to scripture allusions in this case.

³⁹C. K. Barrett, "The House of Prayer and the Den of Thieves," in *Jesus und Paulus* (ed. E. Earle Ellis and Erich Gräßer; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975), 20, speculates that the absence of reference to the Mal 3.1_{ff} prophecy must be due to its prior appropriation to John the Baptist in the gospel tradition. Barrett's article also looks for Zech 14.21 in the tradition of the temple event.

⁴⁰In Mt 10.4, ⳨, W, and Θ have Κανανίτης for Καναναῖος. Greek dictionaries are not particularly clear in distinguishing between these two words: UBS and BAGD define Καναναῖος as Cananean, = Zealot, from Aramaic כְּנַעֲנִי, and Καναנίτης as Cananite, a man from Cana. The textus receptus has this instead of Καναναῖος in Mt 10.4 and Mk 3.18, and interprets it this way. Liddell & Scott, *Abridged Lexicon*, only lists Κανανίτης, a Syriac word, of which the Greek Ζηλωτής, Zealot, is a translation...not to be confounded with Χαναναῖος, a Canaanite.

⁴¹See notes #6 and #12 above for Χαναναῖος and related terms in LXX and NT.

the composite quotation, which may have existed in another setting: from Zech 14.21, וְנִעַן כֹּנָעַן would have brought כֹּנָעַן to mind, and the latter would have “pointed to ζηλωτής or ληστής .”⁴²

If the hypothesis just presented is valid, a Zechariah influence may exist at the sub-textual level, with or without support from the John 2.16 citation. If the theory that the Matthean Jesus was protesting, even in part, against illegitimate temple leadership, then the influence of Zech 11.4-17 may also be read with Zech 14.21b as background for the incident. With the concentration of Zechariah quotations, allusions and echoes in the Passion Narrative, especially in Matthew, it is not inconceivable that the first evangelist also recognized some Zechariah influence in his tradition, but it is not obvious that he emphasizes it in his particular crafting of the temple narrative.

The themes of the special Matthew material which immediately follows the text in question are consistent with the insights discussed here. Mt 21.14-16 may be Matthew’s way of illustrating the proper use of the temple, in contrast with the protest of the previous verses. First, the blind and lame are healed by Jesus, as witnessed by the chief priests and scribes. This brief scene recapitulates the Davidic shepherd-healer imagery which was concentrated in the material between the Infancy and Passion narratives (cf. 4.23-24, 9.35-36, 11.2-6; 20. 20.29-34). Jesus’ descent into Jerusalem from the Mount of Olives (Mt 21.1-9) brought back the royal Son of David imagery from the Infancy narrative. The

⁴²Barrett’s article, *op. cit.*, is the only place I have been able to find a kernel of the idea I have had about the possible confusion of the terms, both in Hebrew and in Greek, although he only mentions the Hebrew association which would have led to ζηλωτής or ληστής . Especially in an oral culture, the two Hebrew/Aramaic words would have sounded similar, as would their equivalent Greek terms. In this way a link could be made between Canaanite [as Gentile or trader] and Cananaean/Cananite/Zealot. Barrett does not draw out how ληστής fits, but in light of Josephus’ circumlocution on this issue, perhaps the usage was common and interchangeable.

praise which the children shout in the temple, “Hosanna to the Son of David, (Mt 21.15)” not only echoes the crowds’ messianic fervor at the Zechariah-inspired entrance to Jerusalem (21.9), but it also portrays the right kind of worship in the temple. Especially if the children are read as ideal disciples, that is, “little ones,” the contrast between the powerless righteous and the spiritually-blind leadership and their opposition to true worship is set in bold relief.

In the beginning of chapter 21, Matthew invests the opening ten verses with overt Zechariah imagery. Jesus makes his official entrance into the holy city as the expected Davidic king (Zech 9.9). Coming from the Mount of Olives, eschatological overtones are perhaps reduplicated in the seismic reaction of the city to his arrival (21.10); cf. Zech 14.4-5). The focus shifts somewhat abruptly, as Jesus is identified as the prophet from Nazareth of Galilee (21.11). The prophetic Nazarene (cf. 2.23) figure⁴³ immediately enters the temple and engages, by means of an allusive/evocative prophetic act (possibly influenced by Zech 14.21b), in a multi-faceted critique of the temple. Immediately, Jesus attracts the blind and the lame and heals them in the temple; he accepts the messianic praise of the children there, and he counters the rebuke of indignant chief priests and scribes with a citation of Psalm 8.2. For that short period of time, when Jesus was in the temple, the eschatological reality of proper worship and activity in the temple has been symbolically accomplished.

⁴³One is reminded also of Mt 16.16, where Jesus asks who people think he is, and one response is “...Jeremiah or one of the prophets.” The prophetic act which occurs in the temple is characterized by a composite citation of Isa and Jer, with a possible echo of Zech. Jeremiah and Zechariah are more obviously linked in the Judas story in Matthew, but see also analysis of the conflated prophet figure(s) in Matthew 23 and 27 below.

CHAPTER FIVE

Jesus and Zechariah

The blood of Zechariah, son of Barachiah, in the Temple
[Matthew 23.35/Zechariah 1.1-7]

Matthew and Luke incorporate the traditional material of the *woes* to the scribes and Pharisees into very different narrative settings.¹ Luke includes these sayings in the context of a meal at which Jesus was the guest of a Pharisee (Lk 11.37-54).² Matthew records them last in a series of conflicts in Jerusalem, possibly in the Temple, at the end of Jesus' public ministry (Mt 23.1-36).³ Immediately after the *woes*, both gospels recall the death of an earlier Zechariah⁴ figure somewhere in the Temple precincts (Lk 11.50/Mt 23.35), and in both Jesus claims that the *blood of Abel to the blood of Zechariah* will be required of the present generation (Lk 11.50-51; Mt 23.35-36).⁵ Jesus' *lament over*

¹The Matthean and Lukan *woes* passages differ in many ways; this study seeks primarily to investigate Matthew's additional identification of the Zechariah figure as the "son of Barachiah" (Mt 23.35; cf. Lk 11.51).

²In the Lukan narrative, the setting of this meal is sometime before, or during, Jesus' trip with his disciples to Jerusalem (cf. Lk 9.31,51-53; 13.22, 33-34; 17.11; 18.31; 19.11, 28). The Lukan Jesus does not wash his hands before eating, which provokes his host's astonishment (Lk 11.37-38); in response Jesus offers corrective instruction (11.39-41), then directs the *woes* first to Pharisees and subsequently to lawyers (11.42-52).

³At least, for the narrative block between Mt 21.23 and Mt 24.1, no change of location is indicated (although cf. Mt 26.55). Exactly where the different groups of opponents in the Matthean narrative (chief priests, elders, Pharisees, disciples of the Pharisees, Herodians, Sadducees, lawyers) confront Jesus, where he tells these parables, and whether the crowds and Jesus' disciples are present throughout these events, is not crucial for the interpretation of the Zechariah reference in Mt 23.35. The entire section takes place in Jerusalem (probably in the environs of the Temple), toward the end of Jesus' ministry. The Matthean Jesus has just put the question about David's son to some Pharisees (22.41-45; cf. Mk 12.35-37; Lk 20.41-44). Next he warns the crowds and disciples about the scribes and Pharisees (23.1-12). He addresses *woes* first to "scribes and Pharisees" and then to "blind guides" (23.13-33).

⁴Apart from references to the father of John the Baptist in Luke (1.5, 12, 13, 18, 21, 40, 59, 67 and 3.2), the name Zechariah appears in the NT only in Mt 23.35 and Lk 11.50.

⁵Lk: Ζαχαρίου τοῦ ἀπολομένου μεταξύ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ τοῦ οἴκου... Luke's use of the middle participle may signal the weaker meaning [perish] over its active form [murdered]; Luke's Jesus asserts that the lawyers *consented* to their fathers' killing of the prophets (13.48). Mt: Ζαχαρίου ... ὃν ἐφονεύσατε μεταξύ τοῦ ναοῦ καὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου. Matthew's Jesus ascribes the *murder* of Zechariah to the scribes and Pharisees (23.35). That this address takes place in Jerusalem (in Mt 23) heightens the narrative impact and foreshadows the treatment Jesus receives at the hands of those who arrest and crucify

Jerusalem immediately follows this statement in Matthew, but in Luke it appears elsewhere (Mt 23.37-39; Lk 13.34-35).

Efforts to trace the *woes* and the *lament* of Matthew 23 (and their corresponding sayings in Luke 11 and 13) to their source(s) have not produced a scholarly consensus. Apart from their divergent settings, the first and third gospels set forth a different number of woes, and those they have in common are neither identical nor in the same order.⁶ In Matthew, Jesus' *lament* over Jerusalem follows directly after the *woes* to scribes and Pharisees, but in Luke, this *lament* is separated from the *woes* to Pharisees and lawyers by more than a chapter. If both evangelists had Q before them,⁷ how did their source describe Zechariah? Were the *woes* and the *lament* adjacent in Q, or was Matthew responsible for joining them?⁸ The texts themselves may shed some light on these questions.

him (20.18-19; 21.15, 45-46; 26.3-5).

⁶For a detailed analysis of the woes in Matthew and Luke, see the discussion and the tabular comparison of the seven Matthean and five Lukan *woes* on pages 51-52 in Kenneth G. C. Newport, *The Sources and Sitz im Leben of Matthew 23* (JSNTSup 117; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995).

⁷This thesis assumes that Matthew and Luke did use Q as a source for the *woes* (see also Mk 12.38-40; cf. Mt 23. 6-7; Lk 11. 43; 20. 46-47) and for the *lament*, for although difficulties remain, it is the most felicitous explanation for the material in the texts under consideration here. For the texts of Q 11.47-51 and 13.34-35, see *The Critical Edition of Q* (ed. James M. Robinson, Paul Hoffmann, & John S. Kloppenborg; Minneapolis: Fortress/ Leuven: Peeters, 2000), 282-88, 420-22. Hagner II, 680, notes that the only place Matthew uses the "Hebraic form" for Jerusalem (Ἱερουσαλήμ) instead of the "Hellenized form" (Ἱεροσόλυμα [sic; should be Ἱεροσόλυμα]), is in Mt 23.37. This may point to a common source (Q 13.34) for the *lament* (Mt 23.37-39; Lk 13.34-35).

⁸In Luke, the woes are in ch. 11, the lament over Jerusalem is in ch. 13, but Jesus' entry to Jerusalem and the Temple does not occur until ch. 19 (although cf. 13.22). Mt's continuous narration of the woes and lament comes later (23.13-36, 37-39), just before the Olivet discourse. David E. Garland, *The Intention of Matthew 23* (Leiden: Brill, 1979), 187-97, accepts the majority view that both evangelists used Q, but he thinks Matthew joined the woes and the lament which were separate in Q. Dale C. Allison, *The Intertextual Jesus: Scripture in Q* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 2000), 85-86, reinforces his earlier argument from *The Jesus Tradition in Q* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 1997), 201-2, that both evangelists used Q here, but that Mt follows the order in Q, while Lk separates Q 11 from Q 13. James M. Robinson, "The Sequence of Q: The Lament over Jerusalem," in *Von Jesus zum Christus: Christologische Studien* (eds. Rudolf Hoppe and Ulrich Busse; BZNW 93; Berlin and NY: Walter de Gruyter, 1998), 225-60, comes to similar conclusions by a different route. Newport, *op. cit.*, 51_{ff}, 154-56, argues a minority opinion; he contends that the differences between Mt 23 and Lk 11/13 support his claim that Matthew used Q, Mk,

Q 11.47-51, which pertains to Mt 23.29-36/Lk 11.47-51, is as follows:

⁴⁷οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οἰκοδομεῖτε τὰ μνημεῖα τῶν προφητῶν, οἱ δὲ πατέρες ὑμῶν ἀπέκτειναν αὐτούς. ⁴⁸...μαρτυρ[[εἶτε ἑαυτοῖς ὅτι υἱοὶ]] ἔστε τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν...⁴⁹ διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡ σοφία .. εἶπεν· ἀποστελῶ [[πρὸς]] αὐτοὺς προφήτας καὶ σοφούς, καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀποκτενοῦσιν καὶ διώξουσιν, ⁵⁰ [[ἵνα]] ἐκζητηθῇ τὸ αἷμα πάντων τῶν προφητῶν τὸ ἐκκεχυμένον ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης, ⁵¹ ἀπὸ αἵματος Ἀβελ ἕως αἵματος Ζαχαρίου τοῦ ἀπολομένου μεταξὺ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ τοῦ οἴκου· ναὶ λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐκζητηθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης.

Woe to you, for you build the tombs of the prophets, but your <<fore>>fathers killed them. <<Thus>> [[you]] witness [[against yourselves that]] you are [[the sons]] of your <<fore>>fathers. .. Therefore also .. Wisdom said: I will send them prophets and sages, and <<some>> of them they will kill and persecute, so that <<a settling of accounts for>> the blood of all the prophets poured out from the founding of the world may be required of this generation, from <<the>> blood of Abel to <<the>> blood of Zechariah, murdered between the sacrificial altar and the House. Yes, I tell you, <<an accounting>> will be required of this generation! ⁹

The text of Q 13.34-35 relates to Mt 23.37-39/Lk 13.34-35:

³⁴ Ἰερουσαλὴμ Ἰερουσαλὴμ, ἡ ἀποκτείνουσα τοὺς προφήτας καὶ λιθοβολοῦσα τοὺς ἀπεσταλμένους πρὸς αὐτήν, ποσάκις ἠθέλησα ἐπισυναγαγεῖν τὰ τέκνα σου, ὃν τρόπον ὄρις ἐπισυνάγει τ[[ὰ]] νοσσία αὐτῆς ὑπὸ τὰς πτέρυγας, καὶ οὐκ ἠθελήσατε. ³⁵ ἰδοὺ ἀθίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν. λέγω .. ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ ἴδητέ με ἕως [[ἤξει ὅτε]] εἴπητε· εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου.

O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, who kills the prophets and stones those sent to her! How often I wanted to gather your children together, as a hen gathers her nestlings under her wings, but you were not willing! Look, your house is forsaken! .. I tell you, you will not see me until [[<<the time>> comes when]] you say: Blessed is the one who comes in the name of the Lord!¹⁰

The most likely biblical precedent for the gospel source (Q) is 2 Chronicles 24, in which the murder of someone named Zechariah is described. The pertinent material begins with Jehoiada, who was a priest in the time of Joash:

The father of Zechariah was Jehoiada the priest, once identified as the ‘chief’ priest (2 Chr 24.6; cf. 2 Kgs 12. 10); he died at the age of one hundred thirty and was buried “in the city of David among the kings.” After Jehoiada’s death, the princes of Judah forsook the house of the Lord and turned King Joash away from the God of their fathers.

and M for the woes, but that the lament did not come from Q. My analysis confirms that Mt 23 preserves the order of Q; I disagree with Robinson’s view that Matthew misunderstood Q’s Zech reference.

⁹*Critical Edition of Q*, 282-88. The ET is from this work as well. (Underlining for emphasis.)

¹⁰*Ibid.*, 420-22. ET also from this work.

The Chronicler reports that God “sent prophets among them to bring them back to the Lord; these testified against them, but they would not give heed.” After this Zechariah prophesied, “Why do you transgress the commandments of the Lord, so that you cannot prosper? Because you have forsaken the Lord, he has forsaken you.” Joash had Zechariah killed: at his command, people stoned Zechariah in the court of the house of the Lord. Zechariah’s dying words were, “May the Lord see and avenge!” After Joash had been wounded in battle by the Syrians, who were given the victory because the people had forsaken the Lord, the royal servants conspired against Joash “because of the blood of the son of Jehoiada the priest, and slew him on his bed.” Joash was buried in the city of David, but not in the tombs of the kings. --2 Chr 24.15-25 ¹¹

Before comparing the Luke 11 and Matthew 23 texts, it is well to note the similarities between the hypothetical Q 11.47-51 and 13.34-35 texts of *woes and lament* (see previous page) and 2 Chronicles 24. In separate studies, James Robinson and Dale Allison both argue that these Q texts are dependent upon 2 Chr 24. Robinson builds on the work of Steck and Lührmann, who traced the “deuteronomistic view of history reflected through both early Judaism and primitive Christianity”:

God kept sending prophets to call his people to obedience, with the prophets being summarily executed, leading to God’s judgment (especially the fall of Jerusalem). The Q redactor superimposed this view that “God would avenge on *this generation* the rejection of Jesus and the Q message,” which would result in the abandonment of the temple. The Q *woes and lament* are based on the deuteronomistic 2 Chronicles 24 model.¹²

Allison proposes that the *intertext* established between 2 Chr 24.17-25 and Q 11.49-51 plus Q 13.34-35 affects the interpretation of this part of Q, which Matthew got right by keeping the woes and lament together: Q “implicitly constructs an analogy: As it was in the days of

¹¹In this compilation of 2 Chr 24, material inside quotation marks is from the RSV. Underlined words and phrases figure in the comparisons below. Also see the discussion of Josephus, *Ant* 9.8.3, further below.

¹²Robinson, “Sequence of Q,” 247-49. He also draws upon Haenchen’s observation that the Zechariah martyred by Jerusalemites in Q 11.51 / 2 Chr 24 evokes Jerusalemites in its “logical continuation” Q 13.34. God’s abandonment of the temple in the Jewish precursor text is “christianized and updated” by Q 13.35. The brief biblical time between Zechariah’s martyrdom and the destruction of the (first) temple is shared/recalled in the time frame from Jesus to the Roman destruction of the temple; see 244-45. Robinson, 250, notes the terminology in common between “Sophia’s Saying and the Lament over Jerusalem” as distinct from the rest of Q (sending of prophets, who are killed, murder in Jerusalem, retribution due, etc.). He also notes, 250-51, the deuteronomistic introduction both to the death of Zechariah (2 Chr 24.19-23) and Sophia’s Saying (Q 11, 49b), the location of martyrdom, reference to stoning, use of “house” for temple in both places.

Zechariah, so now is it in the days of Jesus.”¹³

The part of Luke 11 which is pertinent for this study comes after the Lord’s prayer (11.1-4), Jesus’ teaching on persistence in prayer (11.5-13), the conflict over casting out demons (11.14-26), a lesser and greater beatitude (11.27-28), teaching on “this evil generation,” the sign of Jonah (11.29-32) and the “light of the body” (11.33-36). A Pharisee who has invited him to dine is astonished when Jesus fails to wash before eating. The woes begin after Jesus upbraids Pharisees for their concern for outward appearance more than for inward cleanness (11.37-41).¹⁴

The fifth woe is for building the tombs of the prophets, which demonstrates that those who build testify and consent to their fathers’ killing of the prophets. Therefore, the Wisdom of God said, “I will send them prophets and apostles, some of whom they will kill and persecute,” that the blood of all the prophets may be required of this generation, from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zechariah, who perished between the altar and the temple (μεταξὺ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ τοῦ οἴκου). --Lk 11.47-51¹⁵

Matthew 23 opens (possibly in the Temple) with Jesus telling the crowds and his disciples to observe the teachings of the scribes and Pharisees, for they sit on Moses’ seat, but they do not practice what they preach. They lay heavy burdens on people and do good

¹³Allison, *Intertextual Jesus*, 149, argues that Q 11:49-51 + 13:34-35 draws heavily, indeed is dependent, upon 2 Chr 24:17-25. The dependence of Q upon 2 Chr 24 helps with the identity of the Zechariah figure, the *martyr* of 2 Chr 24. Allison’s chart, 150, compares Q 11:49-51 + 13:34-35 with 2 Chr 24:17-25. He notes these parallels: sending prophets, some they will kill, blood of Zechariah, who perished between the altar and the house, required of this generation; cf. *Tg. 2 Chr.* 24:25: “that the blood of the sons of Jehoiada the priest might be avenged,” stoning those sent, judgment upon Jerusalem, Judah and Jerusalem delivered into hands of Syrians, your house is forsaken. Allison, 84-87, 98, also devotes some attention to the relationship between Q 11:49-51 and Gen 4:8-16, which is not as pertinent to this present study, other than its additional evidence that Q 11:49-51 and 13:34-35 were adjacent in Q. He credits Q with presupposing that readers know the story of Cain and Abel in Gen 4 and will also be able to identify Zechariah; Allison’s suggestion, 86, that the “passing mention of Zechariah [in Q] assumes that his story was not obscure,” deserves consideration. Even Robinson, “Sequence of Q,” 253, writes, “The Q redactor presupposed considerable biblical learnedness.” Yet he disqualifies Matthew with regard to Q’s use of 2 Chr 24. I do not think Allison has proved his suggestion, 152, that the identity of the “Wisdom of God” in Q 11.49 is to be equated with Torah, or the Bible. Allison does not address Robinson’s article.

¹⁴Note that Mk 12.38-39 is made into a woe in Lk 11.43; the Markan text also appears in Lk 20.46.

¹⁵Quotations are from the RSV. (Underlining for emphasis and comparison.)

to be seen by others. They love the best places at feasts and synagogues, salutations in the market places,¹⁶ and being called rabbi. Jesus' followers, as brethren, have one teacher and one Father in heaven, so no one ought to be called rabbi or father, or master, since the Messiah is the one master. "Whoever exalts himself will be humbled, and whoever humbles himself will be exalted" (23.1-12). All but the third woe are addressed to "scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!"

The sixth woe compares the scribes and Pharisees with whitewashed tombs; their hypocrisy lies in their outward appearance as righteous (δικαιοι), while inwardly they are corrupt. The final woe builds upon the previous metaphor, as Jesus accuses the scribes and Pharisees of hypocrisy because they build the tombs of the prophets and adorn the monuments of the righteous, yet they make the disclaimer that they would not have shed the blood of the prophets, had they been alive in the days when their fathers did just that. By saying this, they testify against themselves, that they are sons of those who murdered the prophets. They will fill up the measure of their fathers, for they continue in their ways, thus also being liable to judgment. Jesus will send prophets, wise men, and scribes, some of whom the scribes and Pharisees will kill and crucify, some of whom they will scourge in synagogues and persecute in the towns, so that all righteous blood shed on the earth (ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς), from the blood of righteous Abel to the blood of Zechariah, son of Barachiah, whom [those addressed by Jesus] murdered between the sanctuary and the altar (μεταξὺ τοῦ ναοῦ καὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου). All this will come upon the present generation.

The woes (possibly spoken in the Temple) are immediately followed by Jesus' lament for Jerusalem, who kills prophets and stones those who are sent to her. Jesus would have taken them under his wings, but they rejected him; therefore, their house has been left to them desolate. Jerusalem will not see him again [=forsaken] until they say, "Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord."

-- Mt 23.13-39¹⁷

The following chart may help visualize comparisons between the Luke 11, Matthew 23, and 2 Chronicles 24 texts:

¹⁶Note that Mt 23.6-7 incorporates some of Mk 12.38-39 here, but it does not appear as a *woe*; cf. note 14 above.

¹⁷Quotations are from the RSV. For underlining, see earlier notes.

<u>2 Chronicles 24</u>	<u>Luke 11</u>	<u>Matthew 23</u>
city of David/Jerusalem		(in Jerusalem) location and subject of lament
Joash/ not buried with the kings Jehoiada/ buried with the kings	graves	whitewashed tombs/not righteous monuments of righteous
	building tombs of prophets= [whom fathers killed]	building tombs of prophets= in spite of their disclaimer, 'if we had lived in days of our fathers, we would not shed blood of the prophets,' they now testify they are sons of those who murdered the prophets
	testimony of consent to	
leading people forsook house of the Lord/ God of their fathers Wrath of God on Judah/Jerusalem for their guilt	fathers' killing of the prophets, by building their tombs	Fill up measure of your fathers
Yet God sent prophets to call them back, who testified against them, but they refused to give heed	Wisdom of God sent prophets [some they would kill]	Jesus will send them prophets... [some they will kill and crucify] Jerusalem kills prophets, stones those who are sent
Zechariah prophesied in the Temple, testified against people for disobeying God's commandments, therefore they		Jesus was speaking/prophesying in the Temple--he longed to gather Jerusalem's children, but they refused (were unwilling). Their house is left desolate. They will not see him until they say, "Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord." [=forsaken]
will not prosper; Because they have forsaken God, God has forsaken them		
People stoned Zechariah in the court of the house of the Lord; Joash killed him	Zechariah perished between altar and the <i>house</i>	Zechariah murdered between sanctuary and altar
Zechariah's dying words, for Lord's judgment		
[wrath of God...guilt] Jerusalem/Judah lost to their enemies because they had forsaken the Lord	will be required of 'this generation'	will come upon 'this generation' Jerusalem/Temple will be Lost (to enemies) and forsaken.
Joash killed "because of the blood of [Zechariah]"	blood of Zech [and Abel] (=all blood of prophets)	blood of Zech [and Abel] (=all righteous blood shed on earth)

2 Chr 24, Mt 23.13-39, Lk 11.37-52, and Q 13.34-35 share several common themes:¹⁸

- (1) In a setting of conflict, the speaker recalls the *sending of prophets*. The narrator of 2 Chr 24.19 reminds people that God sent prophets to call them back to the Lord. Lk 11.49 reports that the Wisdom of God said, "I will send them prophets...." In Mt 23.34, Jesus promises, "...I will send you prophets...."¹⁹
- (2) The common theme of *rejection of prophets* includes not only the fact that people "refused to give heed" when God sent prophets (2 Chr 24.19; cf. Mt 23.37, "and you were unwilling"), but also that people killed the prophets. Both gospel accounts also refer to *prophets being killed* (Lk 11.49; Mt 23.34).
- (3) *Zechariah*, upon whom the spirit of prophecy fell, was *murdered by stoning* in the *Temple* (2 Chr 24.20-22); both Lk 11.51 and Mt 23.35 mention a *Zechariah* who was *killed* in the *Temple*. Q 13.34 and Mt 23.37 lament that *Jerusalem kills prophets* and *stones* those sent to her.²⁰
- (4) The prophets *testified against* Judah and Jerusalem, in calling the people to return to God (2 Chr 24.19, 20); Jesus claims that *building the tombs of the prophets* is the present generation's *testimony* of consent to their ancestors' *killing of the prophets* (Lk 11.47-48; Mt 23.29-31).²¹
- (5) Standing above the people in the *Temple*, *Zechariah testified* against the people that "because they had forsaken God, God has forsaken them" (2 Chr 24.20). In Mt 23.37-39, Jesus, possibly also standing in the temple, laments that because Jerusalem has continually refused his wishes to gather them, their *house* will be left *desolate* (cf. Q 13.34-35).²²

¹⁸Lk 13.34-35 is not discussed here; because of its separation from Lk 11.45-5, it loses effective parallels with 2 Chr 24 that Mt 23.37-39 retains. The present comparison is painted with broad strokes.

¹⁹This is not to say that Matthew employs Wisdom Christology; readers of Matthew's gospel would not necessarily know the Q version. Pregeant's "preferred" reading in "Wisdom Passages in Mt," 202, 222, 225-29 (also see excursus on Wisdom Christology in Mt 21.5/Zech 9.9 section above) suggests that Matthew may have been attracted to the "pattern of Wisdom's rejection and withdrawal" as a model to articulate "the dual theme Israel's rejection of Jesus and God's subsequent abandonment of Israel."

²⁰In 2 Chr 24.21, Zechariah was stoned (LXX, ἐλιθοβόλησαν); cf. Mt 23.37, λιθοβολούσα.

²¹J. Duncan Derrett, "You build the Tombs of the Prophets" (Lk. 11.47-51, Mt. 23.29-31)," *SE4/TU* 102 (1968), 187-93, detects a midrashic combination of Jer 7.25 and 29.18-20 (cf. 2 Chr 36.15, Jer 33.5 LXX) behind this gospel saying. See my suggestion below on the possible influence of Zech 1.1-6 on Mt 23, not only with respect to "son of Barachiah" but also the theme, "Do not be like your fathers."

²²Garland, *Reading Matthew*, 232, cites 2 [Syriac]Apoc Baruch 8.2 [for Eng trans. see OTP1, 623] and 2 Macc 5.15-20, for other examples where God forsakes the temple and allows it to be destroyed.

- (6) Burials in or near Jerusalem are mentioned explicitly in 2 Chr 24.16, 25 (Jehoiada was buried in the city of David with the kings, Joash was buried in the city of David, but not with the kings), and implicitly in Lk 11.47-48 and Mt 23.29, with reference to the *tombs of the prophets*; closely-related terms found in these texts include *graves* (Lk 11.44), *whitewashed tombs* (Mt 23.27-28), and *monuments of the righteous* (Mt 23.29).²³
- (7) The term *blood of the prophets* occurs in both Gospels (Mt 23.30; Lk 11.50), and the associated terms *blood of Abel* and *blood of Zechariah* (Mt 23.35/Lk 11.51) conceivably recall the *blood of the son of Jehoiada* in 2 Chr 24.25.
- (8) In 2 Chr 24. 18, the Chronicler reports that their rejection of God in the past brought *wrath* upon Judah and Jerusalem. In Matthew's version, in spite of their disclaimer, the *sons* of those who murdered the prophets will *fill up the measure* of their *fathers*²⁴ (Mt 23.29-31; cf. Mt 23. 35-36/ Lk 11.50-51--all bloodguilt will come upon/be required of *this generation*).
- (9) The call of *Zechariah* for God to *avenge his murder* (2 Chr 24.22) recalls not only Abel's murder (Gen 4.10) but also may resonate in 2 Chr 24.18, 23-24, 25 and, by extension, may echo in Mt 23.32, 35-36/Lk 11.50-51.

The evidence of several shared themes between Luke 11.45-51 and 2 Chr 24, noted above, suggests that the third evangelist may have known the biblical reference to the murder of Zechariah in the court of the Temple during the reign of Joash, and that he may have expected his readers (who did not have to contend with the confusing identification of Zechariah as the "son of Barachiah") also to recall the story.²⁵ Zechariah's dying words,

²³Zechariah's father was buried in the city of David because he had done good toward God and the temple (ἐποίησεν ἀγαθωσύνην μετὰ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ μετὰ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ, 2 Chr 24.16). Contrast this kind of *doing good* with Jesus' criticism of the scribes and Pharisees in Mt 23.5, 28, who do good to be *seen* by people, who outwardly *appear* to be righteous, but who are inwardly full of hypocrisy and iniquity. Jehoiada was considered to be a *righteous* person. Josephus, *Ant* 9.8.3, writes that the high priest Jehoiada was *righteous* (δίκαιος), and that he was buried in the kings' sepulchres at Jerusalem because he had recovered the kingdom to the family of David. He also writes that Zechariah's prophecy to the multitudes and the king was that they should act *righteously* (τὰ δίκαια πράττειν); he foretold that if they would not hearken to this, they would suffer a heavy punishment. The death of Jehoash was "in order to revenge the death of Zechariah." See below, where Mt also links the *prophets* with the *righteous*.

²⁴Garland, *Reading Matthew*, 232, lists texts in reference to the "full measure" of allotted sins; the most helpful include 2 Macc 6.12-14, Pseudo Philo *LAB* 26.13, 1 Thess 2.15-16, cf. 2 Chr 36.15-16.

²⁵However, the fact that Luke separates the lament from the woes and moves them away from their Jerusalem setting in Q is reason for caution: One might ask whether Luke in some way also conflates the Zechariah figures, without referring to Barachiah. He does call the Zechariah figure a prophet, rather than a priest who prophesied. This also raises the question of Luke's identification of Abel as a prophet. Did this concept originate with Q 11.50? If Q makes both Abel and Zechariah to be prophets, does this affect

“May the Lord see and avenge!” (2 Chr 24.22b), are suggestive of the Genesis story, in which God told Cain that his brother’s *blood* was calling out from the ground (Gen 4.10). The Lukan Jesus says that “the *blood of all the prophets*, shed from the foundation of the world, [will] be required of this generation, from the *blood of Abel to the blood of Zechariah*, who perished between the altar and the house (temple),” Lk 11.50-51. If Abel and Zechariah were thought to be the first- and last-named murder victims in the Hebrew scriptures, then their implicit association in 2 Chronicles has been extended by Luke (via Q) to represent *all the prophets* murdered “from the foundation of the world” (Lk 11.50).²⁶

The question arises whether Matthew discerned the similarities between 2 Chr 24 and the Q texts. Because of his identification of Zechariah as “son of Barachiah,” one cannot assume Matthean recognition of these interrelations. However, in some places where themes overlap among the passages, the Matthean text intensifies the meaning. For example, in Luke 11.47-48, the building of the prophets’ tombs is a testimony of *consent* to the deeds of the ancestors, in Mt 23.29-31, those who build the tombs of the prophets

where the reference to Barachiah originated? (These questions are largely tangential to the central concern of this study.) See next footnote.

²⁶For the purposes of this study, it is not crucial to establish whether the order of the Hebrew canon had already been fixed, with 2 Chr at the end, by the time of Jesus or when the Gospels of Mt and Lk were written. The literary citation of ‘Abel to Zechariah’ may be easier to interpret if this was the case. (See references below to a proposal by Peels, which challenges the need to think of Abel to Zechariah in terms of a closed canon.)

If Mt and Lk used the same version of Q here, interpreters rightly ask who is responsible for the identification of the various characters: did Q have *Wisdom* or Jesus as speaker (Lk 11.49/Mt 23.34), or someone else (God)? Was Abel a *prophet* in Q 11.50 or *righteous* and *innocent* (Mt 23.35), or did both evangelists alter their source here? With reference to Zechariah, did Lk omit “son of Barachiah” from Q or did Mt add it? Where Luke has “all the blood of the prophets,” Mt has “all the righteous blood.” [See previous footnote.] I am unable to offer a better version of these Q passages than the editors of *The Critical Edition of Q*. Therefore, I think the evidence from special vocabulary, and other theological considerations, weighs in favor of Luke finding *Wisdom* as speaker in Q. Matthew places the saying in the first person on Jesus’ lips, as he has altered other Σοφία references or allusions (e.g., 11.19, 25-30). Matthew’s use of *innocent* and *righteous blood* is characteristic of his special vocabulary, and reveals his editorial hand in Mt 23. 28, 29, 34, 35.

testify against themselves and are held accountable for the *murder* of the prophets.

The Matthean Jesus does not remind his hearers that God sent prophets in the past (2 Chr 24.19), nor does he look back to a past statement of the personified “Wisdom of God,” who would send prophets (cf. Lk 11.49); instead, the Matthean Jesus says that he *himself* will send prophets, some of whom his hearers will kill (Mt 23.34). The scribes and Pharisees shed blood which is not only figurative (as Lk 11.47-48 may imply), nor do they share with their forefathers merely past-guilt-by-association (Mt 23.30-31): the Matthean Jesus ascribes the murder of Zechariah (“whom *you murdered*,” Mt 23.35) to his contemporary hearers.²⁷ For this reason, the canonical explanation of the Abel-to-Zechariah motif is less satisfactory for the First Gospel; as H. G. L. Peels says, “The quintessence of the entire passage...is precisely that the history of murdering prophets is still continuing and is now even coming to its culmination.”²⁸

Matthew’s version of the call for God’s vindication of *all righteous blood shed on the earth* (πᾶν αἷμα δίκαιον ἐκχυννόμενον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς) makes the allusion to Abel from 2 Chr 24.22b more explicit: πᾶν αἷμα...ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς recalls the *blood of Abel* crying out to God from the ground, φωνὴ αἵματος τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου βοᾷ πρὸς με ἐκ τῆς γῆς (Gen 4.10). Here is another example of Matthew’s intensification of his source. Not only the *blood of all the prophets shed from the foundation of the world* (Lk 11.50-51), but *all*

²⁷Gundry, *Matthew*, 471, points to a closer conformity between Mt 23.35 and 2 Chr 24.22, in the use of ‘murdered’ instead of Lk’s ‘who perished’ (τοῦ ἀπολυμένου). Joash was responsible for the murder of Zechariah (ἀποκτείνῃ=and he murdered), and Jesus accuses the scribes and Pharisees of the murder of Zechariah (ὃν ἐφονεύσατε=whom you murdered). The same verb is used in Mt 23.31. Lk uses ἀπεκτεῖναν in 11.48, 49.

²⁸H. G. L. Peels, “The Blood >>from Abel to Zechariah<< (Matthew 23,35; Luke 13,50f.) and the Canon of the Old Testament,” *ZAW* 113 (2001), 596. Peels does not see a substantial difference here between Luke and Matthew; he sees Jesus in both gospels referring to the future, as well as past, bloodshed. For this thesis, the analytical results are not affected by Peels’ interpretation in this regard.

righteous blood from Abel to Zechariah will be required of the guilty.²⁹ Matthew has extended the measure of the guilt of *this generation* from the past prophets to *all righteous blood being shed on the earth*.³⁰

There are two major distinctions, apart from the issue of canonical order, that can be made with regard to the Abel and Zechariah biblical narratives (Gen 4 and 2 Chr 24):

- (1) These are the only two places in the Old Testament where a person's death includes
 - a. the life is violently taken, although he is innocent;
 - b. his murder is linked to his dedication to God;
 - c. his cry to heaven for retribution is heard (Gen 4.10; 2 Chr 24.22).

²⁹The wording of Lk 11.50-51 can be read as an endorsement of the interpretation of Abel to Zechariah, as first and last in a series which began at creation: the participle, ἐκκεχυμένον, in Lk 11.50 is perfect passive, which reinforces this past series of prophets whose blood was shed. Note, however, that the participle in Mt 23.35, ἐκχυνόμενον, is present passive, which indicates that this blood continues to be shed. Allison, *Intertextual Jesus*, 85 (note 47), says, "Although the use of ἐκχύνομαι with 'blood' (Q 11:50) is from neither LXX Genesis 4 nor 2 Chronicles 24, it does have a parallel in the summary of Zechariah's martyrdom in *Liv. Proph. Zech 23:1*." (for Douglas Hare's translation and notes on *LivPro 23:1*, see OTP 2, 398.)

³⁰Matthew uses δίκαιος and αἷμα together here (23.35). Matthew employs several overlapping terms in the present passage: *tombs of the prophets; blood of the prophets; those who murdered the prophets; prophets, wise men and scribes who will be killed; righteous blood; blood of the righteous Abel... blood of Zechariah...whom you murdered; killing the prophets; stoning those who are sent*. Josephus, *Ant* 1.2.1, uses righteousness with reference to Abel, but does not include the biblical reference to the blood of Abel: "Abel...was a lover of righteousness," Ἀβελος μὲν γὰρ... δικαιοσύνης ἐπεμελείτο." See also 1 Jn 3.12, "Abel's deeds were righteous (δίκαια)." Garland, *Reading Matthew*, 232, notes that 2[Syriac] Apoc Baruch 64.2 (OTPI, 643), mentions among the wicked deeds of Manasseh, that he "killed the righteous" and "shed innocent blood"; cf. 2Kgs 21.16. Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 246-47, notes that the gospel of Matthew uses δίκαιος in a special sense, and that the evangelist is responsible for inserting δίκαιος into Q in this passage.

In addition to Mt 23.29^{ff}, there are two other places in Matthew where the terms "righteous" and "prophets" are joined. In the missionary discourse, Jesus tells the disciples, "The one who receives you receives me, and the one who receives me receives the one who sent me. The one who receives a prophet... shall receive a prophet's reward, and the one who receives a righteous person...shall receive a righteous person's reward" (Mt 10.40-42). In Mt 13.17, Jesus tells the disciples, "Truly, I say to you, many *prophets* and *righteous* people (πολλοὶ προφῆται καὶ δίκαιοι) longed to see what you see..." The Lukan parallel, Lk 10.24, has "many prophets and kings" (πολλοὶ προφῆται καὶ βασιλεῖς). See Charette, *Recompense*, 104-5, for his discussion on the connections Matthew's Jesus makes between the *righteous* and the *prophets* with people in the past (13.57, 23.29, 34-35) and with people in the present and future - disciples (5.12, 10.40-42, 23.29-37). He writes, 105 (n.1), "It is fitting that such titles as 'prophet' and 'righteous one' appear in a discourse section which in great measure is concerned with the persecution of the disciples, considering that a motif is present throughout Matthew that such ones are rejected, persecuted and even killed (cf. 5.12; 13.57; 23.29-37)."

Matthew's Passion Narrative returns to the theme of *innocent* or *righteous blood*, and the consequences of the shedding of Jesus' blood (23.30, 35; 27.4, 6, 8, 24, 25). See below on Judas' betrayal (ch. 9).

- (2) Their “name and history” serve as warnings
- a. at the dawn of humanity, Abel’s blood stained the earth for the first time;
 - b. the prophetic priest Zechariah was murdered on sacred ground in the temple.³¹

Jerusalem as location is perhaps not the major factor in the comparison of the Luke 11 and Matthew 23 texts *per se*, but the Matthew 23 *woes-lament* section definitely enlarges the Matthean text’s affinities with 2 Chronicles 24.³² If the Matthean Jesus is not only in Jerusalem but also speaking in the Temple, the correspondences between Matthew 23 and the Chronicler’s account of the murder of Zechariah in the Temple surpass those of the Q-sayings, which speak *of* Jerusalem, but which presumably have no narrative setting.³³ In the *woes*, Jesus has just told the scribes and Pharisees that they are sons of those who *murdered the prophets* (Mt 23.30-31). It is plausible that the Matthean Jesus’ lament over *Jerusalem* (the city which *kills the prophets* and *stones those who are sent* to her) is also addressed to these same scribes and Pharisees in the Temple. Because Jerusalem has repeatedly refused to acknowledge Jesus, her *house* is *forsaken* (ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν ἔρημος, Mt 23.37-38).³⁴ Similarly, Zechariah announced that because the

³¹I am indebted to Peels, *op. cit.*, 597, for this excellent characterization of the Abel and Zechariah exclusive similarities.

³²I do not share Robinson’s opinion, that Matthew’s identification of Zechariah as “son of Barachiah” disallows the evangelist’s recognition of the parallels between Q and 2 Chr 24. See below.

³³Again, Matthew intensifies the allusion to Jerusalem, the city which kills the prophets, if Jesus is speaking from the temple, where Zechariah spoke and was murdered. Those whom Jesus accuses of killing the prophets in the present narrative time must also be hearing his words in the temple. As their fathers were guilty of killing Zechariah in the (first) temple, they may be plotting murder in the present temple.

³⁴The editors of *The Critical Edition of Q* translate οἶκος both in Q 11.51 and 13.35 as *house*; they capitalize House in 11.51, which presumably implies a reference to the temple building. I agree with them here and would argue that *house* in Mt 23.38 primarily refers to the temple. If Allison, *Intertextual Jesus*, 205, is correct in holding Q 11.49-51 together with 13.34-51 (which I think he is), then the combined subtexts for the *woes* and the *lament* share additional catchwords: 2 Chr 24. 18, 21 + Ps 118.26 “the house of the Lord;” 2 Chr 24.20 + Jer 12.7, “forsaken.” Even Robinson, “Sequence of Q,” 259, grants that, “Indeed Matthew seems to have strengthened” the connection between the prediction of the temple being abandoned (Q 13.34-35) to its imminent destruction (Mt 24.1-2) by adding ἔρημος to the Lament over Jerusalem (Mt 23.38).

people had *forsaken* God (and, by association, the prophets he sent to them), *God has now forsaken* them (2 Chr 24.19-20).³⁵ Zechariah's prophetic words were rejected, and he was *murdered in the Temple*,³⁶ stoned by the people at the king's command. Jesus will be condemned and mocked by the chief priests, scribes, elders and the people, and he will be crucified under the authority of Rome.

In sum, Luke's separation of 13.31-35 from 11.37-52 yields fewer points of contact with the themes of 2 Chron 24 than where the *woes* and the *lament* over Jerusalem are read together, as in Mt 23 (and probably, in Q). The Lukan *woes* are not set in Jerusalem; if the Lukan Jesus was guest for this particular meal (Lk 11.37_{ff}) in Galilee, or in Judah but not in Jerusalem, Luke's version of the *woes* loses the correspondences with 2 Chr 24 that pertain to Jerusalem.³⁷ The feature of Luke 11.37-52 which most enhances any allusions

³⁵Does Matthew draw the comparison between any Zech figure(s) and Jesus? (See below for the suggestion that the imagery behind *your fathers* in Mt 23.30-32 may come from Zech 1.1-6.) He certainly has a tendency to equate Jesus with God in some crucial places; e.g., the citation of Zech 9.9 in 21.5. In Mt 23, two cases come to mind: In place of God (2 Chr 24) or Σοφία (Lk/Q 11.49), in Mt 23.34, Jesus himself sends prophets; where 2 Chr 24 reports that the Judah/Jerusalem leaders/king forsook the Temple and the God of their fathers, Jesus laments that Jerusalem has rejected him, so he will forsake their *house* until they say, "Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord." If the reader is meant to recall Ps 118.26b with the citation of 118.26a, then the anticipated benediction will come from "house of the Lord."

³⁶Robinson, "Sequence of Q," 252, bases his opinion that "Matthew missed completely the allusions to 2 Chr 24,19-23," on the identification of Zechariah as υἱὸς Βαραχίου. He does not consider that Matthew may have recognized the biblical reference in Q but that he may have telescoped two Zechariahs for his own purposes. Nor does Robinson take up the fact that Mt edits the Q-description of where Zechariah was stoned. Is it possible that Mt thinks μεταξύ τοῦ ναοῦ καὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου is a better description of the location described in 2 Chr 24.21 than Q/Lk 11. 51, μεταξύ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ τοῦ οἴκου? See thesis section on Mt's use of temple language (ναός) in the studies of Judas' betrayal of Jesus and the temple charge at Jesus' trial.

³⁷In Luke 11 the *woes* are uttered at a meal, possibly in Galilee [Robinson, "Sequence of Q," 256, places this table scene in Galilee], or at least not in the environs of Jerusalem, and the *lament* over Jerusalem in Lk 13 is also placed in the narrative long before the entourage arrives near the city (Lk 19). In Lk 13.33-34, Jesus is going to Jerusalem, for "it cannot be that a *prophet* should perish away from Jerusalem." The declaration, "Behold, your house is forsaken," seems out of place six chapters before the entry to Jerusalem and the Temple. Further, "You will not see me until you say, 'Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord,'" which is 'fulfilled' in Lk 19.38, renders the Lukan predictions of 19.41-44 and 21.5-6_{ff} both abrupt and awkward. By splitting Q 11 and 13, Luke has missed some of the point of his

to 2 Chr 24 is its *lack* of Matthew's (Zechariah) "son of Barachiah."³⁸

In addition to the connections between 2 Chr 24 and Mt 23 noted above, the First Gospel has more points in common with 2 Chr 24 than Lk 11. 37-52 does, the "son of Barachiah" reference notwithstanding. The strengths of Mt 23.13-39 with relation to 2 Chr 24 include its Jerusalem setting (probably in the Temple) and the intensified allusions which Matthew reinforces by preserving the textual relationship between the *lament* and the *woes*.³⁹ In spite of the many parallels between Q 11.47-51, Q 13.34-35 and 2 Chr 24, the augmentation makes it somewhat difficult to ascribe to Mt 23.35 a reference to the Zechariah of 2 Chr 24.⁴⁰

In the biblical texts, the title "Zechariah son of Jehoiada the priest" appears only in

source and has wrested the eschatological sense from the lament by implying that the fulfillment of Ps 118.26 came with Jesus' approach to Jerusalem and the temple. Luke has thereby made the motive for Jesus' prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple problematic.

³⁸Lk's unaugmented Zechariah reference is not proof that he caught all the 2 Chr 24 allusions in Q; he simply may have copied Q as he found it. An argument from silence here is no more persuasive than that which points to "son of Barachiah" as evidence that Matthew missed or misunderstood Q's Zechariah allusion to 2 Chr 24. *Pace* Garland, *Intention*, 183 (n. 69) where he says, "Luke, aware of the discrepancy, solved the problem by omitting 'son of Barachiah.'" Garland concludes that Mt 23.35 copied the error from its source. I agree with scholars who understand that Q did not have the added designation of Zechariah, that Mt added it.

³⁹Because of the intensified correspondences between 2 Chr 24 (and its underlying Gen 4 subtext), Ps 118.26 [and the Jer echoes here and elsewhere in Mt], and Mt 23, I opt for the original juxtaposition of Q 11.47-51 and 13.34-35; cf. Allison, *Intertextual Jesus*, 205, 209. Suffice it to say that Matthew, by keeping Q 11 and Q 13 adjacent, made use of the enhanced combination of allusions with 2 Chr 24. I agree with Garland, *Intention*, especially 184-97, that it does not matter whether Mt found 23.34-39 as a contiguous unit that he adopted *in toto* or if he placed the lament after the woes to mark the climax of Jesus' public ministry and the transition to the material on the end times.

⁴⁰The editors of *The Critical Edition of Q* retain the Lukan order in Q for purposes of identifying verses. In most cases, this policy reflects the view that, when Mt and Lk disagree, Luke generally preserves the order of Q. With respect to Q 11.47-51 and 13.34-35, however, Robinson, "Sequence of Q," 225-60, affirms that Mt 23 maintains the order of Q. Also, note that 4 Ezra (1.25, 26, 30, 32, 33, 40; 2.1) incorporates sayings that are reminiscent of the texts under study here; (e.g., 2 Chr 24.19, 20b; Mt 23.34/Lk 11.49; 2 Chr 24.18, 22b/Mt 23.30-32, 34, 35-36/Lk 11.49, 50-51). 4 Ezra also names Zechariah in the list of the twelve minor prophets, who will be leaders with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, to the people "coming from the east" (1.38-40; cf. Mt 8.11-12; Zech 2.6, 8.7-8).

2 Chr 24 MT; the LXX refers to him as Azariah (Αζαριαν τὸν τοῦ Ἰωδαε τὸν ἱερέα). If Matthew was aware that the Zechariah figure who was slain “between the sanctuary and the altar” was the prophetic priest who was stoned in 2 Chr 24, perhaps he was familiar with the story in the Hebrew tradition. However, Q, with its many allusions to 2 Chr 24, refers to the character who was murdered in the temple as Zechariah, and Josephus refers to this “Zechariah, son of... Jehoiada.”⁴¹ Since both Q and Josephus know the name Zechariah here, it is possible that Matthew had access to this biblical tradition in a Greek form. The question then arises why the First Evangelist reports that Zechariah was “son of Barachiah” rather than “son of Jehoiada” (Mt 23.35).⁴²

The text of Mt 23.13-39 itself may hold other clues to the identity of this Zechariah figure, particularly with regard to the question of confusion or conflation of the eponymous prophet with the Zechariah of 2 Chr 24. Before studying the Gospel text in more depth, it is desirable to look for possible precedents for a biblical character named Zechariah who would also have been identified as “son of Barachiah.”

Zechariah is identified as “son of Berechiah, son of Iddo” in two places in the

⁴¹I am not aware of any references to this story in the DSS nor in Philo, but Josephus (*Ant* 9.8.3) reports that “Zechariah the son of the high priest Jehoiada” was “stoned to death in the temple” at the command of Jehoash the king; Josephus does not use the LXX name Azariah, but Zechariah: ἀλλὰ καὶ Ζαχαρίαν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως Ἰώδα λίθοις ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐκέλευσε βληθέντα ἀποθανεῖν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ....

⁴²Robinson, “Sequence of Q,” argues that Matthew missed the 2 Chr 24 connections in Q, even though he kept the woes and lament together, because he misunderstood which Zechariah was meant in Q. Here Robinson agrees with Ulrich Luz (*Matthew 1-7*, 137 [n. 21]), that Matthew “no longer had access to the synagogue’s library and himself only had a copy of Isaiah (LXX), quoting other OT books from memory. The Bible with which Matthew himself was familiar was in any case the LXX. Thus his mistaken association of the Zechariah of Q 11,51a with Zech 1,1...is due to the fact that Q did not use the LXX spelling of 2 Chr 24,20 (‘Αζαρίας)...” Robinson apparently has no problem with the author/redactor of Q equating the Hebrew Zechariah with the LXX Azariah, and he omits to mention Josephus here. I have shown in other parts of this thesis that Matthew likely had access to the Hebrew text of Zechariah (9.9, e.g.); if my observation that Mt 23 indeed shows evidence of increased affinity to 2 Chr 24, as compared with Lk or Q, then Robinson and Luz are mistaken in this instance.

opening verses of the prophetic book (Zech 1.1, 7). Ezra 5.1 and 6.14 refer to the prophets, Haggai and Zechariah the son of Iddo the seer. In a list of priests and Levites, Nehemiah 12.16 includes Zechariah, son of Iddo, but it is not certain that this Zechariah is the same as the prophet of the canonical book.⁴³ Among the many biblical characters named Zechariah, there is also a Zechariah who is called “son of Jeberechiah” (MT, בֶּן יְבֶרְכִיָּהוּ) in Isaiah 8.2MT. For some reason, this person is called Zechariah “son of Barachiah” (ὕιὸς Βαραχίου), in Isaiah 8.2 LXX.⁴⁴

⁴³Zech 1.1 MT, זכריה בן־ברכיה בן־עדין הנביא, and LXX: Ζαχαριαν τὸν τοῦ Βαραχίου υἱὸν Ἀδδω τὸν ποιοῦν. Zech 7.1,8 omit any reference to Berechiah and to Iddo. Ralph L. Smith, *Zechariah* (Waco: Word Books, 1984), 168, notes that Zechariah appears in some Psalm titles in the LXX, Vulgate and Syriac; for example, see Pss 145-48 LXX titles, all of which read, “Ἀλληλουια· Ἀγγαίου καὶ Ζαχαρίου.” Edgar W. Conrad, *Zechariah* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 46, believes that Zech 1.1, properly translated, makes Iddo the prophet; he thinks Zechariah is not, strictly speaking, a prophet, but a ‘messenger of the Lord’ (cf. Hag 1.13, Mal 1.1; 3.1). Meyers I, 91-92, makes straightforward reference to “the prophet Zechariah.” Ralph Smith, *Zechariah*, 182, translates, “...son of Iddo the prophet,” but refers to “Zechariah the prophet” in his comments on 1.1; on 187-88, he translates “...son of Iddo the prophet,” as above, but notes that “הנביא ‘the prophet’ refers to Zechariah, not Iddo.” Neither Ezra nor Nehemiah identifies Zechariah as son of Berechiah, although a Berechiah is named in Neh 3.4, 30; 6.18. The name Berechiah appears also in 1Chr 3.20, 6.39, 8.20, 9.16, 15.17, 23 and 2 Chr 28.12 but not with Zechariah. The name Iddo also appears in 1 Kgs 4.14, 1 Chr 6.21 and 2 Chr 9.29, 12.15, 13.22, in Ezra 8.7 and in Neh 12.4. In 1 Chr 27.21, there is an Iddo, son of Zechariah, but this is in the time of David’s census. No explanation for the presence of “son of Berechiah” in Zech 1.1,7 has won over the majority of scholars; that it almost certainly appeared in the Zechariah texts to which Matthew would have had access is the important point here. The extant text fragment of Zech 1.1 from Murabba’at (*DJD II, Les Grottes de Murabba’at*; ed. P. Benoit, J. T. Milik, and R. de Vaux; Oxford: Clarendon, 1961), 205, line 35, reads בן דבר יהוה אל זכריה, “the word of Yhwh to Zechariah, s[on...]”; if complete, the column would be wide enough to complete the rest of “son of Berechiah, son of Iddo.” No variants from MT Zech 1.1-4 are found in this fragment. Parts of Zech 1.1-4 also are preserved in Column 28 of 8 HevXIIgr [*DJD VIII, Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever* (8HevXIIgr); (ed. Emanuel Tov; Oxford: Clarendon, 1990), 66-67, Plate XVI. All that remains of Zech 1.1 is: Ο]·ΝΕΔΔ·[(= s[on of Idd[o]). When I studied the photographic copy of this plate, I thought the first stroke of an Ω/ω was also visible at the edge of the fragment; i.e.,]ΝΕΔΔω[.

⁴⁴Isa 8.2 MT is the only place the name Jeberechiah occurs in the canon. This Zechariah is called by the prophet Isaiah as one of two ‘faithful witnesses,’ the other of whom is Uriah the priest. *Tg. Isa.* 8.2: “And I will get reliable witnesses *before me, the curses which I threatened to bring in the prophecy of Uriah the priest, behold, they have come; even so all the consolations which I promised to bring in the prophecy of Zechariah the son of Jeberechiah I am about to bring back.*” See discussion below for evidence of possible confusion, not only of Zechariahs but also of Uriahs.

One may wonder why Mt 23.35 has “son of Barachiah” without “son of Iddo,” as in Zech 1.1, 7. Did Matthew [and Luke] find the phrase “son of Barachiah” in Q, or is the designation of Zechariah in the gospels evidence that they may have used different versions of Q or other sources? Is “son of Barachiah” in Matthew 23.35 the work of a glossarist?⁴⁵ Did Matthew or someone else confuse or conflate two (or more) biblical characters named Zechariah? Is “son of Barachiah” meant to refer the reader to the Zechariah of Isa 8.2, of Zech 1.1, and/or of 2 Chr 24?

This problem has long perplexed students of the First Gospel.⁴⁶ Outside Mt 23, there is evidence of a tendency to fuse the identity of the canonical prophet with the martyred priest of 2 Chr 24. There are two primary examples which demonstrate the later widespread confusion between the prophet (Zech 1) and the priest (2 Chr). First, the Targum to Lam 2.20, can be rendered: “Shall the priest and the prophet be slain in the sanctuary of the Lord?” followed by the comment, “as you killed Zechariah the son of Iddo, the High Priest and faithful prophet in the sanctuary of the Lord on the Day of Atonement because he admonished them not to do what was displeasing to the Lord.”⁴⁷ The Targumist may have taken the biblical reference to the prophet’s identification as

⁴⁵To say that ‘son of Barachiah’ is a gloss is to say that it was not found in Mt’s source; if Mt and Lk had the same source before them, either the phrase was not there, or Lk eliminated the confusing reference. Whatever the source of ‘son of Barachiah,’ it is not simply a matter of naming Is 8.2LXX as its most obvious source, for the martyred character in 2 Chr 24 LXX is Azariah. Nor can we simply say that *Barachiah* must come from the LXX but that *Zechariah* must be from MT.

⁴⁶Codex Sinaiticus omits υἱοῦ Βαραχίου. The ascription “son of Barachiah” was discussed by Origen; Jerome knew of a variant reading [GospNaz] which left out the reference to Barachiah; see Hagner II, 673-77; Davies & Allison III, 317-19.

⁴⁷Sheldon H. Blank, “The Death of Zechariah in Rabbinic Literature,” *HUCA* 12-13 (1937-38), 327. Although *Tg. Lam.* is not particularly early, its conflation of the Zechariahs seems to be uninfluenced by Mt 23. If that were the case, one would expect to see “son of Berechiah” in place of, or in addition to, “son of Iddo.”

“Zechariah son of Iddo” from Ezra (5.1; 6.14), and not from Zech 1, where Zechariah is “son of Berechiah, son of Iddo.”⁴⁸ Nowhere in scripture is the eponymous prophet identified as a priest,⁴⁹ much less as High Priest, nor is his death recorded anywhere in the canon. Therefore, *Tg. Lam.* 2.20, because it includes “son of Iddo the high priest” in place of something like “son of Jehoiada the [high] priest,” betrays its conflation or confusion of Zechariah figures.

⁴⁸Blank suggests that the identification in Zech 1.1, 7 as “son of Berechiah,” possibly reflects an even earlier confusion or conflation within the Hebrew scriptures, that an editor made an erroneous attempt to identify the prophet with the “faithful witness,” Zechariah son of Jeberechiah in Isa 8.2. This would be evidence of the earliest confusion, since “there is no evidence in the versions to suggest that the words ‘son of Berechiah’ were not already present in the texts from which the translations were made. On the other hand the identification must be later than the time of the Chronicler, who is responsible for the references to Zechariah in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah and who refers to him merely as ‘Zechariah the son of Iddo.’” Blank, 328-9, concluded that the words “son of Berechiah” in Zech 1 are an early gloss. The Jerusalem Bible puts the Berechiah words in parentheses. The Meyers (vol I, 91-92) sift through the evidence for at least three postexilic biblical Zechariah figures, and they tender other explanations for the “inclusion of a second generation of Zechariah’s ancestry,” but which leave open “the question of why Ezra would have omitted the first generation.” Joyce Baldwin, *Zechariah*, 88, cites a popular view among Continental scholars, that Zechariah son of Iddo produced chapters 1-8 of Zechariah, and that an anonymous author of chapters 9-14 took the pseudonym “son of Berechiah,” so that the names were conflated in the heading. Baldwin, 88-89, suggests that the “simplest explanation” is that “in Zech 1.1,7, the father and grandfather are named, whereas in Ezra only the better-known grandfather is mentioned.” She cites the two ways that Jehu is identified—“son of Nimshi” in 1 Kgs 19.16, 2 Kgs 9.20, but “son of Jehoshaphat, son of Nimshi” in 2 Kgs 9. 2, 14. Carroll Stuhlmueller, *Haggai & Zechariah: Rebuilding with Hope* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 48, concludes that “‘Zechariah’ turns out to be more than an inspired individual; we do better to speak of an inspired Zechariah tradition.” Blank, 329-30, also cites Rabbinic evidence that R Akiba associated the witnesses of Isa 8.2 with Uriah from the time of the first temple and Zechariah as the prophet of the second temple. Blank, 330-31, also gives evidence of midrashic belief that Uriah the priest (from Isa 8.2) and Zechariah were killed in the temple, thus identifying the Zechariah from Isa 8.2 as the priest who was stoned in the temple in 2 Chr 24. Other than his suggestion of possible glosses in Zech 1.1, 7, Blank’s citations are not particularly helpful for determining earliest associations with Zechariah figures, for none of Blank’s examples are dated earlier than the composition of Matthew 23.

⁴⁹If Neh 12.16 is meant to refer to the same Zechariah, he is listed “in the days of Joiakim” under “priests, heads of fathers’ houses: ... of Iddo, Zechariah....” If this Zechariah is the same prophet of Ezra 5-6, then the prophet Zechariah was also priest. The priest Zechariah of 2 Chr 24 was also endued with the Spirit in order to prophesy — these biblical texts could provide a source of confusion. The only place the prophet Zechariah is called “son of Iddo” is in Ezra; the only place he is called “son of Berechiah, son of Iddo” is Zech 1. Ralph Smith, *Zechariah*, 168, 183, is not certain that the Zechariah in Neh 12 is the same person as the eponymous prophet. Apart from Mt 23, the only scriptural reference to a character named Zechariah “son of Barachiah” is Isa 8.2 LXX.

The second example of the blending of the Zechariahs from 2 Chr 24 and the prophetic book comes from some later versions of *The Lives of the Prophets*.⁵⁰ In *LivPro*, the existence of section 23, apart from any conflation with section 15, makes it clear that Zechariah the priest (2 Chr 24) was considered by some to have been a *prophet*, even where he was distinguished from the canonical prophet in the earlier editions of this work.⁵¹ It is impossible to substantiate a claim either in favor of, or against, the view that section 15 (Zechariah) and section 23 (Zechariah son of Jehoiada) of *LivPro* were originally composed in light of Matthew 23.35 (or Luke 11.51, or Q 11.51).⁵² Neither is there a scholarly

⁵⁰For an English translation of the text, see D. R. A. Hare, "The Lives of the Prophets," 379-99, in OTP2, especially 394, 98. For the Greek texts of An1, Ep1, Dor, Dp2, and An2, arranged in columns, see Anna Maria Schwemer, *Studien zu den frühjüdischen Prophetenlegenden Vitae Prophetarum. Band II. Die Viten der kleinen Propheten und der Propheten aus den Geschichtsbüchern. Übersetzung und Kommentar*. (Tübingen: J.C.B Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1996), 50*-53*; 72*-75*; [asterisks appear on these pages themselves, to differentiate them from earlier pages in the body of the book.] There is no clear evidence that the material here on Zechariah is earlier than the first gospel. (Schwemer, 291, posits a hypothetical document, an Apocryphon of Zechariah, from which both Q and *VitPro* may draw some of their Zechariah material.) D. Satran, "Biblical Prophets and Christian Legend: The Lives of the Prophets Reconsidered," in *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity* (ed. I. Gruenwald, et. al.; Tübingen: TSAJ, 1992), 143-49, cautions scholars not to assume that material such as in *LivPro* is background for Q or Lk 11.47, 13.34 and parallels. He writes, 147, "Yet it should be recognized as equally probable that the Gospel accounts themselves provided the impetus for the transmission of such burial traditions. These sayings of Jesus, once sanctified and canonical, are no less prescriptive than they are descriptive."

⁵¹That Zechariah ben Jehoiada appears at the end of *LivPro* adds weight to the idea that his was considered by some to be the last recorded prophet's death in the canon. The conflation with Zechariah the father of John the Baptist, in later versions, demonstrates the continued and multifaceted confusion of Zechariahs. See Blank's article, 333-35, on the further confusion of Zechariah son of Jehoida with the father of John the Baptist, which is also evident in the later mss of *LivPro*. Also see Gundry, *Use*, 86-88, on the "utmost confusion" of Zechariahs, including the Baptist's father and the Zechariah figure in Josephus, *War*, mentioned in note #54 below.

⁵²Section 15 contains some material that corresponds to Ezra 3, and also alludes to some prophetic material from the book of Zechariah, and includes details not derived from any scriptural account. Most texts of Section 23 identify the Zechariah figure as son of Jehoiada the priest, whom Joash killed, in collusion with 'the house of David.' The rest of Section 23 is the stuff of later legends. Blank's article, 335-46, traces many strands of this legend, including speculations as to where the *blood of Zechariah* was shed in the Temple. Blank also notes that the attempts of Matthew and Luke to locate the precise spot where Zechariah died are both reflected in variant texts of *LivPro*: Mt's μεταξὺ τοῦ ναοῦ καὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου resembles Codex C [in Schwemer, Ep2], and Lk's μεταξὺ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ τοῦ οἴκου is closest to Codex A[in Schwemer, Ep1]. Blank believes that the author of the variant Codex D betrays familiarity with the talmudic legend [see above] because of its positioning of Zechariah ἐχόμενα

consensus that *LivPro* dates from the first century -- the weight of evidence now supports a later date; therefore, Mt 23.35 cannot have been influenced by the presence of two Zechariah sections, or by the conflated figure found in later editions of *The Lives of the Prophets*.⁵³ The widespread confusion of the Zechariahs in writings of early Christianity and Rabbinic Judaism appears to have been almost boundless.⁵⁴

The foregoing observations demonstrate that Matthew may have been well aware of the 2 Chr 24 setting of the martyrdom of a pre-exilic priest/prophet named Zechariah, from either the Hebrew or a Greek tradition (2 Chr 24, *Ant.* 9.8.3). In fact, Matthew seems to have capitalized on the connections between Q 11.47-51/13.34-35 and 2 Chr 24. The question of the origin of *son of Barachiah* in Mt 23.35 remains. Because the first evangelist has not included *son of Iddo* in his identification of the Zechariah figure, one cannot assume that the term υἱὸς βαραχίου comes from Zechariah 1.1, 7, but how likely is it that *son of*

τοῦ θουσιαστηρίου [in Schwemer, An1 (Vat gr. 2125), Dor, and An2 (Coisl. 224) all have this reading]. This extra-biblical evidence of confusion or conflation of these two Zechariahs demonstrates the potential complexity of the problem: other combinations or conflations of some biblical Zechariah figures, resulting from various theological motives or motifs, may have existed, all of which makes our task of interpretation of Matthew's identification of this Zechariah figure difficult.

⁵³Hare, OTP2, 380-81, suggested that *LivPro* was authored in the first century C.E. but more recent scholars date the earliest versions to the second or third century; Schwemer, 285, suggests that some Christian interpolations were made in An1 in the middle-to-end of the second century. She dates Dor to 3rd-4th c and Ep1 to 6th c. The Ep1 text of *Vitae Prophetarum* 15.1 begins, Ζαχαρίας ὁ προφήτης. Οὗτος ἦν υἱὸς Βαραχίου. The Ep2 text begins, Ζαχαρίας υἱὸς Βαραχίου...The Dor text on Zech (XII) ends with a reference to υἱὸς Βαραχίου. *Son of Barachiah* occurs only here in *LivPro*. Note that *son of Iddo* is absent from all extant texts of *LivPro*.

⁵⁴Some scholars have suggested that the Zechariah of Mt 23.35 reflects the person mentioned in Josephus, *War* 4.5.4, yet another Zecharaiah, son of Bareis (or Baruch, or Bariscaeus), who was a wealthy man murdered "in the midst of the temple" by Zealots just before the destruction of Jerusalem. This suggestion does not help solve the problem of the Matthean text, for Josephus neither identifies this Zechariah as a prophet nor as a priest, nor has Josephus confused the Zechariah in *Ant* 9.8.3 with the Zechariah of *War* 4.5.4. I agree with David E. Garland, *Intention*, 181-83, that Matthew would not have made this a prophecy *ex eventu*, nor would he have put such a "transparent anachronistic" saying on the lips of Jesus; further, it is unlikely that the Matthean redactor would specify the "last martyr as a prominent citizen of Jerusalem who was a victim of Zealot atrocities...because... it was Matthew's intention to identify the last martyrs as the emissaries of Jesus." See also the discussion in Hagner II, 676-77; Davies & Allison III, 318-19.

Barachiah in Mt 23.35 would have been taken from the Greek text of Isa 8.2.⁵⁵ Two points in favor of this less-likely option may be mentioned. First, Isa 8.2 LXX is the only extant biblical text where a person named Zechariah is identified as υἱός Βαραχίου alone; in both the MT and LXX textual traditions, Zech 1.1, 7 includes “son of Iddo.” Second, there is some evidence that both characters named as *witnesses* in Isaiah 8.2 -- Zechariah *son of Jeberechiah/Barachiah*, and Uriah the priest-- could have been confused with other biblical characters. The confusion of Uriah the priest (Isa 8.2) with the last-named martyr in the biblical chronology, Uriah son of Shemaiah (Jer 26.20-23), may have contributed indirectly to the confusion of Zechariah (Isa 8.2) with the canonical prophet.⁵⁶

The beginning of Jer 26 contains the familiar theme, also seen in 2 Chr 24, of a prophet calling the people back to God: Jeremiah is urged to stand in the court of the Lord’s *house*, and speak, “Thus says the Lord: If you will not listen to me...to heed the words of my servants the prophets whom I send to you urgently, though you have not

⁵⁵If there is any merit in a view that the *son of Barachiah* in the later texts of LivPro has its roots in an earlier oral tradition, the question here becomes more complicated.

⁵⁶Blank, 329-30, gives an example of “an haggadic passage” in b. Mak. 24b, where R. Akiba cites a passage, “of Uriah it is written: Therefore because of you Zion will be ploughed as a field [Mic 4.12/ Jer 26.18], and in Zechariah it is written: Old men and old women shall yet dwell in the streets of Jerusalem’ (Zech 8.14 [*sic*, 8.4]) together with Is 8.2 (Zechariah the son of Berechiah!).” Akiba said that the two faithful witnesses of Isaiah were not contemporaries: Uriah lived at the time of the first Temple, and Zechariah at the time of the second. Krister Stendahl, *School*, 92-93, writes, “Matthew’s υἱοῦ Βαραχίου is a mistake not unparalleled in the extremely complex Jewish tradition-literature linked with the martyr name Zechariah,” and that “son of Barachiah” in the LXX is “partly due to the fact that the term ‘martyr’ has here caused the LXX to put together two biblical figures of martyrs, and partly that the character of a martyr could be ascribed to Zechariah son of Barachiah.” Unfortunately, Stendahl has not made his point of reference sufficiently clear -- is the “character of a martyr” (son of Barachiah) meant to refer to the figure in Isa 8.2 LXX or the canonical prophet? Was one (or both) of these conflated with reference to Zechariah, the son of Jehoiada? Stendahl concludes that this “mistake” was inserted into a saying of Jesus, and was “formed without conscious influence from either the M.T. or the LXX.” Stendahl does not specify whether this insertion was made by Q, Mt, or a glossarist. See note #58 below.

heeded, then I will make this *house* like Shiloh....”⁵⁷ When the priests and other prophets bring capital charges against him, Jeremiah replies that God sent him to prophesy against the *house* and the city, but that if they will amend their ways, God will repent of the evil pronounced against them. Jeremiah continues, “Do with me as seems good and right to you. Only know for certain that if you put me to death, you will bring *innocent blood* upon yourselves, upon this city and its inhabitants...” (Jer 26.2-15). After the example of Micah is cited, Jeremiah fades temporarily into the background and another figure, who was not so fortunate, comes to the fore:

There was another man who prophesied in the name of the Lord, Uriah the son of Shemaiah from Kiriathjearim. He prophesied against this city and against this land in words like those of Jeremiah. And when King Jehoiakim, with all his warriors and all the princes, heard his words, the king sought to put him to death; but when Uriah heard of it, he was afraid and fled and escaped to Egypt. Then King Jehoiakim sent [certain men to Egypt and they] brought him to King Jehoiakim, who slew him with the sword and cast his dead body into the burial place of the common people [but Jeremiah was not given over to be put to death].
 --Jer 26.20-24 (RSV)

Is it possible that the two meanings of the concept *witness-martyr* were also fused, so that other interpreters in some way equated the Uriah in Isa 8.2 with the man who was martyred in Jer 26? In this case, the confusion of the Zechariahs and Uriahs, *witnesses* on the one hand and *martyrs* on the other, would have involved a very complicated process. Ultimately, this may have more to do with the identifications of characters named Zechariah and Uriah in the formation of the OT canon than with regard to Matthew’s use of Zechariah in the Gospel.

Especially because Mt 23.29-38 has so much in common with 2 Chr 24.20-25, it is most likely that Matthew was aware of the canonical precedent of the murder of

⁵⁷Jer 7.12-14 deserves mention here, since 7.11 is used in Mt 21.13. Note that Jer 7.6, 22.3-5, and 26.15, contain references to “innocent blood” and have a setting in the temple (22.5, *house* will be a desolation). The concept of *innocent*, or *righteous*, *blood* is very important in the Matthean Passion Narrative.

Zechariah, the son of Jehoiada. When the variables are weighed, it seems preferable to propose that the First Evangelist merged the identities of the *martyred* Zechariah figure (2 Chr 24) and the canonical prophet (Zech 1), with or without assimilating Zechariah, the *witness* of Isa 8.2. In other words, Matthew has merged at least two biblical figures into one integrated character -- Zechariah, son of Barachiah -- who was murdered in the Temple. Perhaps the most satisfactory explanation for the presence of "son of Barachiah" in Mt 23.35 is that Matthew, for theological reasons, fused the identities of two (or three) biblical Zechariahs.⁵⁸

There is another possible link between Mt 23.30-31 and Zech 1.1-6, which may substantiate the claim that Matthew, more than Q or Luke, has merged Zechariah figures. Matthew's editorial work in this context may be seen in comparison with Luke's parallel version:

Mt 23.29-31

Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!
for you build the tombs of the prophets
and adorn the monuments of the righteous, saying,
'If we had lived in the days of our fathers, we would
not have taken part with them in shedding the blood
of the prophets.' Thus you testify against yourselves
that you are sons of those who murdered the prophets.

Fill up, then, the measure of your fathers.
You serpents, you brood of vipers, how are you to
escape being sentenced to Gehenna?

Lk 11.47-48

Woe to you!
for you build the tombs of the prophets
whom your fathers killed.

So you are witnesses and consent to the
deeds of your fathers; for they killed them,
and you build their tombs.

⁵⁸I think "son of Barachiah" is more likely to have been included in the text of Mt 23.35 by the evangelist, rather than to have been inserted by a glossarist (*pace* Blank, and Stendahl). The textual evidence supports this conclusion by virtue of the presence of the more difficult reading, "son of Barachiah," in all but one of the major texts. That the Fathers had to deal with this uncomfortable reading has already been noted. Davies & Allison III, 319, point out that the conflation of two distinct persons, e.g., Phineas and Elijah, is not uncommon and earlier (Davies & Allison I, 175) they note that Mt 1.7 does this with Asa and Asaph. Craig Keener, *Matthew*, 556, writes, "that Matthew's conflation here is accidental...is no more likely than in the transformation of 'Amon' and 'Asa' into 'Amos' and 'Asaph' in 1:7-8, 10." It seems less likely to me that Matthew would have knowingly added the character from Isa 8.2 into his fusion of the Zechariahs from 2 Chr 24 and the canonical prophet, unless one assumes Zech 1.1,7 already to have been a conflation of characters. Employing the concept of *witness* is not a strong enough reason to certify such a conflation, in my opinion.

The last woe (Mt 23.29-30) reads as if the Matthean Jesus has overheard his opponents, perhaps, congratulating themselves on their own righteousness which exceeds that of their *fathers*; now they perceive they are accused of *being like their fathers* who murdered the *prophets*. Jesus does not permit their disavowal --“If we had lived in the days of our *fathers*, we would not have taken part with them in the shedding the *blood of the prophets*”-- to stand. Their denial becomes a testimony of kinship with their *fathers*: they will prove themselves to be sons of their *fathers* when they mistreat those *prophets* and others whom Jesus will send, and thereby they will fill up the measure of their *fathers*. At issue under the surface of this entire “*woes*” text in Matthew is the question of Jesus’ authority.⁵⁹

Zech 1.2-6 recalls a situation where people in the past had to make the decision whether to continue, or to break with, the behavior patterns of their forebears. The *inclusio* around verses 2-6 is the twofold identification of Zechariah as *son of Berechiah, son of Iddo* (1.1, 7). The language almost turns in on itself, as the prophet exhorts the present generation not to be like their *fathers* in rejecting the God who speaks through *prophets*:⁶⁰

...[T]he word of the Lord came to Zechariah the son of Berechiah, son of Iddo, the prophet, saying, “The Lord was very angry with your fathers. Therefore say to them, Thus says

⁵⁹Daniel Patte, *Matthew: A Structural Commentary*, 319-28, presents, under the rubric of divine authority, an excellent discussion of the woes, many of which concern outward and inward righteousness. The Pharisees have questioned Jesus’ authority, as they did John’s (Mt 21. 23-27; cf. 3.7/23.33), and believe they are acting righteously in their rejection of him. With respect to the final woe and the Matthean Jesus’ use of the first-person, Patte writes, “by sending to them prophets, sages, and scribes, whom they will reject, Jesus will make them ‘fill up the measure’ of their ancestors.” When they do mistreat those whom Jesus will send, they “associate themselves with their ancestors who murdered the prophets and the righteous....” and will prove Jesus’ authority, even over them.

⁶⁰Zech 7.1-14 recounts another example when the people did *not* listen to the words God sent through the *former prophets*. It is interesting to note that the content of the exhortation includes, “Render true judgments, show kindness and mercy....”(7.9; cf. 8.16-17). This prophetic exhortation resembles the “weightier matters of the law” in Mt 23.23, as does Mic 6.8. Another place where the people are urged not to be like their fathers, who were made to be a *desolation*, is 2 Chr 30.7 (cf. Isa 65.7; Jer 16.11-12).

the Lord of hosts: Return to me, says the Lord of hosts, and I will return to you, says the Lord of hosts. Be not like your fathers, to whom the former prophets cried out, ‘Thus says the Lord of hosts, Return from your evil ways and from your evil deeds.’ But they did not hear or heed me, says the Lord. Your fathers, where are they? And the prophets, do they live for ever? But my words and my statutes, which I commanded my servants the prophets, did they not overtake your fathers? So they repented ⁶¹ and said, As the Lord of hosts purposed to deal with us for our ways and deeds, so has he dealt with us.” ⁶² --Zech 1. 1-6 (RSV)

They respond to Zechariah’s call to obedience in 1.2-6a with the acknowledgment in verse 6b, that their own evil deeds (i.e., the deeds of the fathers) brought about God’s “punishment — namely, the destruction of the Jerusalem temple and the exile.” ⁶³ This reading accords well with a hypothetical Matthean reading of Zech 1.1-6 in light of the rejection of the prophetic authority of Jesus and of his antecedent, the Baptist.

With Zech 1.1-6 in mind, it is possible to read the text of Mt 23.29-36 (37-39) in a similar way. If the scribes and Pharisees persist in their refusal to acknowledge Jesus, they will bring upon themselves God’s righteous judgment, as their *fathers* did when they rejected the word of God which the *former prophets* spoke in order to bring them back to God. This reading yields an interpretation of Jesus’ *woes* and the subsequent declaration of approaching *desolation*, as a conditional pronouncement: if the scribes and Pharisees will

⁶¹The RSV translation here is somewhat misleading, since the verb שׁוּב is translated ‘return’ in its three other occurrences in this text.

⁶²Underlined portions of the text reflect similarities with themes from Mt 23 (and 2 Chr 24). Ralph Smith, *Zechariah*, 182-84, discusses this “sermon in three parts: (1) Yahweh’s anger with the fathers (1:2); (2) a call for the present generation to repent (1:3-4); and (3) a statement that man is mortal but God’s word is eternal (1:5-6)... The word of Yahweh spoken by the prophets overtook the fathers, and the implication is that the same fate awaits the present generation unless it repents” (cf. Jer 18.11, 25.4-5, 35.17; 2 Chr 30.6-9). Smith limits his comments on this Zechariah text to OT references; the observations about Mt 23 and 2 Chr 24 here are mine.

⁶³Meyers I, 99. See the commentaries for discussion of “Who are ‘they’ and ‘us’ in 1.6b?” For our purposes here, it is not crucial whether one identifies them as those *fathers* who repented after God’s promised judgment became an actuality, thus forcing them to the truth of the words of the *former prophets*, or if they are Zechariah’s hearers (see Smith, 183-84; Baldwin, 91-92; Stuhlmüller, 54-56; Meyers I, 94_n). The Meyers, 98-99, note the beginning of the oracle with the recall of God’s anger at the preexilic Judeans, then notes God’s promise to *return* to them if the people *return* to him.

repent and acknowledge Jesus, their pending judgment will be lifted.⁶⁴

Beyond “son of Barachiah,” Zech 1.1-7 may exert further influence upon Mt 23.29_{ff} at the level of allusive resonance: Jesus is speaking in the *woes* section not only as a figure who has the authority to send the *prophets* but also as a *prophet himself*. His *blood* may be added to all the *righteous blood* which the *fathers* have shed. In this way, the martyred Zechariah of 2 Chr 24 can be amalgamated with the canonical prophet Zechariah, both of whom somehow foreshadow the *righteous prophet* Jesus (cf. Mt 21.11), who is calling people back to God.⁶⁵

This reading recognizes thematic similarities between the *prophetic setting* and *message* of Zechariah, son of Jehoiada (2 Chr 24.18-20), the exhortations of Zechariah, *son of Berechiah* (Zech 1.1-7), and the Matthean Jesus in Mt 23, whose words echo and point back to both Zechariah figures. Here the Matthean Jesus is set in relation to the *former and latter prophets*. The people in Zech 1.6b acknowledge the veracity of the words of the former and present prophet(s), but the scribes and Pharisees, according to Matthew 23, fail to acknowledge Jesus’ authority to speak for God.⁶⁶

⁶⁴Dale Allison’s article, “Matt. 23.39 = Lk 13.35b as a Conditional Prophecy,” *JSNT* 18 (1983), 75-84, takes this kind of view, without making reference to Zechariah.

⁶⁵My reading of Mt 21.11 does not see “This is the *prophet* Jesus from Nazareth of Galilee” as a deficient response by the crowd. Mt 21.10 has brought the seismic echoes from the Infancy narrative back into focus, and Mt 21.11 echoes the Nazareth and Galilee fulfillment citations here (2.22-23; 4.12-16). The refusal of the scribes and Pharisees even to recognize that Jesus may be a prophet demonstrates how they are like their *fathers* in shedding the *blood of the prophets* — *righteous blood*. See discussion of the Passion Narrative below; see also the excursus on Jesus as Shepherd in Matthew, where I propose that Jesus is uniquely the prophet-shepherd like Zechariah.

⁶⁶Patte, 327, notes that the previous *woes* in Mt 23 consist of second and third person description, with the speaker standing outside, but that Mt 23.35 brings to the reader’s attention the “astonishing quasi identification of Jesus (‘I’) with God.” Jesus has not only the authority to speak God’s words but he also can speak as God.

There is an air of somber finality in Jesus' closing words in his *lament* over Jerusalem, "You will not see me again, until you say, 'Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord'" (Mt 23.39). As Matthew has structured chapter 23, Jesus' *lament* looks forward to the Parousia.⁶⁷ Immediately after the lament over Jerusalem, the Matthean Jesus leaves the temple for the last time (Mt 24.1a), predicts its destruction (Mt 24.1b-2), and crosses over to the Mount of Olives, where he gives his apocalyptic discourse (Mt 24.3ff).

The Matthean narrative, which encompasses chapters 21 through 23, marks the beginning and end of Jesus' public ministry in Jerusalem. Chapter 21 opens with an overt enactment and fulfillment of the Zech 9.9 citation, and it can be linked to other allusions and echoes of Zechariah (14.4-5, 21). The "*woes and lament*" section of Mt 23.13-39 reflects the figure and words of a "combined Zechariah" by the submerged echo of an overt exhortation, "Do not be like your *fathers*" (Zech 1.1-7), and by the acknowledgment of Jesus' (prophetic and messianic) authority and identity. Psalm 118.26 is shouted by the crowds in response to Jesus' entry into Jerusalem as the Davidic messiah (Mt 21.5-9; Zech 9.9), by the children who praise Jesus *in the temple* (Mt 21.15), and the same response is anticipated and required, at the Parousia (Mt 23.39).

⁶⁷The announcement, "Behold your house is left to you desolate," fits the Matthean context of Mt 23-24 better than its position in Lk 13. This note of finality in Mt reflects the situation at the time of the Gospel -- it is not to be read with 'gentile' eyes as a statement of final judgment. See Patte, 329-30; Keener, 558-59. Donald P. Senior, *The Gospel of Matthew* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1997), 158-60, emphasizes that the tension portrayed in Mt 23 "remained essentially an intra-Jewish debate and cannot be understood as 'anti-Semitic,'" nor can responsible teachers in our day condone "such a toxic reading of the gospel." Graham Stanton, "The Gospel of Matthew and Judaism," *BJRL* 66 (1984), 264-84, adds much-needed clarification and explanation of the polemic of the First Gospel. In its own setting, Matthew is reflective of a minority community being persecuted by both Jews and Gentiles.

In this reading, all that the Matthean Jesus says and does in the Jerusalem temple is undergirded by allusions to Zechariah — to the *prophet* and to his words — in the Matthean substructure at the boundaries of Jesus' ministry in Jerusalem.⁶⁸

⁶⁸This analysis of Mt 23.29-39, in view of Mt 21.1-11, 12-16, concludes that Matthew inserts his Zechariah allusions, echoes, and quotations (Zech 9.9; cf. 11.12-13 in 27.3-10) in material he takes from both the Markan and Q traditions.

CHAPTER SIX

Jesus as the Son of Man

The Matthean Apocalypse

[Matthew 24.27, 30-31, 36-44, 25.31; Zechariah 2.6(10); 9.14; 12.10; 14.4-7]

The contribution of Zechariah material to the Gospel Passion Narratives is widely recognized.¹ However, scholarly acknowledgment of the extent of Zechariah influence upon apocalyptic imagery in the gospels is less well established.² Much of Jesus' Apocalyptic Discourse in Matthew 24 follows Mark 13: for example, after Jesus has predicted the destruction of the Temple in Mk 13.1-2 and Mt 24.1-2 (cf. Lk 21.5-6), both narratives continue with Jesus and his disciples leaving the Temple and going to the Mount of Olives.³ In the questioning that follows in Matthew, however, the disciples ask Jesus not only about the destruction of the Temple but also about the sign of Jesus' *Parousia*⁴ and the close of the age (Mt 24.3; cf. Mk 13.3-4; Lk 21.7).

With respect to apocalyptic imagery, Matthew 24.29-31 reveals multiple layers of Zechariah influence. The best place to search for possible Zechariah undercurrents here is where Matthew may have introduced changes to the overlapping elements of parallel texts. For example, after reporting that astronomical phenomena will herald the eschaton, Mark

¹In addition to the commentaries, see the following: Bruce, *New Testament Development*; idem, "Zechariah and the Passion Narrative," 336-53; Gundry, *Use of OT*; Lindars, *NT Apologetic*; Moo, *OT in Passion Narratives* (Sheffield: Almond, 1983); Stendahl, *School*.

²However, see M. C. Black, "Rejected and Slain Messiah." Joel Marcus, *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis in the Gospel of Mark* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993), 154-55, cites Black's dissertation in agreement with his study of Mark 14.27-28.

³See comments below which highlight the eschatological stress inherent in the mention of the Mount of Olives, an important motif from Zechariah 14. Note that Luke 21.5-7 omits the change of location from the Temple to the Mount of Olives.

⁴Among the Gospels, the term *parousia* is unique to this chapter in Matthew (Mt 24. 3, 27, 37, 39). It also occurs in 1 Cor 15.23; 16.17; 2 Cor 7.6, 7; 10.10; Phil 1.26; 2.12; 1 Thes 2.19; 3.13; 4.15; 5.23; 2 Thes 2.1, 8, 9; Jas 5.7, 8; 2 Pet 1.16; 3.4, 12; 1 Jn 2.28. Not all refer to Jesus' coming: those most important for the present study include 1 Cor 15.23 [cf 15.52]; 1 Thes 2.19; 3.13.

13.26 and Matthew 24.30 (cf. Lk 21.25-27) both incorporate an allusion to Daniel 7.13-14.

In the night visions, Daniel saw coming “...with the *clouds of heaven* one like a *son of man*,” to whom was given dominion and glory, that all would serve him.⁵ Mark 13.26 includes the Danielic motifs of *seeing*, the *Son of Man* figure, the imagery of *coming on/with clouds* (Dan 7.13) and having *glory* (Dan 7.14):

καὶ τότε ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλαις
μετὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς καὶ δόξης. --Mk 13.26⁶

Mark next points to the *activities* of the coming Son of Man, who “will send out the angels to gather the elect from the four winds...,” but this material is not from Daniel:

καὶ τότε ἀποστελεῖ τοὺς ἀγγέλους καὶ ἐπισυναξεί τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς [αὐτοῦ]
ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων ἀπ’ ἄκρου γῆς ἕως ἄκρου οὐρανοῦ. --Mk 13.27⁷

Although the Matthean parallel to Mark 13.26-27 contains nearly the same words, these occur after two special Matthean additions. First, in response to the disciples’ earlier question about the *sign* of his *Parousia* (Mt 24.3b), Jesus speaks of the *sign* of the Son of Man in heaven:

⁵The textual issues in Daniel 7 are very complex. See Adela Yarbro Collins, “The ‘Son of Man’ Tradition and the Book of Revelation,” in *The Messiah* (ed. Charlesworth; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 536-68; repr. in *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism* (JSJSup 50: Leiden: Brill, 1996), 159-97. See also Loren T. Stuckenbruck, “‘One like a Son of Man as the Ancient of Days’ in the Old Greek Recension of Daniel 7,13: Scribal Error or Theological Translation?,” *ZNW* 86 (1995), 268-76. Stuckenbruck makes a strong case that the reading (...ἦρχετο ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου καὶ ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν...) in the Cologne portion of Papyrus 967, dated 3rd or 2nd century BCE, provides evidence that a close identification between the “one as a son of man” and the “ancient of days” may have existed as an early theological interpretation of Daniel 7.13, and does not merely reflect the end result of a series of textual corruptions. He also notes, 274-5, the argument of Rowland that the “enthroned divine figure in the likeness of a man in Ezekiel 1,26-27 and a humanlike ‘deity’ apart from the throne in Ezekiel 8,2-3 reflects a ‘gradual separation of divine functions’ which, in turn, becomes the source of inspiration for the designation of God’s authority to the ‘son of man’ figure in Daniel 7.” Although outside the scope of this thesis, it is interesting to note a congruency between this early understanding of the Son of Man figure in Daniel 7 — to whom some functions or roles of God have been transferred — and the Messiah (Matthew’s Jesus), especially as they are derived from Zechariah 9.9, 14, 12.10_m, and 14.4-5. See below.

⁶Luke 21.27 is virtually the same as Mark 13.26, with the exception that in Luke the cloud is singular, and πολλῆς comes after δόξης instead of δυνάμεως.

⁷There is no mention of an eschatological gathering of the elect in the Lukan parallel (21.25-28).

καὶ τότε φανήσεται τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν οὐρανῷ. --Mt 24.30a

Second, the Matthean Jesus prefaces the Danielic allusion, which follows Mark 13.26 rather closely, with the remark that “all the tribes of the earth/land will mourn”:

καὶ τότε κόψονται πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς
καὶ ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν
τοῦ οὐρανοῦ μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς. --Mt 24.30b

Verse 31 of Matthew 24 nearly reproduces Mark 13.27, but it inserts a detail not found in any other Gospel: the Son of Man will send out “his angels with the sound of a great trumpet,” and the angels will gather his elect from the four winds of heaven:

καὶ ἀποστελεῖ τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ μετὰ σάλπιγγος[φωνῆς] μεγάλης,
καὶ ἐπισυνάξουσιν τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων
ἀπ’ ἄκρων οὐρανῶν ἕως [τῶν] ἄκρων αὐτῶν. --Mt 24.31

Although Zechariah is not directly cited in Mk 13.26-27 or Mt 24.30-31, words and concepts reminiscent of Zechariah are present both in the Markan text, including the material Matthew borrows, and in the unique Matthean textual additions. It may be helpful first to examine the most obvious Zechariah influence in the Gospel as it now stands, and then to explore other possible points of reference.⁸

According to Matthew 24.30, after the sign of the Son of Man appears in heaven, all the tribes of the earth will mourn (καὶ τότε κόψονται πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς) and they will see a figure (καὶ ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον). The Son of Man coming on the clouds is from Daniel 7.13.⁹ The question arises whether the tribes

⁸The order in which I present these Zechariah influences betrays no claim to have insight into Matthew’s actual composition technique; rather, it is my means to approach these complex verses in an analytical way.

⁹The focus of this thesis is not the use of the Daniel tradition in the Gospel materials, nor the identification of the sign of the Son of Man. Among the wide range of scholarly works on the use of Daniel 7, in addition to monographs devoted to that topic and the references in note # 5 above, see Julian Morgenstern, “The ‘Son of Man’ of Daniel 7 13f. A New Interpretation,” *JBL* 80 (1961), 65-77; Paul Owen and David Shepherd, “Speaking up for Qumran, Dalman and the Son of Man: Was *Bar Enasha* a Common Term for ‘Man’ in the Time of Jesus?,” *JSNT* 81 (2001) 81-122; Jack Dean Kingsbury, “Jesus’ Use of ‘the

mourn over a figure or over some unspecified event. If the former, the one over whom the tribes mourn is from Zechariah 12.

... καὶ ἐπιβλέψονται¹⁰ πρὸς με ἀνθ' ὧν κατωρχήσαντο¹¹
καὶ κόψονται ἐπ' αὐτὸν κοπετὸν ὡς ἐπ' ἀγαπητὸν
καὶ ὀδυνηθήσονται ὀδύνην ὡς ἐπὶ πρωτοτόκῳ.

--Zech 12.10b LXX

...and they will look to me, because they danced spitefully,
and they will beat their breasts in mourning over him, as over a beloved one,
and they will suffer grief, as over a firstborn.

--Zech 12.10b¹² וְהִבִּיטוּ אֵלַי אֶת אֲשֶׁר-דָּקְרוּ וְסָפְדוּ עָלַי כַּמִּסְפָּד עַל-חֵיד וְהָמַר עָלַי כְּהָמַר עַל-הַבְּכוֹר

Son of Man’,” in *Matthew as Story* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 95-103; Adela Yarbro Collins, “The Origin of the Designation of Jesus as ‘Son of Man’,” in *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism* (JSJSup 50; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 139-158; the following three chapters in *The Four Gospels II*, (ed. F. Van Segbroeck et al.; Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 1992): Vol I: M. D. Hooker, “The Son of Man and the Synoptic Problem,” 189-201; B. D. Chilton, “The Son of Man: Human and Heavenly,” 203-18; Vol II: Adela Yarbro Collins, “The Eschatological Discourse in Mark 13,” 1125-40; Joel Marcus, *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis in the Gospel of Mark* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993), 164-71; L. Hartman, “Scriptural Exegesis in the Gospel of St. Matthew and the Problem of Communication,” in *L’Évangile selon Matthieu. Rédaction et théologie* (ed. M. Didier; Gembloux: Duculot, 1972), 142-46; Daniel Marguerat, *Le jugement dans l’Évangile de Matthieu* (Genève: Labor et Fides, 1995), 77-81; N. Perrin, “Mark XIV.62: The End Product of A Christian Peshar Tradition?,” *NTS* 13 (1965-66), 150-55; W. Horbury, “The Messianic Associations of ‘The Son of Man,’” *JTS* 36 (1985), 34-55. For the sign of the Son of Man, in addition to the commentaries, see A. J. B. Higgins, “The Sign of the Son of Man (Matt. XXIV. 30),” *NTS* 9 (1963), 380-82; T. Francis Glasson, “The Ensign of the Son of Man (Matt. XXIV. 30),” *JTS* 15 (1964), 299-300.

¹⁰The textual variant, ὄψονται for ἐπιβλέψονται, appears in S¹ (Hatch & Redpath, 1006; (this is the only place in the LXX where any form of ὄραω is used for נָבַט). The order of seeing and mourning is reversed in Mt 24.30-31 with respect to the order in Zech 12.10. Perhaps this is because Matthew interjects the appearance of the *sign* of the Son of Man before bringing in the Zech 12 material; in effect, the sign must be *seen* to be a sign: the sign is *seen*, the mourning occurs, and then the one coming on the clouds is *seen*. Whether or not the *sign* of the Son of Man bears any relationship to Daniel 7, the *Son of Man* clauses in Mt 24.30 form an *inclusio* around the Zech 12 allusion.

¹¹Κατωρχέομαι, deponent verb, to dance in triumph over, to insult or treat despitefully, is a hapax legomenon in the LXX and does not occur in the NT. LXX has apparently misread דָּקַר as דָּרָק; see R.E. Fuller’s Dissertation (1988), “The Minor Prophets manuscript from Qumrân, Cave 4,” 139. The confusion between dalet and resh in Zech 12.10 can explain the origin of the Greek reading, κατωρχήσαντο. There may have been reluctance to read the first singular speaker (God) being “pierced” as well; note the change from first to third person as the object of mourning. For a critical discussion of the Hebrew text, see the Meyers commentary, 336_{ff}.

¹²See Meyers II, 336_{ff}, for textual and translation issues arising from the difficult first person singular object of piercing. *Tg. Zech.* 12.10 here reads, “...and they shall entreat me because they were exiled; and they shall mourn....” An extensive note on this verse by R. P. Gordon, *Targum Minor Prophets*, 218, suggests that the substitution of an exilic motif for that of the *pierced* one may be a revision in reaction

...and they will look on me whom they pierced, and they will beat their breasts in mourning as for an only son, and they will weep bitterly as one weeps over a firstborn.

The only NT citation of the first part of Zech 12.10b is found in John 19.37, ὄψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν (“they will look upon the one whom they pierced”).¹³

A combination of the same Dan 7 and Zech 12 texts found in Mt 24.30 is also found in Rev 1.7:¹⁴

Ἴδου ἔρχεται μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν, καὶ ὄψεται αὐτὸν πᾶς ὀφθαλμὸς
καὶ οἵτινες αὐτὸν ἐξεκέντησαν, καὶ κόψονται ἐπ’ αὐτὸν
πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς.

Behold, he is coming with the clouds, and every eye will see him,
even those who pierced him, and all the tribes of the earth will mourn over him

In both John 19.37 and Rev 1.7, the verb ἐκκεντέω is an accurate translation of קָרַךְ, which

to the Christian citation of Zech 12.10 as a messianic proof-text. The note includes the Reuchlinianus marginal reading: “And I shall cause to rest upon the house of David and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem the spirit of prophecy and true prayer. And afterwards the Messiah son of Ephraim will go out to do battle with Gog, and Gog will slay him in front of the gate of Jerusalem. And they shall look to me and shall inquire of me why the nations pierced the Messiah son of Ephraim.”

¹³John 19.37 cites Zech 12.10 with reference to Jesus’ crucifixion. See Maarten J. J. Menken, “The Textual Form and the Meaning of the Quotation from Zechariah 12:10 in John 19:37,” *CBQ* 55 (1993), 494-511, also reprinted in *idem.*, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel*, 167-86. Max Wilcox, “Text Form,” 201-2, writes, “One of the most interesting examples of the use of a set but independent text form in the NT is that of Zech. 12:10 (+?12) in Matt. 24:30; John 19:37 and Rev. 1:7. It also appears to underlie Justin, *I Apol.* 52:12, *Dialogue* 14:8, 32:2, 64:7 and 118:1.” Wilcox notes the striking presence of “precisely the same Greek form” of the phrase “all the tribes of the land,” in both Mt 24.30 and Rev 1.7; this recalls Gen 12.3; 29.14, and Ps 71(72).17— those who bless themselves through Abraham and his *seed* are the same ones who will look upon the pierced one, and who will mourn for him as an only son (Zech 12.10_{ff}). Although Wilcox does not carry through to say that the broader sense of the expression, “all the tribes of the earth” (rather than *land* of Israel) is implied, this reading seems to be a logical extension of his point.

¹⁴The combination of Dan 7 and Zech 12 imagery in both Mt 24.30 and Rev 1.7 has previously been examined by scholars. For the Apocalypse, see especially Adela Yarbro Collins, “The ‘Son of Man’ Tradition and the Book of Revelation.” For an attempt to place Markan tradition at the conjunction of two Jewish *peshet* traditions, one of which combines Dan 7 and Ps 110, and the other of which conflates Dan 7 with Zech 12, see Norman Perrin, “Mark XIV.62: The End Product of a Christian Peshet Tradition?,” *NTS* 12 (1965-66), 150-55. It is not a goal of this thesis to examine these texts with the aim to trace their origins in tradition history; rather, it is to focus on Mt’s use of Zech 12 imagery in the context of the apocalyptic and passion accounts. However, I do not find Perrin’s argument convincing with respect to his claim that Mk 14.62 betrays knowledge of Zech 12, by virtue of its use of ὄψεσθε (and ὄψονται at Mk 13.26). Maarten J. J. Menken, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996) 168ff, successfully refutes Perrin at this point.

reflects an independent translation from the Hebrew or a Greek tradition other than the LXX.¹⁵ The first part of Rev 1.7 most resembles the Theodotionic text of Daniel -- καὶ ἰδοὺ μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν (τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου) ἐρχόμενος -- although the expression “one like a son of man” is not mentioned explicitly in the Apocalypse until Rev 1.13.

The expression which Mt 24.30 and Rev 1.7 have in common (πάσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς)¹⁶ is most likely derived from Zechariah 12. In Zech 12.10-14, a singular form of φυλή occurs five times, including the clause καὶ κόψεται ἡ γῆ κατὰ φυλὰς φυλάς (12.12); the phrase πάσαι αἱ φυλαὶ appears once (12.14).¹⁷ Whereas ἡ γῆ in the context of Zech 12 almost surely refers to the land of Israel, it may take on a universal connotation -- the earth -- where this Zech 12.10 allusion is found in the New Testament.¹⁸

¹⁵All three NT texts (Matt 24.30, John 19.37, Rev 1.7) use a form of ὁράω rather than the LXX ἐπιβλέπω. Theodotion retains ἐπιβλέπω, but substitutes ὄν ἐξεκέντησαν for πρὸς με ἀνθ' ὧν κατωρχήσαντο.

¹⁶Gundry, *Use of OT*, 52-53, also sees πάσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς as a conflation of כָּל בְּיָמֵי הַדָּבָר וְכָל הַיָּמִים. Note that the expression “all the tribes/families of the land/earth” appears in Gen 12.3 and 28.14 (cf. Ps 71.17 LXX), Amos 3.2, and Zech 14.17, although it is probably derived from Zech 12.10-14 here. With a view to the connection between Mt 24.30-31 and Mt 25.31-32, note also that “all the nations of the earth” -- πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς, appears in both Dan 7.14 LXX and Zech 12.3 and πάντα τὰ ἔθνη is found in Zech 12.9 and 14.2. See comments below on 25.32 below.

¹⁷My present opinion is that Collins, “The ‘Son of Man’ Tradition and the Book of Revelation,” is right, that Matthew 24.30 and Revelation 1.7 represent independent developments of “a very early Christological tradition.”

¹⁸In context, Zech 12.10-14 ἡ γῆ is applied to the land of Israel: the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem are specifically named in 12.10, the land itself is said to lament in 12.12, and then the tribes/families of David, Nathan, Levi, and Symeon are named in 12.12-13, and finally all the tribes/families that are left are included. Revelation 1.7 makes the seeing and mourning universal: it refers both to *those who pierced Jesus*, and to *all the tribes of the earth*, which seem to have *every eye* as their inclusive antecedent, which may thus be read, “every eye will see him coming with the clouds, not only those who pierced him; and all the tribes of the earth will mourn over him.” The absence of the reference both to the piercing and the object of mourning in Matthew also permits one to interpret *seeing* as universal in the First Gospel, not necessarily restricted to the inhabitants of Israel. Keener, 586, and Hagner II, 714, agree that Mt makes a universal application of the original Israel setting, but Keener seems to see γῆ as “land” also in Rev.1.7.

A comparative review of Matthew 24.30 with its Mark 13.26 parallel may help to determine the fuller effect of Matthew's changes here.

Matthew 24.30

The sign of the Son of Man will appear in heaven

All tribes of the earth will mourn

They will see Son of Man
coming on the clouds of heaven
with power & great glory

Mark 13.26

They (who?) will see Son of Man
coming in/with clouds
with great power and glory

The insertion of the Zechariah material in the middle of Matthew 24.30 has profoundly colored the account of the parousia: for example, Zech 12 has supplied an antecedent (“all the tribes of the earth”) for the pronominal subject (“they”) of Mark's ὄψονται (Mk 13.26); in addition they will not only *see* the Son of Man coming from heaven, but they will also *mourn* (κόψεται πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς). This is the only synoptic mention of mourning associated with the Parousia; in Matthew 24.30 πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς is an all-encompassing phrase.

In this verse, Matthew has also made the Daniel 7.13 allusion clearer by supplying the biblical reference to the clouds *of heaven*. This change also effects a doubling between verse 30*a* and 30*c*: it balances the appearance of the *sign* of the Son of Man *in heaven* with the *seeing* of the Son of Man coming *from heaven*.¹⁹ There may also be an inherently subtle contrast between what comes from the heavens (the Son of Man and his sign) and those who are upon the earth (all the tribes/families of the earth). The *inclusio* formed by Matthew's double mention of “the Son of Man” around τότε κόψονται πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς may be an indication that the Son of Man, whom Matthew elsewhere portrays as a

¹⁹Conceptually, both *sign* and *appearance* imply that something is *seen*; this creates another doubling between verse 30*a* and 30*c*.

suffering/dying figure, is the object of mourning.²⁰ This concept is not new in Matthew; as early as 16.13-21, Jesus is the Son of Man, the Messiah, the Son of the Living God, who must suffer and be killed in Jerusalem (cf. Mk 8.34_{ff}, Lk 9.23_{ff}; also Mt 17.22_f, 20.17_{ff}; Mk 9.30_{ff}, 10.32_{ff}; Lk 9.43_{ff}, 18.31_{ff}). Mark 13 and Luke 21 speak only of the coming of the Son of Man with power and glory; they say nothing of any concomitant mourning, however it is interpreted.

Where Matthew 24.31 and Mark 13.27 overlap, is there any evidence of Zechariah to be found in the seams? At first glance, no overt quotation of Zechariah emerges, such as was found in Matthew 21.5 nor as there will be in Mark 14.27 and its parallel Matthew 26.31, nor is there a Zechariah motif as obvious as the 12.10-14 material discerned in the previous verse. However, there do seem to be subtle hints of Zechariah themes here. Placing the texts of Matthew 24.31 and Mk 13.27 together displays their similarities and differences:

Matthew 24.31

He will send his angels
with the sound of a great trumpet

and they will gather his elect
from the four winds
from (one) end of the heavens to the other

Mark 13.27

He will send the angels

and he will gather the elect
from the four winds
from the end of earth to the end of
heaven

Scholars have suggested the possible Zechariah influence here in the evangelists' use

²⁰Matthew and the Apocalypticist vary in their identification of the mourned figure here. Rev 1.7 identifies him as the *pierced one* coming with the clouds and as Jesus (firstborn of the dead... who...freed us from our sins by his blood, 1.5-6). The tribes wail [in repentance or in terror?] "on account of him" (Rev 1.7). Mt 24.30 is possibly ambiguous: the omission of ἐπ' αὐτὸν from the Zech 12.10 allusion permits the object of mourning to be interpreted as either the Son of Man's suffering/death or the terrible prospect of judgment signaled by his Parousia. The first option requires the assumption that Matthew implies more of Zech 12 than he writes; i.e., the reader will associate the "pierced one" from Zech 12.10 with the Son of Man explicitly identified in Mt 24.30's *inclusio*. The second option, however, can be supported by two other observations: (1) the reference to piercing in Zech 12 is omitted in Mt 24.30; and (2) Mt 25.31-32, an obvious judgment scene, recapitulates the imagery of 24.30-31.

of “the four winds” in the expectation of the gathering of the elect. The expression *four winds* occurs in just a few biblical texts, including Zech 2.6 and 6.5 (see also Jer 49.36, Ezek 37.9, Dan 7.2 and 11.4). The only place in the Old Testament where the Lord is said to *gather* from the four winds ²¹ occurs in the Septuagint of Zechariah 2.6 (=2.10 LXX); elsewhere in the New Testament, *four winds* appears only in Rev 7.1.

...φεύγετε ἀπὸ γῆς Βορρᾶ, λέγει Κύριος· διότι ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων
τοῦ οὐρανοῦ συνάξω ὑμᾶς, λέγει Κύριος... --Zech 2.10 LXX

The Hebrew text also contains the exhortation to “flee from the north” and to “escape to Zion” (see Zech 2.7 (11)), but differs in its report that God *scattered* the people in the past, “for I have spread you abroad as the four winds of the heavens, says the Lord” (RSV).²²

Although scholars are not unanimous in their support of Zech 2.10 LXX as a possible source for Mark 13.27, it cannot be dismissed out of hand simply because it says something different from the extant Hebrew text, nor can the plea that “from the four winds” is merely used to signal “universality” disqualify this Zechariah text from consideration.²³

Matthew 24.31 appears to have made little change to this part of Mark 13.27.

Where Mark says the Son of Man will gather the elect from the four winds, “from (the)

²¹In the OT there are numerous references to God gathering people who were scattered, but this is the only report that God will gather from the four winds (of heaven). There are references to gathering from north, south, east and west, and from the four corners of the earth, and from the uttermost parts of heaven; e.g., see Deut 30.3-4; Neh 1.9; Isa 11.12; 43.5-7; Jer 31.8,10; 32.37.

²²In this case the Targum is close to the MT: “Assemble yourselves together and come from the land of the north,” says the Lord, “for I have scattered you as the four winds of the heavens,” says the Lord. English translation of *Tg. Zech. 2.10* from R. P. Gordon, *Targum Minor Prophets*, 188.

²³*Pace* Gaston, *No Stone on Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels* (NovTSup 23; Leiden: Brill, 1970), 33, who rules out Zech 2.10 LXX for the two reasons mentioned above and because “Zech 2 is not otherwise quoted in the New Testament.” Other scholars are more favorable toward this Zech 2 text as source for Matt 24.31/Mk 13.27; e.g., Davies & Allison III, 363-64; Gundry, *Use of OT*, 54-55, who says, “although Mt and Mk have added ἐπί to συνάξω, their dependence on the LXX is very obvious....”

end of earth to (the) end of heaven” (ἀπ’ ἄκρου γῆς ἕως ἄκρου οὐρανοῦ), Matthew has “from (one) end of the heavens to the other” (ἀπ’ ἄκρων οὐρανῶν ἕως [τῶν] ἄκρων αὐτῶν). There is no expression quite like either of these in the LXX. Gundry and Gaston think Mark has combined ἀπ’ ἄκρου γῆς from Deut 13.8, with ἕως ἄκρου τοῦ οὐρανοῦ from Deut 30.4, which provides a link with Zech 2.10 by virtue of the shared root συναξ- in Deut 30.4 LXX.²⁴

...Ἐὰν δὲ παρακαλέσῃ σε ... ὁ φίλος ὁ ἴσος τῆς ψυχῆς σου λάθρα λέγων Βαδίσωμεν καὶ λατρεύσωμεν θεοῖς ἑτέροις, οὓς οὐκ ᾔδεις σὺ καὶ οἱ πατέρες σου, ἀπὸ τῶν θεῶν τῶν ἐθνῶν τῶν περικύκλω ὑμῶν τῶν ἐγγιζόντων σοι ἢ τῶν μακρὰν ἀπὸ σοῦ ἀπ’ ἄκρου τῆς γῆς ἕως ἄκρου τῆς γῆς, οὐ συνθελήσεις αὐτῷ ... --Deut 13.7-8 LXX

...καὶ πάλιν συναῖξει σε ἐκ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν, εἰς οὓς διεσκορπισέν σε κύριος ἐκεῖ. ἐὰν ᾗ ἡ διασπορά σου ἀπ’ ἄκρου τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἕως ἄκρου τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ἐκεῖθεν συναῖξει σε κύριος ὁ θεός σου ... --Deut 30.3-4 LXX

The setting of Deuteronomy 13.6_{ff} is an exhortation not to follow after other gods, no matter who -- whether a prophet who gives signs and works wonders, or a friend or family member -- suggests it; such evil people are to be purged from the land. On the face of it, Deut 13 appears more suitable as a possible background for Matthew 24.9-12, 23-27²⁵ (cf. Mk 13.21-23) than for gathering the elect (Mt 24.31/Mk 13.27). The framework of Deut 30.3-5 presupposes a post-exilic gathering of the scattered people of Israel back to the land of promise, more suited to God’s promise to gather the outcasts. However, if Mark had something like the text of Deut 30 in mind, he would not have needed the imagery of Deut 13-- he could have borrowed the wording (ἀπ’ ἄκρου τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἕως

²⁴Gundry, *Use of OT*, 55. Gaston, *No Stone*, 33. Note below their different explanations for Matthew’s changes.

²⁵There is also concern about false prophets in Zech 10.1-2a and 13.2-6; see note #10, ch. 2.

ἄκρου τοῦ οὐρανοῦ) from Deut 30.4 intact.²⁶

Gundry and Gaston suggest different reasons for the changes Matthew makes to Mark. Gaston attributes to Mark the thought that combining the phrases *from the end of heaven to the end of heaven* and *from the end of the earth to the end of the earth* would “express the superlative of universality.” Matthew’s change here reflects his disagreement with the expression.²⁷ Gundry proposes a more detailed explanation, that Matthew conformed his Greek to the plurals of the Deut 30.4 not only for “stylistic” reasons but also because the OT Peshitta, and the Targums are plural here, and that *Targum Jonathan* “refers this gathering to the activity of the King-Messiah and his forerunner, Elijah the great priest.”²⁸

It remains to be asked whether anything from Zech 2.10 LXX could have influenced Matthew’s changes to Mark 13.27b. The clause from verse 2.10 under scrutiny here is ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ συνάξω ὑμας, λέγει Κύριος (“I will gather you from the four winds of heaven, says the Lord.”) In the Jewish biblical texts which contain “the four winds,” all but one continues “of heaven;” the exception has no modifying phrase.²⁹ Matthew may have been aware of the fact that “four winds” occurs only alone or

²⁶In addition to Deut 13.8, see also Judg 11.21 and Jer 12.12 for the expressions similar to “(from) one end of earth to the other.” For other texts containing something close to “(from) one end of heaven to the other,” see also Deut 4.32, Neh 1.9, and Ps 18.6 LXX. In the OT/LXX there is no mix of heaven and earth in any form close to what Mk 13.27 has. Neither the Judg nor the Jer reference sheds any light on Mark’s usage; the Neh 1.9 text is similar in theme to Deut 30, and the Psalm refers to the rising and setting sun.

²⁷Gaston, *No Stone*, 33.

²⁸Gundry, *Use of OT*, 55; idem, *Matthew*, 489, calls Mark’s earth-to-heaven a “mongrel expression.” If Matthew knew these plural and King-Messiah traditions, the theory that Deut 30.4 is a source for Mt 24.31 could be valid.

²⁹Jer 49.36; Dan 7.2, 11.4; Zech 2.6 (10), 6.5; only Ezek 37.9 omits “of heaven.” All of these vss. in LXX have the singular τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, and the Hebrew (and Aramaic) have the plural, usually ארבעה עשר.

with “of heaven” in the LXX (or “of the heavens” in the Hebrew) and of the form(s) of the expression in Zech 2.10 LXX (the only biblical text where God will gather people from the four winds). He may have been aware that Mark’s expression (ἀπ’ ἄκρου γῆς ἕως ἄκρου οὐρανοῦ) existed nowhere in scripture. The question is whether Matthew recalled another text, such as Deut 30, or whether he modified the Markan expression with regard to “heaven” or “the heavens,” with an eye toward Zech 2.6(10). Perhaps Matthew knew the Zechariah tradition in Hebrew and Greek or had access to a text no longer extant, which contained “gathering” and “from the four winds of (the) heaven(s).” There is no way to be certain of any of these possibilities, but the burden of proof would seem to be on those who insist that Matthew conflated a Deuteronomy addition with the Zechariah source. Matthew’s alteration of Mark 13.27 can be explained by his knowledge of Zech 2.6(10) alone: he would retain as much of Mark’s saying as was consistent with his knowledge of the Jesus tradition (from his own sources) and of the primary scriptural allusion.

The most obvious change to Mark 13.27 is Matthew’s addition of the sound of a great trumpet which will accompany the angels sent by the Son of Man. A second change here is the attribution of angels to the Son of Man himself, that is, he will send out *his* angels and *they* (and not he) will gather *his* elect from the four winds. Scholars have approached this text with different aims; one approach has been to seek a link between the Matthean additions of the “sign of the Son of Man” in verse 30 and the “great trumpet” of verse 31. Attention may also be given to the range of meanings for τὸ σημεῖον: does *sign* or *ensign* better convey the intended sense in this context? Typical of this method is the work of Glasson, who contends that “the standard and the trumpet were both associated with the eschatological gathering together of the scattered people of God,” which is

precisely what Matthew 24.31 addresses.³⁰ Although Glasson's case for preferring *ensign* over *sign* for his Old Testament citations is valid, he does not establish that for Matthew 24.30, "it is surely beyond question that the meaning 'standard' is the appropriate one here." None of the texts he cites from the scriptures contains all three ingredients which are present in Matthew 24.30-31: *ensign* (or *sign*), *trumpet*, and *gathering the people of God*.³¹

Other studies are devoted more to the interpretation of the *sign* of the Son of Man. Jonathan Draper builds on the work of Glasson, in his attempt to locate the origin of the sign of the Son of Man in the Hebrew biblical texts which mention the sign (סִי) raised on a mountain to gather the tribes for war. Draper argues that Matthew "preserves the original reference of the סִי to the inauguration of warfare":

In this case he has taken the theme from Isaiah of God initiating war *against his own people*. This is the significance of the reference to Zech 12.12, which Matt introduces into the Markan framework, independently of *Did.* or the source he has in common with *Did.* ... This utilization of the terminology of Zechariah indicates that Matthew views the destruction wrought by Roman armies on Judaea and Jerusalem in his own day as a fulfilment of the prophecies concerning the סִי in Isaiah.³²

³⁰Thomas Francis Glasson, "Ensign of the Son of Man (Matt 24:30)," *JTS* 15 (1964) 299-300. He mentions texts which combine either the *ensign* or *trumpet* with a gathering motif, Isa 11.12, 27.13 and 49.22, places where trumpet and *ensign* occur together, Isa 18.3, Jer 4.21, 6.1, 51.27, and where they are found together in the Jewish liturgy. The only biblical passage cited by Glasson which is found in a context favorable to gathering the people of God is Isa 49.22, but it does not contain the trumpet motif; the texts most pertinent to Mt 24.30 are from the *Shimoneh Esreh* and in the New Year Service, both of which include "sound the great trumpet for our freedom," "lift up the *ensign* to gather our exiles," and "gather [us/our dispersed] from the [four corners/ends] of the earth." Glasson also notes the close connection of trumpets and signals in a military sense, in columns 3 and 4 of the Qumran War Scroll (1QM), but he does not read Mt 24.30-31 in a military context.

³¹In fact, Glasson's examples are nearly all in contexts which are inconsistent with his conclusions. Not one of his scriptural citations in which both *ensign* and *trumpet* appear is situated in a context of salvation or gathering exiles; rather, they are in the context of war or judgment. See previous note for these citations.

³²Jonathan A. Draper, "The Development of 'The Sign of the Son of Man' in the Jesus Tradition," *NTS* 39 (1993), 1-21; citation from page 16. The Isaiah passages on which he bases his argument are Isa 5.26; 11.10-12; 13.2, 4; 18.3; 31.9; 49.22; and 62.10-11. I find Draper's article unpersuasive in these ways: (1) some of his statements appear to be misleading; e.g., on 16, he says that "Where *Did.* predicts the resurrection of the dead, who are described as πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι in a citation of Zech 14.5, Matthew follows Mark in referring to the ingathering of the elect from the ends of the earth... *verbatim* here..."

Another scholar who has approached both of Matthew's additions in verse 30, the sign of the Son of Man and the mourning of the tribes, is Angus Higgins.³³ He argues that Matthew took the Zech 12.10 reference from a passion narrative setting and adapted it to an apocalyptic context. Reading between the lines of the scriptural citations, then, he concludes that the "sign of the Son of Man... is an enigmatic allusion to the cross, a phenomenon or portent of the cross in the sky which will cause the tribes to mourn...." The sign and the mourning occur before the parousia; the Son of Man will then appear as judge.³⁴

In his study of Matthew 24, David Sim concludes that Matthew's "dual insertion of the standard and trumpet motifs at this point indicates his intention to portray the arrival of the Son of Man in terms of a military campaign."³⁵ Sim reads Mt 24.15-28 as a description

First, Matthew also makes a similar use of Zech 14.5 elsewhere (Mt 27.51-53), which Draper omits to report in this article; second, Matthew's following of Mark is not verbatim here. (2) He asserts that $\sigma\kappa\iota$ must be understood as a "totem" rather than a signal pole or banner; I think totem is an inappropriate term to read back into ancient Israel; further, Draper fails to see any overlap in possible meanings between $\sigma\kappa\iota$ and $\sigma\kappa\iota$. (3) He insists, 10, that in every instance $\sigma\kappa\iota$ signifies both a war totem and signals the ingathering of people — for most of the Isaiah texts in his study, this conclusion is simply unwarranted. The concepts which Draper joins are not always conjoined — calling people together for war, whether on behalf of or against Israel, is not the same as the ingathering of people for salvation. Actually, two of Draper's Isaiah passages may relate to Matthew's use of the "sign of the Son of Man;" namely, Isa 11.10-13 and 62.10-11, but not in this way. See my comments below. I do agree with Draper that the Didache and Matthew probably were independent of each other, (Isa 62.10-11/Zech 9.9 in Mt 21.5].

³³Angus John Brockhurst Higgins, "The Sign of the Son of Man (Matt XXIV. 30)," *NTS* 9 (1963) 380-82. This article is cited in Davies and Allison III, 359-60, who agree that the sign of the son of Man is the cross; they also combine this argument with the conclusions of Glasson, and cite the same texts he does (see note #30 above). They also fail to distinguish between God raising an ensign for war and the eschatological gathering here.

³⁴However correct Davies and Allison may be in stating that "Matthew and his first readers presumably identified the pierced one with the smitten shepherd of Zech 13.7 (cf. 26.31)..." and further, "may have remembered that the mourning of Zech 12.10 is 'as for an ἀγαπητόν'...", they, like Higgins, go too far in seeing the cross as the sign of the Son of Man because of its juxtaposition with Zech 12.10 in Matthew's additions to Mark 13.26.

³⁵David C. Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew*, 105. He does not identify the sign more specifically than as a military standard.

of the “final eschatological war,” which is followed by “a full-scale response to the all-out assault of the evil forces against the righteous” (Mt 24.30-31); he then reads the Zech 12.10 allusion as a reference to mourning by the “confederates of the antichrist” because of the ensuing judgment they will face.³⁶ The standard, the trumpet and the angels overlay Sim’s war template.

The study of Matthew 24.30-31 may be unnecessarily restricted if one creates a link between the sign-ensign of 24.30 and the *trumpet* of 24.31; in the absence of such a forced connection, the range of possible influences on each Matthean addition is wider. Indeed, there is no compelling reason to infer that Matthew linked the *sign* directly with the *trumpet* or that he derived them from the same scriptural source(s). It suffices here to say that no Zechariah theme arises as a key to the identity of the *sign* of the Son of Man in 24.30.³⁷

³⁶*Ibid.*, 103-108. On 105, he writes that human forces, the Romans, who aligned themselves with the demonic forces led by the antichrist are the ones who will mourn their mistake in the face of certain defeat; on 106, all the tribes of the earth will mourn as “confederates of the antichrist” (cf. Mt 25.32, 41). I do not share Sim’s fundamental reading of the context of Mt 24. He interprets the reference to the angels of the Son of Man in 24.31 in terms of the “12 legions of angels” from Mt 26.53, and concludes, 104-5, therefore that “the evangelist conceived of the heavenly host in military terms.” He also stresses similarities between this Mt text and the Qumran War Scroll (1QM 2:15-19), including the role of standard and trumpet in its depiction of the military battle; further, he finds parallels between Mt 24. 30-31 with Revelation 19.11-19. If Sim’s primary reading of Mt 24 as a battle between evil and righteousness fails, then his insights into Matthew’s additions of the sign of the Son of Man and the allusion to Zech 12 are unfounded. Sim, 107, recognizes that the “Pauline tradition also knows of a trumpet call signalling the return of Jesus (1 Thess. 4:16; 1 Cor. 15:52 cf. Rev. 11:15),” but he asserts that “Matthew’s association of the trumpet with the sign or standard of the Son of Man gives this motif an overt military sense which it does not have in these Pauline passages.” In spite of the fact that Matthew continues to follow Mark with the gathering of the elect from the four winds, Sim, 107, cannot get away from his conviction about Matthew’s “advanced cosmic dualism, which he shares with Revelation and the Qumran scrolls.”

³⁷However, see below on the comparison of the coming of the Son of Man with the appearance of lightning. The nature of the sign is swift and widely visible. One source suggested by many scholars seems most likely, if one must posit a tenable solution to this difficult question of the *identity* of the sign of the Son of Man: Isa 11 is a well-known mine for messianic interpretive nuggets. Verses 10-12 have both eschatological and messianic references: “In that day the root of Jesse shall stand as an ensign of the peoples; him shall the nations seek” and, “In that day the Lord will extend his hand yet a second time to recover the remnant... He will raise an ensign for the nations and will assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth.” The Targum makes it clear from the outset that this chapter is about the King-Messiah (from the sons of Jesse, 11.1) and follows the wording of the MT fairly closely, but changes the end of verse 12 to “from the four winds of the earth.” The Messiah

One scholar whose narrative-critical approach yields no connection between the Sign of the Son of Man and the trumpet motif in Mt 24.30-31 is Jeffrey Gibbs.³⁸ In fact, his translation of verse 30 avoids both expressions, “sign” and “Son of Man” :

And at that time, that which shows this man who is in heaven will appear, and at that time all the tribes of the land will mourn and they will see that this man is coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory.

In his analysis of the structure of the Eschatological Discourse in Matthew, Gibbs places 24.29-31 in the section concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, not the Parousia. He reads the parables of the Wicked Tenants (21.33-46) and the Wedding Feast (22.1-13) as keys to the sequence of events in 24.29-31, that is, judgment on Israel and the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple will occur because the people reject Jesus as Christ and Son of God; this opens the way to the Gentile mission. In Gibbs’ reading, the “sign that shows ‘this man in heaven’ will appear” is the destruction of Jerusalem, “for in that event the implied reader perceives the truth that God has vindicated Jesus over his enemies, the religious leaders of Israel.” Mt 24.30 is illuminated by “parallel concepts” found in Mt 22.44 and 26.64.³⁹

himself is the sign or ensign (11.10) who will stand as an *ensign* to the peoples (11.11). See Gundry, *Matthew*, 488. There is no good reason to keep the sign and the trumpet together in this analysis unless the weight of evidence indicates that both lightning and trumpet imagery from Zech 9.14 justifies a joint reading of verses 29 and 31; still yet the sign of verse 30 remains apart from, but enclosed by, these Zechariah allusions or echoes.

³⁸Jeffrey A. Gibbs, *Jerusalem and Parousia. Jesus’ Eschatological Discourse in Matthew’s Gospel* (St. Louis: Concordia, 2000). In fact, Gibbs invests nothing in the trumpet motif in Mt 24.31; on 239 (note 209), Gibbs states his agreement with an article by Beare [“Synoptic Apocalypse: Matthean Version,” in *Understanding the Sacred Text*; ed. John Reumann; Valley Forge: Judson, 1972], that the trumpet here is “merely an incidental borrowing from the general stock” of imagery.

³⁹*Ibid.*, 199. Gibbs has argued that the fulfillment of Jesus’ words to the high priest include the “apocalyptic signs” at Jesus’ death (27.51-54), the testimony of the guards who fled the tomb (28.11-15) and the predicted destruction of Jerusalem: “Although no one in the narrative of the Gospel ever actually sees that Jesus is sitting at God’s right hand, his opponents from now on will see these proofs that Jesus is indeed in heaven, at God’s right hand...The complex of events around the destruction of the temple and Jerusalem will be the sign of this man in heaven. It will show that Jesus is exalted on high.” I cannot agree

Gibbs therefore understands the Zechariah 12 reference as mourning by the tribes of the land in response to the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, evidence that God is vindicating the one who now “sits at God’s right hand until God puts his enemies under his feet” (Matt 26:64; 22:44). Since Gibbs concurs with the view that this is not a mourning of repentance, it is unclear what kind of “seeing” he envisions in the combined Zech 12/Dan 7 allusions. The tribes perceive the destruction of the temple and the fall of Jerusalem as divine judgment on their unbelief (as will the high priest and Sanhedrin in 26.64) and as evidence of Jesus’ true identity. What kind of mourning is this, which is combined with persistent unbelief? ⁴⁰

Gibbs asserts that Matthew 24.30-31 will inform the implied reader that after the fall of Jerusalem (which was both an “eschatological judgment” and the “earthly manifestation of ‘this man in heaven’”), Jesus will send out human messengers (οἱ ἄγγελοι) to gather the elect; this “gathering” encompasses the period of mission between Jesus’ resurrection

with Gibbs that Mt 24.30-31 is directly related only to the destruction of Jerusalem and not at all to the Parousia. In fact, I think he contradicts himself somewhat in his discussion, 144, of the trial of Jesus. Gibbs attempts to clarify how “from now on” the high priest and Sanhedrin will see “this man sitting at the right hand of power”: he says the “proofs” of Jesus’ identity (fulfillment of his predictions) are the evidence that suffices until they, and all people, will see Jesus at the Parousia, on the “last day.” Gibbs ascribes this “seeing” at the Parousia to Mt 25.31-32. I understand Matthew to include both “seeing” and “mourning” at the Parousia, which is the focus of both Mt 24.(29-)30-31 and 25.31-32. See below my discussion of the influence of Zechariah in Mt 26.61-64, 27.40, and 27.51-53. It seems more likely that Mt 27.51-53 refers back to Mt 24.1-3, rather than to the trial scene.

⁴⁰*Ibid.*, 199-201. Gibbs does not elaborate on this issue of the mourning of the tribes of the land; he strongly asserts that the implied reader knows Mt 24.30 to be a reference to events around 70 C. E. The tribes seem to be in a position analogous to the religious enemies of Jesus, if I understand Gibbs at this point. Is the difference between them that the tribes wail in face of this judgment (destruction of temple and Jerusalem) but the leaders do not? Is this judgment recognized as the vindication of Jesus, or does that come only at 25.31_π, or elsewhere? Would either of these readings require Gibbs to affirm the Zech 12 reference to include “tribes of the land” and compassionate “mourning” as in Zechariah’s own context, where all the inhabitants of Jerusalem will mourn over the pierced one?

and Parousia, and not the angelic activity at the Parousia itself.⁴¹ Gibbs' reading stresses the parallels between Mt 24.30-31 and 26.64 at the expense of the parallels between Mt 24.30-31 and 25.31-32. Rather than reading the pair of passages in the Eschatological Discourse as mutually reinforcing, the latter as a recapitulation of Parousia-judgment imagery of the earlier, he separates them almost entirely by importing the mission theme to replace the Parousia in Matthew 24.⁴²

Scholars who look separately at the trumpet imagery in Matthew 24.31 (καὶ ἀποστελεῖ τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ μετὰ σάλπιγγος [φωνῆς] μεγάλης)⁴³ point out that the only place in the Jewish Scriptures which also makes reference to a great trumpet is Isaiah 27.13, καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ σαλπιούσιν τῇ σάλπιγγι τῇ μεγάλῃ ..., at which time the refugees from Assyria and Egypt will come to worship on the

⁴¹*Ibid.*, 201-202. Gibbs bases much of this upon his study of the verb ἐπισυνάγω in Matthew (here and in 23.37) and his understanding that, "in Matthew's Gospel divine or angelic activity on the judgment day with regard to human beings always includes the concept of 'separating,' even when a 'gathering' on the last day also occurs (3.12; 7.21-23; 11.21-24; 12.41-42; 13.48-50; 24.40; 25.14-30; 25.31-46)." I suggest that this passage in Matthew owes the "gathering" motif to OT models of divine gathering, which do not necessarily include scattering or separating. Gibbs, 174, acknowledges Matthew's use of prophetic themes from the scriptures in his summary of Mt 24.29-31, and he recognizes, 203-4, that Mt 24.29 is theophanic and eschatological; however, his method (or his presupposition that the destruction of Jerusalem is followed immediately by the universal mission — taken from Acts and not from Mt?) seems to keep him from discerning other prophetic applications in this section of the First Gospel. See below on Mt 24.27.30-31.

⁴²Note that a better reference related both to gathering (implicit) and mission (explicit) is Mt 9.37-38, where the harvest is gathered neither by angels nor messengers but by "laborers."

⁴³Bruce Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (3rd ed; London/NY: UBS, 1971), 61-62, comments on the textual variant of [φωνῆς] in Mt 24.31, "Although it is possible that copyists may have omitted φωνῆς as unnecessary, it is much more probable that, in accord with their habits, they would have made the expression more explicit by adding φωνῆς or καὶ φωνῆς (being influenced perhaps by the account of the theophany in Ex 19.16). It should be observed that, though the expression φωνὴ μεγάλη occurs many times in the New Testament, σάλπιγξ μεγάλη occurs only here." (Cf. Rev 1.10.) In Ex 19.16, the expression, φωνὴ τῆς σάλπιγγος ἤχει μέγα, is used and the theophany is accompanied by thunder and lightning and a thick cloud.

holy mountain at Jerusalem.⁴⁴ It is certainly possible that Matthew knew the significance of the trumpet in this context, or in Exodus 19.16 (theophany on Sinai, accompanied by thick cloud, thunder and lightning, as well as a loud trumpet sound, φωνή τῆς σάλπιγγος ἤχει μέγα), but neither Isa 27.13 nor Exod 19.16 provides a close enough match to Mt 24.31-- where at the Parousia the Son of Man, by means of a loud trumpet, sends out his angels to gather his elect -- to make a concrete case.

Zechariah 9.14 merits attention with respect to the trumpet imagery in Matthew 24.31.

וַיְהִי עֲלֵיהֶם יְרֵאָה וַיֵּצֵא כַבֶּרֶק חֲצוֹ
וַאֲרָנֵי יְהוָה בְּשׁוֹפָר יִרְקַע וְהָלַךְ בְּמַעְרֹת תַּיִם׃ --Zech 9.14 MT

Then YHWH Elohim will appear/be seen over them, and his arrow will come/go forth like lightning; the Lord YHWH will blow the shofar/ram's horn and he will go forth in the gale of the south wind.

καὶ κύριος ἔσται ἐπ' αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐξελεύσεται ὡς ἀστραπή βολίς,
καὶ κύριος παντοκράτωρ ἐν σάλπιγγι σαλπιδεῖ καὶ πορεύσεται
ἐν σάλῳ ἀπειλήσ αὐτοῦ --Zech 9.14 LXX

And the Lord will be over them and an arrow will come forth like lightning, and the Lord Almighty will blow a trumpet and he will come in the surge of his threatening.

And the Lord shall reveal himself over them and his words shall go forth like lightnings, and the trumpet shall be sounded before the Lord God, and he shall go forth in the whirlwind of the south. --Tg. Zech. 9.14⁴⁵

In both Hebrew and Greek traditions of Zech 9.14, it is God who blows the shofar.⁴⁶ This

⁴⁴Scholars who favor Isa 27.13 as the source for the trumpet imagery in Mt 24.31, or who mention it as a possible or probable source, include Davies and Allison III, 316; Gundry, *Matthew*, 489, *Use of OT*, 54-55; Keener, *Matthew*, 587-88; Hagner II, 714-15.

⁴⁵In keeping with its tendency to eliminate anthropomorphic expressions, God does not blow the trumpet in the targum. English translation of *Tg. Zech. 9.14* from R. P. Gordon, in *Targum Minor Prophets*, 206.

⁴⁶Markus Bockmuehl's article, "'The Trumpet Shall Sound.' *Shofar* Symbolism and its Reception in Early Christianity," in *Templum Amicitiae* (ed. William Horbury; JSNTSup 48; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 199-225, traces military, cultic and other uses of the trumpet in the scriptures and other early literature, including the symbolic use of the "eschatological trumpet motif in the context of an apocalyptic tradition."

is the only clear reference to God blowing the trumpet in the Jewish scriptures; there is one reference to the “trumpet of God” in 1 Thess 4.16.⁴⁷ Another place where God is said to blow a trumpet is *Tg. Zech* 14.4, in Codex Reuchlianus: “At that time the Lord will take in his hand the *great trumpet* and will blow ten blasts upon it to revive the dead.”⁴⁸

According to Matthew 24.31, when the Son of Man appears, he will send his angels with (the sound of) a great trumpet. The natural reading of this verse infers that it is the Son of Man *himself* who will blow the trumpet to signal his angels to gather the elect from the four winds. Matthew makes a leap from God blowing the trumpet (*Zech* 9.14) to Jesus doing so, just as he previously has identified the victorious *king* who would ride into Jerusalem on a donkey (*Zech* 9.9) as the humble Messiah Jesus in Mt 21.5.⁴⁹ Matthew borrows both of these theophanic texts from Zechariah and applies them to Jesus, the Son of Man.

Because Zechariah 9.14 is set in the context of a theophany, and because Matthew has also adapted part of the verse to the *Parousia* in 24.31, it is well to note that another section of *Zech* 9.14 may be related to the arrival of the Son of Man in Matthew. The segment in view is the first half of *Zech* 9.14, where the appearance of the Lord is compared

⁴⁷See also Rev 1.10, where the seer hears “a loud voice like a trumpet,” φωνὴν μεγάλην ὡς σάλπιγγος.

⁴⁸English translation from R. P. Gordon, in *Targum Minor Prophets*, 223. This text will also figure in the discussions below on the Mount of Olives and the resurrection of the saints. See also *Apoc. Ab.* 31.1, where God says, “I will sound the trumpet out of the air, and I will send my chosen one, having in him one measure of all my power, and he will summon my people, humiliated by the heathen.” (OTP 1, 704.) Bockmuehl, 207, mentions this text as well as *Pss. Sol.* 11.1f. Bockmuehl, 213, also mentions *Zech* 9.14 in relation to the *Aqedah* in early Rabbinic literature, “Just as the entangled horns of a ram delivered Isaac, so Israel will be saved when the Lord blows the great ram’s horn (*Zech.* 9.14).”

⁴⁹It is likely that Mt 26.28 recalls *Zech* 9.11 as well as Exod 24.8 (see discussion below); it is certain that Mt 21.5 is a citation of *Zech* 9.9; therefore, the cumulative weight of evidence favors the possibility that Matthew also could have known and used *Zech* 9.14 here with reference to Jesus.

to lightning,⁵⁰

...καὶ κύριος ἔσται ἐπ' αὐτούς καὶ ἐξελεύσεται ὡς ἀστραπή βολίς --Zech 9.14a LXX

...and the Lord will be over them and he will come out as flash of lightning

In Mt 24. 23-26, Jesus tells the disciples not to believe rumors that the Messiah is out in the wilderness or hidden away; rather the *coming of the Son of Man* will be as visible and wide-ranging as *lightning*, which appears from east to west (Mt 24.27; cf. Lk 17.24).⁵¹ As one scholar says, this is finally an answer to one of the disciples' questions from 24.3, "What will be the sign of your *Parousia*...?"⁵²

ὡσπερ γὰρ ἡ ἀστραπή ἐξέρχεται ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ φαίνεται ἕως δυσμῶν,
οὕτως ἔσται ἡ παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. --Mt 24.27

For as the lightning comes out from the east and appears as far as the west,
so will be the Parousia of the Son of Man.

The disciples had asked about *his* coming; Jesus' answers come embedded in theophanic imagery⁵³ and the terminology of Messiah (24.5, 23-24), Son of Man (24.27, 30-31, 37,

⁵⁰There are three or four major types of *lightning* imagery in the OT: (1) with thunder and *trumpet* sounds in the theophany on Sinai, Ex 19.16, 20.18; (2) the wonder of God and creation, Job 37.3-4, 38.25, 35; Ps 77.18, 97.4; Jer 10.13, 51.16; (3) comparison of likeness (or speed) with lightning: Ezek 1.13, 14; Dan 10.6 (cf. Mt 28.3), Na 2.4; and (4) imagery of *lightning and arrows* -- to scatter the enemy, 2 Sam 22.15 || Ps 18.14, 144.6 -- or to gather and save, Zech 9.14. Note also the change the Targum makes to 9.14: "And the Lord shall reveal himself over them and his *words* shall go forth like lightnings...."

⁵¹In Lk 17.20-24, the setting is one in which the Lukan Jesus says, "The kingdom of God is not coming with signs to be observed... for behold, the kingdom of God is in your midst." The disciples, who will "desire to see one of the days of the Son of man" are not to follow those who say, 'Lo, there!' or 'Lo, here!' The saying which follows is similar to Mt 24.27: "For as the lightning flashes and lights up the sky from one side to the other, so will the Son of Man be in his day."

⁵²Hagner II, 706-7; Hagner notes Zech 9.14 here, as do Davies & Allison III, 354; cf. Keener, 582.

⁵³J. Lambrecht, "The Parousia Discourse. Composition and Content in MT XXIV-XXV," in *L'Évangile selon Matthieu: Rédaction et théologie* (BETL 29; ed. M. Didier; Gembloux: Duculot, 1972), 324, cites the Grundmann commentary (1968), 508, for the view that φαίνεται in Mt 24.27 and φανήσεται in Mt 24.30 are not accidental; i.e., the appearance of lightning in the heavens and the appearance of the sign of the Son of Man in the heavens are related in Matthew's thought. I find this line of reasoning more compelling than Gibbs' assertion that these verses in Matthew, up through 24.31, elucidate the destruction of the temple and of Jerusalem, and have nothing to do with the Parousia.

39, 44) and Son of the Father (24.36).

There is another possible Zechariah influence in the apocalyptic material which Matthew 24 takes from Mark 13. It is the reference Jesus makes to the eschatological *Day* known *only* to the Father: the angels of heaven do not know, nor does the Son (Mt 24.36; cf. Mk 13.32). Speaking of the *Day of the Lord*, Zech 14.6-7 MT reads, “On that day there shall be neither cold nor frost. And there shall be continuous day (it is known to the Lord), not day and not night, for at evening time there shall be light.”⁵⁴ Zech 14 is surely concerned with the eschatological *Day of the Lord*; moreover, the repeated phrase “on that day” makes up the connective tissue from chapters 12 and 13 through Chapter 14.⁵⁵

By putting the texts side-by-side once more, but now focusing attention on the *angels*, one can observe the magnitude of the change Mt 24.31 makes to Mk 13.27, which reveals further potential influence from Zechariah:

⁵⁴In contrast, the LXX speaks of both cold and frost, but, instead of continuous day, it will not be light until toward evening; compare Mt 24.29, where both the sun and moon are dark and the stars fall from the heavens. The thought in Mt 24.29 and 24.36 is consistent with Zech 14.7 LXX, although the primary OT allusion must be from Joel 2.10; 3.4 [2.31 ET]; 4.15 [3.15 ET]. The clause in Zech 14.7 in primary view expresses the same thought in both the Greek and Hebrew: “and that day will be known to the Lord.” The MT may have influenced Rev 22.5. In addition to Zech 14.7, Gundry, *Matthew*, 492, cites Daniel 12.13 LXX; it may have exerted some influence on the tradition in Mark 13.32 (cf. Mt 24.36) with its terms “day” and “hour” [both in plural, however]: ἔτι γάρ εἰσιν ἡμέραι καὶ ὥραι εἰς ἀναπλήρωσιν συντελείας, καὶ ἀναπαύση καὶ ἀναστήση ἐπὶ τὴν δόξαν σου εἰς συντέλειαν ἡμερῶν.

⁵⁵Beginning with a siege of Jerusalem (12.2-3), continuing with the mysterious reference to the pierced one over whom the tribes mourn (12.10-14), to the day when a fountain opens up to cleanse the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem (13.1), at which time idolatry and false prophecy is eliminated (13.2-6), to the striking of the shepherd (13.7), the decimation and subsequent purification of the remnant (13.8-9), followed by a reprise of the battle of the nations with Jerusalem, which the Lord himself fights on behalf of his people (14.1-3), when the Mount of Olives is split and when the Lord comes with all his holy ones (14.4-5), followed by this “day” of Zech 14.6-7 upon which living waters will flow from Jerusalem (14.8), when God will be “king” over all the earth, the topography of which will change (14.8-10), and finally, after plagues and more fighting (14.12-15), when all worship is purified and the remaining gentiles worship the Lord of hosts, and keep the feast of booths (14.16-19), when finally there will be no traders in the Lord’s house, when all of Jerusalem and Judah are holy (14.20-21). Several of these motifs are found in the text of Matthew’s gospel or in the substratum of his Jesus tradition, whether in his sources (Mark, Q, *Sondergut*) or in material that Matthew adds himself.

Matthew 24.31

He will send his angels
with the sound of a great trumpet

and they will gather his elect
from the four winds
from (one) end of the heavens to the other

Mark 13.27

He will send the angels

and he will gather the elect
from the four winds
from the end of earth to the end of
heaven

Matthew is the only gospel in which the Son of Man has angels under his command:

they undertake the eschatological gathering of *his* elect.⁵⁶ Mt 16.27 also adapts Mk 8.38

(cf. Lk 9.26; 12.8-9) with reference to the angels and to judgment:

Matthew 16.27

For the Son of man is to
come with his angels

in the glory of his Father,

and then he will repay every
person for what he has done.

Mark 8.38

For whoever is ashamed
of me and of my words in
this adulterous and sinful
generation, of him will the
Son of man also be ashamed,

when he comes
in the glory of his Father
with the holy angels.

Luke 9.26

For whoever is ashamed
of me and of my words,

of him will the
Son of man be ashamed

when he comes in his glory
and the glory of the Father
and of the holy angels.

Whereas both Mark and Luke mention the *holy angels* in reference to the glory of the Son of Man's coming, Matthew omits the adjective "holy" and assigns the angels to the Son of Man himself. The negative facet of the judgment implied in Mark and Luke has been replaced by the concept of recompense, which incorporates both reward and punishment.

The Parable of the Weeds and its interpretation (Mt 13.24-30, 36-43) fall under the wider scrutiny of Matthean texts pertinent to the Son of Man's relationship with angels and judgment. In his interpretation of the parable, the Matthean Jesus identifies the figures of the parable: for example, the "sower" is the Son of man, and the "reapers" are angels. At the end of the age, the "Son of Man will send *his* angels, and they will gather out of *his*

⁵⁶In the NT, only 2 Thes 1.7-8 makes a similar reference, "...when the Lord Jesus is revealed from heaven with his mighty angels in flaming fire, inflicting vengeance upon those who do not know God...."

kingdom all causes of sin and all evil-doers....” These “weeds” are first gathered for burning, after which the “righteous will shine like the sun in the kingdom of their Father.” In this interpretation, the Son of Man has both angels and a kingdom, and the eschatological separating and gathering commence at his command. A twofold judgment and separation is implicit: after the wicked are “gathered” out of the Son of Man’s kingdom, the righteous remain.

In the text from the triple gospel tradition (Mt 16.24-27, Mk 8.34-38, Lk 9.23-26), as noted above, Matthew uses recompense terminology for the judgment, implying future rewards for those who have been disciples of Jesus (demonstrated by picking up their crosses and following him in self-denial), and future punishment for non-disciples. The Matthean “little apocalypse,” reports that the Son of Man will come with *his* angels who then will proceed to gather his elect, but it contains no mention of the fate of any others (Mt 24.30-31).

The last Matthean text which involves the angels and the Son of Man comes at the end of the apocalyptic discourse, the pericope concerning the last judgment:

When the Son of man comes in his glory, and all the angels with him, then he will sit on his glorious throne. Before him will be gathered all the nations, and he will separate them one from another as a shepherd separates the sheep from the goats. Then the King will say to those at his right hand, ‘Come, O blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you....Then he will say to those at his left hand, ‘Depart from me, you cursed, into the eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels....And they will go away into eternal punishment, but the righteous into eternal life.

--Mt 25.31-46 (excerpted)

This final section from Matthew 24-25 brings several common concepts into focus, as it takes up again the disciples’ questions on the Parousia and the end of the age from 24.3: when the Son of Man comes in glory, the angels will come with him; he is a royal figure who sits on a glorious throne, and he is called King in his own right; he is also the judge of all the nations gathered before him, and as a shepherd he separates the flock; he consigns

the wicked to perdition and the righteous to the blessed kingdom.

The other texts that share the Son of Man and angels motifs encompass either implicit or explicit references to the future judgment:⁵⁷

<u>Matthew 13.36</u> _{ff}	<u>Matthew 16.27</u>	<u>Matthew 24.30-31</u>	<u>Matthew 25.31</u> _{ff}
Son of Man	Son of Man	Son of Man	Son of Man
at end of the age, he sends <u>his</u> angels as reapers	comes with <u>his</u> angels in his Father's glory	comes on clouds... with great glory he sends <u>his</u> angels	comes with <u>all the</u> angels in his glory he is also a king with glorious throne
they gather wicked	with recompense	they gather his elect	all are gathered before him to be judged
righteous shine like sun in the Father's kingdom	for every person Son has a kingdom	all tribes of the earth see him	he separates wicked from righteous, who inherit a kingdom prepared by the Father

The first clause of Matthew 25.31 is of primary importance for this study, both because it recapitulates these common themes from chapters 13, 16, and 24 and because it returns to the questions about the eschaton. Furthermore, Mt 25.31 is almost certainly related to Zechariah.⁵⁸

“Ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ καὶ πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι ⁵⁹ μετ’ αὐτοῦ, τότε καθίσει ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ... --Mt 25.31

καὶ ἔξει κύριος ὁ θεὸς μου καὶ πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι μετ’ αὐτοῦ. --Zech 14.5b LXX

⁵⁷Charette, *Recompense*, 113, points out similarities between the judgment scenes in Matthew, especially the wording in 19.28 and 25.31, where the Son of Man sits on his glorious throne.

⁵⁸As Matthew's Jesus stands before Caiaphas, the combined force of these texts exerts a cumulative effect on his reference to the Son of Man seated at the right hand of Power and coming on the clouds of heaven (Mt 26.63-64). I also contend that the “false testimony” which precedes this Son of Man statement is related to another powerful image from the Zechariah tradition, i.e., Zech 6.12 (see ch 10, on the Temple charge).

⁵⁹Textual variant -- some mss (AW et.al.) read ἅγιοι in place of ἄγγελοι. Hagner, 739, agrees that this variant evidence confirms influence of Zech 14.5LXX. Davies and Allison III, 420, note that the Peshitta, Targum and Vulgate agree with the LXX and Matthew, “in opening with ‘and’ and in having ‘with him’.” See Gundry, *Matthew*, 511. While Hagner suggests the OT background for Mt 25.31 is also from Deut 32.43; 33.2LXX, Davies and Allison say “Zech 14.5 itself depends upon Deut 33.2.” In any case, I see no direct Deut 32.43 or 33.2 influence on Mt 25.31; however, Deut 33.2 certainly appears to have influenced the form of 2 Thess 1.7.

וּבֹא יְהוָה אִלַּי הִי כָל־קְדוֹשִׁים עִמָּךְ

--Zech 14.5b MT⁶⁰

...and YHWH my God will come (and) all the holy ones with you.

...and the Lord my God shall reveal himself and all his holy ones with him. --Tg. Zech. 14.5b⁶¹

The Septuagint often translates קְדוֹשִׁים (which denotes holy things, holy persons, or heavenly beings) with ἅγιοι (holy ones); LXX never uses ἄγγελοι for this Hebrew word.⁶²

The Greek form (ἅγιοι, usually interpreted as *saints*) appears to be behind Paul's use of Zech 14.5b in 1Thess 3.13, "...ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ..."

Mark 8.38 and Luke 9.26 (cf. Mt 16.27) agree on something which seems to be derived from Zech 14.5b: when the Son of Man comes, he will be accompanied by (Mk), or in the glory of (Lk), *the holy angels*. In these gospel texts *holy angels* may reflect oral or textual variant traditions, due to the ambiguity of ἅγιοι from Zech 14.5b LXX. Matthew, however, never uses the expression "holy angels."⁶³

In texts which refer to the Parousia, Matthew consistently refers to those who will accompany the Son of Man as *angels*, even when his gospel source (Mark 8.38) has the conflated term. In 13.41, 16.27 and 24.31, the Matthean Jesus speaks of the angels of the

⁶⁰With Gundry, *Use*, 142, many scholars believe the MT to be corrupt here; yet Meyers II, 430-1, see "compelling reasons for retaining the MT 'with you' [2fs] as a reference to Jerusalem." They note that all the major versions (LXX, Vulg, Targ, and Syr), as well as many [45] Hebrew mss read "with him" in reference to YHWH. They also note that the Syriac and Aramaic put the [3s] suffix with the previous noun, "his holy ones."

⁶¹English translation from R. P. Gordon in *Targum Minor Prophets*, 223.

⁶²Holladay's *Concise Lexicon*, 312, specifies "heavenly beings" for קְדוֹשִׁים in Zech 14.5. Gundry, *Use of OT*, 142, also reads the MT to mean "angels" and not "saints" for Zech 14.5. Meyers II, 430, reads "angelic beings" in this military context.

⁶³Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology*, 107, in his comment on Mt 24.31, seems to make a "slip of the pen" in asserting that the "close relation between Jesus the Son of Man and the *holy angels*" is a particular concern of the first evangelist. [emphasis added.]

Son of Man (that is, “his angels”); however, in Mt 25.31 Jesus says the Son of Man will come with “*all the angels.*” This departure from Matthew’s preferred usage may signal some influence from Zech 14.5b. If he was working with the biblical text of Zechariah, it is possible that he had access to both Greek and Hebrew traditions.⁶⁴ Matthew has demonstrated his ability to utilize Greek and Hebrew variants in his exegesis of biblical traditions;⁶⁵ with Zech 14.5b, he may have chosen to transmit the Hebrew קַדְשֵׁי־אֱלֹהִים to signify “angels” here in Mt 25.31, where it suits his theological purposes.⁶⁶ Once again, Matthew has chosen a passage of Zechariah which refers to God and has transferred the divine role to Jesus, the Son of Man. In a sense, the Lord God has become the Lord Jesus.

It seems fitting that the apocalyptic discourse in Matthew has been found to have several layers of Zechariah in its substructure, for Zechariah is one of the richest sources of apocalyptic or proto-apocalyptic imagery in the Old Testament. In this survey, Matthew has retained and sharpened Zechariah motifs and allusions found in his source(s), and he has added other strands of Zechariah’s unique imagery, either singly or in combination with other biblical traditions. The eschatological day, known only to the Lord figures from Zech 14.7 (Mt 24.36); “on that day” language is embedded in Zechariah 12-14; the lightning and trumpet of God (Zech 9.14) prominently feature in separate verses in the

⁶⁴Zech 14.1-5 is set in an apocalyptic military context, when God comes with the angels to Jerusalem to do battle. Mt 25.31_{ff} is set in an apocalyptic context of judgment; in this case it is angels who act. See thesis section above on Mt 21.5 for evidence of Matthew’s knowledge of both Greek and Hebrew traditions of Zech 9.9.

⁶⁵E.g., Mt 27.3-10 shows his facility in using textual variants from Zech 11.11-13; another kind of Matthean exegesis appears in his application of the variant meanings of Zech 10.2 MT/LXX to Mt 9.36. See thesis sections related to these passages.

⁶⁶See thesis section on Eschatological Signs below, where the case is made that Matthew also surely knew this Greek textual tradition, for he utilized ἅγιοι (saints) from Zech 14.5b (cf. *Tg. Zech.* 14.4 Codex Reuchlianus) with reference to the raising of the bodies of many at Jesus’ resurrection (Mt 27.52).

apocalyptic discourse (Mt 24.27, 31), the second of which is linked by Matthew to the angelic gathering from the four winds (Zech 2.10 LXX); the Lord coming with the “holy ones” from Zech 14.5 is an unmistakable theme, both in texts Matthew adopts from Mark and from his unique material (16.27; 25.31; cf. 27.52). Finally, all of this apocalyptic discourse takes place as Jesus teaches his disciples on the Mount of Olives (Matthew 24.3; Zechariah 14.4).

CHAPTER SEVEN
Jesus' Blood of the Covenant
 Forgiveness of Sins
 [Matthew 26.28/Zechariah 9.11]

In their accounts of the Last Supper, although the sequence of drinking and the words over the cup is reversed, Matthew and Mark present Jesus' explanation of the cup in similar fashion, the primary difference being Matthew's additional phrase, "for the forgiveness of sins":¹

τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης
 τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον
 εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. --Matthew 26:28

τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης
 τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν.
 --Mark 14.24

Jesus' words, "This is my blood of the covenant," are identical in Mt and Mk. The only other places where *blood* and *covenant* occur together in biblical tradition are Exodus 24.8, Zechariah 9.11, Luke 22.20, 1 Corinthians 11.25 and Hebrews 9.20, 10.29, and 13.20.²

In Exodus 24.3-8, the plot centers on the reception of God's word, first spoken through, then written down by, Moses. The people's pledges of obedience were accompanied by burnt offerings and peace offerings to the Lord. Moses threw half of the blood of the oxen against the altar and the other half of the blood upon the people, saying,

¹Matthew 3.1_{ff} does not follow Mark 1.4, with respect to John's preaching a "baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins." There is confession of sin (Mt 3.6) and repentance (Mt 3.1, 11), but the expression "for the forgiveness of sins" appears in the "cup saying" at the Last Supper.

²The "words of institution" in Lk 22 and I Cor 11 both have "new covenant in my blood." Lk 22.20: ...τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον. The textual issues in Lk 22 are many; see the treatment of the longer and shorter versions, including the table of six forms of the Lukan text, in Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 173-77. 1 Cor 11.25: τοῦτό τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστιν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι. *Covenant* and *blood* appear together three times in Hebrews: τοῦτο τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης ἧς ἐντείλατο πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὁ θεός (9.20); πῶς δοκεῖτε χεῖρονος ἀξιοθήσεται τιμωρίας ὁ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καταπατήσας καὶ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης κοινὸν ἡγησάμενος...; (10.29); Ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης, ὁ ἀναγαγὼν ἐκ νεκρῶν τὸν ποιμένα τῶν πορβάτων τὸν μέγαν ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης αἰωνίου, τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν... (13.20). (ἐν αἵματι functions differently in Zech 9.11, as compared with Lk 22 and I Cor 11, but see Heb 13.20, which is very similar to Zech 9.11.) Hebrews seems to know both Exod 24.8 and Zech 9.11.

“Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord has made with you in accordance with all these words”:

וַיֹּאמֶר הָנָה דַם־הַבְּרִית אֲשֶׁר בְּרַח יְהוָה עִמָּכֶם עַל־כָּל־הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה --Ex 24.8b MT

καὶ εἶπεν Ἴδου τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης, ἧς διέθετω κύριος πρὸς ὑμᾶς
περὶ πάντων τῶν λογῶν τούτων. --Ex 24.8b LXX

Zech 9.11 follows the prophetic exhortation for Daughter Zion/Daughter Jerusalem to rejoice over the coming of the humble king who will bring peace to the nations (Zech 9.9-10):

וְגַם־תִּפְתָּח בְּדַם־בְּרִיתְךָ שְׁלֵחַתִּי אֶסְרִיךָ מִבּוֹר מַיִם בַּיָּם --Zech 9.11 MT

καὶ σὺ ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης [σου] ἐξαπέστειλας δεσμίους σου ἐκ λάκκου
οὐκ ἔχοντος ὕδωρ. --Zech 9.11 LXX

In the Hebrew, the one who will set the prisoners free is referred to in the first-person singular; the verse may be translated, “And as for you, because of the blood of your covenant, I will set your prisoners free from the waterless cistern.” In the Greek, the second-person singular pronoun seems instead to indicate the one who acted on behalf of the prisoners, “And you, by the blood of [your] covenant, set your prisoners free from the waterless cistern.”³

Both Exodus 24.8 and Zechariah 9.11 have figured in scholarly studies of the “cup

³Other than Zech 9.11, the only reference to covenant with the 2fs suffix (and the Greek equivalent in the LXX) appears in Ezek 16.61, where Daughter Jerusalem is also addressed. In Ezek 16.59-63 covenant occurs once as “your covenant,” as well as “the covenant,” “my covenant with you (twice),” and “everlasting covenant.” See Meyers II, 138-42. Some English translations of Zech 9.11 from the Hebrew “clarify” that the covenant is between God and the people by reading “my covenant with you,” instead of “your covenant.” The LXX seems to reflect some confusion about who is speaking and who acts in Zech 9.11 and 12. Does the Greek version interpret the second-person singular [vocative] in vs. 11 as Daughter Zion/Daughter Jerusalem, as in the Hebrew, or does it address God in vs. 11, and then interpret the speaker in vs. 12 as God?

saying” in Mark 14.24 and Matthew 26.28.⁴ If Zech 9.11 itself is an allusion to Exod 24, the emphasis in the prophetic context is different from the Pentateuchal passage.

Exod 24.3-8 describes the ceremony surrounding the giving of the law and the people’s vow to obey God’s commandments. In Zech 9.11-12, God remembers a covenant which was sealed by blood, and that is the basis upon which prisoners will be set free and recompensed double.⁵

Arguments marshaled in favor of a primary (or exclusive) allusion to Exod 24.8 in the “cup saying” in Mk 14.24 and Mt 26.28 include the following:⁶

- (1) “the blood of the covenant” is closer to the gospel wording.⁷

⁴For comments on Zech 9.11 itself, see the commentaries by Achtemeier, Baldwin, and the Meyers; also see Katrina J. A. Larkin, *The Eschatology of Second Zechariah* (Kampen: KOK Pharos, 1994), 77-83. With reference to Mark, see Marcus, *Way*, 157-8; see also Bruce, “Book of Zechariah,” 347. For Matthew, in addition to the commentaries, see Charette, *Recompense*, 77, 142; Bruce, *NT Development*, 54, 102; Allison, *End*, 35; idem, *Intertextual Jesus*, 219; Gundry, *Use of OT*, 57-58; Lindars, *NT Apologetic*, 131-34; Heil, *Death & Resurrection*, 36, 56 (n. 16).

⁵Elizabeth Achtemeier, *Nahum-Malachi* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1986), 150, says about Zech 9.11 that God remembers the covenant at Sinai, and on that basis promises to deliver the people from the “waterless pit,” an OT symbol of *Sheol* or death. Meyers II, 138-39, interprets those addressed in Zech 9.11-14 as exiles who have been removed from their homeland; Zechariah’s “blood of your covenant” imagery links the freeing of captives with God’s promise at Sinai to establish the Israelites in their land. In Zechariah’s context, the prisoners to be delivered could refer to Egypt [i.e., to Passover] or to the Babylonian exile. Although Bruce, *NT Development*, 55, gives pride of place to Exod 24.8, he raises an intriguing question, 102, on the role of Zech 13.7-9 and the *shepherd* theme (Mk 14.27, Mt 26.31): Is the formula for covenant renewal in Zech 13.9 a reference to the “blood-sealed covenant of Zech. 9:11?” See chapter following for more on Zech 13.7 and the shepherd theme. It seems to me that we cannot be certain whether Zechariah had the Exod 24.8 covenant, exclusively, in mind with reference to the covenant blood in Zech 9.11.

⁶Among those who favor Exod 24.8 are Keener, 631; Davies & Allison III, 465-75; Hagner II, 773; Gundry, *Use of OT*, 57-58; Bruce, *NT Development*, 54 [but see “Book of Zechariah,” 247, where he writes, “Hard upon the proclamation of the peaceful king comes Yahweh’s announcement of liberation to the captives ‘because of the blood of my covenant with you’ (Zech. ix. 11). The resemblance between this and ‘my covenant blood’ in our Lord’s words of institution (Mark xiv. 24) can scarcely be fortuitous, although the scripture principally in His mind then appears to have been Exodus xxiv. 8,” Allison, *Intertextual Jesus*, 219 [but see his *End of the Ages*, 35, where he includes Zech 9.11 in a table of quotations and allusions in Mark, opposite Mk 14.22-25].

⁷Allison, *Intertextual Jesus*, 219, notes that the Peshitta, *Tg. Ps.-J.* and *Tg. Onq.* on Exod 24.8 use a demonstrative which agrees with the NT τοῦτο.

- (2) the interpretive trajectory inferred from Targums Onqelos and Pseudo-Jonathan shows that some Jewish communities understood the Sinai covenant to have expiatory value.⁸
- (3) the framework of Hebrews 9.15-22 places Jesus' self-sacrifice in an interpretive reading of Exod 24.3-8.⁹
- (4) the meal which followed Moses' throwing the covenant-blood on the people supports the meal context in the Gospels.¹⁰

Evidence adduced in support of the influence of Zech 9.11 on Jesus' "covenant-blood" saying includes the following:¹¹

- (1) in Zech 9, God directly addresses the people as Daughter Zion/Daughter Jerusalem concerning the blood of their covenant; in the Gospel, Jesus addresses people directly concerning the cup (of the covenant) they drink.
- (2) "covenant-blood" is modified by a possessive pronoun in Zech 9.1, Mt 26.28, and Mk 14.24 but is unmodified in Ex 24.8.
- (3) the setting is one of hope and restoration of captives, not on law-giving and obedience.¹²

⁸Davies & Allison III, 475. In Heb 9.20, "This is the blood of the covenant," must come from the tradition of the words of institution, for "this is" is not present in Exod 24.8. Davies and Allison liken Jesus' mediation of a new covenant in blood, his self-sacrifice, to Moses' inauguration of the old covenant by sprinkling the "blood of the covenant." In Heb 9, they claim to see the same tradition of expiation as in the targums to Exod 24.8; they find proof in Heb 9.19-22 that it was taken "for granted that the blood Moses sprinkled was for the forgiveness of sins," which, in turn, demonstrates the "currency of this interpretation in the first century." They see the same ideas in the First Gospel as in Heb 9 and dismiss a possible connection with Passover blood. Davies & Allison see no need to tie Matthew's addition of "unto the forgiveness of sins" to the influence of Jer 31, since they derive such influence from Exod 24.8. They give a lot of weight to Heb 9, read with the targums; they do not comment here on the Pauline and Lukan cup sayings which incorporate "new covenant" explicitly.

⁹*Ibid.* Hagner II, 773, also refers to Hebrews but does not go as far as Davies & Allison.

¹⁰Allison, *Intertextual Jesus*, 219, citing a note in Gundry, *Use of OT*, 57, mentions that Exod 24.8 is the only place in the Tanak where blood-sprinkling for cleansing is connected with a meal. It is not clear to me that "cleansing" is emphasized by the cutting of the covenant in Exod 24. Moreover, although a meal may be implied by the expression in Exod 24.11, "And he did not lay his hand on the chief men of the people of Israel; they beheld God, and ate and drank," it was not a paschal meal.

¹¹Lindars, *NT Apologetic*, 132-33, argues that the overall redemptive motive in Zechariah 9's eschatological setting favors the escape from Egypt; therefore the primary covenant-blood imagery is from Passover (not the Sinai covenant *per se*) in the Gospel use of Zech 9.11. Charette, *Recompense*, 77, argues that Zech 9.11 may be included with Exod 24.8 as influences on Mt 26.28.

¹²Charette, *op. cit.*, 77, although citing Exod 24.8, also mentions the need for restoration after the Sinai covenant was broken. Jesus' words about his covenant-blood being "poured out for many" for "the forgiveness of sins" recalls both the servant of Isa 53 and the new covenant of Jer 31. Matthew's use of

- (4) *Tg. Zech.* 9.11 is placed in a Passover/Exile setting; ¹³ a paschal (re-) interpretation is also reflected in the Synoptic Last Supper accounts.
- (5) *Zech* 9.11 concerns a covenant with Zion/Jerusalem; the Last Supper takes place in Jerusalem (Mt 26.18).
- (6) the abundance of allusions to, or echoes of, *Zechariah* 9-14 in the Passion Narrative upholds the likelihood that *Zechariah* may also be discerned here.¹⁴

On the strength of these arguments, it is perhaps more reasonable to allow a joint influence of these only two texts which contain the expression “the blood of the covenant” than to eliminate one text.

There is enough in the context of *Zechariah* 9.11-17, with its promise of deliverance, to suggest its influence on the Last Supper tradition. Jesus and his disciples have partaken of a Passover meal in Jerusalem; at some point, after they began to eat (26.21, 26) Jesus took the elements of bread and wine and reinterpreted them for a new context, “This is

περί rather than Mark’s ὑπέρ reflects LXX sacrificial terminology, providing an additional link with sacrificial language in *Isa* 53. The connection in *Zech* 9.11 “between the blood of the covenant and the liberation of the exiles is quite suggestive, especially when one considers...that it is those ‘exiles’ redeemed by the blood of Jesus who will be restored.”

¹³This Targum verse has been translated, “You also, for whom a covenant was made by blood, I have delivered you from bondage to the Egyptians, I have supplied your needs in a wilderness desolate as an empty pit in which there is no water.” Even if the covenant-blood was originally seen as that of *Exod* 24.8, this passage goes on to transfer covenantal significance to the blood of the Passover lambs. See Gordon’s notes to *Tg. Zech.* 9.11, 205-6 (notes 30-33).

¹⁴Gaston and Lindars both note the preponderance of *Zech* 9-13 material in the Passion Narrative. Lloyd Gaston, *No Stone*, 34, with reference to *Mark* 13, lists the following *Zechariah* *testimonia*: 9.9 (king riding an ass into Jerusalem); 9.11 (he writes “the blood of my covenant”); 9.14 (the advent of the Lord with a trumpet call) to save the flock (9.16); 10.3 (punishment of false prophets); 10.4 (from the flock will come the cornerstone); 10.8b (the Lord will signal and gather the dispersed); 12.2-3 (siege of Jerusalem); 12.10, cf. 13.1 (pouring of spirit and *testimonium* about the pierced one); 13.7 (shepherd struck and sheep scattered); 14.2 (fall of Jerusalem) 14.5 (Lord comes with his angels); 14.8 (living water flows from Jerusalem); 14.16 (those gathered will be survivors of the nations). Lindars interprets this as evidence to support the influence of *Zech* 9.11 on the “cup saying” at the Last Supper. With reference to *Matthew*, Lindars, *op. cit.*, 134, begins with the “Passion prophecy” of *Zech* 9.9, then moves to similar motive for the use of *Zech* 11.13 (treatment of Jesus before applied to Judas); *Zech* 12.10 (earliest was reference to method by which Jesus died); *Zech* 13.7 (same as 12.10, before applied to flight of disciples); and *Zech* 9.11 was an earlier gospel allusion to the blood of the covenant, which arose before more precise correlation of other passages, like *Exod* 24.8 and *Jer* 31.33. Lindars contends that *Zech* 9.11 is reminiscent of the escape from Egypt, via a blood covenant (*Exod* 12.22, 26-27, sacrifice of the Lord’s Passover).

my blood of the covenant...poured out for many.” On the surface level of the texts, both Mark 14.24 and Matthew 26.28 appear to be equally influenced by Zech 9.11. Is there anything in Matthew’s account that would suggest a deeper awareness of the Zechariah “blood of the covenant” text there?

In Matthew 1.21, the reader is told that Jesus was given his name to reflect his calling to “save his people from their sins.” Just as the portrayal of a savior figure was radically altered (from the expectation political deliverance, and/or restoration to the land) to signify *salvation from sins*, so also the *blood of the covenant* -- Jesus’ own blood (sacrificially understood)-- effects a radical understanding of the *forgiveness of sins*.¹⁵ The hope of deliverance, by the blood of the covenant, also resonates with themes from adjacent Zechariah texts -- the promise of a humble king who will come to bring peace (Zech 9.9-10), as well as salvation to his people (Zech 9.11,16; cf. Zech 8.7, 11-13, 20-23). If there is any increased perception of Zechariah motifs in Matthew’s account of the Last Supper, it derives from the cumulative effect of those themes that re-emerge from the Infancy Narrative with greater clarity.

¹⁵The saving “from sins” and “forgiveness of sins” of Mt 1.21 and 26.28 are a kind of inner-biblical allusion, an intra-gospel echo. Mt 26.28 reveals how Jesus will “save his people from their sins,” i.e., by his own blood shed for many, “for the forgiveness of (their) sins.” If there is Zechariah influence in Matthew’s sub-structure, its influence may be operative only on a subconscious level. One might also see some allusive resonance of Jesus’ blood/innocent-righteous blood in Mt 23 and in the Passion Narrative.

CHAPTER EIGHT
Jesus, the Stricken Shepherd
 The Prophecy Fulfilled
 [Matthew 26.31/Zechariah 13.7]

Mark's only explicit quotation of Zechariah occurs just after his account of the Last Supper. Although the context of the Matthean parallel is nearly identical, its citation of Zech 13.7 is somewhat altered:

Mt 26.30-32

Καὶ ὑμνήσαντες ἐξῆλθον εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν.
 Τότε λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς·
 πάντες ὑμεῖς σκανδαλισθήσεσθε
 ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ,
 γέγραπται γάρ·
 πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα,
 καὶ διασκορπισθήσονται τὰ πρόβατα
 τῆς ποίμνης.
 μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐγερθῆναί με προάξω ὑμᾶς
 εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν.

Mk 14.27-29

Καὶ ὑμνήσαντες ἐξῆλθον εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν.
 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι
 πάντες σκανδαλισθήσεσθε,
 ὅτι γέγραπται·
 πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα,
 καὶ τὰ πρόβατα διασκορπισθήσονται.
 ἀλλὰ μετὰ τὸ ἐγερθῆναί με προάξω ὑμᾶς
 εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν.

In these passages Zech 13.7 provides a scriptural warrant for Jesus' double announcement that his coming death is part of God's plan and that his disciples will abandon him in his time of trial. As the Zechariah quotation is interpreted, it reveals both the occasion and the manner of the "stumbling"-- striking the shepherd (Jesus) causes the sheep (disciples) to scatter. Matthew's addition of ὑμεῖς sharpens Jesus' claim that his disciples are among the πάντες who will be "scandalized," and ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ accentuates the imminence of their defection.

A comparison of extant versions of Zech 13.7 is helpful for analysis of the gospel texts:

חֲרֹב עֹרֵי עַל־רְעִי וְעַל־נֹכַח עֲמִיתִי נֹאֵם יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת
 הִךְ אֶת־הָרֹעֶה וְהַפְּזִיץ הַצֹּאֵן וְהָשִׁבֹתִי יָדִי עַל־הַצְּעָרִים

--Zech 13.7 MT¹

¹"Sword, awake against my shepherd, (and/namely) against the man who is my comrade," declares YHWH Sebaoth. "Strike the shepherd and the sheep/flock will scatter; and I will turn back my hand upon/against the little ones." This *hiphil* perfect of שׁב may be understood to indicate either that God's hand brings restoration or retribution to the little ones (see Holladay, *Concise Lexicon*, 362-3). The Zech 13.7-9 context may recall Isa 1.25-26, where God's hand turns against the people to refine them, with restoration as a result. The potential ambiguity in Zech 13.7 MT is demonstrated in two of

The majority of LXX manuscripts transform the singular object (shepherd) to plural and, without signaling a change of subject, convert the singular verbs in verse 7b to second-person plural; the object in verse 7c is changed from “little ones” to “shepherds”:

Ῥομφαία, ἐξεγέρθητι ἐπὶ τοὺς ποιμένας μου καὶ ἐπ’ ἄνδρα πολίτην μου, λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ· πατάξατε τοὺς ποιμένας καὶ ἐκσπάσατε τὰ πρόβατα, καὶ ἐπάξω τὴν χεῖρά μου ἐπὶ τοὺς ποιμένας. --Zech 13.7 LXX^B ²

Codex Alexandrinus (LXX^A) is the only extant version with a variant reading of verse

7b nearly the same as Matthew 26.31: τῆς ποιμνῆς appears neither in Mark nor (its equivalent) in any known Hebrew version of Zech 13.7, but only in Mt 26.31b and here: ³

Ῥομφαία· ἐξεγέρθητι ἐπὶ τὸν ποιμαίνα μου καὶ ἐπ’ ἄνδρα πολίτην αὐτοῦ, λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ· πάταξον τὸν ποιμένα καὶ διασκορπισθήσονται τὰ πρόβατα τῆς ποιμνῆς. Καὶ ἐπάξω τὴν χεῖρά μου ἐπὶ τοὺς ποιμένας. --Zech 13.7 LXX^A ⁴

Except for the future indicative πατάξω, the Zech 13.7b quotation in Matthew 26.31 is

its interpretations: (1) CD - B xix. (7)8-9 [for a translation of this excerpt from CD, see p 193 below]; and (2) Tg. Zech 13.7: “O sword, be revealed against the king and against the prince his companion who is his equal, who is like him, says the Lord of hosts; slay the king and the princes shall be scattered and I will bring a mighty stroke upon the underlings.” These differ on whether the shepherd is good or bad, and whether the “little ones” are shepherd boys (undershepherds?) or sheep. The Targum correctly reads “equal companion” but places him with a bad shepherd instead of as a good figure next to God. See below on LXX^A.

²LXX^B (Codex Vaticanus): “Sword, be raised against my shepherds and against the man who is my fellow-citizen,” says the Lord of hosts. “Strike [2 pl] the shepherds and pluck out/rescue the sheep, and I will lay my hand against the shepherds.” A variant tradition renders the last clause καὶ ἐπάξω τὴν χεῖρά μου ἐπὶ τοὺς μικροῦς. See note #29 below.

³On textual traditions of the Greek translations, see Gundry, *Use of OT*, 25-28. Stendahl, *School*, 80-83, labels LXX^B as tendentious. DeWaard, *OT Quotations*, 37-40, and Moo, *OT in Passion Narratives*, 183, agree that both LXX^A and LXX^Q are bearers of a Palestinian septuagintal tradition. I am unaware of any plausible explanations for the change to plural verbs in other Greek translations of Zech 13.7b.

⁴*The Codex Alexandrinus* (Royal Ms. 1 D v-viii) in *Reduced Photographic Facsimile*. Old Testament. Part III. Hosea-Judith. (London: British Museum, 1936). Note the variant spelling of “shepherd” in verse 7a (cf. 7b). Also note that ἄνδρα πολίτην is modified by αὐτοῦ, which is not found in the apparatus of Gottingensis, although it lists this variant for W Eus.ecl. The change of possessive pronoun from the MT first-person singular to third-person singular in LXX^A offers a reason for the plural “shepherds” in verse 7c. Perhaps this was done to remove any hint that God had a counterpart; rather, the shepherd figure had a counterpart; cf. Tg. Zech. 13.7 in note #1 above.

completely identical with LXX^A, as Mark 14.27 is with LXX^Q (Codex Marshallianus).⁵ LXX^A and LXX^Q, both of which preserve the sense of the MT better than LXX^B, also support the NT singular τὸν ποιμένα and the verb διασκορπισθήσονται. Πατάξω in the gospels may simply reflect a choice to underline God's agency in the striking, whether attributed to Mark's own hand or to his source.

It is difficult to determine the origin of Matthew's use of τῆς ποίμνης in 26.31. The fact that the additional phrase appears in both Zech 13.7 LXX^A and Mt 26.31 does not entail a direct relationship between the two; however, ποίμνη (flock) occurs just once (or twice) in the LXX and only four times in the NT.⁶ Possibly Matthew knew a textual tradition which, like LXX^A, incorporated τῆς ποίμνης, but this is not certain; likewise, one cannot establish that LXX^A derives from Matthew's Gospel.⁷ Nevertheless, it must have suited Matthew's purpose to transmit the longer reading of Zech 13.7b rather than to offer a direct translation of the Hebrew text, for he was certainly capable of translating Hebrew

⁵As DeWaard writes, 38, "A correction of LXX A and LXX Q on the basis of Mt and Mk, respectively, is impossible, because the imp. πάταξον would certainly have been exchanged for a fut. πατάξω in the case of a supposed correction and because both LXX codices give a better rendering of the Hebrew text traditions by their reading of the sing. τὸν ποιμένα." DeWaard's observations about LXX^A are correct with respect to verse 7b, but he fails to mention that LXX^A diverges from the MT in Zech 13.7a, c.

⁶Besides Mt 26.31, ποίμνη is found in Lk 2.8, Jn 10.16 and 1 Cor 9.7. Except for Zech 13.7 LXX^A, ποίμνη is found only in Gen 32.16(17); otherwise קָדָשׁ is translated upwards of 25 times by ποίμνιον in LXX. Ποίμνιον occurs only four times in the NT (Lk 12.32; Acts 20.28, 29; 1 Pet 5.2). Of course, if Matthew found τῆς ποίμνης in a Greek LXX tradition, there would be double certainty that he knew Zechariah was the original source for the quotation in Mark 14.27. (Nothing in the Genesis passage sheds light on this discussion.)

⁷Allison & Davies III, 485, suggest that Mt 26.31 preserves a reading known to Matthew, which was the source for "of the flock" in the gospel text. See Hagner II, 776. Soares Prabhu, *Formula Quotations*, 82, rejects the conformity of the gospel to LXX^A, which like LXX^Q now appears in an "obviously retouched form." I see no compelling reason to assume either that LXX^A is dependent upon Mt 26.31 or that Mt relies upon LXX^A; neither do I assume that the evangelist had access only to a Greek version like LXX^A and was therefore unable to compare such a reading with other traditions in Greek and Hebrew. If LXX^A were dependent upon Mt 26.31, whence the variants in Zech 13.7a,c?

into Greek.⁸ Matthew has been shown to have used multiple textual traditions in his theological exegesis on occasion: while one might further imagine that Matthew had before him the Hebrew text of Zech 13.7 (which supplied the singular *shepherd*; the semantic range of the collective רֶמֶשׂ includes both sheep and flock) and a Greek text like LXX^A (which corroborated τὸν ποιμένα in 7b, plus the more accurate verb διασκορπισθήσονται and τῆς ποιμνῆς), this is not evident in Matthew 26.31_{ff}.⁹

Certainty regarding the textual tradition is not possible, but other tentative suggestions for Matthew's Zech 13.7b reading may be advanced. Some scholars have proposed that the phrase "of the flock" is meant to stress the close relationship between the shepherd and his sheep.¹⁰ If Matthew himself added τῆς ποιμνῆς to his Markan source, it may be that he meant to distinguish between different groups understood as *sheep*, that is, between the crowds who were like "sheep without a shepherd" (Mt 9.36), those called the "lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Mt 10.6; 15.24), and the disciples who are identified as

⁸M. C. Black, "Rejected and Slain Messiah," 186, thinks that, because of the singular "shepherd," the Hebrew text is the source of both Mark's and Matthew's citations of Zech 13.7. Mark's source may have had access to the Hebrew, or equally may have found the singular in the tradition behind LXX^Q. See section above on Zech 9.9, which includes a discussion of Matthew's translation of Zech 9.9 MT in Mt 21.5 and of Isaiah 8.23-9.1 in Mt 4.14-16. I assume from CD-B that Zech 13.7 MT is close to the Hebrew of the time. (See discussion of CD-B below.)

⁹See above on Zech 10.2 MT & LXX in 9.36, where both the Hebrew and Greek traditions influence Matthew's use of Zech 10.2. Hypothetically, the tradition behind LXX^A alone can account for the version of Zech 13.7b in Mt 26.31, so one cannot prove that Mt used the Hebrew here, although the use of both *sheep* and *flock* to render רֶמֶשׂ may derive from knowledge of the Hebrew. It may also be possible that Matthew knew a tradition which, like CD-B, combined Zech 13.7 with "of the flock," whether in reference to Zech 11.11 or an interpretation of Zech 13. 8-9. (See discussion of CD-B below and note #23.)

¹⁰So Schweizer, *Matthew*, 492. See also Hagner II, 776; Gundry, *Matthew*, 530; and Stendahl, *School*, 81, who suggest literary and stylistic reasons for the additional phrase. I do not discount these possibilities, which fit well with the Matthean additions noted above, but the issue is more complex than a simple (singular) shepherd-sheep relationship suggests.

“sheep of the flock” in Mt 26.31.¹¹ Perhaps Matthew also intended τῆς ποίμνης to reinforce Jesus’ statement that even the disciples -- the sheep of *his* flock -- would be scandalized because of him and would desert him.¹² The focus here has shifted from Jesus and his band of disciples to the solitary figure of Jesus¹³ — in Gethsemane, they fall asleep as he prays, leaving him virtually alone to face suffering and death. Jesus will have to accomplish God’s purposes without human support.¹⁴

Most scholars agree that Mk 14.27 and Mt 26.31 are structured to be interpreted in parallel with their enclosed prophetic extract of Zech 13.7b: Jesus is the shepherd who will be struck and the disciples are the sheep who will scatter. However, scholarship is divided on the question of how much of the biblical text/context of Zechariah 13.7_{ff} the evangelists intended their readers to recall, that is, whether the shepherding metaphor from the quotation of Zech 13.7 continues to have influence beyond its immediate gospel setting.

This poses a multifaceted and very complex question. In its own framework,

¹¹Mt’s use of shepherd-sheep imagery is not monolithic. The crowds, compared to sheep (9.36), are surely distinct from disciples - “sheep of the flock” (26.31). The nature of “shepherding” traits also differs from place to place in the gospel; e.g. healing is in view at Mt 9.36, while “lost sheep” need to be found (18.12_f).

¹²The disciples had *all* partaken of an intimate meal where they heard that *one* of them would betray Jesus (26.20-29); here the rest are being told that they will *all* desert Jesus; see John Paul Heil, *Death and Resurrection*, 39-40. The close association between Jesus and his disciples was not merely fractured by the singular defection of Judas; their wholesale abandonment of him was foretold -- not even one disciple would remain at his side. The leaders of the people had already taken offense at him and the crowds no longer followed him (26.47; 27.15_{ff}).

¹³Peter’s underlying focus on himself in his denial of Jesus’ prediction illustrates this point.

¹⁴A. Descamps, “Rédaction et christologie dans le récit matthéen de la Passion,” in *L’Évangile selon Matthieu. Rédaction et théologie* (ed. M Didier, BETL 29; Gembloux: Duculot, 1972) 401_{ff}, makes a most important observation about some of Matthew’s changes to the Markan PN. He writes that Matthew underscores the centrality of the character of Jesus in the narrative; e.g., the addition of “because of me” sharpens the focus on Jesus in Mt 26.31, 3. Descamps notes that from the time he cites Zech 13.7 to the time of his arrest, Jesus is obedient to the divine will: Jesus alone understands the theological significance of every action, while neither his disciples nor his antagonists do. Only Jesus’ will and actions are in *unity* with God’s plan.

Zech 13.8-9 preserves God's promise to put a scant number of survivors into a refining fire, after which this purified eschatological remnant will call upon God, who then will renew the covenant with them.¹⁵ With respect to the context of Zech 13.7-9, these events take place after the shepherd figure has disappeared from the scene and after two-thirds of the people have already perished. In its canonical context, therefore, it is unrealistic to construe verses 8-9 to indicate that the shepherd figure *either* leads the sheep *or* precedes them at a future time to a place where he (re)gathers them -- the shepherd of 13.7 never reappears in Zechariah.

The question remains whether Zech 13.8-9 has been transferred from its canonical context to exert influence on Mk 14.28 and/or Mt 26.32 in a way its original context does not allow. Jesus predicts that the sheep will *scatter*, but does he also promise *as shepherd* to (re)gather the sheep? If so, does Zech 13.8-9 provide a *shepherding* subtext for Mark 14.28 and/or Mt 26.32? Scholars who pursue these lines of thought read the verb προάξω in Mk 14.28 and in Mt 26.32 as an almost technical shepherding term: Jesus, the shepherd, promises to lead his flock to Galilee after his resurrection.¹⁶ This "theme" is reinforced in

¹⁵The LXX seems to soften its interpretation of 13.7-9 somewhat. God's hand is more protective than judging; God brings the third *through* the fire, where MT is causative.

¹⁶Joel Marcus and M. C. Black are two scholars who, by different means, come to see an influence of Zech 13.8-9 on Mark 14.28. Black, "Rejected and Slain Messiah," 193, counters those who find Mark 14.27-28 to be too disjointed to belong together with the following reasoning: "...on closer examination..., verse 28 would appear to reflect Zech 13.8-9, the reuniting of the flock after being refined by fire. It continues the shepherd theme with the use of προάγω." Mark 14.27-31 "reflects a tradition which identifies Jesus as the smitten shepherd of Zech 13.7, stricken by God for the purpose of scattering *and then cleansing* the flock. Zech 13.7 is not simply about desertion but about desertion of a shepherd who is to be smitten but whose smiting will nevertheless lead to the refining and strengthening of the flock" [emphasis Black's]. I see no evidence to suggest that Zech 13.7-9 is about "desertion," nor that these gospel verses are about "cleansing the flock." Joel Marcus, *Way*, 154-55, allows that Mark 14.27b and 28 go in to "rather different directions." He thinks that Mark found verse 27 [i.e., the quotation of Zech 13.7] in his tradition but that he added verse 28 to reflect Zech 13.8-9. Mark's additional material, which incorporates the verb "to lead" (προάγειν) "continues the shepherd metaphor," which is found throughout Zech 9-14. Marcus equates the "restoration of Israel" promised in 13.8-9 with the use of a shepherding metaphor in 13.7. I see many problems with this equation, including the unquestioned acceptance of

Mark 16.7 (cf. Mt 28.7), where the women at the tomb are told, "...he is going before (προάγει) you to Galilee; there you will see him, as he told you." The issue here is not whether Jesus has promised that the disciples will see him after his resurrection, but whether anything from Zech 13.8-9 contributes to the interpretation of Mk 14.28 or Mt 26.32. Perhaps it is best not to assume that Mk 14.28 and Mt 26.32 have absolutely identical meanings in their own contexts; it may prove helpful to reserve judgment and to look at these texts separately, beginning with Mark.¹⁷

If one insists upon reading προάξω in Mark 14.28 as a "shepherding term," then Jesus is expected to "lead" his sheep to Galilee. There is scant evidence to support such a construal: there is no overlap in terminology between Zech 13.8-9 and Mark 14.27-28 to suggest verbal dependence; in fact, the prophetic verses shed no light on the meaning of this verb, since προάγω occurs nowhere in Zechariah LXX. Προάγω is better taken in the usual sense of "going before, to precede."¹⁸ Furthermore, if the promise that the disciples will

προάγω as a shepherding term. See below on Mt's lack of emphasis on "gathering" as a shepherding term, and Cousland's contribution to this topic, and see notes #30 - 32.

¹⁷See discussion below on Mt 28.7,10, which may indicate that Matthew altered the sense of Mark 16.7.

¹⁸*Pace* C. F. Evans, "I Will Go Before You to Galilee," *JTS* 5 (1954) 3-18. Evans, 9-11, tries to establish that προάγω means "to lead" in Mk 14.28. He admits that Mt does not "reproduce the classical and LXX usage" for προάγω, but he does not venture the opinion that Mt 26.32 might read the verb in a different sense from Mark. Evans' conclusions regarding the LXX and NT use of this verb are not beyond challenge. He cites Liddell and Scott in support of his understanding of the transitive of προάγω in classical usage; he sweeps through the LXX; he does not note the Hebrew verb, *אָבַח* (see Holladay, 227-28 for its primary meaning, "step up, come near, approach, step forth, bring up, take"), which προάγω translates in all 14 LXX uses. BAGD, 702, includes the definition of προάγω (in the transitive) of time, with the accusative of the person, as "go or come before someone;" examples of this usage include Mt 26.32||Mk 14.28; Mk 6.45; Mt 21.31. (See also Mt 14.22||Mk 6.45; Mt 21.9||Mk 11.9, and Mt 2.9.) It is obvious that Mk 16.7 refers back to 14.28 (cf. Mt 26.32, 28.7); however, nowhere do the Gospels record anything that might be construed to mean that Jesus did *lead* the disciples back to Galilee after his resurrection. I see no way in which a shepherding metaphor from Zechariah enhances this recapitulation or the appearances promised in Mk 16.7 and Mt 28.7. In the LXX, προάγω does not occur in any biblical text related to shepherding, neither in Zechariah nor in any other prophetic book. Of the 20 NT uses, not one gives unassailable support for a shepherd leading his flock here. See on Mt 28.7, 10 below.

see Jesus in Galilee points to a resurrection appearance, there is nothing in the Markan narrative to suggest that the eschatological scattering and purification of the disciples on a scale required by Zech 13.8-9 could have taken place; Mark does not report that the disciples did “follow” Jesus to Galilee. If the Parousia is the focal point of the promise, problems also arise with the abrupt ending of Mark, problems which obviate reading προάγω as a shepherding term in Mk 14.28.¹⁹ *Gathering* is possible only in the sense that the disciples will regroup in Galilee and will see Jesus there.²⁰ In both cases, the hypothetical shepherding link between verses 27 and 28 of Mark 14 dissolves.²¹ *Gathering* as opposed to *scattering* is not the best way to characterize the purpose behind Jesus’ citation of Zech 13.7b, especially not in any sense which would draw in imagery or motifs

¹⁹A further complication arises when “there you will see him” is factored into the equation: is this meant to be understood in terms of a resurrection appearance or of the Parousia? Gundry, *Matthew*, 530, contradicts the shepherding interpretation of προάξω and sees no reference to the Parousia in Mk 14.28. He notes that “going before them” in the shepherding sense precludes the disciples “seeing” Jesus “coming in the clouds.” This observation by Gundry also demonstrates the undue stress many exegetes have put on “you/they will see” in the apocalyptic discourse and texts possibly related to it. In a different vein, C. F. Evans, “I will go before you into Galilee,” 12-18, interprets προάξω and “Galilee” here as a call to gentile missions rather than a prediction of resurrection appearance of Jesus or a promise of the Parousia. Evans says Mark’s use of Zechariah here, as elsewhere, is meant to interpret the last week of Jesus’ life as the “judgement and redemption of the last days.” Evans, 8, 15-16, like Marcus, *Way of the Lord*, 159-61, is also especially interested in the themes of *Gentiles* and the *Temple*.

²⁰With respect to Mk 14.28, Zech 13.8-9, and the use of προάξω, Douglas Moo, *OT in Passion Narratives*, 215-17, suggests that reading a parallel structure between Mk 14.27 and 28 recognizes “Jesus’ death as the event which leads to the scattering of the disciples [as contrasted with] his resurrection as the event which enables the scattered flock to be reconstituted.” It is only in this very limited sense that the wider context of Zech 13.8-9 can be said to undergird Mk 14.27-28. This is a weak argument which does not hold up under scrutiny. Nothing in Zech 13.8-9 forges a link between the concepts expressed in Mk 14.27-28 or Mt 26.31-32.

²¹Allowing the evangelists some license to be creative in their exegesis of Zech 13.7-9 still falls short of what would be necessary to incorporate 13.8-9 into a list of probable allusions in the gospel texts. The use of Zech 13.7b is fairly straightforward, especially in contrast with the scenario envisioned for Zech 13.8-9. This is especially true of the short period of time between Jesus’ death and the Galilee appearance in Mt 28. Speculation abounds as to whether a “lost” resurrection account is now “missing” from the end of Mark’s gospel. For the purposes of this discussion, it is unlikely that the question of Zech 13.8-9 influence would be affected in any case. As Gundry, *Matthew*, 530, suggests, Matthew would [most likely] have known Mark’s original ending, whether the promised appearance was a resurrection event or the Parousia. See below on Wilcox’s argument.

from Zech 13.8-9.²²

It is intriguing to ask whether reflection on the events of 66-70 C. E. would support a broader reading of this Zechariah context in Mark 14.27-28, that is, whether the Markan community may have sensed an extended allusion to Zechariah 13.7-9, irrespective of what the Matthean community would later understand. Joel Marcus compares the function of Zech 13.7 in Mark 14.27-8 with its use in the Damascus Document:

“Wake up, sword, against my shepherd, and against the male who is my companion - oracle of God - wound the shepherd and scatter the flock and I shall return my hand upon the little ones.” Those who are faithful to him are the poor ones of the flock. These shall escape in the age of the visitation; but those that remain shall be delivered up to the sword when there comes the messiah of Aaron and Israel. --CD-B xix. (7)8-11a²³

Both communities believed they were near the eschatological “time of visitation” and both groups would have interpreted the promises of Zech 13.8-9 in a sectarian fashion — *they* were going to be saved when their corrupt national/religious leaders were visited with judgment.²⁴ Marcus says:

This motif of the flock’s salvation is drawn from the immediately following Zechariah verses, 13:8-9, even though they are not quoted; the Qumran text is thus structurally similar to Mark 13:27-29, which first quotes part of Zech. 13:7-9, then alludes to its continuation.... A further contact between the Qumran document and Mark 14:27-28 is that in the former

²²See below on Matthew’s use of “gathering,” which is *not* predominantly used as a shepherding term.

²³Translation of CD-B xix. (7)-11a taken from García Martínez, *DSS Translated*, 45. The occurrence of the expression, “the poor of the flock,” (one reading of the consonantal text) in Zech 11.11 and in CD-B (xix. 9) recalls scholarly questions about the placement of Zech 13.7-9 with respect to Zech 11 [see DeWaard, 39-40, n. 5], the issue of the good and evil shepherd imagery in Zech 9-13 passages, and how this might have been read at the turn of the eras, irrespective of canonical placement. More pertinent to Matthew than to Mark, one may ask if LXX^A and/or Matthew’s tradition equated the “poor of the flock (Zech 11.11MT)” with the “little ones” of Zech 13.7c MT? This is especially suggestive in light of Mt 18.6 and 26.31. One might query whether Zech 11.11 may have influenced Mt’s use of τῆς ποιμνῆς, substituting *sheep* for *poor* “of the flock.”

²⁴See also Marcus, “The Jewish War and the *Sitz im Leben* of Mark,” 44-62. Gaston, *No Stone*, 480_n, ties gathering the scattered sheep with Mk 16 (and Mt 28) in an elaborate interpretation of Mark’s equation between the destruction of the temple, the death of Jesus, and the last judgment. A detailed evaluation of Markan scholarship is outside the scope of this thesis; however, Marcus’ work on the Jewish War and its impact on Mark’s gospel is most intriguing.

the “poor of the flock” who receive the Zecharian promise of restoration are the faithful members of the elect community, just as in Mark they are the stumbling but ultimately faithful disciples of Jesus.... For Mark, the occurrences of Jesus’ last night on earth inaugurate the time of eschatological testing spoken of by Zechariah, a time in which the shepherd of God’s people will be struck and the people themselves will be tested to the breaking point.²⁵

There is nothing specific, however, in either text to suggest that the community who preserved CD-B or Mark’s community reflected on the *fiery* purification here, although line 9 in this CD-B passage may equate the “faithful to him...the poor of the flock” as those purified ones who call upon God. Nowhere in Mark’s Gospel does “poor of the flock” occur; in fact, Mark never uses ἡ ποίμνη or τό ποίμνιον. In the gospels, Jesus refers to *himself* as the shepherd; it is unclear whether the shepherd of Zech 13.7 in CD-B was regarded as a messianic figure.²⁶

Especially with respect to the Markan Passion Narrative, scholars have extended the question of possible Zech 13.7-9 influence beyond the isolated focus of Mark 14.27-28, 50 and 16.7. For example, Max Wilcox reads Mark’s Zechariah 13.7 citation as a “keynote passage” which directs the reader to the eschatological significance of all that happened on the Mount of Olives, at least until the arrest of Jesus, possibly to the end of Mark 14. For Wilcox, the main function of Zech 13.7b in Mark 14.27 is neither Jesus’ prediction of Peter’s denial nor the defection of the disciples, but rather the foreshadowing of “the time of testing” from all of Zechariah 13.7 - 14.4.²⁷ In response to Wilcox, one must emphasize

²⁵Marcus, *Way of the Lord*, 158-59.

²⁶R.T. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, 176-77, sees the figure as a leading member of the community but not as a messiah. The community of CD-B did think of itself as the “poor of the flock.”

²⁷Max Wilcox, “The Denial-Sequence in Mark xiv.26-31, 66-72,” *NTS* 17 (1970-71) 426-36. Black, 191, in agreement with his argument, cites Wilcox’s conclusion. Black says that the “allusion” to Zech 13.8 is “integral” to Mark’s quotation of Zech 13.7, and that Mk 16.7 refers back to it. Allison, *End of the Ages*, 34-35, agrees that the “extensive correlation” between Zech 13.7-14.5 and Mark 14-16 should not be credited to chance. I agree with Wilcox that the Mount of Olives is very significant [more so to Mt,

that there is neither an overlap in vocabulary nor a clear *refining* or *remnant* motif in the Galilee references (Mk 14.28; cf. Mt 26.32). Nothing from Zech 13.8-9 influences the narrative when the disciples abandon Jesus at his arrest (Mk 14.50; cf. Mt 26.56b); moreover, nothing of Zechariah is detected when the women at the tomb are told to inform the disciples that Jesus is going before them to Galilee (Mk 16.7; cf. Mt 28.7). Critical observations can also be made with respect to the proposed influence from Zech 14.1^{ff}, which in its canonical context deals with an eschatological attack on Jerusalem, climaxed by the Lord going forth to fight on Jerusalem's behalf. Although eschatological overtones may be discerned from the Passion Narrative passages in view, no clear echo of Zech 14.1-4 is heard. The only way for Wilcox's main thesis to be valid would be to establish that Mark understood Jesus' προάγω-statement to refer to a still-future Parousia event. In such a case, Mark's community might have interpreted its trials as the period of fiery eschatological testing. The events of the *Jewish War* might have allowed the extended context of Zech 13.7-9[-14.4] to be read back into the Markan Passion Narrative. Zech 13.7-14.4 is an intriguing interpretive template for Mark, but there is not enough textual evidence to warrant an enthusiastic endorsement of Wilcox's thesis, particularly with reference to Zech 13.8-9.²⁸

If one cannot render a sure verdict with respect to the circumstances underlying the Markan composition -- that is, whether an extended Zechariah subtext might have

perhaps, than to Mark]; I do not agree that an extended context of Zech 13.7-14.4, which Wilcox envisions as exerting influence on Mark, can be applied equally to Matthew. See below on the Mount of Olives.

²⁸Douglas Moo, *OT in Passion Narratives*, 215-17, disagrees with Wilcox on other grounds, including Wilcox's estimation that the quotation of Zech 13.7 is an "aside" and not suited to its context in the gospel. The shift in subject matter at Zech 14.1, between the purified remnant and the Mount of Olives material, also precludes reading Zech 13.7-9 and 14.4 together as basis for the "time of testing" foreshadowed. I agree with Moo's assessment here.

functioned on some level for Mark 14.27-28 -- one is even less able to envision a deliberate allusion to Zech 13.8-9 in Matthew 26.31-32, especially with Matthew 28 in view. Given the first evangelist's facility with Hebrew and Greek, one would expect a wider influence of Zech 13.7-9 to be evidenced by an allusion to (or echo of) verse 7c in the Mt 26.31 quotation. For example, the more accurate variant Greek tradition (καὶ ἐπάξω τὴν χεῖρά μου ἐπὶ τοὺς μικρούς) would suit this situation very well.²⁹ Or, if Matthew understood the time between Jesus' arrest and the meeting envisioned in Galilee (Mt 26.32) as a period of eschatological testing, he could have added comments, such as he included in Chapter 10 or 24, to underscore the tribulations the disciples would face before they met Jesus again. Moreover, the time-frame imposed on the narrative by Matthew 28.7-10 -- when the women see the angel at the tomb and then meet Jesus nearby -- and 28.16-20, when the eleven see Jesus on the mountain in Galilee, does not allow enough narrative time for eschatological testing as suggested by the Zechariah 13.8-9 passage to take place. The wording Matthew employs in 28.7 is not identical to Mark 16.7, and the First Gospel also has a follow-up comment in 28.10 that affects the meaning of προάγω in Mt 26.32:

ἀλλὰ ὑπάγετε εἶπατε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ ὅτι
προάγει ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν· ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν ὄψεσθε, καθὼς εἶπεν ὑμῖν. --Mk 16.7

But go tell his disciples and Peter that he goes before you to Galilee;
there he will meet you, just as he told you.

²⁹Variant from B-S*. Hagner II, 777, notes that μικρούς here is in parallel with πρόβατα [LXX (B-S*)]; elsewhere it modifies τοὺς ποιμένας, another indication of textual confusion, in my view. If Matthew knew the Greek Zech 13.7c tradition including μικρούς, he chose not to utilize this clause containing מִקְרוּתִים/μικρούς (little ones). The Matthean Jesus does use μικρός with reference to "little ones" who believe in him elsewhere (10.42; 18.6, 10-14); μικρότερος, "least in the kingdom of heaven" (11.11); and ἐλάχιστος, "least of these [my brethren]" (25.40, 45). However, Matthew may have wished to reserve the use of μικρός/μικρότερος/ἐλάχιστος to refer to those who believed in Jesus without having to address the question of God's hand (in Zech 13.7c) being raised against "the little ones" of his community. In such a case, Matthew would not have added the final clause.

καὶ ταχὺ πορευθεῖσαι εἶπατε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ὅτι ἠγέρθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν,
καὶ ἰδοὺ προάγει ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν ὄψεσθε· ἰδοὺ εἶπον ὑμῖν. --Mt 28.7

And go quickly (and) tell his disciples that he has risen from the dead,
and behold, he goes before you to Galilee; there you will see him; behold, I told you.

τότε λέγει αὐταῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· μὴ φοβεῖσθε· ὑπάγετε ἀπαγγείλατε
τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου ἵνα ἀπέλθωσιν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, κάκεῖ με ὄψονται. --Mt 28.10

Then Jesus said to them, Fear not. Go and tell my brothers to go to Galilee;
they will see me there.³⁰

Matthew 24, like Mark 13, mentions “gathering,” but the imagery is *not* of a shepherd figure leading the flock somewhere nor gathering them in the Eschaton; rather, the Son of Man will send angels to the four corners to gather the elect (Mt 24.31; Mk 13.27). Matthew retains this imagery in the judgment scene of 25.31_{ff} -- the angels are present with the Son of Man, and before him the nations are *gathered* to be separated as sheep from goats.³¹ The only time the Matthean *Jesus* himself is directly associated with gathering people is found in his lament, in 23.37, that Jerusalem repeatedly refuses to be “gathered” by him; in its context this lament implies that Jerusalem has rejected Jesus the prophet (cf. 23.29-35).³²

³⁰I read Mt 28.10 as being roughly equivalent to 28.7, i.e., Jesus repeats the essence of the message the angel gave the women at the tomb. “Brethren” means “disciples.” There is no sense of Jesus *leading* them to Galilee here.

³¹J. R. C. Cousland, *The Crowds in the Gospel of Matthew* (Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill, 2002) 170, remarks, “While the motif of the shepherd ‘gathering’ his flock is conspicuously lacking in the first gospel, its absence actually contributes to Matthew’s exalted depiction of Christ.” Cousland makes much of the crowds “following” Jesus rather than Jesus “gathering” followers. Although Cousland mentions Mt 26.31 twice (and Zech 13.7 once), he does so more in passing than in exposition.

³²The two main terms for “gather” in Matthew are συνάγω and ἐπισυνάγω (the latter only at 23.37 and 24.31). In addition to 24.31, the angels/reapers are said to gather the wheat (and weeds) in 13.30 (cf. the Baptist’s expectations in 3.12). The only place other than 23.37 where Jesus talks about gathering himself is 12.30, “...who does not gather with me scatters” (see also 25.24). Before the PN, the crowds *gathered* about Jesus (13.2) and after his trial they *gathered* before Pilate to request Barabbas instead of Jesus (27.17); a battalion of soldiers *gathered* before Jesus in a mock coronation (27.17). The most common use of *gathering* in Mt refers to those who are opposed to him (chief priests, scribes, Pharisees, elders, in different combinations), in the Infancy Narrative (2.4) and in the Passion Narrative (22.34, 41; 26.3, 57; 27.62; and 28.12). There is little, if any, evidence to support a pastoral emphasis in Matthew’s use of *gathering* imagery; Jesus does not specifically *gather* the disciples.

In Matthew 26.31, Jesus' citation of Zechariah 13.7 functions on multiple levels. The earlier passion predictions brought the matter of Jesus' violent death to their attention; now Jesus informs his disciples that their response to his situation will be one of "falling away."³³ This prediction of their "collapse of faith" in Mt 26.30 is supported by the Zech 13.7 quotation in verse 31: "the shepherd will receive a mortal blow, and the sheep will flee even at the prospect of this calamity"³⁴ -- the disciples do not remain with Jesus until his death but flee when he is arrested. The promise of Jesus in Mt 26.32, "I will go before you to Galilee," recalled by the angel in Mt 28.7, assures the disciples that their desertion will not be permanent.³⁵

The Matthean Jesus' use of Zechariah 13.7 also certifies that Jesus himself is a prophet: he understands biblical prophecy, he interprets it authoritatively, and he applies its message as a revelation of God's will concerning himself.³⁶ The earlier passion predictions

³³Jesus announced that one of his disciples would betray him (26.21); in the context of Mt 26.31-35, all the remaining disciples were told they would be scandalized because of him, and that Peter would deny him. The verb changes from παραδίωμι to σκανδαλίζω to ἀπαρνέομαι. With respect to Mt 26.30 || Mk 14.26, Jesus' exchange with Peter in Mt 26.33-35 || Mk 14.29-30, is suggestive of Peter's earlier rebuke of Jesus (only in Mt 16.22) and Jesus' response, ὑπάγε ὀπίσω μου, σατανά · σκάνδαλον εἶ ἐμοῦ, ὅτι οὐ φρονεῖς τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀλλὰ τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων (unique to Mt 16.23). As with the first passion prediction, so also at the final explication of the Passion, Peter refused to accept Jesus' word. With this in mind, one sees that the cause for scandal in the disciples must be more than Jesus' refusal to resist arrest; it may include their refusal to accept that God would permit the Messiah to be killed. A full discussion of Matthew's use of σκανδαλίζω (Mt 13.21, 13.57||Mk 6.3-4; 15.12; 17.24-27; 18.6||Mk 9.42||Lk 17.2; 24.10) and σκάνδαλον (appearing in the gospels only in Mt 13.41; 16.23, 18.7||Lk 17.1) is outside the scope of this thesis; neither term occurs in Zech LXX. (See Heil, *Death and Resurrection*, 38-40, the commentaries by Hare, *Matthew*, 299, Hagner II, 776, and others, on these Greek verbs in their contexts.)

³⁴Hagner II, 777.

³⁵*Ibid.*, where Hagner refers to Mt 26.32 as a "parenthetical statement," which provides the "consoling thought that the smitten shepherd and the scattered sheep will be reunited." The dominant theme here remains Jesus' death, however.

³⁶For Matthew, although it is not a completely adequate identification, Jesus does function as a prophet, which may relate to Matthew's emphasis on fulfilled prophecy. In the First Gospel Jesus fulfills prophecy in several ways. The entry to Jerusalem can be read on one level as two enacted parables (21.1-9, 10-16), for example. With respect to the entry to Jerusalem, Hartmut Gese, *Essays on Biblical Theology*, (trans. K. Crim; Mineapolis: Augsburg, 1981), 150, says, "Here with the combining of the basic apocalyptic

revealed Jesus' knowledge of the circumstances of his death: he must go to Jerusalem, where the elders, chief priests and scribes would cause him to suffer; they would condemn him to death and deliver him to Gentiles, who would mock, scourge and crucify him; yet on the third day he would be raised (Mt 16.21, 17.22-23, 20.18-19). As on the way to Jerusalem, he had predicted his death and resurrection there, as he had predicted that he would be delivered up to be crucified around Passover (only in Mt 26.2), and as he had revealed that one of the twelve would betray him (Mt 26.21), he now clarifies that his death is divinely ordained. Mt 26.31-32 is, in one sense, a recapitulation of the passion predictions in Matthew -- once more Jesus tells his disciples that he will be killed and then be raised.³⁷ This time he cites the Zechariah prophecy to substantiate his own prophetic statement. Not only was one of his close disciples about to hand him over to his foes, but the remaining disciples would *all* be "scandalized" *because of him* and would scatter -- Peter would even deny him (Mt 26.31-34). Jesus' predictions in Mt 26.31-32 have been fulfilled in 26.51-54, in 26.56 and in 26.69-75.³⁸

tradition of the coming of the kingdom of God and the messianic tradition, we have a central passage in the history of messianic thought. Zechariah 9:9-10 is not merely cited in the New Testament as having been fulfilled; its fulfillment is portrayed." Mt 23.29_{fr} also suggests that Jesus is one of the prophets whose righteous blood will be shed in Jerusalem.

³⁷Instead of Zech 13.8-9 influence, it is better simply to recognize that Matthew 26.32 follows 26.31 as in Jesus' previous three passion predictions: he will be killed but afterward he will be raised. (Hare, 299, also notes the similarity of 26.31-32 with passion predictions.) The crucifixion prediction of 26.2 is the only place where Jesus' death is mentioned in a context apart from the resurrection. The promise of 26.32 (that Jesus will return to Galilee after his death and resurrection) is something new, but because Jesus is a true prophet, it is a reliable word.

³⁸At Mt 26.51-54, the disciple who strikes the High Priest's servant with a sword has resisted the will of God as revealed in Zech 13.7||Mt 26.31 (see Heil, *Death & Resurrection*, 51). At 26.56, the disciples all flee, just after Jesus mentions the fulfillment of the "scriptures of the prophets" -- this "scattering" at Jesus' arrest and not at his death suggests that the issue is the disciples' resistance to the Passion, which goes back to Peter's rebuke of Jesus at 16.22-23. The first passion prediction (16.21) -- in which Jesus said he must go to Jerusalem, suffer many things from the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed -- is coming close to fulfillment at Mt 26.47. After the cock crows, (26.74-75) Peter remembers Jesus' saying that he would deny him. The additional "of the prophets" is found only in Matthew, and it serves to

The primary focus of the Zechariah 13.7 quotation in Matthew, however, is not on Judas, nor Peter and the other disciples, but on Jesus, the *shepherd* who is about to be struck. The intended identification of the shepherd figure(s) in Zech 9-13 is notoriously difficult, but the historical question has little bearing on the appropriation of Zechariah shepherd motif(s) in the New Testament. The good vs. bad shepherd imagery may be relevant, but more important for Matthew's use of shepherd imagery is whether and how his tradition understood the various Zechariah shepherding texts (9.16; 10.2-3; 11.3-17; (12.10-14?); 13.7) to illuminate the life, ministry, and passion of Jesus.³⁹ The prophetic text certifies that this shepherd will be left alone to face his violent death; all that follows is part of the foreknowledge and providence of God.

highlight which scriptures are being fulfilled; this also reinforces the Matthean emphasis on prophecy in Mt 26.31 by supporting Jesus' own prophetic statement with the words of a prophet (Zech 13.7). This is a very powerful example of a fulfillment citation, but it is on Jesus' lips here and not introduced with a typical Matthean "fulfillment formula" by the narrator.

³⁹ In his Zechariah commentary, 283, Ralph Smith contends that, whatever the historical setting of the oracle was, Jesus interpreted it eschatologically and saw himself as the smitten shepherd of Zech 13.7. Keener, 635-36, writes, "The scattering of the flock when the shepherd was struck (26:31) stems from Zechariah 13:7, which in its immediate context could refer to false prophets (Zech 13:2-6), but given the singular and the shepherd image of Zechariah 11:9-13, to which Matthew alluded in 26:15, he may understand it messianically.... The fact that the Qumran community also interpreted this text eschatologically (CD 19.5-9)... perhaps testifies to a broader eschatological reading in Matthew's day of which he could make apologetic use." (See ch 9 below on Judas and Zech 11.)

CHAPTER NINE
Jesus and the Price of His Betrayal
 Judas Sells the Shepherd for Thirty Pieces of Silver
 [Matthew 26.14-16; 27.3-10/Zechariah 11.4-13]

The Gospels all mark Judas' betrayal of Jesus;¹ Mark and Luke record Judas' offer to betray Jesus to the chief priests (and officers, Luke 22.4), to which their glad response includes the promise of money, presumably to be paid after the deed is done (Mk 14.10-11; Lk 22.4-6; cf. Jn 13.18-30). Only Matthew gives details of Judas asking the chief priests how much they will give him to deliver Jesus to them, followed by their payment to him of thirty pieces of silver:

Τότε πορευθεῖς εἰς τῶν δώδεκα, ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰούδας Ἰσκαριώτης, πρὸς τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς εἶπεν· τί θέλετέ μοι δοῦναι, καὶ γὰρ ὑμῖν παραδώσω αὐτόν; οἱ δὲ ἔστησαν αὐτῷ τριάκοντα ἀργύρια. καὶ ἀπὸ τότε ἐζήτει εὐκαιρίαν ἵνα αὐτὸν παραδῶ.
 --Mt 26.14-16²

Judas' act of betrayal and its tragic consequences may be seen as the two foci of an ellipse that encompasses the text between Matthew 26.2 and 27.26.³

¹The betrayal is noted early in the First Gospel when Judas is introduced as the one who betrayed Jesus, ὁ καὶ παραδοὺς αὐτόν (Mt 10.4). It is anticipated in the second passion prediction, when Jesus informs his disciples that he will be *handed over* and killed (Mt 17.22-23). In the third passion prediction, Jesus says he will be *delivered* into the hands of the chief priests and scribes, who will *hand him over* to Gentiles to be crucified (Mt 20.18-19). The last prediction that he will be *handed over* to be crucified is embedded in the Passion Narrative (Mt 26.2). Judas betrays Jesus to the chief priests and elders; they, in turn, hand Jesus over to Pilate (Mt 27.2); and when Pilate has released Barabbas to the people, he *delivers* Jesus to be crucified (Mt 27.26). In each instance, whether translated "betray, hand over, deliver," the verb is παραδίδωμι. It occurs both in the participial (Judas is the *betray*) and in the active (chief priests, elders, Pilate *deliver* Jesus) and passive forms (Jesus is *handed over*).

²"Then one of the Twelve who was called Judas Iscariot approached the chief priests, and he said, 'What are you willing to give me to hand him over to you?' So they weighed out thirty silver coins for him, and from then on he was seeking a good opportunity to betray him." No other biblical text specifies the amount paid to Judas; he is not mentioned again after Jesus' arrest, except in Mt 27.3-10 and Acts 1.15-20, which also acknowledges that Judas was guide to those who arrested Jesus, that he received a reward for this deed, and that he died horribly. Acts relates variant traditions of the purchase of the field, Akeldama, and of Judas' death.

³Of the Gospels, only Mt relates Judas' remorse, his return of the thirty pieces of silver, and his death. The allusions to Zech 11 are found only in Mt's Passion Narrative, already rich in Zech motifs. On ellipse, see below.

In Matthew 26.15b the phrase, οἱ δὲ ἔστησαν αὐτῷ τριάκοντα ἀργύρια (“and they weighed out for him thirty silver coins”) is the chief priests’ immediate response to Judas’ request for payment to betray Jesus. The eleventh chapter of Zechariah contains a strikingly similar expression.⁴ In Zech 11.4 God tells the prophet to “shepherd the flock doomed to slaughter.” The prophet’s employers (the *traffickers in the sheep*) reportedly recognize his *enacted* covenant breaking as “the word of the Lord,” but the sheep detest him (Zech 11.7-11).⁵ The prophet-shepherd soon loses patience and refuses to continue as their shepherd; he asks for his wages, and they weigh out for him thirty shekels of silver:

וַיִּשְׁקְלוּ אֶת־שֶׁכֶרִי שֶׁל־שִׁים בְּסֶפֶר --Zech 11.12b MT

καὶ ἔσθησαν τὸν μισθόν μου πριάκοντα ἀργυροῦς --Zech 11.12b LXX

He obeys God’s order to cast the “lordly price” to the temple treasury/potter

(Zech 11.13a).⁶

⁴There are several conflicting pictures of shepherd-figures in Zechariah 9-13, and Chapter 11 is very difficult to interpret in its own context. Representative of this view, *IB* states, “There is no more enigmatic section in the Bible than [Zech 11.4-14].” [This oracle] “takes the form of a parable acted out in imitation of the dramatic parables of older prophets...[here] merely a literary device, since the actions could not possibly have been performed.” Hanson, *Dawn of Apocalyptic*, 343, agrees that Zech 11.4-14 “bears striking resemblance to the prophetic sign-act though it departs from that genre in including elements which the shepherd would have been incapable of acting out, and in moving back and forth between sign and interpretation.”

⁵The vocalization of the Hebrew לֶכֶן עֲנִי, “poor of the flock,” seems a less likely reading here for Zech 11.7, 11 MT; “traffickers in the sheep” reflects the LXX reading, which takes the consonantal text as לֶכֶן עֲנִי. For a summary of the arguments for “traffickers of the sheep” versus “poor of the flock,” see Mike Butterworth, *Structure and the Book of Zechariah*. (JSOTSup 130; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992)208-10, who says, of the thirty shekels of silver, that they “represent at least the low value placed by either the ‘traffickers in the sheep’ or the ‘poor of the flock’ on the services of God’s shepherd.” In either case, those who weigh out the thirty pieces of silver are representatives of the “flock,” the people of Israel. Nowhere in Zech 11 do the people, whether “poor of the flock,” or “traffickers in the sheep,” demonstrate a positive response to their shepherd; therefore, Zechariah annuls the covenant “with all the peoples” in the enacted scene (Zech 11.10).

⁶Not all scholars hold that the amount of silver (the price of a Hebrew slave, Ex 21.32) is an insult or that the act of casting the silver into the temple is meant sarcastically; on the latter, see especially Meyers II, 276-79. Where the prophet throws the thirty silver shekels will be discussed below in the section on Mt 27.3-10. Whatever the term(s) meant, Zechariah reports that he cast the thirty shekels there in the

The irony of Zechariah 11 transfers to the Matthean context, even if the details are radically altered. In its canonical setting, the payment of thirty silver coins to Zechariah reflects the negative evaluation of his shepherding by the *traffickers in the sheep*, presumably some leaders of Israel. In the Matthean setting, when Judas asks the chief priests to set a price on the head of Jesus, they weigh out the same number of silver coins. In both stories, the ministry of God's representative is rejected by Israel's religious leaders, and, in both stories, the coins are thrown back into the temple (Zech 11.13; Mt 27.5).

Had there been no further reference to Judas and the thirty pieces of silver, the case for the influence of Zechariah 11 on Matthew 26.15 remains strong.⁷ The phrase, "and they weighed out for him thirty silver coins," is very close to Zech 11.12.⁸ Nothing else in the MT or LXX comes close to this near-quotation which Matthew draws from Zech 11.⁹ Its usage is consistent with other additions of Zechariah allusions to the Passion Narrative and elsewhere in the First Gospel.¹⁰ Here Matthew's narrative fills out the offer (or agreement) of the Markan chief priests to pay Judas by recording the amount and payment

"house of the Lord" (Zech 11.13b).

⁷Sometimes it seems that scholars are in such a rush to explain the reference to Jeremiah in Mt 27.9-10 that they overlook the clear case for Zechariah influence here in Mt 26.14-16.

⁸The minor differences are accounted for by the necessary change of person, use of the plural noun ἀργύρια (cf. Mk 14.11) in place of LXX ἀργυροῦς, and omission of the term wages (reward) — μισθός, שכר.

⁹Nothing in the context of Exod 21.32 commends it as a referent for Mt 26.15; if the price of a slave had influenced the amount in Zech 11.12, it exerts no special influence on Matthew. Moo, *OT in Passion Narratives*, 188, finds it improbable that Exod 21.32 has any direct bearing on Matthew's allusion. Sief Van Tilborg, "Matthew 27.3-10: An Intertextual Reading," in *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings* (ed. Draisma; Kampen: Uitgeversmaatschappij, 1989), 167, doubts that Matthew's readers would immediately think "the price of a slave" at the mention of "thirty pieces of silver."

¹⁰For example, Matthew adds the citation of Zech 9.9 to his account of Jesus' entry to Jerusalem in Mt 21.5. See also the discussions of the influence of Zech 1.1; 9.14; 12.10; 14.4-5, etc., elsewhere in the thesis.

itself (Mt 26.14-16; cf. Mk 14.10-11). The importance of Zech 11 for Matthew lies in the valuation of the prophet-shepherd figure by his opponents: in Zechariah, it is the *value* of the prophet's shepherding ministry; in Matthew, it is the *price* paid for Jesus. The theme of the rejected (good) shepherd in Zechariah 11.4-14 returns in Mt 27.3-10.

Although this allusion to Zechariah is clear in Matthew 26.15, its importance is sometimes de-emphasized because the Zech 11.12-13 material in Mt 27.3-10 has been attributed to Jeremiah. However, evidence marshaled to substantiate the informed use of both Zechariah and Jeremiah motifs in the final Judas section effectively will remove any suggestion that Matthew himself knew little of the Zechariah corpus.

It is well to seek reasons for the inclusion of the additional Judas pericope in Matthew 27.3-10 before one delves into the complicated citation at its conclusion (27.9-10). The larger text serves at least two functions: first, it tells the outcome of Judas' act of treachery; and, second, it lays the bloodguilt of Jesus' death at the feet of Jerusalem's religious leaders.¹¹ It should come as no surprise that Matthew notes the *fulfillment* of Jesus' predictions recorded in the Passion Narrative: e.g., predictions of the betrayal by one disciple (Mt 26.21) and the flight of the rest (Mt 26.31) are both reported in the account of Jesus' arrest (Mt 26.47-56); Peter's denial of Jesus (Mt 26.34) takes place that same night (Mt 26.69-75; Mk 14.66-72; Lk 22.56-62).

With regard to Judas, the act of betrayal itself is witnessed in the account of Jesus' arrest, but Mark leaves the saying of Jesus about the betrayer's fate unresolved:

¹¹So also Donald Senior, "The Fate of the Betrayer. A Redactional Study of Matthew XXVII, 3-10." *ETL* 48 (1972), 380. See below the comments by Berkley and Conard on the Jeremiah connection to Matthew's cause.

“The Son of man goes as it is written of him, but woe to that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! It would have been better for that man if he had not been born.”¹²

--Mt 26.24||Mk 14.21

In his concern for the fulfillment of Scripture -- and because of his particular emphasis on Jesus as an authoritative prophet -- Matthew sees this lacuna in Mark's Passion Narrative and supplies the fulfillment material (Mt 27.3-10).¹³

The link between Judas and the enemies of Jesus is formed as the passion predictions merge into reality:

The *chief priests* and the *elders of the people* take counsel to arrest Jesus by stealth (Mt 26.1-4). After the costly anointing of Jesus by the unnamed woman (Mt 26.6_{ff}), Judas approaches the *chief priests*, who pay him a paltry *thirty pieces of silver* to deliver Jesus to them (26.14-15). Following the supper at which Jesus has revealed that his betrayer is one of the Twelve, Judas leads the arresting party from the *chief priests* and *elders of the people* to Jesus and betrays him with a kiss (26.47-50). Jesus is led to Caiaphas the high priest, where the scribes and *elders* have gathered (26.57).¹⁴ When Judas sees that Jesus has been condemned, he returns the *thirty pieces of silver* to the *chief priests* and the *elders*, in remorse over his sin of betraying *innocent blood* (27.3-4a). Although they refuse to absolve Judas of his bloodguilt, they are left with the *pieces of silver*, for Judas has thrown the *money* down in the temple before departing to hang himself (27.4b-5). The *chief priests*, knowing they cannot put such *blood money* in the temple treasury, use the *silver coins* to buy a potter's field for use as a burial ground (Mt 27.6-8).

At this point in the narrative, Matthew introduces the unusual fulfillment citation, ascribing it to Jeremiah, although much of it comes from Zechariah 11.12-13:

τότε ἐπληρώθη τὸ ῥῆθὲν διὰ Ἰερεμίου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος·
καὶ ἔλαβον τὰ τριάκοντα ἀργύρια, τὴν τιμὴν τοῦ τετιμημένου
ὄν ἐτιμήσαντο ἀπὸ υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ ἔδωκαν αὐτὰ εἰς τὸν ἀγρὸν
τοῦ κεραμέως, καθὰ συνέταξέν μοι κύριος. --Mt 27.9-10

¹²Lk 22.22 contains the first sentence, but omits the second; cf. John 13.21-30. In Mt 26.25, Jesus acknowledges Judas' query, "Is it I, Rabbi?," with "You have said so."

¹³So also, Kim Paffenroth, "The Stories of the Fate of Judas and Differing Attitudes towards Sources," *Proceedings: EGL & MWBS* 12 (1992), 68-70; and Donald Senior, "A Case Study in Matthean Creativity. Matthew 27:3-10," *BR* 19 (1974), 29-30.

¹⁴Presumably Judas, as well as Peter, followed at a distance to learn the outcome of the trial at close hand (Mt 26.58; cf. 27.1-3). The apparent parallels and dissonances between Peter and Judas fall outside the boundaries of this thesis, as do speculations about the motives behind the actions of Judas and Peter. The paraenetic and apologetic concerns attributed to this text also fall outside the interests of this thesis.

Then that which was spoken through Jeremiah the prophet was fulfilled, saying, "And they took the thirty silver coins, the value of the valuation at which some of the sons of Israel evaluated him; and they gave them for the potter's field, just as the Lord had directed me."¹⁵

The purpose of the narrative section (Mt 27.3-8) that precedes this fulfillment citation can now be seen: it not only cements the relationship between Judas and the *chief priests* and *elders* as Jesus' betrayers, but it also brings some segments reminiscent of Zech 11 together with motifs intended to evoke Jeremiah.¹⁶ The *thirty pieces of silver* (Mt 26.15; Zech 11.12-13) are mentioned repeatedly in Mt 27.3-10 (verses 3, 5, 6, 7, 9). Tracing this tainted money -- following the "trail of silver" -- leads, by way of Zechariah imagery, to the heart of the betrayal narrative. Although the purchase of the *potter's field* (Mt 27.7, 8, 10) is often proposed as the primary link to Jeremiah,¹⁷ a more subtle and pervasive image here is the concept of *bloodguilt*. Judas confesses that he has betrayed *innocent blood* (Mt 27.4); however, the text is unequivocal in portraying the *chief priests* and *elders* as sharing that guilt (Mt 27.6, 8-9). By following this "trail of blood," Jeremiah's most important influence upon the fulfillment citation of Mt 27.9-10 is found. Do the "trail of silver" and "trail of blood" merge in the potter's field, or do Zechariah and

¹⁵ Carson, *Mt*, 567, captures the paranomasia thus: "the price of the one whose price had been priced...."

¹⁶This may mean evoking traditions about Jeremiah the prophet, or the writings attributed to him, or both. This thesis will not endeavor to examine Matthew's general use of Jeremiah; for this, see works dedicated to the two fulfillment quotations (Mt 2.17-18; Mt 27.9-10); also see M. J. J. Menken, "The References to Jeremiah in the Gospel according to Matthew, *ETL* 60 (1984), 5-24; and Michael Knowles, *Jeremiah in Matthew's Gospel*. The fate of Judas, and its literary meaning for Matthew, will be covered only insofar as this impinges on the Zechariah-Jeremiah question in Mt 27.3-10.

¹⁷See, for example, R. S. McConnell, *Law and Prophecy in Matthew's Gospel*, 132, who sees the field as such a crucial element of tradition that Matthew, not finding a field in Zechariah, sought the only prophetic source where the purchase of a field had significance (i.e., Jer 32). I agree that for the question of the outcome of Judas, the use of the silver to buy the Field of Blood is very important, but still secondary to other concerns within the text.

Jeremiah meet elsewhere for Matthew?¹⁸

The Trail of Silver.

The Zechariah text at the source of the “trail of silver” is Zech 11.12b-13.¹⁹ There are many textual issues involved in both the Hebrew and Greek extant versions; those which are of most importance to the exegesis of Matthew 26.14-16 and 27.3-10 will be examined here.²⁰

נִאמַר יְהוָה אֵלַי הַשְׁלִיכוּהוּ אֶל-הַיּוֹצֵר ^a אֶדְרַךְ הַיֶּקֶר אֲשֶׁר יִקְרְתִי מֵעַלֵיהֶם
וְאֶקְחָה שָׁלֹשׁ שִׁים הַכֶּסֶף וְנָא שְׁלִיךְ אֹתוֹ בֵּית יְהוָה אֶל-הַיּוֹצֵר ^a --Zech 11.13 MT ²¹

And YHWH said to me, Throw it to the potter/founder/treasury,^a the splendid price at which I was valued by them, and I took the thirty silver shekels and threw them into the house of YHWH, to the potter/founder/treasury.^a

καὶ εἶπεν κύριος πρὸς με Κάθες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ χωνευτήριον, καὶ σκέψαι ^b
εἰ δόκιμόν ἐστιν, ὃν τρόπον ἐδοκιμάσθη ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν. καὶ ἔλαβον τοὺς
τριάκοντα ἀργυροῦς καὶ ἐνέβαλον αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν οἶκον κυρίου εἰς τὸ
χωνευτήριον. --Zech 11.13 LXX ²²

¹⁸Moo, “Tradition and Old Testament in Matt 27:3-10,” in *Gospel Perspectives III* (eds. R. T. France and David Wenham; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983), 199, uses the term *chain of ‘blood’* with reference to αἷμα ἄθρον, but does not have a parallel expression, such as *chain of ‘silver.’* I am building on the images “The Trail of Silver” and “The Trail of Blood” from the article by Audrey Conard, “The Fate of Judas: Matthew 27:3-10,” *TJT* 7 (1991), 158-68. We differ in some of our conclusions about where the trails ultimately lead, but we come across many of the same landmarks along the way. (See below.)

¹⁹The Greek text of Mt 26.14-16 is found on the first page of this chapter and the Hebrew and Greek texts of Zech 11.12b are reproduced on the second.

²⁰For Zechariah 11, see Meyers II, 272-80; Ralph Smith, *Zechariah*, 268-72; Hanson, *Dawn*, 339-354; Mike Butterworth, *Structure and Zechariah*, 198-212; for the relation of Zech 11 to the story of Judas in Matthew, in addition to the appropriate sections in the commentaries, see C. H. H. Wright, *Zechariah and His Prophecies* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1879) 325-342; Bruce, *NT Development*, 108-110; Gundry, *Use*, 122-26, 142; Lindars, *NT Apologetic*, 116-22; Stendahl, *School*, 120-27; Timothy W. Berkley, “OT Exegesis and the Death of Judas,” *Proceedings EGL & MWBS* 14 (1994) 29-45; Douglas J. Moo, “Tradition and Old Testament in Matt 27:3-10,” 157-75; Donald Senior, “A Case Study,” 23-36; Sjef Van Tilborg, “Matthew 27. 3-10: an Intertextual Reading,” 159-74.

²¹The variant for ^a הַיּוֹצֵר is הַיּוֹצֵר (in the latter part of the verse in Kennicott MS 530 [see Meyers II, 277]; reflected also in the Peshitta and the Targum).

²²A variant for ^b σκέψαι is σκέψομαι, which may reflect confusion about who is speaking in vs 13-- where is it Zechariah and where God? Aquila and Symmachus contain significant variants: ^a = καὶ εἶπεν κύριος πρὸς με ριψον αὐτο πρὸς τὸν πλαστήν ὑπερμεγεθῆς ἢ τιμῆ ἣν ἐτιμήθη ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν...καὶ

And the Lord said to me, Let them fall into the melting furnace/refiner's fire, and examine^b whether they are genuine, in the same way I have been assayed by them. I took the thirty pieces of silver and threw them into the house of the Lord, into the melting furnace/refiner's fire.

The evidence from the Greek translation(s) and the other variants suggests that there was some confusion from earliest times concerning where Zechariah threw the pieces of silver. Even though the most reliable term for the Hebrew text appears to be קִיָּוִן (potter, founder), many scholars accept the emendation to קִיָּוִן (treasury, storehouse) from the Syriac and the Targum.²³ The confusion is compounded by the fact that, in obedience to God's command, Zechariah threw the pieces of silver somewhere in the "house of the Lord." Was there a "potter" or a "founder" in the temple?²⁴ Was there a "treasury" in the temple? How does *κορβανᾶς* in Mt 27.6 relate to *γαζοφυλάκιον* in the other gospels? Another question is whether Matthew knew and used the variants in his citation and exegesis of Zech 11.12-13. Closer study of the pertinent textual elements of Mt 27.3-10 may be helpful:

ερριψα αυτο εν οικω κυριου προς τον πλαστην -- And the Lord said to me, "Throw it down to the moulder, the excessively enormous price at which I was priced by them...and I threw it in the house of the Lord to the moulder." σ' = ριψον αυτο εις το χωνευτηριον...και ερριψα αυτο εις τον οικον κυριου εις το χωνευτηριον.

²³See Meyers II, 276-78; they strongly agree with other scholars that a *yodh* was confused with an *aleph*, and because "four of the five letters of 'potter' and 'treasury' are the same, the reading of the more appropriate 'treasury' is compelling." The LXX term *χωνευτήριον* (a furnace in which metal was melted before being moulded) and its variant *ὁ πλαστής* (one who moulds or models) may reflect the attempt to combine, if possible, the meanings encompassed by "potter" and "treasury, storehouse" for the silver. The Targum assumes that קִיָּוִן refers to a person, an officer of the treasury; however the Targum obliterates all mention of the thirty pieces of silver and, instead, has a writing tablet of deeds cast into the Sanctuary in care of a treasury official.

²⁴In the notes to this verse of the Targum, R. P. Gordon, *Targum Minor Prophets*, 215, writes, "Decisions as to the affiliations of Tg. and Matthew are complicated by the possibility that their authors were aware of the existence of a temple foundry (cf. LXX and see C.C. Torrey, *JBL* 55[1936]256f.), in which case *ywsr* would have been sufficient to suggest a temple connection." In a sense, it does not matter whether Torrey's article, "The Foundry of the Second Temple at Jerusalem," proves that there was a foundry in the Second Temple. What is crucial is the establishment that textual uncertainty gave rise to these variants, ranging from "potter" to "treasury," by Matthew's time. The LXX, Peshitta, and Targum provide the grounds to assume that Matthew was aware of the variant possibilities.

Ἰούδας ... ἔστρεψεν τὰ τριάκοντα ἀργύρια
 τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσιν καὶ πρεσβυτέροις....
 καὶ ῥίψας τὰ ἀργύρια εἰς τὸν ναὸν
 ἀνεχώρησεν....
 Οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς λαβόντες τὰ ἀργύρια
 εἶπαν· οὐκ ἔξεστιν βαλεῖν αὐτὰ εἰς
 τὸν κορβανᾶν, ἐπεὶ τιμὴ αἱματός ἐστιν.
 τότε ἐπληρώθη τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ...τοῦ προφήτου
 λέγοντος· καὶ ἔλαβον τὰ τριάκοντα ἀργύρια,
 τὴν τιμὴν τοῦ τετιμημένου ὃν ἐτιμήσαντο
 ἀπὸ υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ ἔδωκαν αὐτὰ εἰς τὸν
 ἀγρὸν τοῦ κεραμέως, καθὰ συνέταξέν μοι
 κύριος.

Judas...brought back the 30 pieces of silver
 to the chief priests and elders....
 And having thrown down the pieces of silver in(to)
 the temple (sanctuary), he departed....
 But the chief priests, taking the pieces of silver, said,
 “It is not lawful to throw them into the treasury,
 since they are *blood money*.”
 Then was fulfilled that which was spoken through...
 the prophet, “And they took the 30 pieces of silver,
the price of him on whom a price had been set by
some of the sons of Israel, and they gave them for
 the field of the potter, as the Lord directed me.”
 --Mt 27.3-10

Judas returns the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests, who first refuse to take them; after he throws down the coins in the temple/sanctuary, they do take the “blood money” because it cannot lawfully remain in the *treasury* (or place of sacred gifts).²⁵ The expression, “some of the sons of Israel, who had put a value on the evaluated one, gave the money for the field of the *potter*,” betrays Matthew’s knowledge of the tradition preserved in the MT.²⁶ That Mt uses both *potter* and *treasury* (κορβανᾶν) indicates that he knew the variant term(s) in Zech 11.13.²⁷ In the prophetic text, Zechariah threw the money to

²⁵Only Mark 7.11 uses the term κορβᾶν, which includes its definition as ὃ ἐστὶν δῶρον. In Mt 27.6, κορβανᾶς is also a NT *hapax legomenon*. Josephus, *War* 2.175, uses the term to describe the “sacred treasure” which Pilate spent on an aqueduct, which provoked a protest by the people in Jerusalem: Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα παραχρῆν ἐτέραν ἐκίνει τὸν ἱερὸν θησαυρόν, καλεῖται δὲ κορβωνᾶς (corrected to κορβανᾶς), εἰς καταγωγὴν ἰδατων ἐξαναλίσκων. From Mt 27.6, κορβανᾶν must refer to a place where at least some sacred gifts/funds were kept in the temple.

²⁶Allowing that “by them” (בְּיָמָם, Zech 11.13 MT; ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν LXX) has been understood by Mt as a partitive “(those) from among them,” Gundry, *Use*, 127-8, explains that “Ἰσραὴλ merely identifies בְּיָ- and does not presuppose a different Hebrew text” underlying Mt’s “some of the sons of Israel.” Although it is a common expression in the OT, the final phrase of verse 10, καθὰ συνέταξέν μοι κύριος, “as the Lord directed me,” may reflect the opening, “And YHWH said to me,” of Zech 11.13; it is not necessary to trace it to a specific text as if it is an allusion apart from the Zech 11.13 material [pace Lindars, *NT Apologetic*, 121, who traces the final phrase of Mt 27.10 to Ex 9.12, via Jer 32.12-14 and Zech 11.13; this “ingenious final exegete” supposedly saw a connection between the “foundry” of Zech 11.13 and the “furnace from which Moses obtained the dust to produce the boils” -- R.T. France, *Jesus and the OT*, 205, also rejects Lindars’ concept of this particular “elaborate midrashic development”]. Senior, “Fate of the Betrayer,” 382-85, concludes for verse 9b that, although Mt adapts Zech 11.13 to the context of the pericope, “The Massoretic text is much closer to Matthew’s quotation than the Septuagint.”

²⁷For other evidence that Mt may use MT and LXX textual traditions simultaneously, see earlier thesis section on the influence of Zech 10.2 on Mt 9.36.

the person or place in the temple (potter/foundry/treasury); in the gospel, Judas also threw the silver coins somewhere in the temple, but the chief priests picked them up and figuratively *threw the silver coins* to the potter.²⁸ At this point, one concludes that the text from Zech 11.4-14 struck a familiar chord for Matthew's picture of Jesus as a rejected prophetic shepherd whose worth was estimated by his enemies at thirty pieces of silver, the monetary *price* for which his *innocent blood* was betrayed.

The Trail of Blood.

The Jeremiah text which provides the most resonance with the Matthew 27.3-10 narrative, and with related Matthean themes in the Passion Narrative, is Jeremiah 19.²⁹ Since Matthew does not quote Jeremiah directly, the textual issues are minimal for the

²⁸ Matthew took advantage of the first-person singular/third-person plural possibilities for ἔλαβον to transfer Zechariah's first-person report (Zech 11.13) that he *took the coins* (and *threw them* in the temple) to relate the transfer of the silver from Judas to the chief priests: Judas *threw the coins* to the chief priests in the temple (Mt 27.3, 5), then the chief priests *took the coins* (27.6). This indicates that Matthew *also* used the LXX in formulating the citation. For the purposes both of the prophetic sign-act in Zechariah and the gospel fulfillment citation, it is not crucial to know exactly where in the temple the silver pieces were thrown; on the literary level both texts show that the value the leaders placed on God's appointed shepherd was insulting and refused by divine order in the first instance, and was tainted with innocent blood in the second. In Zech 11.14 the second part of the covenant was broken by the prophet-shepherd; at some level for Mt's readers, the destruction of Jerusalem may have been related to the people's rejection of Jesus (cf. 23.29-24.2). This comes clearer when the Jeremiah connection is explored.

²⁹In addition to the commentaries and references given above, see Raymond F. Person, *Zechariah and the Deuteronomistic School*, 125-29; H. F. D. Sparks, "St. Matthew's References to Jeremiah," *JTS* 1(1950), 155-56; M. J. J. Menken, "The References to Jeremiah in the Gospel according to Matthew," *ETL* 60 (1984), 10-11; Michael Knowles, *Jeremiah in Matthew's Gospel*; Michel Quesnel, "Les Citations de Jérémie dans L'Évangile selon Saint Matthieu," *EstBib* 47 (1989), 513-27. Because of the mention of the *potter's field* in Mt 27.7, 10, scholars have often suggested Jer 18.1-2 (because the potter's house is mentioned) and 32.6-9 (because Jeremiah is told to buy a field) as the source for Matthew's Jeremiah attribution of the fulfillment citation of 27.9-10. There are studies which evaluate the claims for Jer 18 and 32 and conclude that the balance weighs in favor of Jer 19; e.g., see Gundry, *Use of OT*, 124-27; Senior, "Case Study," 32; Senior, "Fate of Betrayer," 385-89. Quesnel, 523, attempts to make a case for the influence of Lam 4.1-2, but his proposal has not sparked much favor. I am persuaded that these proposed Jeremiah texts exert minor influence on Matthew, especially compared with Jeremiah 19 (cf. 7.25-26, 30-34) and possibly Jer 26.14-15 (cf. 35.14b-15, 17).

purposes of this study.³⁰

The pertinent Jeremiah 19 themes can be summarized:

The Lord commands Jeremiah to go and buy the earthen flask of a potter, to lead the chief priests and elders of the people to the Hinnom Valley, and to prophesy to them. Because the people have forsaken God and committed evil pagan practices, filling the place with the blood of innocents, the place *will no longer be called* Topheth, or the valley of the son of Hinnom, but the valley of Slaughter. Jeremiah is then told to break the potter's flask, a picture of how God will break the people and the city of Jerusalem. Topheth will become a burial ground and Jerusalem will be like Topheth. Jeremiah returns to the court of the temple and repeats God's word against the city.³¹

A brief return to the text of Mt 27.3-10 will highlight the points of contact with Jer 19:

<p>Ἰούδας ... τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσιν καὶ πρεσβυτέροις λέγων· ἡμαρτον παραδοὺς αἷμα ἀθῶον Οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς...εἶπαν· ... τιμὴ αἵματος ἐστίν.</p> <p>ἠγόρασαν...τὸν ἀγρὸν τοῦ κεραμέως εἰς ταφὴν τοῖς ξένοις. διὸ ἐκλήθη ὁ ἀγρὸς ἐκεῖνος ἀγρὸς αἵματος ἕως τῆς σήμερον. τότε ἐπληρώθη τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἰερεμίου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος· ... καὶ ἔδωκαν αὐτὰ εἰς τὸν ἀγρὸν τοῦ κεραμέως...</p>	<p>Judas [returned] to the <u>chief priests and elders</u>, saying, “Having betrayed <u>innocent blood</u>, I sinned.” But the chief priests said, “They [the 30 pieces of silver] are the price of <u>blood</u>.” They bought the <u>field</u> of the <u>potter</u> as a <u>burial ground</u> for strangers. Therefore that field <i>has been called</i> the <i>field of</i> <i>blood</i> to this day. Then was fulfilled that which was spoken through <u>Jeremiah</u> the prophet, saying, “And they gave them [the 30 pieces of silver] for the <u>field of the potter</u>....”</p>
--	---

The catch-words (*potter, field, innocent blood, burial ground*) and the characters

(Jeremiah and the *chief priests and elders of the people*) in Jeremiah 19 evoke themes

not only from Matthew 27.3-10 but also from other parts of the First Gospel.

In Matthew the betrayal of *innocent blood* is traced through the Judas texts to the scene of Jesus' trial before Pilate. When Judas returns the thirty pieces of silver to the

³⁰Although see Knowles, *Jeremiah in Matthew's Gospel*, 71, who follows Senior, *Passion Narrative*, 361, in suggesting a way Matthew “could have modeled 27.8 on the wording of Jer. 19.6.”

³¹Emphasis added. Cf. Jer 7.30_{ff}. In Jer and Mt, a place name changes to reflect bloodshed and burial. Person, *Zech and Dt School*, 125, makes a convincing case, that “The phrase ‘the flock doomed for slaughter’ (צאן ההרגה) betrays the influence of Jer, for the only other occurrences of ההרגה are in Jer 7.32*; 19.6*....” [in the expression valley of ‘slaughter.’] Less viable is his proposal that, “The ‘prophet’ who is commanded to become a shepherd (Zech 11.4) represents the prophet Jeremiah, whose prophetic ministry included his own impatience...and the people’s response of detestation....” My reading is that Zechariah is speaking in his own right as a prophet. Nowhere does Jeremiah, or any writing prophet, tell of God’s call to become a shepherd. In this Zechariah is unique (see also Meyers II, 250).

chief priests at the temple, their actions confirm what their words deny (Mt 27.3-8). They will not permit *blood money* to stay in the temple (as if getting rid of it would prevent the temple from being defiled by their payment for Jesus' death). The *chief priests and elders* then persuade the people to ask for Barabbas' release and for Jesus' death (Mt 27.20).

Pilate tries to absolve himself of bloodguilt, saying, "I am *innocent* of this man's *blood*; see to it yourselves"-- the same response the *chief priests* gave to Judas' confession of the sin of betraying *innocent blood* (Mt 27.24; cf. 27.4). The people reply, "His blood be on us and on our children" (Mt 27.25). In Matthew, the betrayal of innocent blood falls upon Judas, the chief priests and elders, Pilate, and finally, all the people. The words *innocent* and *blood* on Pilate's lips (27.24) are linked to the admonition of his wife, "Have nothing to do with that *righteous man*" (27.19).³²

This, in turn, recalls the concept of *righteous blood* and the *blood of the prophets* in Matthew 23.29-39; hence, the "trail of blood" has been traced to its source in Jesus' woe to the scribes and Pharisees.³³ While the prophet Zechariah is specifically named in Mt 23.35, there are also echoes of Jeremiah under the surface of the text of Mt 23.29.³⁴ First,

³²As I read Mt 27, no one who protests innocence with respect to shedding Jesus' blood is exonerated from their guilt, not Judas who throws the silver down in the temple, not the chief priests and elders who purchase a field with the tainted coins, and not Pilate who ultimately sanctions the crucifixion, for fear of an uprising (27.24-26).

³³So also Conard, "Fate of Judas," 163; Senior, "Fate of Betrayer," 409-11. When the people in Mt 27.25 call down the blood of Jesus on their own and their children's heads, they are fulfilling Jesus' words that "all the righteous blood shed on earth, from the blood of innocent Abel ...to the blood of Zechariah...will come upon this generation" (Mt 23.25-26). In light of the Jeremiah connection, this is best read as Matthew's explanation for the dire circumstances of the fall of Jerusalem in 70 C.E. (cf. Mt 23.37-24.2). With reference to Jeremiah's message, Senior, "Fate of Betrayer," 398, says, "The sombre shadow of Jeremiah's message is spread across the entire Mt 27.9-10 quotation." Both the fate of the composite Zechariah character and the message of Jeremiah come together here (cf. Jer 34.14b-15, 17) regarding the fate of Jerusalem.

³⁴See earlier thesis section on Mt 23.29-39.

Jer 26.14-15 comes to mind, where the prophet has been speaking against the temple and Jerusalem, and the priests, prophets and princes think him worthy of death:

But as for me, I am in your hands. Do with me as seems good and right to you. Only know for certain that if you put me to death you will bring *innocent blood* upon yourselves and upon this city and its inhabitants, for in truth, the LORD sent me to you to speak all these words in your ears. RSV

The second text to note is Jer 7.25-26, 30-34:

...I have persistently *sent all my servants the prophets* to them...yet they did not listen to me.. .but stiffened their neck. They did worse than their fathers....For the sons of Judah have done evil in my sight; they have set their abominations in the house which is called by my name, to defile it. And they have built the high place of Topheth ...in the valley of the son of Hinnom.... Therefore, behold, the days are coming when it will no more be called Topheth, or the valley of the son of Hinnom, but the valley of Slaughter: for they will bury in Topheth, because there is no room elsewhere....

RSV

In Matthew 23.29-39, Jesus is in the temple, speaking as a prophet himself. He calls the present generation to account for all the *righteous blood* shed on earth, from that of Abel to that of Zechariah the prophet, murdered between the *sanctuary* and the altar. Jesus' claim is implicitly that of Jeremiah: if they kill him, they will bring *innocent blood* upon themselves and all Jerusalem, for he has come to speak God's word to them. In this text, Zechariah is named, and the allusion is to Jeremiah.³⁵

The situation is reversed in Matthew 27.3-10, where Jeremiah is credited, but the citation is from Zechariah. It must be that Matthew expected his well-versed readers to see and hear both prophets in each case. In Mt 23, the elaborate construction of the text, the conflated identity of Zechariah, son of Berechiah, seems artificial to present sensibilities; in Mt 27, the attribution of a Zechariah citation to Jeremiah seems artificial, at best! Yet Matthew used all the exegetical skills he had at hand to make sure that the fulness of

³⁵Knowles, *Jer in Mt*, 182-84, on the Parable in Mt 21.33-41, makes the case that the prophets who were beaten, stoned and killed were Jeremiah, the conflated Zechariah (and possibly Uriah of Jer 26). See also Heil, *Death & Resurrection*, 67-68, 76, who links the story of Judas with 23.30_{ff} and also connects the parable in Mt 21 with 23.35-56. I think the second connection Heil makes here is firmer than the first.

meaning could be drawn from the prophecies he believed pointed to the Messiah's passion.

Jeremiah was undoubtedly the better known of the two prophets. In Mt 23.29^{ff}, Matthew could count on Jeremiah's words being recalled, but he needed to construct the text so that the one prophet he wanted to single out-- Zechariah, son of Berechiah -- was brought to mind. In Mt 27.3-10, Matthew had both the tradition of the Field of Blood, formerly known as the Potter's Field, and the tradition of the betrayal money -- the thirty pieces of silver -- from the Judas story. He knew the variants "throw the silver to the potter" and "...to the foundry/treasury," in Zech 11 but also knew there was no "field" in Zechariah. In order for his readers to grasp the significance of both traditions, the First Evangelist attributed the Zechariah quotation to Jeremiah.³⁶

Perhaps the answer to the question of where the "trail of silver" and the "trail of blood" meet can now be addressed. In a sense, they do meet in the Potter's Field, with the linking word *potter* from Zech 11.13 and Jer 19.1; the change of place names in Jer 19.6 also recalls the change from Potter's Field to Field of Blood in Mt 27.7-10.³⁷ From Zech 11.12, the thirty pieces of silver make their way, via the *chief priests*, to the *field of the potter*.³⁸ Thus Conard rightly concludes:

'The purpose of [Jeremiah's] action is to announce God's judgement upon Jerusalem. By buying the potter's field the religious leaders unknowingly do the same thing.' As we have seen, the money and Judas are linked to the field and the field is linked to Jeremiah, who is loosely linked

³⁶Thus ensuring for twenty centuries that readers would search the scriptures to seek the meaning of the text(s)!

³⁷Senior, "Fate of Betrayer," 415-17, sees the intertwining of *innocent blood* and *price of blood* as a key structural support for the entire text.

³⁸Van Tilborg, "Intertextual Reading," 166, perceives a new allusion to Zech 11. 4 -5 LXX when Judas ceases to be the "go-between" and the silver is back in the hands of the "original owners," whom Van Tilborg identifies as Zech's "buyers of the sheep," who did not repent (μεταμέλομαι in LXX instead of "go unpunished" of the MT). The chief priests and elders are both the sheep buyers and the bad shepherds. I think it is a stretch to make a connection between the use of μεταμέλομαι in Zech 11.5 LXX and Mt 27.3.

to Zechariah through a potter, or a potter's field. At the centre of this web of links we find the chief priests. Their image, picking up and 'taking the pieces of silver,' lingers as vividly as that of Judas throwing them down....[Matthew's intent in the Passion Narrative is] to place the final responsibility for the rejection of Jesus as Messiah on the heads of the chief priests and elders.... What is fulfilled as spoken by the prophets...is not Judas' singular action but the action of 'some of the sons of Israel....'³⁹

More important than their intersection in the field is the fact that the "trail of silver" and the "trail of blood" meet in the Jerusalem temple. In Jer 19, from which the tradition of *innocent blood* is evoked in Mt 27.3-10, the prophet first leads the *chief priests and elders of the people* to the Hinnom Valley, but he returns from Topheth to the *court of the Lord's house* and repeats there the gist of the prophecy. In Jer 26.14-15, in the *house of the Lord*, Jeremiah tells the *princes, prophets and priests* that, if they put him to death, they will bring *innocent blood* upon themselves and the city. In the *temple*, Jesus berates the *scribes and Pharisees* for following in their fathers' footsteps: their tacit approval of killing the *prophets* would bring upon them all the *righteous blood* from Abel to *Zechariah*, whom they *murdered* between the *sanctuary* and the altar (μεταξὺ τοῦ ναοῦ καὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου, Mt 23.35).

Zechariah 11.12 does not indicate where the *traffickers in the sheep* obtained the *thirty pieces of silver*, but the *prophet-shepherd* reports that he obeyed God's command to throw them back to the *potter/treasury* in the *house of the Lord* (εἰς τὸν οἶκον κύριου -- Zech 11.13). In Matthew 26.14-15, it makes sense that Judas sought out the *chief priests*

³⁹Conard, "Fate of Judas," 162, 165 [quotation marks are in Conard's text]. See also Berkley, "OT Exegesis and Judas," 36-37. Conard reads this story in light of Matthew's intent to get Judas offstage by his death, in order to deflect his guilt onto the chief priests and elders. Although this thesis is not concerned with the 'fate of Judas' *per se*, I have stated above my position that Mt exonerates no one from their guilt over the betrayal and death of Jesus (note #32 above). The leaders are more guilty, perhaps, because they are supposed to recognize Jesus (cf. the religious leaders in the Infancy Narrative), but they do not bear the entire guilt of Jesus' blood. My conclusions also depart from Conard's with respect to the dual intersection of the "trails" of silver and blood; not only do the allusions from Zech and Jer meet in the potter's field, but more importantly, they drop the load of bloodguilt in the temple. See discussion which follows.

and elders of the people in the *temple*, but this is not stated; the reader is left to infer from the narrative that the *thirty pieces of silver* were given to the betrayer in the *temple*. In Mt 27.3-6, it is also reasonable to assume that the return of the *thirty pieces of silver* to the *chief priests and elders* occurred in the *temple*, where Judas acknowledged his sin of *betraying innocent blood*. When they neither absolved him nor acknowledged their own part in Jesus' betrayal, Judas threw down the *pieces of silver* in the *sanctuary* (εἰς τὸν ναὸν) and departed. The *chief priests* took up the *pieces of silver* because they could not deposit them in the *treasury* (κορβανᾶν, Mt's alternate to the *potter* in Zech 11.13). If not when the *thirty pieces of silver* were given by the *chief priests and elders* to Judas, then at least when Judas threw them down, the *sanctuary* was defiled by *blood money*, the *price* of the prophet-shepherd Jesus.

The text of Zechariah 11.12-13 is at the heart of the betrayal narrative, in both Matthew 26.14-16 and 27.3-10, and the key to Matthew's use of this section of Zechariah 11 is that the *prophet-shepherd* figure is valued at *thirty pieces of silver*. The image of the ellipse (with Zech 11.12-13 at both foci) encompasses a large part of the Matthean Passion Narrative: the betrayal agreement for *thirty pieces of silver*; the Last Supper (the betrayer present and known to Jesus); the institution of the Lord's Supper (Jesus' reference to his *blood of the covenant* being *poured out* for the forgiveness of sins -- Zech 9.11/Mt 26.28; cf. 23.35);⁴⁰ the prediction of the shepherd being struck and the sheep scattering (Zech 13.7/Mt 26.31); the arrest ("all the scriptures of the prophets" are fulfilled,

⁴⁰The allusion to Zech 9.11 is strengthened by its proximity to so many other Zech 9-14 references in Matthew's Passion Narrative. The similarities and the differences between the *blood poured out* (ἐκχυννόμενον) in Mt 23.35 and 26.28 are not pertinent for this thesis.

Mt 27.56); the trial and conviction;⁴¹ Judas' return of the *pieces of silver* to the chief priests in the temple; the delivery of Jesus to crucifixion (with the assumption of bloodguilt by all the people).

This enclosure of two other significant Zechariah references -- the blood of the covenant (Zech 9.11), and the shepherd and sheep citation (Zech 13.7) -- by Zech 11.4-14 is extremely important as a demonstration of Matthew's use of Zechariah in the passion of Jesus. What is unique in Zechariah is the image of the *prophet* called to be a *shepherd*.⁴² Matthew portrays Jesus as the rejected prophet-shepherd of Zechariah.

⁴¹It may be that Matthew 27.59-63, who follows Mark's trial narrative at 14.55-61, reflects the expectation that the Messiah would (re)build the temple from Zech 6.12.

⁴²While Jer 23 and Ezek 34 are important in relating God's woes to the shepherds, and while Zechariah may draw some of his shepherd-sheep imagery from them, there is no question that Zech 11.4-14 is unique in the prophetic corpus.

Excursus. Jesus the Shepherd in Matthew's Gospel

The image of Jesus as a Royal shepherd, from David's lineage and born in David's city, is part of Matthew's messianic exegesis: in the first verse of this gospel Jesus is identified as "son of David."¹ Magi come to Jerusalem looking for the newborn "king of the Jews" whose star they saw in its rising. The *chief priests* and *scribes* answer Herod's inquiry about the Messiah's expected birthplace with a mixed citation they attribute to "the prophet": the Messiah is to be born in Bethlehem and he will *shepherd* God's people, ποιμαίνει τὸν λαόν μου τὸν Ἰσραήλ (Mt 2.6)²

"Son of David" language does not disappear after the Infancy Narrative,³ but its royal imagery is eclipsed by Matthew's portrayal of Jesus as the *healing shepherd* in the ministry narrative. As early as Mt 4.23-25, the reader is prepared to encounter Jesus as a healer:

[Jesus] went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues and preaching the gospel of the kingdom and *healing* every disease and every infirmity among the people. --Mt 4.23

Matthew 8 and 9 report many occasions when Jesus healed people; for example, after Jesus has raised the daughter of a ruler (Mt 9.18-26), two blind men follow him, crying out,

¹David figures prominently in the messianic genealogy, which traces Jesus' lineage from Abraham, through David, and eventually to Joseph, also called a "son of David" (Mt 1.20).

²This is the only place in the First Gospel where the verb ποιμαίνω occurs. Detailed study of the mixed citation from Mic 5.1, 3 and 2 Sam 5.2 in Mt 2.6 is outside the scope of this thesis; however, see Infancy narrative above. The focus here is on Davidic imagery used to describe the Messiah as a shepherd.

³Although no direct Zechariah influence can be claimed for this first instance of shepherding imagery in Matthew, there is evidence that the messianic language of Branch-Ἀνατολή may undergird the important narrative of Mt 2 (see thesis section above on the Infancy Narrative). Zech 6.12 must not be ruled out here, especially since the theme of the Messiah building the temple appears in the trial of Jesus (Mt 27.59-63 (see on Jesus and the Temple Charge below). In his article, "Ezekiel 34 and the Narrative Strategy of the Shepherd and Sheep Metaphor in Matthew," *CBQ* 55 (1993), 698-708, John Paul Heil contends that Ezek 34 influences and guides all of Matthew's shepherding material. Heil's proposal is problematic in the first instance, for Mt's citation from Mic 5 and 2 Sam 5 betrays no influence from Ezek 34.23.

“Have mercy on us, Son of David,” and their eyes are opened. The summary passage of Mt 9.35 (essentially a repeat of 4.23) is followed by Matthew’s first use of *shepherd* (ποιμήν):

Seeing the crowds, he was moved with compassion for them, for they were mangled and exposed, like sheep without a shepherd. --Mt 9.36

The emphasis on *healing* as a manifestation of Jesus’ compassionate *shepherding* is supported primarily by Zechariah 10.2 MT/LXX.⁴

Reports of individual healings and healing summaries continue in Chapters 12-20 (12.9-13, 22-23; 14.14, 35-36; 15.21-28; 17.14-18; 19.1-2; 20-29-34).⁵ Among these healing accounts, “Son of David” terminology is used three more times: (1) after Jesus heals the man who could neither see nor speak, the amazed people asked, “Can this be the Son of David?” (Mt 12.22-23); (2) when a Canaanite woman approaches Jesus to heal her daughter, she cries, “Have mercy on me, O Lord, Son of David” (15.22); and (3) when Jesus leaves Jericho, the two blind men by the road cry out, “Have mercy on us, Son of David.....Lord, have mercy on us, Son of David” (20.30, 31). On all these occasions,

⁴See earlier thesis section on Jesus’ Ministry in Galilee, in which Mt 9.36/Zech 10.2 is proposed as a central text on Jesus as *healing shepherd* in the body of the First Gospel. Against those who prefer Ezek 34.5-6 (over Zech 10.2 MT/LXX) as the source for Mt’s expression “sheep without a shepherd” (e.g., Martin, “Image of Shepherd,” 275, 298 *et passim*; Heil, “Shepherd and Sheep,” 701 *et passim*), note that the wording and imagery in Ezek 34 are much farther from “sheep without a shepherd” than most of the other OT possibilities (Ezek 34.5-8 emphasizes that the sheep are “scattered” and have become “food for all the wild animals” and “shepherds” is in the plural). Ezek 34.4, 11-12 and Jer 23.1-5; 50.6(27.6), which include expressions like “seek the lost,” may influence the “lost sheep of the house of Israel” in Mt 10.6, 15.24 and the parable of the “lost sheep” in Mt 18.12-14, but they have no major influence on the description of the sheep in Mt 9.36 or the healing shepherd motif.

⁵In Matthew, most healings are indicated by θεραπεύω or, less often, ἰάομαι (8.8, 13; [13.15/Isa 6.10]; 15.28). On occasion, neither verb is used: e.g., the blind men’s “eyes were opened” (9.30) or they “received their sight” (20.34); the leper “was cleansed” (8.3), and the hemorrhaging woman was “made well,” (σώζω, 9.21-22). It is interesting to note that the three Isaiah fulfillment citations in this section, either directly or indirectly, support Jesus’ healing ministry (Mt 8.16-17; 12.15-21; 13.14-15 [ἰάσομαι, Cf. Mk 4.12]). In LXX, θεραπεύω never appears for פָּרַח; ἰάομαι (Zech 11.16; Is 6.10; 53.5; 61.1) does not appear in Ezek; ἰάσις (Zech 10.2) does not appear in Ezek 34.

“Son of David” is used with reference to *healing*.⁶

Matthew’s account of Jesus’ entry into Jerusalem immediately follows Jesus’ healing of the blind men. The Zech 9.9 citation in Mt 21.5 recalls and underscores the royal Son of David imagery. As Jesus rides the donkey from the Mount of Olives into the holy city, the pilgrim crowds around him shout, “Hosanna to the Son of David! Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord...” (Mt 21.9). In accordance with Matthew’s carefully reformulated fulfillment quotation, “Say to the daughter of Zion, ‘Behold your king is coming to you’” (Mt 21.5; cf. Isa 62.11/Zech 9.9), this is the proclamation of the ascent of their kingly Messiah to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. The appropriate welcoming response is not given.⁷

Nevertheless, Jesus makes his way to the temple (Mt 21.12), where the blind and lame are brought to him, and he heals them.⁸ In perfect praise, children cry out, “Hosanna to the Son of David!”⁹ Jesus’ roles of Royal Shepherd-king and Healing Shepherd intersect in the temple at Jerusalem. The *chief priests* and *scribes* are indignant over the

⁶Kim Paffenroth, “Anointed and Healing Son of David,” 552, observes that a “reference to David (or his son) could be used to evoke a number of different associations”: the greatest king of Israel; a charismatic and authoritative leader; a humbled penitent; a great poet of the Psalms; one capable of predicting the future like a prophet — only this last “would carry any association of healing abilities.” As to a possible reference to Solomon, Paffenroth eliminates that by virtue of the fact that Matthew “deliberately redacts his material to present Jesus more as a healer than as an exorcist.”

⁷Verseput, “Davidic Messiah,” 113-14.

⁸*Ibid.*, 114. In contrast to the other synoptics, the Matthean narrative “makes a seamless transition to what follows so that the whole of 21:1-17 may be perceived as a single episode.” I would add to Verseput’s remarks here that the transition is from the image of Jesus as *royal shepherd-king* to *healing shepherd*, under the influence of the Zech 9.9 citation. I do agree with Verseput’s comment, “There is no attempt upon Matthew’s part to distance Jesus from the Davidic hope.” As David was king, prophet and shepherd, so was the greater David, according to Matthew.

⁹Kim Paffenroth, “Anointed and Healing Son of David,” 550, rightly notes that Mt omits all reference to Jesus teaching in the temple in 21.12-17 (cf. Mk 11.17||Lk 19.47), in order to transform Jesus’ time in the temple (Mt 21.14- 16) into the “climax of Jesus’ healing ministry.”

healings and the children's praises to the Son of David (Mt 21.14-16).¹⁰

Matthew's second use of the term shepherd (ποιμήν) occurs in the judgment scene of Mt 25.31-46. The Son of Man will be seated on his throne, with all the angels about him, and the nations will have been gathered before him; he will separate them as a shepherd separates sheep from goats. In the space of three verses, the figure of the judge -- who functions as a *shepherd* -- is called Son of Man, King, and by implication, Son of God [=son of "my Father," 25.34]. The influence of Zechariah upon the apocalyptic discourse of Mt 24 and upon the related scene in 25.31_{ff} have been presented elsewhere in this thesis.¹¹ Ezekiel 34.17_{ff}, where God promises to "judge between sheep and sheep, rams and he-goats," may also be influential here.¹²

Matthew's third and final use of ποιμήν occurs in Jesus' citation of Zech 13.7 in Mt 26.31, "Strike the shepherd and the sheep of the flock will scatter." There can be no doubt that the portrayal of Jesus as a *shepherd* is influenced here by Zechariah, nor is there any doubt that Mt 26.31 (and Mk 14.27) mean to say that Jesus refers to himself as *the*

¹⁰Some themes from the Infancy Narrative re-emerge when Jesus enters the city and temple: as with Herod, the whole city was troubled (ἐταράχθη, 2.3), so now the whole city is shaken as if by an earthquake (ἐσεισθη, 21.10). The *chief priests and scribes*, aware of scriptures anticipating his birth in Bethlehem, did not leave Jerusalem to seek the newborn "king of the Jews," (2.1-6); the same type of group opposes Jesus when he comes to Jerusalem (21.14-16).

¹¹See thesis section above on Apocalyptic Imagery in Mt 24 - 25. For Mt 24.27, 30-31, 36-44, and 25.31, I propose Zechariah influence from Zech 2.6 (10); 9.14; 12.10 and 14.4-5, 6-7. Especially for Mt 25.31_{ff}, the *holy ones* are the *angels* of the Son of Man who will "gather his elect" in Mt 24.31/ Zech 14.5.

¹²In my opinion, this is the clearest place where Matthew may have written with Ezek 34 in mind; but see also Zech 10.3 MT, where God says, "My anger is hot against the shepherds, and I will punish the rams/he-goats." I disagree with Heil's proposal, "Shepherd and Sheep," 708, that Ezek 34 *guides* and *unifies* the shepherd metaphor in Matthew. The fact that Mt does not quote from Ezek 34 in places where it might be expected, i.e., Mt 2.6, seems to refute Heil's claim. Although he attributes the major influence on shepherd and sheep imagery in Mt 1-20, including the healing shepherd, to Ezek 34, Martin, "Image of Shepherd," 298, does credit Deut-Zech (9.9; 9.11; 12.10; 13.7; 14.5) for influencing the portrayal of the shepherd figure in the Passion Narrative.

shepherd who knows his own death is imminent. Jesus the *shepherd* is also a *prophet*: he both interprets and applies the prophecy of Zech 13.7 to himself.¹³

Matthew's portrayal of Jesus as a *prophet-shepherd* like Zechariah has been demonstrated in the use of Zech 11.4-14 in the betrayal story of Mt 26.14-16; 27.3-10.¹⁴ Zechariah the prophet has also figured in Mt 23.35: this conflated figure, identified as "son of Berechiah" (Zech 1.1), was murdered in the temple by the leaders of Israel;¹⁵ his blood shed there is required of the "present generation," according to Matthew's Jesus. That his blood shed in the temple was defiling, even to the present generation, must be inferred from the context of Mt 23. 29-36; the blood money paid out for the betrayal of Jesus was also defiling (Mt 27.4-6); when Jesus the *prophet-shepherd* died, the curtain of the temple split from top to bottom (27.51).¹⁶

With the aid of shepherding imagery from Zechariah, Matthew has portrayed Jesus as the multivalent "Son of David" -- the Royal Messiah (Zech 9.9), the *healing shepherd*

¹³Heil, "Shepherd and Sheep," 706-7, attempts to tie verbs from Ezek 34.12-13 (ἐξάξω, συνάξω, εἰσάξω) to the use of (προάξω) in Mk 14.28||Mt 26.32, all of which backs up the shepherd "regathering and bringing [the sheep] back to Galilee..." Again, Heil is claiming the influence of Ezek 34 (he says it supplies readers with *all concepts and images* of the *shepherd metaphor*) upon Matthew's use of shepherd and sheep imagery in which the direct influence of a Zechariah passage (13.7) is well established. Nothing in Ezek 34 can be construed to affect the image of God striking his (good) shepherd. See thesis section on The Stricken Shepherd (Mt 26.31/Zech 13.7) for evidence which refutes both the concept of προάγω and the scattering-gathering metaphor as major shepherding motifs in Matthew.

¹⁴This is the object of study in thesis chapter above, where the Meyers commentary is cited in support of the unique position of Zechariah, the only prophet commissioned by God to become a shepherd, also despised by some of his flock.

¹⁵Zech 12.10 reports that another figure (who may have been a prophet) was killed by the inhabitants of Jerusalem. Mt 24.30 uses some of Zech 12.10 "all the tribes of the earth will see him," (cf. Rev 1.7); Jn 19.37 recalls the "piercing" aspect of Zech 12.10. If this murder, over whom the inhabitants of Jerusalem mourn, has any influence on Matthew, it is tangential and not direct. However, the murder of the conflated Zechariah figure is very important in Matthew. See thesis sections above on Mt 23, 24 and 26-27.

¹⁶The thirty pieces of silver are blood money to both Judas and the *chief priests* and *elders*; the guilt of Jesus' innocent blood must be seen to cling to the temple, where Judas throws the coins (27.5), as well as to all the people involved in the betrayal, trial, and death of Jesus.

(Zech 10.2), and the rejected and martyred *prophet-shepherd* (Zech 11.4-14; 13.7) who saves his people from their sins by his “blood of the covenant” (Zech 9.11).

CHAPTER TEN
Jesus and the Temple Charge
 Rebuilding the Temple
 [Matthew 26.60-61/Zechariah 6.12]

In Jesus' trial scene, both Matthew and Mark record the (false) testimony against

Jesus, with reference to the destruction and rebuilding of the temple:¹

ὕστερον δὲ προσελθόντες δύο
εἶπαν· οὗτος ἔφη·

δύναμαι καταλύσαι τὸν ναὸν
τοῦ θεοῦ
καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν
οἰκοδομήσαι. --Mt 26.60b-61

Finally two came forward
and said, "This man said,

"I am able to destroy the temple
of God,
and to build (it)
within three days."

καὶ τινες ἀναστάντες ἐψευδομαρτύρουν κατ'
αὐτοῦ λέγοντες ὅτι ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν αὐτοῦ
λέγοντος ὅτι

ἐγὼ καταλύσω τὸν ναὸν
τοῦτον τὸν χειροποίητον
καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἄλλον ἀχειροποίητον
οἰκοδομήσω. --Mk 14.57-58

And some stood up and testified falsely against
him, saying, "We have heard him
saying,

"I will destroy this temple
made with hands,
and within three days I will build another,
not made with hands."

In both gospels, Jesus is silent when the high priest asks him to answer this charge

(Mt 26.62-63a || Mk 14.60-61a); in both gospels, the high priest apparently equates the

accusation about the temple with a claim to be the Messiah:

καὶ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἶπεν αὐτῷ·
ἐξορκίζω σε κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ
τοῦ ζῶντος ἵνα ἡμῖν εἶπῃς εἰ
σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.
--Mt 26.63b

And the high priest said to him,
"I put you under oath: in the name
of the living God, tell us if
you are the Messiah, the Son of God."

πάλιν ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ·
σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ;
--Mk 14.61b

Again the high priest asked him and said to him,

"Are you the Messiah, the Son of the Blessed?"

¹Neither Luke nor John mentions such a charge in their trial narratives, but in the temple cleansing scene at the beginning of the Johannine Jesus' ministry, John records Jesus saying, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up" (Jn 2.19). There are some differences between the trial accounts of Mt and Mk, but the focus here is on the accusation about the temple and the implications drawn from it.

Two questions arise in connection with this gospel tradition: (1) which passages in the gospel(s) illuminate Jesus' attitude toward the temple, specifically with regard to the temple charge? and (2) is there any early Jewish tradition about the Messiah building and/or destroying the temple?² This second question is pertinent to both Mark and Matthew studies; therefore, it might be well to begin there before seeking to analyze where the two gospels differ.

Only a few biblical texts have led to interpretations that link the Messiah with building the temple. One which figures large in early Jewish interpretation is 2 Sam 7, the oracle of Nathan, in which God promises to raise up David's offspring who will *build a house* for God's name; in return, God will establish his *house* and throne forever. God promises to be *father* to him, as he will be *son* to God. The midrash on this biblical passage, found in Qumran cave 4 and known as 4QFlorilegium [4Q174], is illustrative. It reads Nathan's oracle as an eschatological prophecy. After citing 2 Sam 7.12-14, the interpretation is given:

And <<YHWH de[clares] to you that he will build you a house. I will raise up your seed after you and establish the throne of his kingdom [forev]er. I will be a father to him and he will be a son to me.>> This (refers to the) <<branch of David>>, who will arise with the Interpreter of the law who [will rise up] in Zi[on in] the last days, as it is written....³

²With respect to Mark's trial narrative, this last question has been investigated by Donald H. Juel. His work appears in two forms: (1) his Ph. D. Dissertation from Yale University, 1973 ("The Messiah and the Temple. A Study of Jesus' Trial before the Sanhedrin in the Gospel of Mark," in facsimile from University Microfilms: Ann Arbor, 1984); and (2) *Messiah and Temple. The Trial of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark* (SBLDS 31; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977). Citations here will be according to the Dissertation pagination. The present study will deal with Mark only insofar as it helps to establish Zech 6.12 influence on the temple charge.

³Translation of lines 10-12 of 4Q174 taken from García Martínez, *DSS Translated* (2nd ed.), 136. Juel, 264-76, also cites 4QFlor. His work is also interested in the earlier part of 4QFlor, on Ex 15.17-18 because of Mark's temple "made with hands," etc. 4Q174 is somewhat ambiguous about who will build the eschatological temple; Juel, 275_{ff}, suggests that it probably reflects the Qumran tendency to downplay the Davidic Messiah's role. Even so, the midrash preserves the messianic interpretation by identifying the offspring of David as the Branch. Juel also notes that 4QFlor preserves the father-son imagery without comment.

The *Branch of David* is well-established as a designation for the Davidic Messiah.⁴

Zech 6.12 is the only biblical text which explicitly states that the *Branch* will build the temple:⁵

הַנְּהַאֲשִׁי שְׂמֹחַ וְנִמְתָּחַתִּיר יִצְחָק וְבָנָה אֶת־הַיְיָכֵל יְהוָה --Zech 6.12 MT

...Ἴδοὺ ἀνὴρ, Ἀνατολή ὄνομα αὐτῷ, καὶ ὑποκάτωθεν αὐτοῦ ἀνατελεῖ,
καὶ οἰκοδομήσει τὸν οἶκον κυρίου... --Zech 6.12 LXX

Behold the man, whose name is *Branch/Rising*, and he will branch out in his place/rise up from below, and he will build the temple/house of the Lord.

The Targums provide some support for this concept, by interpreting the figure who builds the temple to be the Messiah:

...Behold, the man whose name is *Anointed* will be revealed, and he shall be raised up,⁶ and shall build the temple of the Lord. He shall build the temple of the Lord and he shall assume majesty and shall sit and rule upon his throne... --Tg. Zech. 6.12-13a⁷

And he will build the sanctuary which was profaned for our sins... --Tg. Isa. 53.5⁸

The Targums do not say anything about the Messiah tearing down the existing temple, nor do any of the scriptures of Israel. At most, the evidence from Qumran and the Targums shows that, for some interpretive communities, the Messiah could have been expected to

⁴See coverage of this topic above in the Infancy Narrative section; note #39 gives reference to three other Qumran works which also refer to the Davidic Branch in eschatological terms (4Q161, 4Q252; 4Q285). The same thesis section recognizes the connection between Is 11.1-10, Jer 23.5, and the messianic associations with the Branch in Zech 3.8; 6.12.

⁵Infancy Narrative thesis section examines Zech 6.12 influence on Mt 2.1-2; see notes #37-38 for textual notes.

⁶This phrase “and he shall be raised up,” seems close to the LXX, “and he shall rise...” as well as to the MT, “and he shall branch out....”

⁷Zech 3.8 refers to God’s “servant, the Branch (MT)/Ἀνατολή (LXX),” and Tg. Zech. 3.8 reads, “For behold, I will bring my servant the anointed One, and he shall be revealed.”

⁸English translation from Bruce D. Chilton, *The Isaiah Targum* (vol. 11 of *The Aramaic Bible: The Targums* (ed. Kevin Cathcart, Michael Maherr and Martin McNamara; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987), 104. The complexities of the Targum of Isaiah 53 are outside the scope of this study; however, this is one of the few places where the tenet that the Messiah is to build the future sanctuary occurs.

build the eschatological temple. This is most strongly supported by Zech 6.12 MT and LXX.⁹

Before the question of Matthew's divergence from Mark can be answered, a brief look at one scholar's work on the temple charge in Mark will be helpful. The method and focus of Donald Juel's thesis on Mk 14.58 can be summarized as follows:

In the Gospel, and particularly in the passion story, Mark employs a "double-level narrative" style in order to explore the "real" meaning of the text at a sub-surface level, where only the reader (and not the characters in the story) can understand the meaning of Jesus' trial and death.

A study of the temple charge in view of the taunts (which are repetitions of the trial accusations) at the foot of Jesus' cross suggests that Mark intended the charge to be understood (on a literary level) as *true* in some sense, i.e., that it is not simply *false testimony*. The charge is part of a Markan preoccupation with the temple that begins in chapter 11 and culminates, at the moment of Jesus' death, in the tearing of the temple veil (15:58), which vindicates Jesus as Messiah. Thus Mark ties the (pending?) destruction of the temple with the theme of Jesus' rejection by the Jewish leaders, and he relates both to Jesus' death and resurrection by means of the charge in 14:58. The "truth" of the charge is that the Christian community is the successor to the temple establishment. The temple charge points to Jesus as the Messiah who will build the eschatological temple - again at a level of meaning accessible only to the reader. .¹⁰

For the study of the temple charge in Matthew, Juel is most helpful with his concept of a *double-level narrative style* which allows the informed gospel reader to find a *true* meaning beneath the surface of the text, that is, to be able to ascertain that the false testimony may not be completely *false*, even if the false witnesses had false information and false motives. However, one cannot confirm that Juel's conclusions about the meaning for Mark hold for Matthew's understanding of the temple charge and its significance. For, although Matthew generally follows the Markan order in sections dealing with the temple, he does make some significant changes. For example, Matthew consolidates the account of

⁹For Rabbinic references to Zech 6.12, see Juel, 303-4; his comment that, "potential traditions according to which the Messiah would build the eschatological temple have been actualized in the community from which this comment derives," is apt. Especially after the destruction of the Jerusalem temple, texts like Zech 6.12 would be even more susceptible of an eschatological interpretation.

¹⁰See Juel's Dissertation, especially 78-82, for his literary approach to the Markan trial.

Jesus cursing the fig tree, in place of Mark's sandwich around the temple "cleansing" (Mt 21.18-22; cf. Mk 11.12-14, 20-25); Matthew also omits reference to Gentiles in the "house of prayer" statement (Mt 21.13; cf. Mk 11.17).¹¹ In Mt 24.1-4, Jesus leaves the temple complex for the last time; in Mk 13.1-4, after the prediction that one stone would not be left standing on another, the Mount of Olives is still located in relation to the temple.

Both Mark and Matthew use *ἱερόν* in the prediction of the destruction of the temple, and both use *ναός* in the temple charge, the taunt and the rending of the temple curtain.¹² Matthew uses *ναός* in two other scenes that spark a highly-charged atmosphere into which the trial scene and its focus on the temple is projected: (1) in Mt 23.35, Jesus warns that "this generation," is responsible for "all righteous blood shed on earth, from...Abel to...Zechariah...murdered between the sanctuary (*ναός*) and the altar (*θυσιαστήριον*);" and (2) in 27.4-5, Judas throws the thirty pieces of silver, money paid to him for Jesus' innocent blood, into the sanctuary (*εἰς τὸν ναόν*). The sanctuary, once polluted with the righteous blood of Zechariah slain in the temple, has *now* become defiled with the innocent blood of Jesus.¹³

At the textual level, Matthew's trial account appears to simplify Mark's version of the temple-building expectations of the Messiah.¹⁴ Matthew's version of the temple charge

¹¹Moreover, Mark's Jesus teaches in the temple (11.17-19), when Matthew's Jesus is healing and receiving children's praises (21.14-17).

¹²See Mt 21.2||Mk 13.2; Mt 26.62||Mk 14.58; Mt 27.40||Mk 15.29; Mt 27.51||Mk 15.38. These are the only places Mark uses *ναός*, but Mt uses it elsewhere, which may point to a different nuance in meaning.

¹³In 2 Chr 24.20-22, it is the courtyard of the temple where Zechariah/Azariah was slain, but Mt chooses to use the term *ναός* instead of *αὐλή οἴκου κυρίου*.

¹⁴Of course, both gospels have the "three days" in common, which already calls to mind the resurrection and its interpretive possibilities. The Markan "made with/without hands" language invites a more *spiritualized* range of interpretations, e.g. a community could become the new temple, similar to some

omits the “made with/without hands” imagery, perhaps to shift the focus away from the tradition that God would build the temple, or it could be that Matthew was aware of “Markan redaction” of the tradition.¹⁵ Matthew’s wording in the taunt at the cross is nearly identical to Mark’s:

You who would destroy the temple and build it in three days, save yourself!
If you are the Son of God, come down from the cross. --Mt 27.40; cf. Mk 15.29-30¹⁶

The other difference in wording between Matthew and Mark is the claim attributed to Jesus by the “witnesses” — in Mark, Jesus is made to say, “I *will destroy* this temple...and build another,” but in Matthew Jesus reputedly said, “I *am able to destroy* the *temple of God* and to build it.”¹⁷ One could derive from either gospel here the tradition that the Messiah was the *son* of God and would build the (eschatological) temple. The joint concepts of Messiah and temple both figure in the trial, for after the temple charge is made the High Priest adjures Jesus to tell whether he is the *Messiah*, the *Son of God* (Mt 27.63; cf. Mk 14.61, *Son of the Blessed*). At the death of Jesus, when the curtain of the sanctuary (*ναός*) is split in two *from top to bottom*, the reader understands that God

Qumran exegesis. But cf. Mt 16.16-18, and see discussion below.

¹⁵About Mt’s omission of the *χειροποίητον/ἀχειροποίητον* antithesis of Mk 14.58, see James D. G. Dunn, “Matthew’s Awareness of Markan Redaction,” 1356.

¹⁶Matthew’s “if you are the Son of God” does not appear in Mark’s taunt scene. Before the confession that Jesus is God’s Son in Mt 27.54, in contrast with Mk 15.37-39, more than Jesus’ death and the rending of the temple curtain has occurred. See on Eschatological Signs at Jesus’ Crucifixion below.

¹⁷The basis for the charge of blasphemy in both Mark and Matthew, however, seems not to be related to the focus of this thesis. Unless a claim to be Messiah (or Son of Man) was blasphemous in and of itself, is the reader meant to understand Jesus’ supposed claim to be placing himself on a par with God; i.e., able to destroy the temple? Yet on the surface of the text that is not the question the High Priest asks. Of course, it is possible that either form of the charge about *destroying* the temple is the *false* part of the testimony; however, it might at the same time be understood by the reader as *ironic* and prophetic (see Juel’s diss., 319-20).

has acted to vindicate Jesus.¹⁸

Especially with Matthew, the *temple of God* is clearly central; he has removed any modifiers that might deflect the reader's attention. But what does the expression "temple of God" signify for Matthew and his readers? Perhaps this is where it would be well to apply Juel's concept of a double-level narrative to Matthew's temple charge. If one does not assume that the findings for Matthew will necessarily match those for Mark, what options are available on the level of deeper meaning?¹⁹

(1) Both parts of the charge are false: Jesus did not say he was able to destroy the temple of God; nor did he say he would build it again in three days. Option (1) can be derived from the surface level of the text. False witnesses bring false charges against Jesus and he is condemned in a mockery of justice.

(2) The first part of the charge is false and the second is true: Jesus did not say he was able to destroy the temple of God, but he did claim that he would build it (again) in three days. Option (2) reflects popular contemporary exegesis (of both Mt and Mk); Jesus spoke figuratively, and he would build the (new) temple in 3 days [either he would rise, or he would build his church after the resurrection].

(3) The first part of the charge is true and the second is false: Jesus did say he was able to destroy the temple of God, but he did not claim that he would build it again. Option (3), although possibly a reversal of Mark's true-false division of the temple charge, might function on the sub-narrative level of Matthew. Readers of Mt might understand that because of the rejection of Jesus, the temple had been destroyed [post 66-70 C.E.], a near-equivalent to his purported claim to be able to destroy it, but they would not expect the Jerusalem temple to be re-built.

(4) Both parts of the charge are true: Jesus did claim that he was able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it (again) in three days. Option (4) would see both halves of the charge to be true at the deepest level: Jesus was endowed with godly power and could destroy and/or build the temple.

Taking into account the possibility of meanings under the surface of the text, Reading (4) presents Matthew's reader with some inner-gospel resonances to explore. In light of the

¹⁸Although neither *ἱερόν* nor *ναός* appears, Jesus in Mt 23.38 has lamented that his rejection by Jerusalem will leave their *house* desolate; this is most certainly a reference to the temple, and the rending of the sanctuary veil could engender fulfillment of this prophecy. In Matthew's trial account, the terms Messiah, Son of God, and Son of Man appear, as does a belief that the Messiah was expected to be a prophet (27.67).

¹⁹None of this analysis is a claim about what happened historically; rather, it is an attempt to make use of a *double-level narrative style* to discern what Matthew's readers may have read under the text.

expectation of Zech 6.12 (that the Messiah would build the temple), Matthew's reader might recall Jesus' passion predictions as the source of the "three days" imagery (Mt 16.21; 17.23; 20.19) in the accusation. Immediately following Peter's confession of Jesus as "the Messiah, the Son of the living God," Matthew's Jesus replies, "...My father in heaven [has revealed this to you]" (16.16-17). This is followed by Jesus' promise, "I will build my church" (16.18). This is very much like the claim in Zech 6.12 that the messianic figure (the Branch/'Ανατολή) will build the temple of the Lord. In Mt 26.61, Jesus is reported to have said, "I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it again within three days,"

δύναμαι καταλύσαι τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν οἰκοδομῆσαι.

This may be compared with Jesus' claim, as recorded by Matthew, and with Zechariah's "messianic prophecy":

οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν --Mt 16.18

οἰκοδομήσει τὸν οἶκον κυρίου --Zech 6.12

At the level of allusive references, one might hear in the charge that Jesus *said* he would build the temple in three days (or that he was able to do so) the parallel expression that Jesus *said* he would build his church, which is verbally similar to the Zechariah promise.²⁰

In sum, one is left with something like a midrash on 2 Sam 7 and Zech 6.12 informing Matthew's trial narrative at a deep level, with the bulk of influence coming from Zech 6.12 -- the Messiah will build the (eschatological) temple. It appears that the imagery from Zechariah 6.12 has been split between the Infancy Narrative's use of the messianic "name" (Branch-'Ανατολή) at a deep level, and the Passion Narrative's use of the

²⁰Using Schaefer's terminology (see Methodology in thesis introduction), we can see thematic parallelism and verbal parallelism here: 'He will build'/'I will build'/'He said he was able to build;' these in turn could be equated as a claim to be the Messiah. In addition, the 'three days' seems to come in from the passion predictions (--three days then transfers to the related building motif), which would come from the sub-text of the reader's knowledge that Jesus rose from the dead after three days.

messianic expectation that the Branch-Ἄνατολή will build the temple, in relation to the temple charge made at Jesus' trial. These two possible uses of Zechariah 6.12, both exerting their influence at very deep subtextual narrative levels also reinforce each other.

CHAPTER ELEVEN
Jesus' Crucifixion
 The Eschatological Signs
 [Matthew 27.51-53/Zechariah 14.4-5]

Both Matthew and Mark report that, following three hours of darkness at the crucifixion, the veil of the temple was torn in two from top to bottom when Jesus died (Mt 27.51||Mk 15.38).¹ Only Matthew adds a sequence of complementary events to the splitting of the curtain: the earth quaked; rocks were split; tombs were opened; many bodies of the holy dead were raised: they left their tombs and went into the holy city (after Jesus was raised) and they appeared to many (Mt 27.51b-53).² Although Mt 27.51-53 nowhere suggests a fulfillment motif, its apocalyptic and eschatological terminology invites the reader to look for scriptural allusions.³

Two texts most often nominated for having influence on Mt 27.51-53 are Ezek 37.12-13 and Zech 14.4-5.⁴ The pertinent parts of these three Greek texts are as follows:

Καὶ ἰδοὺ τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ ἐσχίσθη ἀπ' ἄνωθεν ἕως κάτω εἰς δύο
 καὶ ἡ γῆ ἐσειέσθη καὶ αἱ πέτραι ἐσχίσθησαν, καὶ τὰ μνημεῖα ἀνεώχθησαν
 καὶ πολλὰ σώματα τῶν κεκοιμημένων ἀγίων ἠγέρθησαν, καὶ ἐξελθόντες ἐκ
 τῶν μνημείων μετὰ τὴν ἔγερσιν αὐτοῦ εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν
 καὶ ἐνεφανίσθησαν πολλοῖς. --Mt 27.51-53

¹Other than Mt's addition of ἰδοὺ and the reversed word order of Mk, the two are identical. Lk 23.44-46 also reports the darkness, but reports the tearing of the temple curtain just before Jesus breathes his last.

²Davies & Allison III, 628, note *parataxis*, *divine passives*, *parallelism*, plus *catchwords* and repetitive vocabulary in this text, all in service of the theophanic and eschatological meaning of the crucifixion.

³Descamps, "Rédaction et Christologie de la Passion," 405, interprets Jesus' death in Matthew as a messianic victory, and notes, "L'allusion aux saints est une sorte de variante sur le thème de l'accomplissement de l'Écriture dans le destin de Jésus...."

⁴The LXX of the parts of Ezek 37.12-13 and Zech 14.4a, 5b here are very like MT, so only the Greek will feature in this study, except for ׀ִשָׁדָּק. (See ch 4 above on the Matthean apocalypse, where Mt 25.31 and Zech 14.5bMT/LXX, and Tg. Zech. 14.5b are presented). Underlined and italicized parts are of most interest here.

διὰ τοῦτο προφήτευσον καὶ εἰπόν· Τάδε λέγει κύριος Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀνοίγω ὑμῶν τὰ μνήματα καὶ ἀνάξω ὑμᾶς ἐκ τῶν μνημάτων ὑμῶν καὶ εἰσάξω ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν γῆν τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ γνώσεσθε ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι κύριος ἐν τῷ ἀνοίξαι με τοὺς τάφους ὑμῶν τοῦ ἀναγαγεῖν με ἐκ τῶν τάφων τὸν λαόν μου. --Ez 37.12-13

καὶ στήσονται οἱ πόδες αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν τὸ κατέναντι Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐξ ἀνατολῶν· καὶ σχισθήσεται τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν, τὸ ἥμισυ αὐτοῦ...καὶ τὸ ἥμισυ αὐτοῦ ... (ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τοῦ σεισμοῦ ἐν ἡμέραις Οὐζίου βασιλέως Ἰουδα·) καὶ ἦξει κύριος ὁ θεὸς μου καὶ πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι μετ' αὐτοῦ. --Zech 14.4a, 5b

In its original context, Zech 14.1-5 probably lends a “military nuance” to the expression “holy ones” (קִדְּוִיִּם), yet a more usual military expression like “heavenly hosts” or “armies” might have been expected here.⁵ The natural reading for קִדְּוִיִּם in Zech 14.5b MT is “heavenly beings” (angels), yet the flexibility of the Greek ἅγιοι (“holy ones”) in Zech 14.5b LXX leaves the way open for Matthew to be equally flexible and to use “angels” — the more literal sense of the MT — in Mt 25.31 and to reserve “holy ones,” that is, “saints” for use in Mt 27.52.⁶

The main point of contact between Mt 27.51-53 and Ezek 37.12-13 is God’s promise to open the monuments of the exiles (and to lead them from their graves into the land of Israel).⁷ Zech 14.4-5 mentions an earthquake near Jerusalem and uses σχίζω with reference to the Mount of Olives being split in half. God does not merely appear on the Mount of Olives (14.4a), but he comes into Jerusalem with *all his holy ones* (14.5b).⁸

⁵For this reason Meyers II, 430, suggests that a “sacral nuance” may be discerned in Zech 14.5 (when the battle ends); thus the “holy ones” who are angels may serve in a “purifying role.”

⁶The ambiguity is inherent in the Hebrew word and in its Greek counterpart; see Matthean apocalypse section, where the lexical citations are given in note #59.

⁷Donald Senior, “The Death of Jesus and the Resurrection of the Holy Ones (Mt 27:51-53),” *CBQ* 38 (1976) 312-29, sees Ezek 37 as source; on p. 321, in support of Ezek influence, he notes Ezek 37.7 reference to an earthquake, and Ezek 37.12 to resurrection.

⁸Perhaps the most insistent advocate of Zech 14.4-5 influence is Dale Allison, *The End of the Ages Has Come* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985) 41-46; see also Davies & Allison III, 628-35; and Raymond E. Brown, “Eschatological Events Accompanying the Death of Jesus, Especially the Raising of the Holy Ones

Zechariah's use of eschatological terminology (e.g., *on that day*--14.4) may support the theological position that the Matthean Jesus' death has significance with reference to last things⁹ -- even the dead are raised.¹⁰

Although Zech 14.4-5 has not been widely understood as a resurrection text, there are indications that some early Jewish interpretive communities may have read it thus. The first evidence comes from the Targums:

(At that time the Lord will take in his hand the great trumpet and will blow ten blasts upon it to revive the dead.) And at that time, he shall reveal himself in his might upon the mount of Olives which is before Jerusalem on the east, and the mount of Olives shall be split in two to the east and to the west by a very great valley.... and you shall flee just as you fled before the earthquake which came in the days of Uzziah....and the Lord my God shall reveal himself and all his holy ones with him. --Tg. Zech. 14.4-5¹¹

When the dead rise, the Mount of Olives will be cleft, and all Israel's dead will come up out of it, also the righteous who have died in captivity; they will come by way of a subterranean passage and will emerge from beneath the Mount of Olives. --Tg. Cant. 8.5¹²

The north panel of the synagogue at Dura-Europos portrays an affinity between Ezekiel's vision of resurrection (37.1-14) and the events on the Mount of Olives described in Zech 14.4-5.¹³

from Their Tombs (Matt 27:51-53)," 59-61, 67, 72 (note 33), in *Faith and the Future* (ed. John P. Galvin; New York: Paulist, 1994).

⁹Pace Ronald L. Troxel, "Matt 27.51-4 Reconsidered: Its Role in the Passion Narrative, Meaning and Origin," *NTS* (2002)30-47, who sees the sole aim of this passage to undergird Jesus' identity as God's son; Troxel denies Zechariah influence and prefers I Enoch 93.6 as Mt's source.

¹⁰Compare with Mt 11.4, where "the dead are raised" is included among the works of the Messiah.

¹¹The sentence in parentheses precedes Zech 14.4 in Codex Reuchlinianus; English trans. of Tg. Zech. 14.4-5 from R. P. Gordon, in *The Targum of the Minor Prophets*, 223. [underlining for emphasis] Also cf. Tg. Zech. 9.14: when the trumpet is blown, God reveals himself.

¹²Cited in Allison, *End of the Ages*, 43; see also Larry Gilbert Schneekloth, "The Targum of the Song of Songs," (Ph. D. diss., University of Wisconsin [Madison], 1977), 268-69, 308.

¹³Dated mid-third century CE; as with the dating of the Targums and their traditions, we may assume that the depiction in this panel testifies to traditional beliefs of some early Jewish faith communities at least by the third century. For scholarly interpretations of this panel, see Rachel Wischnitzer-Bernstein,

In the section of the panel which depicts the resurrection of the dead, the Mount of Olives is indicated by the two olive trees on top of the mountain which has been *split in two* (the only clear occurrence of such a *cleft motif* in the Bible is in Zech 14.4). It seems that the artist has combined the *resurrection from Ez 37* with the *Mount of Olives being cleft at the Lord's coming in Zech 14.4*. The fallen building on the slope of the mountain may symbolize an *earthquake*; those resurrected may be the "holy ones" of Zech 14.5. One of the figures in the panel may be the Davidic messiah.¹⁴

The *splitting* of the Mount of Olives when the Lord's feet stand upon it may signify that an *earthquake* would happen simultaneously (Zech 14.4,5); this would be congruent with the gospel account of rocks (and tombs) splitting open due to an earthquake when Jesus died (Mt 27.51-2).¹⁵ Presumably, any tombs to be opened (Mt 27.52; by God, Ezek 37.12) would also be situated outside the city. The appearance of the bodies of the *saints* (σώματα τῶν...ἁγίων) in the holy city may derive from the appearance there of the *holy ones* (οἱ ἅγιοι) with the Lord in Zech 14.5. It is very possible that Matthew 27.51b-53 borrows imagery from both Ezek 37 and Zech 14, in his description of the eschatological events which accompanied the death of Jesus.

That Matthew knew and probably already has alluded to Zech 14.5b is demonstrated with reference to the Son of Man appearing with *all the angels* (καὶ πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι

"The Conception of the Resurrection in the Ezekiel Panel of the Dura Synagogue," *JBL* 60 (1941), 43-55; also John B. Curtis, "The Mount of Olives in Tradition," *HUCA* 28 (1957), 170-72. Both of these articles include facsimilies of the panel in question. For rabbinic references to Zech 14.1-5 and related texts, see M. C. Black, "The Rejected and Slain Messiah," 142-50.

¹⁴This description is my compilation of interpretive suggestions taken from Allison, *End of the Ages*, 43, from Curtis, "Mount of Olives," 171, and from Wischnitzer-Bernstein, "Resurrection in Ezekiel Panel," 49-50.

¹⁵Mt 28.2 reports a great earthquake (σεισμός ἐγένετο μέγας) occurred as an angel of the Lord descended from heaven to roll away the stone from Jesus' tomb. The most natural reading of the text suggests that Jesus was already raised before this time, but he did not appear to the women until later in the scene. Although the language here is not as difficult as 27.51-53 (the textual and theological question about when the saints were raised relative to Jesus' resurrection), the events are not narrated in strict chronological order in 28.2_{ff} either.

μετ' αὐτοῦ) in Mt 25.31.¹⁶ Matthew's preferred term for the "saints" is οἱ δίκαιοι; except for this scriptural allusion to οἱ ἅγιοι in Zech 14.5b, one would expect the "tombs of the righteous (Mt 23.29)" to be opened or the "bodies of the righteous" to appear in Mt 27.52.¹⁷

The flexible way that Matthew seems to have used Zech 14.5b is signaled by the key Hebrew word קְדוֹשִׁים ("holy persons" or "heavenly beings"), and its equivalent ἅγιοι ("holy ones," as "saints" or "angels"). Matthew could certainly utilize the inherent ambiguity in terminology to advantage, especially by using familiar eschatological imagery as Zechariah 14 with reference to apocalyptic or eschatological events.¹⁸ In both Mt 25.31 and 27.51-53, imagery from Zech 14.4-5 has served his exegetical aims. There is no doubt that Mt 25.31 refers to eschatological times; Matthew's imagery in 27.51-53 strengthens the impression that Matthew meant to attach eschatological meaning to Jesus' death.

When Jesus died on the cross, the curtain of the temple was split in two from top to bottom (Mt 27.51), a sign that the destruction of the temple would surely happen (Mt 24.2-3; cf. 26.61; 27.40). Also associated with the time of Jesus' death, the earth

¹⁶See thesis section on Matthean apocalypse, note #59, which covers some textual issues of Zech 14.5b MT/LXX, and Mt 25.31 textual variants (e.g., ἅγιοι for ἄγγελοι). Also of special note are the Mark 8.38 and Luke 9.26 parallels to Mt 16.27, which say that the Son of Man will come with/in the glory of *the holy angels* -- Matthew uses either *holy ones* (27.52) or *angels* (16.27) but never writes *holy angels*. When angels are present with the Son of Man, Mt usually refers to them as *his angels*; the reference to *all the angels* in 25.31 supports Zech 14.5b influence on Matthew.

¹⁷By inserting "holy ones" in place of a Matthean expression, "the righteous," one is led to seek the source of this allusion. Here an expected inner-gospel allusion gives way to an intertextual allusion, which, in turn, produces a different kind of intra-gospel "key word" echo of Zech 14.5.

¹⁸Reference has been made above which demonstrates Matthew's knowledge of Hebrew (Zech 9.9 in 21.5), and to his incorporation of textual variants in his exegesis (e.g., Zech 10.2 in 9.36; Zech 11.13 in 27.3-10). It is not necessary to argue that one or the other text, Mt 25.31 or 27.51-53, must be redactional and the other not! The burden of proof in such a claim is to show that Matthew was unaware of such rich textual possibilities; this may have been the case, but it seems more likely here that he had access to the texts and was conscious of the Zech 14.5b textual tradition(s) at this point.

quaked, tombs were split open and the saints were raised (Mt 27.51b-52), a sign that the end of the age had begun (cf. Mt 24.3b). This was not the end, but the promise of the resurrection and the future Parousia.¹⁹

¹⁹In some ways, the report of Mt 27.51-53 seems to be an answer the disciples' questions about the timing of the destruction of the temple, of Jesus' Parousia and the beginning of the end. The rending of the curtain prefigures the temple's complete destruction; the raising of saints prefigures the final resurrection; and one is left to think about Jesus' resurrection appearances in terms of the promise of his final Parousia.

(Is it possible that the events reported in Mt 27.52-3 also represent a proleptic appearance of the Lord coming from the Mount of Olives with his holy ones into Jerusalem? Would such a reading affect the significance of Jesus' entry to Jerusalem in Mt 21.5/Zech 9.9? Is the reader meant to understand the raising of the saints as partial fulfillment of Zech 14.4-5?)

CHAPTER TWELVE
Jesus on the Mount of Olives
 The Shepherd King

[Matthew 21.1-11; 24.3_{ff}; 26.30-56/Zechariah 9.9; 13.7;14.4-5]

Two of Matthew's most-recognized Zechariah citations come from the Passion Narrative, the first in a "fulfillment citation" (Mt 21.5/Zech 9.9), and the second when Jesus himself quotes the prophetic text (Mt 26.31/Zech 13.7). On both occasions Jesus and his disciples are on the Mount of Olives — does this reflect more than a notation of their geographic location? Before examining references to the Mount of Olives in the First Gospel, it is necessary to consider its tradition-historical context.

The Mount of Olives

The Mount of Olives is rarely mentioned in the Old Testament. It is identified as the "ascent of Olivet" in one Davidic text: in response to Absalom's revolt, David the king wept as he went up the Ascent of Olives, (עֲלֶה בְּמַעְלֵה הַזַּיְתִּים MT; καὶ Δαυὶδ ἀνέβαινεν ἐν τῇ ἀνάβασει τῶν ἐλαιῶν ἀναβαίνων καὶ κλαίων...LXX), at the summit of which God was worshiped (2 Sam 15.30-32).¹ The only place in the Jewish scriptures in which the Mount of Olives is *named* as such is Zechariah 14.4, where it is twice-mentioned: (a) עַל-הַר הַזַּיְתִּים ; (b) הַר הַזַּיְתִּים; τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν.²

And on that day his feet will stand on the Mount of Olives, opposite Jerusalem to the East,
 and the Mount of Olives will be split (in half). --Zech 14.4

¹Does this Davidic incident echo in Jesus' agonizing prayer in Gethsemane? 2 Sam 15.30 refers to τῇ ἀνάβασει τῶν ἐλαιῶν, of which Lk 19.28-29 is reminiscent (καὶ εἰπὼν ταῦτα ἐπορεύετο ἔμπροσθεν ἀναβαίνων εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα, καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἤγγισεν εἰς Βηθφαγὴ καὶ βηθανίαν πρὸς τὸ ὄρος το καλουμενον Ἐλαιῶν... (cf. Lk 19.37).

²Ezek 11.23 probably alludes to the Mount of Olives, even though it is not identified by name: in the prophetic vision, the glory of the Lord, which had already left the Temple (Ezek 10.18), now went up from the midst of the city (Jerusalem) and stood upon the mountain on the east side of the city. Other possible references to the same location may include the following: 1 Kings 11.7, 2 Kings 23.13, Neh 8.15; see the detailed article by John Briggs Curtis, "An Investigation of the Mount of Olives in the Judaeo-Christian Tradition," *HUCA* 28 (1957) 137-80, especially 139-42, for these suggested OT texts. Ezekiel figures in rabbinic speculation: the glory of the Lord was said to rest on the Mount of Olives for three and a half years waiting for Israel's repentance. See the Articles in *ABD* and *IDB*, on the "Mount of Olives," for other references including the belief that the ashes of the red heifer (Num 19) were to be prepared on the Mount of Olives, and the belief that the resurrection of the faithful dead would occur when the Mount of Olives was split. Also see comments elsewhere in thesis (eschatological signs at the crucifixion) on the fresco at the synagogue at Dura Europas, which likely conflates Ezek 37.1-14 and Zech 14.4. (A possible NT allusion to the Mount of Olives is Zech 4.7 in Mt 21.21, par.)

The first part of Zechariah 14 describes the eschatological Day of the Lord, when he will come forth from the Mount of Olives to do battle against the nations at Jerusalem; the resultant upheaval is described in apocalyptic terms: the mountain will be split and the surrounding topography will be dramatically altered. The next verse tells of the Lord coming, presumably to Jerusalem, with all his “holy ones” (Zech 14.5).

The Mount of Olives does not feature much in “intertestamental” texts, but in the eschatological vision of the *T. Naph. 5.1*_{ff}, the patriarch is reported to have seen a vision on the Mount of Olives: while the sun and the moon stood still, Levi seized the sun and Judah grasped the moon.³

The Mount of Olives is mentioned twelve times in the New Testament, eleven in the Gospels and once in Acts.⁴ The Synoptics all record Jesus’ entry into Jerusalem from the Mount of Olives,⁵ but only Matthew and Mark situate the apocalyptic discourse on the Mount of Olives.⁶ The Synoptics all locate Jesus’ arrest on the Mount of Olives.⁷

The Mount of Olives surfaces in Matthew where the first evangelist is following his Markan source, as Jesus prepares to enter Jerusalem for the first time (Mt 21.1||Mk 11.1), in what appears to be a deliberate enactment of Zechariah 9.9. Jesus’ careful planning of the event includes his instruction for the disciples to tell anyone who asks them untying the

³In *T.Naph. 5.3* a certain young man gives Levi twelve date palms. The Curtis article, *op. cit.*, 170, mentions that date palms were likely gathered from the Mount of Olives for Sukkah (Neh 8.15; cf. Zech 14.16-19); he speculates that the origins of this usage may come from the cult of Nergal, who is thought to have been worshiped on the Mount of Olives. Curtis, 139 *et passim*, also believes that this worship may lie beneath the mention of the worship of God in 2 Sam 15.32. In *T. Naph. 8.1*_{ff}, the visionary claims to have seen what will happen in Israel in the *last times*; not surprisingly, Levi and Judah are expected to play principal roles.

⁴Matthew and Mark refers to the Mount of Olives three times (Mt 21.1; 24.3; 26.30 / Mk 11.1; 13.3; 14.26); Luke four times (Lk 19.29, 37; 21.37; 22.39; cf. Lk 24.50_{ff}; Acts 1.12, which fixes Jesus’ ascension there); and John once (Jn 8.1; cf. 18.1-2).

⁵Mt 21.1-11; Mk 11.1-11; Lk 19.28-44; cf. Jn 12.12-19. John expresses interest in the Zech 9.9 motif at the entry to Jerusalem, but he mentions neither Zech 13.7 nor the Mount of Olives in Passion texts.

⁶Mt 24.3; Mk 13.3; cf. Lk 21.5-7. In his apocalyptic discourse, Luke eliminates Jesus’ move from the temple to Olivet and suppresses the Zechariah 13.7 quotation. Luke may be influenced by other parts of Zech 14; e.g., in the lament over Jerusalem, Jesus predicts that the city will be surrounded, 19.41-44. The Mount of Olives figures in his Ascension account, thus the potential influence of Zech 14.4 is transferred to that event and not to Jesus’ passion or resurrection.

⁷Mt 26.30_{ff}; Mk 14.26_{ff}; Lk 22.39_{ff}. This assumes that Gethsemane (Mt 26.36, Mk 14.32) is on the Mount of Olives. John’s account (18.1-2) places the arrest similarly, across the Kidron in a garden known to the disciples.

donkey(s), "The Lord needs it/them" (Mt 21.3; cf. Mk 11.3). Matthew adds the weight of scripture to this narrative, in the fulfillment citation of Zech 9.9 (Mt 21.5), the first in a series of Zechariah allusions, citations and echoes. C. H. Dodd called Zech 9-14 essentially an "apocalypse of the Day of the Lord," much of which is quoted or echoed in the New Testament:⁸

It begins with the King entering Zion, meek and riding upon an ass, to bring peace and to liberate the prisoners, and it ends with all the nations of the earth coming up to Jerusalem to worship Jehovah their King -- in other words, with the proclamation of the universal Kingdom of God. Between this beginning and this ending there is a complicated plot, in which Israel, the 'flock' of God, passes through stages of rebellion against God and the punishment it entails in the course of which the shepherd is smitten and the flock scattered....

J. Nieuviarts is a scholar who reads the sequence of Zechariah references in Matthew's Passion Narrative very much in this way: the citation of Zech 9.9 is the first in a series which includes Zech 12.10-14 (Mt 24.30); Zech 14.5 (Mt 25.31); Zech 11.12 (Mt 26.15); Zech 13.7 (Mt 26.31); and 11.13 (Mt 27.3-10).⁹

The second reference to the Mount of Olives occurs as Jesus leaves the temple (in Matthew, for the last time); he sits on the Mount of Olives and instructs his disciples on things relating to the destruction of the temple and pertaining to his Parousia (Mt 24.1-3;

⁸C. H. Dodd, *The Old Testament in the New*, 13; see also Bruce, "Book of Zechariah and the Passion Narrative," 352, where he concludes, "If Jesus was the first to speak of His passion in terms of Zechariah ix-xiv, the Evangelists follow His example...in finding other foreshadowings of His passion there...These chapters present a pattern of revelation and response which the Evangelists recognize as recurring in the story of Jesus."

⁹J. Nieuviarts, *L'Entrée de Jésus à Jérusalem (Mt 21, 1-17). Messianisme et accomplissement des Écritures en Matthieu* (Lectio Divina 176; Paris: Cerf, 1999). Nieuviarts, 61, writes "Dans ce cadre, le récit de l'entrée de Jésus à Jérusalem, dans lequel apparaît la première des citations de Zacharie, prend un relief tout à fait particulier....Un coup d'œil rapide sur la liste des passages de Zacharie montre que la citation de Za 9,9 est l'ouverture d'une série concernant de façons diverses la Passion." This is in line with Lindars' view, *NT Apologetic*, 111. Because of this sequence from Zechariah, Nieuviarts, 34-37, asserts that the evangelist invests the Mount of Olives with the eschatological significance it derives from Zech 14, and that Jesus' entry into Jerusalem from the Mount of Olives is to be read as the "L'Apparition du Seigneur."

cf. Mk 13.1-4).¹⁰

The Mount of Olives is mentioned for the third time on the night Jesus is betrayed; after supper, he and his band of disciples sing a hymn as they go to the Mount of Olives, where Jesus cites Zech 13.7 — he will be struck and they will scatter, that very night (Mt 26.30-32; Mk 14.26-28; cf. Lk 22.39). After his prayer vigil in Gethsemane (26.36_{ff}), Jesus is arrested; the entire sequence of events from the hymn-singing after supper to the arrest presumably takes place on the Mount of Olives (26.47-56).

In both Matthew and Mark, each time Jesus is reported to be on the Mount of Olives, the connection with Zechariah thematic material has been demonstrated by the increased frequency of Zechariah echoes or allusions in these places -- Jesus' entry into Jerusalem, Jesus' apocalyptic discourse, and Jesus' quotation of Zech 13.7. Because Matthew intensifies the importance of Zechariah by enhancing Mark's implicit Zechariah material, the importance of Zech 14.4 as a location of eschatological expectation may be inferred.¹¹

Another way to show the significance of such indirect allusions to Zech 14.4 comes by way of an inadvertent external testimony from Flavius Josephus. Josephus, who did not write as a messianic enthusiast, names the Mount of Olives twice with reference to an Egyptian "false prophet." This man took a crowd of Jewish followers to the wilderness and led them to believe God would perform miracles (through him) so that they would defeat the Romans in Jerusalem. According to one report, he promised that the walls

¹⁰In Mk 13, the Mount of Olives is still identified with reference to the temple; this is not the case in Mt 24.

¹¹These connections have been explored in thesis chapters on Jesus' entry into Jerusalem, the Matthean Apocalypse, and the events from the Last supper to Jesus' arrest.

of Jerusalem would fall at his command, which would be issued from the Mount of Olives (*Ant.* 20.8.167-72); in Josephus' second account, this Egyptian's attack on the Roman army would begin from the Mount of Olives (*War* 2. 13. 258-63). Although his narrative does not dwell on the potential "messianic" aspirations of such troublemakers, Josephus reveals enough about several messianic pretenders that the undercurrents of the ferment and apocalyptic fervor of those times cannot quite be suppressed. Josephus' example of the Egyptian alone provides enough evidence to show that, at least on occasion, attempts to free Jerusalem from Roman occupation could lead to actions being staged from the Mount of Olives.¹² It may not be stretching too far to suggest that those who were particularly zealous for Jerusalem would recall both David's time on Olivet and the promise that the Lord himself would come against his enemies from the Mount of Olives.

These stories are reminiscent of Jesus' warnings about "false prophets" and "false messiahs" who would lead many astray (Mt 24.5, 11) and, more specifically, who would "arise and show great signs and wonders, so as to lead astray...even the elect."¹³ The Matthean Jesus speaks these words to the disciples as he sits on the Mount of Olives; he urges them not to go out into the wilderness to follow such false leaders (Mt 24.23-26).

¹²A full study of the connections between various types of messianic, prophetic, and zealous fervor in first-century Palestine is outside the range of this thesis. For an exhaustive and convincing study of the period, see Martin Hengel's *The Zealots*; for a different perspective, see Richard A. Horsley, "Like One of the Prophets of Old': Two Types of Popular Prophets at the Time of Jesus," *CBQ* 47 (1985), 435-63; also David Hill, "Jesus and Josephus' 'messianic prophets,'" in *Text and Interpretation* (ed. Ernest Best and R. McL. Wilson; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 143-54. The two examples from Josephus here are given for their similarities with the apocalyptic discourse (Mt 24) and their specific reference to the Mount of Olives.

¹³See Graham Stanton, "Jesus of Nazareth: A Magician and a False Prophet Who Deceived God's People?," in *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ* (ed. Joel B. Green and Max Turner; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), especially 169-73, 177-78. Here Stanton approaches the testimony of Josephus from an angle complementary to this study; in addition, he derives evidence from the gospels that Jesus was accused of being a "magician and a false prophet." Beginning from different perspective on this topic, Stanton's study also confirms the kinds of overlapping vocabulary I observe between Josephus and the gospels.

In comparing Josephus' accounts of pretenders and their attempted uprisings with Jesus' warnings about false prophets and messiahs in Mt 24, one sees overlaps in their concepts and vocabulary: they include, for example, ψευδοπροφήτης, ληστής, ἀπατάω/πλανάω, ἐρεμία, σημεῖα.

The term ληστής is particularly interesting in this connection, for the charge Jesus makes against the temple, when he goes directly there from the Mount of Olives (Mt 21.10-13)¹⁴ is that they have made it into a cave of brigands, σπήλαιον ληστῶν (Mt 21.13 par). When Jesus is arrested on the Mount of Olives, he asks the arresting crowds, "Have you come out as against a brigand?" (ὡς ἐπὶ ληστήν, Mt 26.55). Lastly, Jesus is crucified between two brigands: Τότε σταυροῦνται σὺν αὐτῷ δύο λησταί, εἷς ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ εἷς ἐξ ἐνανθῶμων, (Mt 27.38 par).¹⁵

In summary, each of these accounts when Jesus begins, stays, or returns to the Mount of Olives, incorporates allusions to, or echoes of, Zechariah. By means of the citation, Matthew's Jesus is portrayed as having planned to enact the prophecy of Zech 9.9 in his entry into Jerusalem. Before the apocalyptic discourse, the Matthean Jesus has left the temple behind; when he sits to teach on the Mount of Olives, he uses theophanic and apocalyptic imagery from Zechariah to describe the Parousia and makes use of Zech 14.4-5 to describe the judgment.¹⁶ After the Last Supper, where "blood of the covenant" imagery

¹⁴In the Markan narrative, Jesus goes in, looks around, and leaves the temple; in Matthew the temple act follows his entrance into the city amid shouts of "Hosanna to the Son of David."

¹⁵The references to ληστής in Matthew are mentioned in ch.4 above; see discussion and footnotes #28-#31.

¹⁶This thesis has noted that Matthew might reflect some of Zechariah's concern about false prophecy (see note #10 in ch 2). In the apocalyptic discourse, Mt uses other Zech imagery not shared with Mark (trumpet, tribes mourn, etc.). Also cf. Ezek. 10.18, 11.23, when the glory of the Lord left Jerusalem and stood upon the mountain.... in Mt Jesus left the temple and went (decisively) to the Mount of Olives.

is used, they move to the Mount of Olives, where Jesus tells his disciples that Zech 13.7 refers to his imminent death. The eschatological signs set into motion at Jesus' crucifixion (earthquakes, rocks and graves splitting, and "holy ones" appearing in Jerusalem) come at the end of this long sequence of Zechariah echoes. The cumulative references to Zechariah reinforce the impression that the setting of the Mount of Olives is important because of its prophetic-apocalyptic context in Zechariah 14. As Matthew has portrayed Jesus the Messiah as the humble Davidic King of Zechariah 9.9, so also he had made him to be the Lord of Zechariah 14.4-5, who is coming to Jerusalem from the Mount of Olives.

CONCLUSION
Matthew's Use of Zechariah

In this thesis I have concentrated my study upon explicit and implicit uses of Zechariah traditions in the First Gospel. A survey of the kinds of Zechariah traditions used in Matthew yields a rich variety. There are two well-known direct quotations of Zechariah in Matthew: in the first instance, Zech 9.9 is prefaced by a "fulfillment formula" (Mt 21.5); in the second instance, the Matthean Jesus himself quotes Zech 13.7 (Mt 26.31). By means of Zech 9.9, Jesus is identified by the evangelist as the royal shepherd-king, who comes to Jerusalem; his entry to the city, itself a prophetic enactment (of seismic proportion), is followed immediately by a dramatic prophetic action in the temple. By means of the citation of Zech 13.7, Jesus is made to identify himself as a prophet-shepherd; he interprets the scriptures with reference to his own impending violent death. Both of these Zechariah-inspired events take place on the Mount of Olives (see Zech 14.4), and they form a kind of *inclusio* around Jesus' ministry in Jerusalem; the remaining time Jesus spends in Gethsemane is recorded as a struggle in prayer until Judas betrays him to the arresting party from the chief priests and elders.

In addition to these explicit citations, there are numerous allusions and echoes of Zechariah traditions in Matthew. It is not surprising that many of these traditions are found in the Jerusalem ministry and Passion Narrative at the end of the gospel. Some of the Zechariah influences are solitary or dominant, and others are in clusters, that is, in tandem with other biblical traditions. Zech 13.7 stands alone in Mt 26.31 (Mk 14.27). Zech 9.9 is the dominant influence in Mt 21.5 (with Isa 62.11). Allusions to Zechariah traditions are clustered in the apocalyptic discourse of Mt 24-25: Zech 2.6(10); 9.14; 12.10/Dan 7.13; 9.14; 14.4-7, together with "stock" apocalyptic imagery. Zech 14.4-5 figures in

combination with Ezekiel 37 imagery in Mt 27.51-53.

If there is influence from Zech 14.21 in Mt 21.12-16, it stands in the shadow of Jer 7.11 and Isa 56.7. The mysterious reference to Zechariah in Mt 23.35 is related to the biblical prophet and his opening words (cf. 2 Chr 24), but there may also be an echo of Jeremiah in the substructure of the text (cf. Jer 26; and other prophets who died violently). In contrast, Jeremiah does figure prominently in combination with both an allusion to, and a citation from, Zech 11.11-13 (Mt 26.14-16; 27.3-10); here the expression “thirty pieces of silver” is an example of “key word” inner-biblical exegesis by Matthew. Jesus’ reference to his “blood of the covenant” is most likely derived from Zech 9.11 (cf. Exod 24.6-8) in Mt 26.28 (cf. Mk 14.24).

There seems to be another use of “thematic parallelism” in the echo of Zech 6.12 in the charge against Jesus at his trial; this same Zechariah text figures in the Infancy Narrative, with the Ἀνατολή-Branch imagery for the Messiah (Mt 2.1-6, 23). The Emmanuel and salvation imagery of Mt 1.18-25 may reflect themes from Zech 8 as well as from Isaiah 7: thematic resonance with several sections of Zech 8 suggests it may have contributed to part of the foundation upon which the Infancy Narrative is based. The possibility that Matthew may have known both Hebrew and Greek traditions of Zech 10.2 strengthens the possibility that this Zechariah tradition contributes to his portrayal of Jesus’ compassionate healing ministry.

How do these sorts of Zechariah traditions relate to Matthew’s use of his sources? Is there a discernible pattern in how Matthew uses the Zechariah materials? From the cases studied in this thesis, a pattern has emerged wherein it can be argued that Matthew has added Zechariah traditions to, or enhanced those he found already in, many of his

sources. With reference to Mark, Matthew retains the Zech 13.7 quotation and seems to place his emphasis in the expressions he adds to the Markan form of the citation. Also with Mark, Matthew inserts the Zech 9.9 citation, making explicit what was implicit in Mark, and molding the citation to underscore the conviction that Jesus was *πραῦς*; only in Matthew's Gospel does Jesus refer to himself as *πραῦς*, another indication that Zechariah 9.9 is at work beneath the surface of the description of Jesus as Messiah; this influence on the demands of, and invitation to, discipleship has also been noted (Mt 5.5; 11.25-30).

To the apocalyptic imagery in Mk 13 Matthew adds definite Zechariah imagery, particularly in the combination of Zech 12.10 with Dan 7.13, but there are subtle Zechariah echoes here as well (e.g., the trumpet). Matthew adds more bold imagery to his Markan source in the case of Judas' betrayal of Jesus; where in Mark the officials and Judas agree on some form of payment, Matthew draws on the imagery of the prophet-shepherd whose ministry is despised: the ring of the thirty pieces of silver on the floor of the temple echoes throughout the betrayal and crucifixion scenes. The shift of Jesus' compassion for the "sheep without a shepherd" from a teaching (so Mark) to a healing context is perhaps more subtle, and the shift of allusion from Ezek 34 to Zech 10.2 is also subtle, although I have argued here that Matthew was certainly capable of using the variants known in both Greek and Hebrew traditions in his theological exegesis.

The prime example of Matthew's use of Q-materials with reference to Zechariah comes in the shift of the "woes" to the scribes and Pharisees (from a meal setting in Luke) to the temple, which makes the imagery of the Zechariah blood shed there (2 Chr 24) more vivid. I have argued that the conflation of this character with Zechariah, son of Barachiah, is best explained by Matthew's deliberate theological purpose. Zechariah is the only

prophet in the Jewish scriptures who is called by God to be a “shepherd,” and the shepherd imagery from Zechariah figures prominently in Matthean exegesis. In this instance, the violent death of “Zechariah” in the temple, comes to its full horror when Jesus alludes to his own righteous blood being shed; although his blood is not literally spilled there, the guilt of the blood-money paid for his innocent blood leaves a stain in the temple. When Jesus tells his disciples that his death (and their falling away) is the fulfillment of Zech 13.7, the resonance with the death of the shepherd in Zechariah (and of “Zechariah”) is remarkable.

The presence of Zechariah tradition has also been discerned in Matthew’s own material; although we cannot know how this came to be, we see it in the substructures of the Infancy Narrative with the messianic language that welds Isaiah, Jeremiah and Zechariah Branch-’Ανατολή imagery together in a variety of ways. The combination of Zech 12.10 with Dan 7.13 seems most likely to be a Matthean insertion into his Markan source.

Although this thesis has not explored every possible allusion to Zechariah in the First Gospel, it has sought to look at the most significant “candidates.” These have been representative of the variety of ways in which the Zechariah tradition operates in Matthew. With reference to the scope of this study, the fact that the entire Gospel of Matthew was examined in light of the whole book of Zechariah has allowed me to make observations that might otherwise have been missed.

For example, the Matthean transfer of “sheep without a shepherd” to the healing context of Mt 9.36, and the provocative use of Zech 10.2 (in place of a higher-profile prophetic text), allows one to glimpse, however briefly, a part of the structure which undergirds Matthew’s presentation of Jesus’ healing ministry in Galilee. In the narrative section of Matthew 3-20, the Son of David language is subsumed under the ministry of

the healing shepherd (also supported by Isaiah fulfillment citations). Matthew's double reference to two blind men calling out to the Son of David to heal them (9.27; 20.29-31) is reinforced by the healing of a blind and mute person (12.22) immediately after a mini-healing summary (12.15) and an Isaiah citation (12.16-21/Isa 42.1-4), all of which sparks the query, "Can this be the Son of David?" (12.22). The double healing in 9.27-31 comes just before the healing summary of 9.35-36. When the two blind men on the road from Jericho call out to the Son of David for mercy, his compassionate response is to heal them.

The next scene is the entry into Jerusalem; in Matthew 21.1-16, where the "seamless transition" between healing Son of David and Royal Son of David is woven. Jesus heals the blind men (20.29-31); he enters the city as king (21.1-9), to the shouts of "Hosanna to the Son of David!" As the prophet from Nazareth (the Davidic Branch, cf. Mt 2.23/ Zech 6.12) he enters the temple (21.10-13); after the prophetic act, the blind and lame come to him in the temple and he heals them, causing the children's praises, "Hosanna to the Son of David!" to echo in the temple.

The combination of the royal shepherd of Zech 9.9 and the healing shepherd of Zech 10.2 illuminates a possible christological connection between Matthew's Infancy and Passion Narratives in terms of the Son of David imagery. We have seen how the Son of David is a royal messianic figure in the Infancy section of the gospel; we have also observed that this motif reappears when the royal, humble king leaves the Mount of Olives to enter Jerusalem and the temple (Zech 9.9). The way these Son of David motifs are connected can be attributed to their juxtaposition in alternating scenes of Matthew 20.29-34, 21.1-9, 21.10-13, and 21.14-16. In a sense, then, a bridge is built by the healing (Davidic) shepherd imagery of Jesus' Galilean ministry (undergirded at the deep structural level by

Mt 9.36/Zech 10.2) to span the Royal Son of David themes in the Infancy and Passion Narratives .

Thus, with particular reference to the impact Zechariah traditions have on Matthew's Christology, the approach of this thesis permits me to make the following observations. Zechariah tradition helps reinforce Matthew's conviction that Jesus is a Davidic Messiah. Moreover, it provides a basis for expanding the understanding of his messiahship to include the prophetic. As part of the Son of David Christology of Matthew's Gospel, Jesus is portrayed as the shepherd-king, as the healing shepherd, and as the prophet, who like Zechariah is called to be a shepherd. This composite Davidic Shepherd enters the holy city, riding from the Mount of Olives on an ass, knowing that his death, foretold by the prophet Zechariah, will be violent; yet this Shepherd cares for his flock until the end, when he is struck down.

Finally, this thesis has opened up some ways forward which might be fruitful for further study. Among more widely-ranging possibilities, two arise immediately with respect to Matthew's gospel. First, an exploration of the use of other "minor prophets" in Matthew would be interesting; for example, Hosea 11.1, and Micah 5.1,3 already figure in the fulfillment citations of the Infancy Narratives, and Micah 7.6 may be reflected in Mt 10.21 -- perhaps there is more to learn about the influence of the Minor prophets individually, or as a collection of Twelve. A second area of interest is to explore what significance there is, if any, between the uses of "fulfillment citations" in the First Gospel and the scriptural citations put on the lips of the Matthean Jesus.

APPENDIX - Possible Zechariah Influence in Matthew's Gospel

Part One - in order of appearance in Zechariah

ZECHARIAH ONE

- 1.1, 7 (& 9.11) Mt 23.35 - confusion/conflation of Zechariahs
- killing prophets
- 1.4_{ff} Mt 23.34_{ff} - be not like your fathers
- 1.6 (& 2 Chr 24.21) Mt 21.33_{ff} - prophet-servants beaten (Jer), stoned (Zech)

ZECHARIAH TWO

- 2.4 Mt 15.14 - uproot [without planting]
- 2.6 MT=2.10 LXX Mt 8.11-12 - Messianic banquet, east-west, 4 winds
Mt 24.31 [LXX- I will gather you]; συναξ - 4 winds
- composite (Deut 13.7; 30.4; Isa 27.13)
-Tg. Jn. - gathering King-Messiah, forerunner Elijah the great Priest
- 2.7 LXX Mt 27.42 - Save yourselves (ἀνασωζεσθε)
- (2.9); 12.10; 13.1, 7-9 Shepherd/Prophet/Pierced One
- 2.10-11 Mt 18.20 - I am in your midst (also recalls Ezek 43.7, Joel 2.27)
- 2.10-11; 8.3; 14.6-7 Mt 17.4 Transfiguration - tents
- 2.13 LXX Mt 17 Transfiguration/ Mt 28 Resurrection
- let all flesh fear before the Lord, for he has risen up from his holy clouds
- 2.14-17; 9.9; 14.9, 21 fusion of YHWH and Messiah

ZECHARIAH THREE

- 3.4_{ff} MT (angel) LXX (Lord) spoke to Joshua/Jesus - sins removed, clean clothes;
mitre on head.
- 3.5; 14.6-21 Mt 17 - Transfiguration/Feast of Tabernacles
- 3.7-8 Joshua/Jesus will judge
- 3.8; 6.12 Mt 2.23 [network of crypto-Davidic messianic passages]
- Ναζωραῖος - נצר - צמ - 'Ανατολή - Servant -Davidic Branch
- 3.8; 9.9; 12.10; 13.7 Suffering Servant
- 3.8 (9) Mt 1.21
- 3.8-9; 9.13, 16 Stone-Son metaphor for Son of David
-stone-son-jewel; 7 facets, wells, streams
-3 strands stone imagery intertwine in royal theology

ZECHARIAH FOUR

- 4.6-7 Mt 17.20; by the Spirit, say to mountain, 'Become a plain;' - say to this mountain, 'Be cast into the sea.'
- 4.6-10; 8.1-17, 20-23 rebuilding temple is work of the Holy Spirit; restored temple for Jews and Gentiles
- 4.6-10; 12.10-12; 13.1; 14.8 Mt 21.42 [and Tg. Ps. 118.22] - foundation of new temple is youngest son of Jesse
- 4.7 (14); 6.13 Mt 21.5_{ff} Jesus went to High Priest to enact the kingly/priestly peaceful understanding [Zech 4. 11-14 dual messianism of Qumran?]

ZECHARIAH FIVE

- 5.1-5 Mt 5.34; flying scroll, cursed, one who swears [oath] falsely
- 5.9 Mt 13.41

ZECHARIAH SIX

- 6.5 (MT) LXX- (going to) the four winds of heaven; cf. Mt 24.31
- 6.9_{ff} Mt 27.28f -crown Joshua/Jesus;[||Jn 19.5, 'behold the man'?)
- 6.9-14 Mt 10.41-42
- 6.12 Mt 2.2, 23 - ἰδὸν ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς... τὸν ἀστέρα ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ
Mt 16.18 (17-19, 23); Tg. Zech. 6.12/ Tg. Isa. 53.5 Messiah builds temple/
Jesus - οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν
- 6.12-13 [see 4.7(14)] above

ZECHARIAH SEVEN

- 7.8-14 Mt 13 (cf. Isa 6)
- 7.9 Mt 23.23
- 7.11 [see note on Targum]

ZECHARIAH EIGHT

- 8.3 Mt. 16.18; renaming?
- 8.3, 8 Mt 17.4 [also Zech 2.10-11; 14.6-9]
- 8.6 Mt 19.26 [+Gen 18.14; cf Job 4.22 and/or Job 10.13 LXX]
- 8.7 Mt 8.10-12, return from east and west
- 8.7, 11-13; 9.9, 16; 10.6; 12.7 Mt 1.21; Zech vss. contain forms of σῴζω

- 8.11-13, 20-23 (Isa 7.14) Mt 1.23; forms of Immanuel
- 8.17 Mt 5.33
- 8.19 Mt 6; Christians do not fast [temple cult?] no temple in New Jerusalem
- 8.20-23 Jewish-Gentile/Canaanite woman
- 8.23 Tent had acquired messianic significance?
-restoration; temple for Jews and Gentiles

ZECHARIAH NINE

- 9.2-4 Mt 11.21; woes
- 9.8 Mt 21.12; God encamps at house as guard?
- 9.9 Mt 5.5; 11.29; 21.5 - παύς
Mt 21. 5-12; Jesus enters city as king, enters temple as prophet
-[also Mt 12.15-20] or [Mt 8.17; 9.25; 12.9-14, 18-20; 18.12]
- 9.9 & Isa 62.10-12 savior comes bringing reward; restoration from exile
- 9.9 & Psa 118.26 Mt 21.9; cf. 11.3 - ὁ ἐρχόμενος
- 9.9; 14.1-5 || 2 Kgs 1.38-40, Jesus on Mt of Olives, where Messiah expected to appear
- 9.9; 14.6-7 God is King in Zech 14.6-7; Messiah is king in Zech 9.9
- 9.11 Mt 23.35; 26.28; also 27.4, 6, 8, 19, 24-25; αἷμα
|| Ex 24.8; liberation of exiles by blood (cf. Jer 31.31, 34)
Mt 26.28; God/Jesus re-sets covenant by blood (cf. Isa 53.4, 10, 12)
righteous/innocent blood; new covenant/Deut motif
-cf Heb 13.20
- 9.11 (& 1.1) Mt 11.9; 21.26/ 21.11, 46 [JnBap & Jesus both prophets]; 27.4; 26.38
-blood of the prophets (innocent/guilty)
- 9.14 Mt 24.31; blowing trumpet
- 9.16 (Mic 5.2) Mt 1.21 (2.6) - savior/shepherd of "his people"

ZECHARIAH TEN

- 10.2 Mt 9.36, 'like sheep without a shepherd'
- Mt 10.6-8; 12.30b; 14.14; 15.29-31
- 10.2 LXX Mt 9.25, 27, 36; 12.11, 22-30; 15.21-28; 20.29-34; 21.1-17, etc
emphasis on healing in Jesus' compassion for sheep without shepherd
- 10.2; 13.2 - false prophets; Mt 7.15; 24.11, 24; cf. Mt 5.12
- 10.3 Mt 2.6? shepherd/judgment

ZECHARIAH ELEVEN

- 11.4 Mt 25.32; may recall judgment on shepherd?
- 11.4, 7 Zechariah only prophet called by God to become a shepherd of the flock [Matthew's Jesus as prophet-shepherd]
- 11.4-17 Mt 21.33_{ff}; wicked tenants [flock rejects shepherd, etc]
- 11.7-14 Mt 26.14-16 bitter iron: leaders of Israel barter for betrayal of Messiah; Prophet becomes shepherd of people doomed for destruction
- 11.11-13 Mt 27.3-10; 30 pieces silver
- 11.12 Mt 26.15, 31
- 11.14_{ff} Mt 25.32? judgment on shepherds
- 11.15 Mt 9.36
- 11.17 Mt 23 woes
- Zech 11-12 good shepherd of Zech 11 is YHWH's pierced representative in 12.10

ZECHARIAH TWELVE

- 12.1, 12-14 Mt 24.30 [tribes of the earth]
- 12.7-13.1 Mt 16.18; Peter steward of new temple; keys to house of David, keys of kingdom
- 12.8 Mt 11.11 'little ones' - least of these
- 12.10 (-14) Mt 17.5; LXX uses ἀγαπητός; μονογενής to translate דָּרָךְ; ties Gen 22.2 to Mt 17.5 mountain context
- [+/- Dan 7.13-14] Mt 24.28, 30
-word play: κόψονται...ἄψονται
Mt 26.64 [+Ps 110.1]
- [+Zech 13.7] Mt 26.32; 28.7, 10, 17
-see also Targum Reuchliniansus Zech 12 [cf *Sukkah* 52a Josephite Messiah]
- 12.10-12; 13.1; 14 Mt 21.42 [+Tg. Ps. 118.22] foundation new temple; rejected son is youngest son of Jesse

ZECHARIAH THIRTEEN

- 13.1 Mt 1.21
Mt 21.42 [see above on 12.10]
- 13.2
(&10.2) Mt 10.1; 12.43; Zech 13.2 only occurrence of ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα in LXX
-false prophets; Mt 7.15; 24.11, 24; cf. 5.12

- 13.7 (CD-B XIX.7b-9a; also Zech 11.11) - Mt 18.14 'little ones'
Mt 9.36||Jn 16.32
Mt 26.31||Mk 14.27||Jn 16.32; Isa 53.6, 10; Jn 10 shepherd discourse

-Mt inserts 'of the flock' (cf. Zech 11.11MT)
Mt 26.56; 28.7
- 13.7 (+12.10) Mt 24.30; 26.32, 64; 28.7, 10
- 13.8-9 Mt 26.32
- 13.9 Mt 3.11-12; eschatological symbolism of JnBap and Q; fire and purification

ZECHARIAH FOURTEEN

- 14.1, 4, 6, 8, 9, 13, 20 Mt 24; 'on that day' = eschatological Day of YHWH
(cf 12.3, 4, 6, 8 9, 11, 13.1, 2, 4)
- 14.1, 4, 5 -role of mountain (Mt of Olives) in Jewish eschatology
- 14.2 Mt 24.22; 'rest' will not be cut off/time cut short for elect survival
- 14.3-5 Mt 27.51-53
- 14.4 (a,b-5) Mt 16.27||Mt 25.31 'coming with angels'
Mt 17.21; say to this mountain, 'move'
Mt 21.21; say to this mountain, 'be cast into the sea'
Mt 23.37-39; Mt of Olives; Shekinah (Jesus' presence in NT?) left temple
Mt 24.3; cf. Mt 26.30 & ||s
Mt 24.3, 6, 27, 37, 39
Mt 24.10; 26.30
Mt 24.16
Mt 25.31; Son of Man coming with 'his angels' - Lord God becomes Lord Jesus
Parousia ||s 1 Thess 3.13; 4.16
- +Dan 7 strong allusion, further evidence for Day of YHWH in Matthew's coming
Son of Man theme/language
- 14.5 Mt 25.32; shepherd term between King and Son of Man; cf Ezek 34.17
Mt 24.16; fleeing/mountains [1 Macc]; earthquake
- 14.6 Mt 29.29; sun darkened; no longer day/night; cf Joel
- 14.7 Mt 24.36; +Pss. Sol. 17.23
- 14.8 Mt 24.20; winter/summer; water
- 14.8-10 water flows from mountain, not temple; God here, not messiah
- 14.8-11 Zion enthronement; place where he would shepherd his people
- 14.9, 16-17 Mt 24.14; who are the nations? Who comes to Jerusalem - regathered remnant
or Gentile mission? How did Matthew read it?
Mt 25.34; God is king [Zech 14.16-17]; Messiah is king [Zech 9.9]

- 14.10 Mt 17.20
 14.21 Mt 21.12||Mk 11.15_{ff} (+Zech 14.20?)||Jn 2.16; Canaanites/traders

Part Two - in order of appearance in Matthew

MATTHEW ONE

- 1.21 Zech 3.9; 13.1? Name [Jesus/Joshua]; will save from sins
 1.18-25 -savior/Immanuel; Zech 8.7; 11-13, 20-23; 9.9, 16

MATTHEW TWO

- 2.2 possibly Zech 6.12, ἀνατολή
 -also Mt 4.16
 2.6 Zech 10.3; shepherd image, judgment
 2 Sam 5.2; Mic 5.3LXX
 2.23 Zech 3.8; 6.12; network of crypto-Davidic messianic passage
 - Ναζωραῖος πᾶς τῶ - ἀνατολή

MATTHEW THREE

MATTHEW FOUR

MATTHEW FIVE

- 5.5 Zech 9.9; along with Mt 11.29; 21.5 - only use of πρᾶϋς in NT
 5.33 Zech 8.17; forbidding oaths {cf. Ex 20.7; Lev 19.12; Num 30.3-15; Deut 23.21-23; Wisd 14.48; best choice Pss Sol 14
 5.34 Zech 5.3(1-5); flying scroll

MATTHEW SIX

MATTHEW SEVEN

MATTHEW EIGHT

- 8.10-12 Zech 8.7; return from east & west {in lists of OT refs: Isa 43.5; Bar 4.37; 5.5; Pss Sol 11.2; 1 Dn 57.1; Deut 30.4LXX}
 8.11-12 Zech 2.10; Messianic banquet; east-west, 4 winds

MATTHEW NINE

- 9.36 Zech 10.2 MT/LXX; like sheep without shepherd/healing
 -included among other 'sheep without shepherd' OT texts
 -some add Zech 11.16 +/- Zech 13.7; one sees Num 27.17; many see Ezek 34

MATTHEW TEN

- 10.1 Zech 13.2; 'unclean spirit'
- 10.6-8 Zech 10.2LXX; exorcism part of commission to go to lost sheep
- 10.41-42 Zech 6.9-14?

MATTHEW ELEVEN

- 11.11 'least of'; cf. Zech 12.8
- 11.12-13 Zech 11.4 {source of Mt quote}
- 11.21 Zech 9.2-4; woes
- 11.29 Zech 9.9; see Mt 5.5; 21.5 *πραῦς*
-cf. 2 Cor 10.1; T Dan 6.9; Yoke of messiah: Pss Sol 7.9; 17.30

MATTHEW TWELVE

- 12.15-20 Jesus' *πραῦς* demonstrated
- 12.30b Zech 10.2 - gather/scatter; technical shepherding terms; Mt 9.37

MATTHEW THIRTEENMATTHEW FOURTEENMATTHEW FIFTEEN

- 15.13 Zech 2.4; uproot (without plant; Jer 1.10; Jer in Sir 49.7)

MATTHEW SIXTEEN

- Mt 16-18 Zech 12.7-13.1; Peter steward of new temple; Eliakim Isa 22.22; key to house of David; keys to kingdom
- 16.18 Zech 6.12, possibly; Mt 16.17-19, 23 [cf Eph 2.20-22]
Peter is the 'stone' (?); Jesus *οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν*

Zech 8.3; renaming an important event
- 16.27 Zech 14.5; Son of man coming with angels; 1 Thess 3.13

MATTHEW SEVENTEEN

- 17.4 Zech 2.10-11; Peter's offer to build tents; Transfiguration/Tabernacles
-also Zech 8.3, 8; 14. 6-9
-+ Rev 21.3; Ezek 37.27. 43.7, 9; Zech 14?
- 17.5 Zech 12.10; LXX uses *ἀγαπητός* or *μονογενής* to translate MT *בן*;
-ties Gen 22.2 to Mt 17.5 mountain context

17.20 Zech 4.6-7; by the Spirit, say to mountain, 'become a plain'
-say to this mountain, 'be cast into the sea'

Zech 14.10?

17.21 Zech 14.4, say to this mountain, 'move'

MATTHEW EIGHTEEN

18.14 Zech 13.7, may recall 'little ones'

MATTHEW NINETEEN

19.26 Zech 8.6 (+Gen 18.14; cf Job 10.13 LXX)

MATTHEW TWENTY

MATTHEW TWENTY-ONE

21.1-5 Zech 9.9

21.12 Zech 14.21b; Canaanites/traders

21.21 Zech 14.4; say to this mountain, 'be cast into the sea'

21.42 Zech 4.6-10; 7 facets, wells, streams; 3 strands of stone imagery intertwine
in royal theology

Zech 12.10-12 {Tg Pss 118.22} foundation new temple; Zech 13.1; 14
-rejected son is youngest son of Jesse, Son of David

MATTHEW TWENTY-TWO

MATTHEW TWENTY-THREE

Mt 23 woes Zech 11.17; to worthless shepherd who deserts flock/Enochian woes

23.23 Zech 7.9; justice, mercy & faith

23.35 Zech 1.1, 7; confusion or conflation of the Zechariahs/killing prophets;
Zech 1.6; prophet as servant common in OT; Jeremiah beaten; Zechariah stoned
Zech 9.11; righteous blood, innocent blood; +Mt 27.19, 24-25; cf Jer 31.31-34
-also Mt 11.9; 21.11, 46 {John & Jesus also prophets}

23.37-39 Zech 14.4; Mount of Olives; Shekinah [=Jesus' presence] left temple/house
desolate {cf. Ezek}

MATTHEW TWENTY-FOUR

Mt 24 Zech 14.1, 4 'on that day' — Eschatological Day of YHWH;
Cf. Zech 12.3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11; 13.1, 2, 4

24.3 Zech 14.4a; cf. Mt 26.30 ||s
-suitable location for Parousia discourse; Mt of Olives

- cf. Mt 24.10; 26.30; Jesus predicts 'falling away,' cf. Mt 13.21
- 24.3, 27, 37, 39 Zech 14.5; Parousia || 1 Thess 4.16; cf Mt 25.31
-the Lord God becomes the Lord Jesus
- 24.11 -false prophets arise; Zech 13.2-6
- 24.16 Zech 14.5; fleeing mountains; σεισμος
- 24.19-51 Zech 12.10-14 + Isa 13.19-22; 34.3; Dan 7.13-14; apocalyptic language
- 24.22 Zech 14.2; the 'rest' will not be cut off; time cut short; 'elect' survive
- 24.28 Zech 12.10; 'you will see;' κοψονται, ὀψεσθε, ὀψονται
- 24.29 Zech 14.6; sun darkened; not day-not night; cf Joel
- 24.30 Zech 12.1, 12-14 + Dan 7.13-14; {cf Perrin peshet method & Mk}
Zech 12.10-12; Mt 26.64; 28.7, 10
Zech 12. 10, 12, 14 || Rev 1.7; Jn 19.37; echo of Mt 24.30 in 26.64
- 24.31 Zech 2.6 MT/2.10 LXX; Isa 27.13; Deut 13.7; 30.4
-συναξ; four winds, Tg Jn gathering of King-Messiah;
forerunner Elijah, the great Priest
Zech 6.5

Zech 9.14; blowing the trumpet

- 24.36 Zech 14.7 + Pss Sol 17.23

MATTHEW TWENTY-FIVE

- 25.31 Zech 14.5; Son of Man coming with angels
- 25.32_{ff} Zech 11.4_{ff}; may recall judgment on shepherds
-term *shepherd* occurs between *King* and *Son of Man*; Zech 14.5. Ezek 34.17
- 25.34 God is King (Zech 14.16-17); Messiah is King (Zech 9.9)

MATTHEW TWENTY-SIX

- 26.14-16 Zech 11.7-14; bitter irony; leaders of Israel barter for betrayal of Messiah;
prophet becomes shepherd of people doomed for destruction
- 26.15 Zech 11.12; contrast Mk 14.11
- 26.24, 31 Zech 13.7; Son of Man goes as it is written of him; rejected prophet
-suffering righteous one in Psalms/Zech 13.7
- 26.28 Zech 9.11; also context of exiles||Exod 24.7-8; Isa 53.12; Jer 31.31-34; Isa 42.6
-Jesus may quote; blood of eternal covenant; whole of Zech 9.11 is redemptive
in eschatological Heb 13.20
-also Mt 23.35; 27.4, 6, 8, 24-25; 27.25; 'blood'[righteous/innocent]

- 26.30-35 Zech 13.7; scandalized disciples; God will strike the shepherd
-Mt inserts 'of the flock' [from where?]
- 26.31 Zech 11.12
Zech 13.7; 'it is written'
Jesus as shepherd; disciples/Israel sheep; cf. Mt 9.36; 25.32
- 26.32 Zech 13.8-9
- 26.56 Zech 13.7
- 26.61 Zech 6.11-12; adapts Mk 14.58; 15.29 Mt's typological interest
-Ps 110.1; Dan 7.13
-may recall 'you will see'; echo of Mt 24.30/Zech 12.10-14

MATTHEW TWENTY-SEVEN

- 27.3-10 Zech 11.11-13; Judas, Ahithophel [2 Sam 17.23; Mt 27.5]
- 27.4? Zech 11.13? Judas and Pilate enlisted under same rubric; guilty of Jesus'
innocent blood/innocent of Jesus' blood; Tie Mt 1-2 dreams - Pilate's wife, 27.19
- 27.4; 24-25 Zech 9.11 (+Zech 1.1; + Mt 11.9; 21.11, 46- 'blood of prophets,' innocent/
guilty
- 27.9-10 Zech 11.12-13; 30 pcs. Ag
- 27.28_f Zech 6.11; crown Joshua/crown of thorns Jesus
- 27.40 Zech 6.12; adapts Mk 14.58; 15.29 (cf Mt 26.61)
- 27.51-52 Zech 14.4b-5
- 27.51-53 Zech 14.3-5; may recall earthquake
Zech 14.5; Saints' bodies venture from tombs after Jesus' resurrection

MATTHEW TWENTY-EIGHT

- 28.7, 10 recalls Mt 24.30 and Zech 12.10; κοψονται, ὀψονται, ὀψεσθε and
Zech 13.7; see Mt 28.17 ἰδοντες and 26.32, 64 ???

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Reference Works

- Abegg, Martin, Jr., Peter Flint, and Eugene Ulrich. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible: The Oldest Known Bible Translated for the First Time into English*. New York: Harper San Francisco, 1999.
- Aberbach, Moses, and Bernard Grossfeld. *Targum Onqelos on Genesis 49*. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976.
- _____. *Targum Onkelos to Genesis*. Denver: Ktav, 1982.
- Aland, K. et al., eds. *The Greek New Testament*. 4th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft/United Bible Societies, 1993.
- Allegro, J. M. *Qumran Cave 4.I (4Q158-4Q520)*. DJD V. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.
- Bauer, W., W. F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich, and F. W. Danker. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 2nd ed. Chicago, 1979.
- Benoit, P., J. T. Milik and R. de Vaux, eds. DJD II. *Les Grottes de Murabba 'at*. DJD II. Oxford: Clarendon, 1961.
- Blass, F., A. Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Cathcart, Kevin, Michael Maher and Martin McNamara, eds. *The Aramaic Bible. The Targums*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark
- Vol. 1A. *The Targum Neofiti I to Genesis*. Martin McNamara, 1992.
- Vol. 1 B. *The Targum Pseudo Johnathan to Genesis*, Michael Maher, 1992.
- Vol. 6. *The Targum Onqelos to Genesis*. Bernard Grossfeld, 1988.
- Vol. 11. *The Isaiah Targum*. Bruce D. Chilton, 1987.
- Vol. 14. *The Targum of the Minor Prophets. (Tg. Zechariah)*, R. P. Gordon, 1989.
- Charles, R. H. *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1908.
- Charlesworth, James H., ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 Vols. Garden City: Doubleday, 1983.
- Codex Alexandrinus. Facsimile of the Old Testament. Vol. II. Hosea-4 Maccabees. London: British Museum, 1883.

- Codex Alexandrinus. (Royal MS. I D-v-viii) in Reduced Photographic Facsimile. Old Testament Part III. Hosea - Judith. London: British Museum, 1936.
- Dupont-Sommer, A. *The Essene Writings from Qumran*. Translated by G. Vermes. Gloucester, Mass: Peter Smith, 1973.
- Elliger, K., and W. Rudolph, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Editio Minor. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1984.
- García Martínez, Florentino. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated. The Qumran Texts in English*. 2nd ed. Translated by Wilfred G. E. Watson. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- García Martínez, Florentino and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 Volumes. Leiden: Brill, 1997-1998.
- Hatch, Edwin, and Henry A. Redpath. *A Concordance to the Septuagint*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998.
- Holladay, William L. *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. (8th Impression.) Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984.
- Josephus, Flavius. Josephus. Edited by H. St. J. Thackeray, R. Marcus and L. H. Feldman. 9 vols. LCL. 1926-1965; reprint ed., Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University, 1956-81.
- Liddell, Henry George and Robert Scott. *A Lexicon*. (Abridged from *Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon*.) Oxford: Clarendon, 1993.
- May, Herbert G. and Bruce M. Metzger. *The New Oxford Annotated RSV*; 2nd. ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. (Corrected edition.) London/New York: United Bible Societies, 1975.
- Moulton, W. F., and A. S. Geden. *A Concordance to the Greek Testament*. 3rd ed. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1953.
- Philo. With English translation by F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker. 10 vols. LCL, 1929-1953; reprint ed., Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University, 1981.
- Puech, É. *Textes Hébreux (4Q521 - 4Q528, 4Q576- 4Q579): Qumran Cave 4. XVIII. DJD XXV*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.
- Rahlfs, Alfred, ed. *Septuaginta*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979.

- Robinson, James M., Paul Hoffmann, and John S. Kloppenborg, eds. *The Critical Edition of Q*. Minneapolis and Leuven: Fortress and Peeters, 2000.
- Schmoller, Alfred. *Handkonkordanz zum griechischen Neuen Testament*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.
- Strong, James. *Strong's Exhaustive Concordance*. Compact ed. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980.
- Tov, Emanuel. *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr) (The Seiyâl Collection)*. *DJD VIII*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1990.
- Vermes, Geza. *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. 4th edition. London: Penguin, 1995.
- Whiston, William, trans. *The Works of Josephus*. Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson, 1996.
- Yonge, C. D., trans. *The Works of Philo*. Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson, 1997.
- Ziegler, Joseph, ed. *Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Auctoritate Societatis Litterarum Gottingensis. XIII. Duodecim prophetae*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1943.

Secondary Literature

- Achtemeier, Elizabeth. *Nahum-Malachi*. Atlanta: John Knox, 1986.
- Albright, W. F., and C. S. Mann. *Matthew*. AB. Garden City: Doubleday & Co., 1971.
- Allen, Willoughby C. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Matthew*. Edinburgh: T& T Clark, 1907.
- Allison, Dale C., Jr. "Anticipating the Passion: The Literary Reach of Matthew 26:47 - 27:56." *CBQ* 56 (1994) 701-14.
- _____. "Matt 23:39 = Lk 13.35b as a Conditional Prophecy." *JSNT* 18 (1983) 75-84.
- _____. *The End of the Ages Has Come: An Early Interpretation of the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
- _____. *The Intertextual Jesus. Scripture in Q*. Harrisburg: Trinity, 2000.
- _____. *The Jesus Tradition in Q*. Harrisburg: Trinity, 1997.

- _____. *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1983.
- _____. "Two Notes on a key text: Matthew 11:25-30." *JTS* ns 39 (1988) 477-85.
- Aune, David, ed. *The Gospel of Matthew in Current Study*. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2001.
- Aus, Roger. *The Wicked Tenants and Gethsemane. Isaiah in the Wicked Tenants' Vineyard, and Moses and the High Priest in Gethsemane: Judaic Traditions in Mark 12:1-9 and 14:32-42*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- Balabanski, Vicky. *Eschatology in the Making. Mark, Matthew and the Didache*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Baldwin, Joyce G. *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi..* London: Inter-Varsity, 1974.
- Barrett, Charles Kingsley. "The House of Prayer and the Den of Thieves." Pages 13-20 in *Jesus und Paulus*. Edited by E. Earle Ellis and Erich Gräßer. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975.
- Barrois, G. A. "Olives, Mount of." *IDB*. III. 596-99.
- Barth, Gerhard. "Matthew's Understanding of the Law." Pages 58-164 in *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*. Translated by P. Scott. Edited by G. Bornkamm, G. Barth, and H. J. Held. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963.
- Bauckham, Richard. *The Climax of Prophecy. Studies on the Book of Revelation*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993.
- Bauer, David R. "The Kingship of Jesus in the Matthean Infancy Narrative: A Literary Analysis." *CBQ* 57 (1995) 306-23.
- Bauer, David R. and Mark Allan Powell, eds. *Treasures New and Old. Recent Contributions to Matthean Studies*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- Bauer, Walter. "The 'Colt' of Palm Sunday." (Der Palmesel). Eng. trans. F. W. Gingrich. *JBL* 72 (1953) 220-29.
- Baumstark, A. "Die Zitate des Mt.-Evangeliums aus dem Zwölfprophetenbuch." *Bib* 37 (1956) 296-313.
- Beale, G. K., ed. *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts. Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1994.
- Beare, Francis Wright. *The Gospel According to Matthew*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981.

- Berkley, Timothy W. "OT Exegesis and the Death of Judas." *Proceedings: EGL&MWBS* 14 (1994) 29-45.
- Betz, H. D. "The Logion of the Easy Yoke and of Rest (Matthew 11:28-30)." *JBL* 86 (1967) 10-24.
- Betz, Otto. "The Dichotomized Servant and the End of Judas Iscariot (Light on the dark passages: Matthew 24, 51 and parallel; Acts 1, 18)." *RevQ* 5 (1964) 43-58.
- Beutler, Johannes, and Robert T. Fortna, eds. *The Shepherd Discourse in John 10 and its Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Black, M. C. "The Rejected and Slain Messiah Who is Coming with the Angels: The Messianic Exegesis of Zechariah 9-14 in the Passion Narratives." Ph. D. diss. Emory University, 1988.
- Blank, S. H. "The Death of Zechariah in Rabbinic Literature." *HUCA* 12-13 (1937-38) 327-46.
- Blenkinsopp, J. "The Oracle of Judah and the Messianic Entry." *JBL* 80 (1961) 55-64.
- Bloch, Renée. "Midrash." Pages 29-50 in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism: Theory and Practice*. Translated by Mary Howard Callaway. Edited by William Scott Green. (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978).
- Bock, Darrell L. "The Son of Man Seated at God's Right Hand and the Debate over Jesus' 'Blasphemy.'" Pages 181-91 in *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ*. Edited by Joel B. Green and Max Turner. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.
- Bockmuehl, M. N. A. "The Trumpet Shall Sound." Pages 199-225 in *TEMPLUM AMICITIAE*. JSNTSup 48. Edited by William Horbury. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.
- Borgen, P. "'There Shall Come Forth a Man' Reflections on Messianic Ideas in Philo." Pages 341-61 in *The Messiah*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Bornkamm, Gunther. "End-Expectation and Church in Matthew." Pages 15-51 in *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*. Translated by P. Scott. Edited by G. Bornkamm, G. Barth, and H. J. Held. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963.
- Brandon, S. G. F. *Jesus and the Zealots*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1967.
- Broadhead, Edwin K. *Teaching with Authority: Miracles and Christology in the Gospel of Mark*. JSNTSup 74. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.

- Brock, S. P. "Translating the Old Testament." Pages 87-98 in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture*. Edited by D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Brooke, George J. *Exegesis at Qumran: 4Q Florilegium in its Jewish Context*. JSOTSup 29. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985.
- _____. "The Messiah of Aaron in the *Damascus Document*." *RevQ* 15 (1991-92) 215-30.
- Brown, Raymond E. "Eschatological events accompanying the death of Jesus, especially the raising of the holy ones from their tombs (Matt 27:51-53)." Pages 43-73 in *Faith and the Future*. Edited by John P. Galvin. New York: Paulist, c1994.
- _____. *The Birth of the Messiah*. New York: Doubleday, 1977.
- _____. *The Death of the Messiah*. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1994.
- Brown, Schuyler. "The Mission to Israel in Matthew's Central Section (Mt 9:35-11.1)." *ZNW* 69 (1978) 73-90.
- Bruce, F. F. *New Testament Development of Old Testament Themes*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968.
- _____. "The Book of Zechariah and the Passion Narrative." *BJRL* 43 (1960) 336-53.
- Buchanan, George Wesley. "An Additional Note to "Mark 11.15-19: 'Brigands in the Temple.'" *HUCA* 31 (1960) 103-5.
- _____. "Mark 11.15-19: 'Brigands in the Temple.'" *HUCA* 30 (1959) 169-77.
- Burkett, Delbert. *The Son of Man Debate. A History and Evaluation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Burnett, Fred W. *The Testament of Jesus-Sophia. A Redaction-Critical Study of the Eschatological Discourse in Matthew*. Washington, D. C.: University Press of America, 1979.
- Butterworth, Mike. *Structure and the Book of Zechariah*. JSOTSup 130. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.
- Cargal, Timothy B. "His blood be upon us and upon our children: a Matthean double entendre?" *NTS* 37 (1991) 101-12.

- Carson, D. A. "Do the Prophets and the Law Quit Prophesying Before John? A Note on Matthew 11.13." Pages 179-94 in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A. Evans et al. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, c1994.
- _____. *Matthew*. (Vol. 8, The Expositor's Bible Commentary). Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984.
- _____. "Matthew 11:19b/Luke 7:35: A Test Case for the Bearing of Q Christology on the Synoptic Problem." Pages 128-46 in *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ*. Edited by Joel B. Green and Max Turner. Grand Rapids and Carlisle: Eerdmans and Paternoster, 1994.
- Carson, D. A. and H. G. M. Williamson, eds. *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Carter, Warren. *Households and Discipleship: A Study of Matthew 19-20*. JSNTSup 103. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994.
- _____. "'To see the Tomb': Matthew's Women at the Tomb." *ExpTim* 107 (1996) 201-5.
- Catchpole, D. R. "The Answer of Jesus to Caiaphas: MATT XXVI. 64." *NTS* 17 (1970/71) 213-26.
- Charette, Blaine. "A Harvest for the People: An Interpretation of Matthew 9:37f." *JSNT* 38 (1990) 29-35.
- _____. *Restoring Presence. The Spirit in Matthew's Gospel*. JPTSUP 18. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- _____. *The Theme of Recompense in Matthew's Gospel*. JSNTSup 79. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.
- _____. "'To Proclaim Liberty to the Captives': Matthew 11.28-30 in the Light of OT Prophetic Expectation." *NTS* 38 (1992) 290-97.
- Charlesworth, James H., ed. *The Messiah. Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Chester, Andrew. "Citing the Old Testament." In *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture*. Pages 141-69. Edited by D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Chilton, Bruce. "Jesus ben David: Reflections on the *Davidssonfrage*." *JSNT* 14 (1982) 88-112.

- _____. "Commentary on the Old Testament (with particular reference to the pesherim, Philo, and the Mekilta)." Pages 122-40 in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture*. Edited by D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- _____. "References to the Targumim in the Exegesis of the New Testament." SBLSP 1995, 77-81.
- _____. "The Son of Man: Human and Heavenly." Pages 203-18 in *The Four Gospels 1992*. Vol. I. Edited by F. Van Segbroeck et al. Leuven: Leuven University Press/ Uitgeverij Peeters, 1992.
- Collins, Adela Yarbro. *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism*. JSJSup 50. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- _____. "The Eschatological Discourse of Mark 13." Pages 1125-40 in *The Four Gospels 1992*. Vol. II. Edited by F. Van Segbroeck et al. Leuven: Leuven University Press/ Uitgeverij Peeters, 1992.
- _____. "The 'Son of Man' Tradition and the Book of Revelation." Pages 536-68 in *The Messiah*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Collins, John J. *Apocalypticism in the DSS*. London and New York: Routledge, 1997.
- _____. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to the Jewish Matrix of Christianity*. New York: Crossroad, 1984.
- _____. *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*. New York: Doubleday, 1995.
- Conard, Audrey. "The Fate of Judas. Matthew 27: 3-10." *TJT* 7 (1991) 158-68.
- Conrad, Edgar W. *Zechariah*. Readings: A New Biblical Commentary. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Cope, O. Lamar. *Matthew: A Scribe Trained for the Kingdom of Heaven*. CBQMS 5. Washington, D. C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1976.
- Cousland, J. R. C. *The Crowds in the Gospel of Matthew*. NovTSup 102. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Curtis, John Briggs. "An Investigation of the Mount of Olives in the Judaeo-Christian Tradition." *HUCA* 28 (1957) 137-80.

- Dahl, Nils Alstrup. *Jesus the Christ: The Historical Origins of Christological Doctrine*. Edited by Donald H. Juel. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- Davies, Margaret. *Matthew*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Davies, W. D. "'Knowledge' in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Matthew 11:25-30." *HTR* 46 (1953)113-39.
- _____. *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964.
- Davies, W. D. and Dale C. Allison, Jr. *Matthew: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew*. 3 vols. ICC. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988-97.
- de Conick, April D. "The Yoke Saying in the Gospel of Thomas 90." *VC* 44 (1990) 280-94.
- De Jonge, Marinus. *Jewish Eschatology, Early Christian Christology and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Collected Essays of Marinus de Jonge*. Leiden: Brill, 1991.
- _____. "Matthew 27:51 in early Christian exegesis." *HTR* 79 (1986) 67-79.
- _____. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Study of Their Text, Composition, and Origin*. 2nd Edition. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1975.
- Derrett, J. Duncan M. *The Making of Mark: The Scriptural Bases of the Earliest Gospel*. Warwickshire: P. Drinkwater, 1985.
- _____. "'You build the Tombs of the Prophets' (Lk. 11, 47-51, Mt. 23, 29-31)." *SE 4/TU* 102 (1968) 187-93.
- de Saignac, J. "Le Messianisme de Philon d'Alexandrie." *NovT* 4 (1960) 319-24.
- Descamps, A. "Rédaction et christologie dans le récit matthéen de la Passion." Pages 359-415 in *L'Évangile selon Matthieu. Rédaction et théologie*. BETL 29. Edited by M. Didier. Gembloux: Duculot, 1972.
- Deutsch, Celia. *Hidden Wisdom and the Easy Yoke: Wisdom, Torah and Discipleship in Matthew 11.25-30*. JSNTSup 18. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.
- _____. "Wisdom in Matthew: Transformation of a Symbol." *NovT* 32 (1990) 13-47.

- De Waard, J. *A Comparative Study of the Old Testament Text in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament*. Leiden: Brill, 1965.
- de Wit, Willem-Jan. "Expectations and the Expected One. 4Q521 and the Light It Sheds on the New Testament." Doctoraalscriptie, Nov, 2000. Universiteit Utrecht.
- Dodd, C. H. *According to the Scriptures. The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology*. London: Nisbet, 1952.
- _____. *The Old Testament in the New*. London: Athlone, 1952.
- Doeve, J. W. "Purification du Temple et dessèchement du figuier: Sur la structure du 21 chapitre de Matthieu et parallèles (Marc xi.1- xii.12, Luc xex.28 - xx.19)." *NTS* 1 (1954-55) 297-308.
- Donaldson, Terence L. *Jesus on the Mountain: A Study in Matthean Theology*. JSNTSup 8. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985.
- Dorival, Gilles. *La Bible D'Alexandrie. Les Nombres*. Paris: Cerf, 1994.
- Douglas, Mary. *In the Wilderness. The Doctrine of Defilement in the Book of Numbers*. JSOTSup 158. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- Doyle, Brian Roderick. "Matthew's Wisdom: A Redaction-Critical Study of Matthew 11.1 - 14.3a." Ph. D.diss. University of Melbourne, Australia, 1984. [Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1997]
- Draisma, Sipke, ed. *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings*. Uitgeversmaatschappij J. H. Kok: Kampen, 1989.
- Draper, Jonathan A. "Resurrection and Zechariah 14.5 in the Didache Apocalypse." *JECS* 5:2 (1997) 155-79.
- _____. "The Development of 'The Sign of the Son of Man' in the Jesus Tradition." *NTS* 39 (1993) 1-21.
- Duff, Paul Brooks. "The March of the Divine Warrior and the Advent of the Greco-Roman King: Mark's Account of Jesus' Entry into Jerusalem." *JBL* 111 (1992) 55-71.
- Duguid, Iain. "Messianic Themes in Zechariah 9-14." Pages 265-80 in *The Lord's Anointed; Interpretation of Old Testament Messianic Texts*. Edited by Philip E. Satterthwaite, Richard S. Hess, and Gordon J. Wenham. Carlisle and Grand Rapids: Paternoster and Baker, 1995.
- Duling, D. C. "Solomon, Exorcism, and the Son of David." *HTR* 68 (1975) 235-52.

- Dunn, James D. G. *Christology in the Making: An Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*. London: SCM, 1980.
- _____. *Jesus and the Spirit*. London: SCM, 1975.
- _____. "Matthew's Awareness of Markan Redaction." Pages 1349-59 in *The Four Gospels 1992*. Vol II. Edited by F. Van Segbroeck et al. Leuven: Leuven University Press/Uitgeverij Peeters, 1992.
- Evans, Craig. A, and Richard Stegner, eds. *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Evans, C. F. "I will go before you to Galilee." *JTS* 5 (1954) 3-18.
- Feldman, L. H. "Josephus' Portrait of Balaam." *Studia Philonica Annual* (1993), part 5. 48-83.
- Fenton, J. C. *The Gospel of St Matthew*. London: Penguin, 1973.
- Finegan, Jack. *The Archaeology of the New Testament. The Life of Jesus and the Beginning of the Early Church*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "Aramaic Evidence Affecting the Interpretation of *Hosanna* in the New Testament." In *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament*, eds. Gerald F. Hawthorne with Otto Betz, 110-18. FS E. Earle Ellis. Grand Rapids/Tübingen: Eerdmans / J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1987.
- _____. *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1971.
- _____. "Use of explicit Old Testament quotations in Qumran and in the New Testament." *NTS* 7 (1961) 297-333.
- Flesher, Paul V. M., ed. *Targum Studies. Volume One. Textual and Contextual Studies in the Pentateucal Targums*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- France, R. T. *Jesus and the Old Testament*. Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity, 1971.
- _____. *Matthew. Evangelist & Teacher*. Exeter, Paternoster, 1989.
- _____. "The Formula-Quotations of Matthew 2 and the Problem of Communication." *NTS* 27 (1981) 233-51.
- France R. T. and David Wenham, eds. *Gospel Perspectives. III. Studies in Midrash and Historiography*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983.

- Frankemölle, Hubert. *Matthäus: Kommentar*. 2 vols. Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1994-97.
- Frenz, Albrecht. "MT XXI 5.7." *NovT* 13 (1971) 259-60.
- Freyne, Sean. *Galilee, Jesus and the Gospels. Literary Approaches and Historical Investigations*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.
- Fuller, Russell E. "The Form and Formation of the Book of the Twelve: The Evidence from the Judean Desert." Pages 86-101 in *Forming Prophetic Literature: Essays on Isaiah and the Twelve in Honor of John D. W. Watts*. JSOTSup 235. Edited by James W. Watts and Paul R. House. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1996.
- _____. "The Minor Prophets manuscript from Qumran, Cave 4." Ph. D. diss. Harvard University, 1988.
- García Martínez, Florentino and Julio Trebolle Barrera. *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs and Practices*. Translated by Wilfred G. E. Watson. Leiden, New York, Cologne: E. J. Brill, 1995.
- Garland, David E. *Reading Matthew: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the First Gospel*. New York: Crossroad, 1995.
- _____. *The Intention of Matthew 23*. Leiden: Brill, 1979.
- Gärtner, Bertil Edgar. "The Habakkuk Commentary (DHS) and the Gospel of Matthew." *ST* 8 no. 1 (1954) 1-24.
- Gaston, Lloyd. *No Stone on Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels*. NovTSup 23. Leiden: Brill, 1970.
- Gench, Frances Taylor. *Wisdom in the Christology of Matthew*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1997.
- Gese, Hartmut. *Essays on Biblical Theology*. Translated by K. Crim. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1981.
- Gibbs, Jeffrey A. *Jerusalem and Parousia. Jesus' Eschatological Discourse in Matthew's Gospel*. St. Louis: Concordia, 2000.
- Gibbs, J. M. "The Son of God as Torah Incarnate in Matthew." *SE 4/TU* 102 (1968) 38-46.
- Glasson, Thomas Francis. "Ensign of the Son of Man (Matt 24:30)." *JTS* ns 15 (1964) 299-300.

- Glover, Richard. "The Didache's Quotations and the Synoptic Gospels." *NTS* 5 (1958) 12-29.
- Gnilka, Joachim. *Das Evangelium Nach Markus*. [Band 1, Mk 1-8,26]. Benziger Verlag: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978.
- Gordon, Robert P. *Studies in the Targum to the Twelve Prophets from Nahum to Malachi*. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Goulder, M. D. *Midrash and Lection in Matthew*. London: SPCK, 1974.
- Gourges, Michel. "Sur l'articulation des béatitudes matthéennes (Mt 5:3-12): une proposition." *NTS* 44 (1998) 340-56.
- Gowan, Donald E. *Eschatology in the Old Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.
- Grabbe, Lester L. *Etymology in Early Jewish Interpretation. The Hebrew Names in Philo*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.
- Grant, Robert M. "The Coming of the Kingdom." *JBL* 67 (1948) 297-303.
- Gray, George Buchanan. *Numbers*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1903.
- Green, F. W. *The Gospel according to Saint Matthew*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1936.
- Green, H. B. "The Structure of St Matthew's Gospel." *SE 4/TU* 102 (1968) 47-59.
- Green, Joel B. "Jesus on the Mt of Olives (Lk 22.39-46)." *JSNT* 26 (1986) 29-48.
- _____. *The Death of Jesus: Tradition and Interpretation in the Passion Narrative*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1988.
- Green, Joel B. and Max Turner, eds. *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ*. Grand Rapids and Carlisle: Eerdmans and Paternoster, 1994.
- Greenberg, Moshe. *Ezekiel 21-37*. AB. New York: Doubleday, 1997.
- Gundry, Robert H. *Matthew: A Commentary on His Handbook for a Mixed Church under Persecution*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984.
- _____. *The Use of the Old Testament in Matthew's Gospel*. NovTSup 18. Leiden: Brill, 1967.
- Hagner, Donald A. *Matthew*. 2 Vols. WBC. Dallas: Word, 1993-95.

- Hamilton, Neill Q. "Temple Cleansing and Temple Bank." *JBL* 83 (1964) 365-72.
- Hanson, Paul D. *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.
- _____. "Zechariah 9 and the Recapitulation of an Ancient Ritual Pattern." *JBL* 92 (1973) 37-59.
- Hare, Douglas R. A. *Matthew*. IBC. Louisville: John Knox, 1993.
- _____. "The Lives of the Prophets." Pages 380-99 in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, Vol. 2. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday, 1985.
- _____. *The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel According to St Matthew*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.
- Harrelson, Walter. "Messianic Expectations at the Time of Jesus." *SLJT* 32 (1988) 28-42.
- Harrington, Daniel J. *The Gospel of Matthew*. Collegeville: Liturgical, 1991.
- Hartman, L. "Scriptural Exegesis in the Gospel of St. Matthew and the Problem of Communication." Pages 131-52 in *L'Évangile selon Matthieu. Rédaction et théologie*. BETL 29. Edited by M. Didier. Gembloux: Duculot, 1972.
- Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Hayward, C. T. R. "Balaam's Prophecies as Interpreted by Philo and the Aramaic Targums of the Pentateuch." Pages 19-36 in *New Heaven and New Earth: Prophecy and the Millenium*. Edited by P. J. Harland and C. T. R. Hayward. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Head, Peter M. *Christology and the Synoptic Problem: An Argument for Markan Priority*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Heard, Warren J. "Olives, Mount of." *ABD* 5. 13-15.
- Hecht, Richard D. "Philo and Messiah." Pages 139-68 in *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*. Edited by Jacob Neusner, William S. Green, and Ernest Frericks, 139-68. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Heil, John Paul. "Ezekiel 34 and the Narrative Strategy of the Shepherd and Sheep Metaphor in Matthew." *CBQ* 55 (1993) 698-708.
- _____. *The Death and Resurrection of Jesus: A Narrative-Critical Reading of Matthew 26-28*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.

- Hein, Kenneth. "Judas Iscariot: Key to the Last-Supper Narrative?" *NTS* 17 (1971) 227-32.
- Hengel, Martin. *The Zealots: Investigations into the Jewish Freedom Movement in the Period from Herod I until 70 A. D.* Translated by David Smith. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1997.
- Hiers, Richard H. "Purification of the Temple: Preparation for the Kingdom of God." *JBL* 9 (1971) 82-90.
- Higgins, Angus John Brockhurst. "Sign of the Son of Man (Matt 24:30)." *NTS* 9 (1963) 380-82.
- Hill, David. "Jesus and Josephus' 'messianic prophets.'" Pages 143-54 in *Text and Interpretation*. Edited by Ernest Best and R. McL. Wilson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- _____. *The Gospel of Matthew*. London: Oliphants, 1978.
- Hooker, M. D. "The Son of Man and the Synoptic Problem." Pages 189-201 in *The Four Gospels 1992*. Vol. I. Edited by F. Van Segbroeck et al. Leuven: Leuven University Press/Uitgeverij Peeters, 1002.
- Horbury, William. *Jewish Messianism and the Cult of Christ*. London: SCM, 1998.
- _____. "The Messianic associations of 'The Son of Man.'" *JTS* ns 36 (1985) 34-55.
- Horgan, Maurya P. *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*. CBQMS 8. Washington, D. C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979.
- Horsley, Richard A. "'Like One of the Prophets of Old': Two Types of Popular Prophets at the Time of Jesus." *CBQ* 47 (1985) 435-63.
- _____. "Popular Prophetic Movements at the Time of Jesus: Their Principal Features and Social Origins." *JSNT* 26 (1986) 3-27.
- House, Paul R. *The Unity of the Twelve*. JSOTSup 97. Sheffield: Almond, 1990.
- Howell, David B. *Matthew's Inclusive Story. A Study in the Narrative Rhetoric of the First Gospel*. JSNTSup 42. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.
- Hultgard, Anders. "The Ideal 'Levite,' the Davidic Messiah, and the Saviour Priest in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." Pages 93-110 in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism*. Edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg and John J. Collins. Chico: Scholars Press, 1980.

- Hunter, A. M. "Crux Criticorum — Matt. XI. 25-30 — A Re-Appraisal." *NTS* 8 (1962) 241-49.
- Janzen, J. Gerald. "The Yoke That Gives Rest." *Int* 41 (1987) 256-68.
- Johnson, Luke T. *The Writings of the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.
- Johnson, Marshall D. "Reflections on a Wisdom Approach to Matthew's Christology." *CBQ* 36 (1974) 44-64.
- Johnson, Sherman E. *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Mark*. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1960.
- Jones, Douglas R. "A Fresh Interpretation of Zechariah IX-XIV." *VT* 12 (1962) 241-59.
- Jones, John Mark. "Subverting the Textuality of Davidic Messianism: Matthew's Presentation of the Genealogy and the Davidic Title." *CBQ* 56 (1994) 256-72.
- Juel, Donald H. *Messiah and Temple. The Trial of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark*. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977.
- _____. *Messianic Exegesis. Christological Interpretation of the Old Testament in Early Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.
- _____. "The Messiah and the Temple. A Study of Jesus' Trial Before the Sanhedrin in the Gospel of Mark. Ph. D. diss. Yale University, 1973.
- Kampen, John. "The Sectarian Form of the Antithesis Within the Social World of the Matthean Community." *DSD* 1 (1994) 338-63.
- Kee, Howard Clark. "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." Pages 775-828 in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, Vol. 1. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- _____. "The Function of Scriptural Quotations and Allusions in Mark 11-16." Pages 165-88 in *Jesus und Paulus*. Edited by E. Earle Ellis and Erich Gräßer. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975.
- Keener, Craig S. *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*. Grand Rapids and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Kim, Seyoon. "Jesus — The Son of God, the Stone, the Son of Man, and the Servant: The Role of Zechariah in the Self-Identification of Jesus." Pages 134-48 in *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament*. Edited by Gerald F. Hawthorne and Otto Betz. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.

- Kingsbury, Jack Dean. *Matthew as Story*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.
- _____. *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom*. London: SPCK, 1976.
- _____. *The Parables of Jesus in Matthew 13. A Study in Redaction-Criticism*. London: SPCK, 1969.
- Kinman, Brent R. *Jesus' Entry into Jerusalem*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Klassen-Wiebe, Sheila. "Matthew 1:18-25." *Int* 46 (1992) 392-95.
- Klassen, William. "Jesus and the Zealot Option." Pages 131-9 in *The Wisdom of the Cross*. Edited by Stanley Hauerwas, Chris K. Huebner, Harry J. Huebner, and Mark Thiessen Nation. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Kline, Meredith G. "The Structure of the Book of Zechariah." *JETS* 34 (1991) 79-93.
- Knibb, Michael A. "The Interpretation of *Damascus Document* VII, 9b - VIII, 2a and XIX, 5b -14." *RevQ* 15 (1991-92) 243-51.
- _____. *The Qumran Community*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Knowles, Michael. *Jeremiah in Matthew's Gospel. The Rejected-Prophet Motif in Matthean Redaction*. JSNTSup 68. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Krause, Deborah. "The One Who Comes Unbinding the Blessing of Judah: Mark 11.1-10 as a Midrash on Genesis 49.11, Zechariah 9.9, and Psalm 118-25-26." Pages 141-53 in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by C. Evans and J. Sanders. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Kugler, Robert A. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Kupp, D. D. *Matthew's Emmanuel: Divine Presence and God's People in the First Gospel*. SNTSMS 90. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Laansma, Jon. '*I Will Give You Rest*'. *The Rest Motif in the New Testament with Special Reference to Mt 11 and Heb 3-4*. WUNT 98. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.
- Laato, Antti. "The Eschatological Act of *Kipper* in the *Damascus Document*." In *Intertestamental Essays in honour of Józef Tadeusz Milik*, ed. Zdzislaw J. Kapera, 91-107. Kraków, 1992.
- Lamarque, P. *Zacharie IX-XIV structure litteraire et messianisme*. Paris: Librairie Lecoffe, J. Gabalda, 1961.

- Lambrecht, Jan. *Out of the Treasure: The Parables in the Gospel of Matthew*. Louvain: Peeters/W. B. Eerdmans, 1992.
- _____. "The Parousia Discourse. Composition and Content in MT XXIV-XXV." Pages 309-42 in *L'Évangile Selon Matthieu: Rédaction et théologie*. BETL 29. Edited by M. Didier. Gembloux (Belgique): J. Duclot, 1972.
- Larkin, Katrina J. A. *The Eschatology of Second Zechariah: A Study of the Formation of a Mantological Wisdom Anthology*. Biblical Exegesis Theology 6. Kampen: KOK Pharos, 1994.
- Law, David R. "Matthew's enigmatic reference to Jeremiah in Mt 16, 14." Pages 277-302 in *The Book of Jeremiah and its Reception* Edited by A. H. W. Curtis and J. Romer. Leuven: Leuven University Press/Peeters, 1997.
- Leske, Adrian M. "Context and Meaning of Zechariah 9:9." *CBQ* 62 (2000) 663-78.
- Levenson, Jon D. *The Death and Resurrection of the Beloved Son*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.
- Lindars, Barnabas. *New Testament Apologetic*. London: SCM, 1961.
- Luz, Ulrich. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*. Band I (Mt 1-7); Band II (Mt 8-17); Band III (Mt 18-28). Zurich/Neukirchen-Vluyn: Benzinger/Neukirchner, 1985-97.
- _____. *Matthew 1-7*. Translated by Wilhelm C. Linss. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1989.
- _____. *The Theology of the Gospel of Matthew*. Translated by J. Bradford Robinson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Maher, M. "Take My Yoke Upon You" (Matt. XI. 29)." *NTS* 22 (1976) 97-103.
- Malina, Bruce J. and Jerome H. Neyrey. *Calling Jesus Names: The Social Value of Labels in Matthew*. Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1988.
- Marcus, Joel. "Mark 14:61: 'Are You the Messiah-Son-of-God?'" *NovT* 31 (1989) 125-41.
- _____. "The Jewish War and the *Sitz im Leben* of Mark." *JBL* 111 (1992) 44-62.
- _____. *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis in the Gospel of Mark*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1992.
- Marguerat, Daniel. *Le jugement dans l'Évangile de Matthieu*. 2^e édition augmentée. Genève: Labor et Fides, 1995.

- Martin, Francis. "The Image of Shepherd in the Gospel of Sant [sic] Matthew." *ScEs* 27 (1975) 261-301.
- Mason, Rex A. "Some Examples of Inner Biblical Exegesis in Zech. ix-xiv." *SE* 7 (1982) 343-54.
- _____. *The Books of Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- _____. "The Relation of Zech 9-14 to Proto-Zechariah." *ZAW* 88 (1976) 227-39.
- Matera, Frank J. *Passion Narratives and Gospel Theologies: Interpreting the Synoptics Through Their Passion Stories*. New York & Mahwah: Paulist, 1986.
- Mauser, Ulrich W. *The Gospel of Peace: A Scriptural Message for Today's World*. Louisville: John Knox, 1992.
- McCasland, S. Vernon. "Matthew Twists the Scriptures." *JBL* 80 (1961) 143-48.
- McConnell, R. S. *Law and Prophecy in Matthew's Gospel: The Authority and Use of the Old Testament in the Gospel of St. Matthew*. Basel: Friedrich Reinhardt, 1969.
- McNamara, Martin. "Early Exegesis in the Palestinian Targum (Neofiti 1) Numbers Chapter 24." *PIBA* 16 (1993) 57-79.
- _____. *Targum and Testament: Aramaic Paraphrases of the Hebrew Bible: A Light on the New Testament*. Shannon: Irish University Press, 1972.
- _____. *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966.
- Menken, Maarten J. J. *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form*. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996.
- _____. "The Old Testament Quotations in John 19,36. Source, Redaction, Background. Pages 2101-18 in *The Four Gospels 1992*. Vol. III. Edited by F. Van Segbroeck et al. Leuven: Leuven University Press/Uitgeverij Peeters, 1992.
- _____. "The Quotations from Zech 9, 9 in Mt 21, 5 and in Jn 12, 15." Pages 571-78 in *John and the Synoptics*. BETL 101. Edited by A. Denaux. Leuven: Leuven University/Peeters, 1992.
- _____. "The References to Jeremiah in the Gospel according to Matthew." *ETL* 60 (1984) 5-24.

- _____. "The Textual Form of the Quotation from Isaiah 7:14 in Matthew 1:23." *NovT* 43 (2000) 144-60.
- Menninger, Richard E. *Israel and the Church in the Gospel of Matthew*. New York: Peter Lang, 1994.
- Meyers, Carol L. and Eric M. *Haggai and Zechariah 1-8: a new translation with introduction and commentary*. AB. Garden City: Doubleday, 1987.
- _____. "The Future Fortunes of the House of David: The Evidence of Second Zechariah." Pages 207-22 in *Fortunate the Eyes that See*. Edited by Astrid B. Beck et. al. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- _____. *Zechariah 9-14: a new translation with introduction and commentary*. AB. New York: Doubleday, 1993.
- Mitchell, Hinckley G, John Merlin Powis Smith, and Julius A. Bewer. *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi and Jonah*. ICC. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1912. [1961, last impression.]
- Moo, Douglas J. *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*. Sheffield: Almond, 1983.
- _____. "Tradition and Old Testament in Matt 27:3-10." Pages 157-75 in *Gospel Perspectives III*. Edited by R. T. France and David Wenham. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983.
- Morgenstern, Julian. "The 'Son of Man' of Daniel 7 13f. A New Interpretation." *JBL* 80 (1961) 65-77.
- Morris, Leon. *The Gospel according to Matthew*. IVP. Grand Rapids and Leicester: Eerdmans and Inter-Varsity, 1992.
- Moses, A. D. A. *Matthew's Transfiguration Story and Jewish - Christian Controversy*. JSNTSup 122. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Mowinckel, Sigmund. *He That Cometh*. Translated by G. W. Anderson. Nashville: Abingdon, 1954.
- Moyise, Steve. *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation*. JSNTSup 115. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Neusner, Jacob, William S. Green, and Ernest Frerichs, eds. *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

- Newport, Kenneth G. C. *The Sources and Sitz im Leben of Matthew 23*. JSNTSup 117. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Neyrey, Jerome H. "The Thematic Use of Isaiah 42:1-4 in Matthew 12." *Bib* 63 (1982) 457-73.
- Nicklesburg, George W. E., Jr. *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972.
- Nielsen, Eduard. "A Note on Zechariah 14, 4-5." Pages 33-37 in *In the Last Days*. Edited by Knud Jeppesen et al. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1974.
- Nieuviarts, J. *L'Entrée de Jésus à Jérusalem (Mt 21, 1-17). Messianisme et accomplissement des Écritures en Matthieu*. Lectio Divina 176. Paris: Cerf, 1999.
- Nolan, Brian M. *The Royal Son of God: The Christology of Matthew 1-2 in the Setting of the Gospel*. OBO 23. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.
- Nolland, John. "No Son-of-God Christology in Matthew 1.18-25." *JSNT* 62 (1996) 3-12.
- Orton, David E. *The Understanding Scribe: Matthew and the Apocalyptic Ideal*. JSNTSup 25. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
- Overman, J. A. *Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism: The Social World of the Matthean Community*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
- Owen, Paul and David Shepherd. "Speaking up for Qumran, Dalman and the Son of Man: Was *Bar Enasha* a Common Term for 'Man' in the Time of Jesus?" *JSNT* 81 (2001) 81-122.
- Paffenroth, Kim. "Jesus as Anointed and Healing Son of David in the Gospel of Matthew." *Bib* 80 (1999) 547-54.
- . "The Stories of the Fate of Judas and Differing Attitudes Towards Sources." *Proceedings: EGL&MWBS* 12 (1992) 67-81.
- Patte, Daniel. *The Gospel according to Matthew: Structural Commentary on Matthew's Faith*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.
- Peels, H. G. L. "The Blood 'from Abel to Zechariah' (Matthew 23, 35; Luke 11, 50_f) and the Canon of the Old Testament." *ZAW* 113 (2001) 583-601.
- Perrin, Norman. "Mark XIV.62: The End Product of a Christian Peshet Tradition?" *NTS* 12 (1965-66), 150-55.

- _____. "The High Priest's Question and Jesus' Answer (Mark 14:61-62)." Pages 80-95 in *The Passion in Mark: Studies in Mark 14-16*. Edited by Werner H. Kelber. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.
- Person, Raymond F. *Second Zechariah and the Deuteronomistic School*. JSOTSup 167. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Pesch, Rudolf. "'He Will Be Called a Nazorean': Messianic Exegesis in Matthew 1-2." Translated by Spencer Stadler. Pages 129-78 in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and Richard Stegner. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Powell, Mark Allan. "Do and Keep What Moses Says (Matthew 23: 2-7)." *JBL* 114 (1995) 419-35.
- _____. *God With Us. A Pastoral Theology of Matthew's Gospel*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.
- _____. "The Magi as Kings: An Adventure in Reader-Response Criticism." *CBQ* 62 (2000) 459-80.
- Pregeant, Russell. "The Wisdom Passages in Matthew's Story." Pages 197-232 in *Treasures New and Old: Recent Contributions to Matthean Studies*. Edited by David R. Bauer and Mark Allan Powell. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- Przybylski, Benno. *Righteousness in Matthew and his world of thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- Puech, Émile. "Messianisme, Eschatologie et Résurrection dans les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte." *RevQ* 18 (1997-98) 255-98.
- _____. "Une apocalypse messianique (4Q521)," *RevQ* 15 (1992) 475-519.
- Quesnel, Michel. "Les Citations de Jérémie dans L'Évangile selon Saint Matthiew." *EstBib* 47 (1989) 513-27.
- Reditt, Paul L. "Israel's Shepherds: Hope and Pessimism in Zechariah 9-14." *CBQ* 51 (1989) 631-42.
- _____. "The Two Shepherds in Zechariah 11:4-17." *CBQ* 55 (1993) 676-86.
- _____. "Zerubbabel, Joshua and the Night Visions of Zechariah." *CBQ* 54 (1992) 249-59.
- Rhea, Robert. "Attack on Prophecy: Zechariah 13, 1-6." *ZAW* 107 (1995) 288-93.

- Riches, John K. *Conflicting Mythologies. Identity Formation in the Gospels of Mark and Matthew*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000.
- Roberts, J. J. M. "The Old Testament's Contribution to Messianic Expectations." Pages 39-51 in *The Messiah*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Robinson, James M. "The Sequence of Q: The Lament over Jerusalem." Pages 225-60 in *Von Jesus zum Christus: Christologische Studien*. Edited by Rudolf Hoppe and Ulrich Busse. BZNW 93. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1998.
- Rosenberg, Roy A. "The Slain Messiah in the Old Testament." *ZAW* 99 (1987) 259-61.
- Roth, Cecil. "Cleansing of the Temple and Zechariah 14:21." *NT* 4 (1960) 174-81.
- Rouillard, Hedwige. *La Pericope de Balaam (Nombres 22-24): La Prose et les "Oracles."* Études bibliques (Nouvelle série. N° 4). Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, J. Gabalda, 1985.
- Sanders, James A. "Ναζωραῖος in Matthew 2.23." Pages 116-28 in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, Edited by Craig A. Evans and Richard Stegner. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Satran, D. "Biblical Prophets and Christian Legend: The Lives of the Prophets Reconsidered." Pages 143-49 in *Messiah and Christos. Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity*. Edited by I. Gruenwald, et al. Tübingen: TSAJ, 1992.
- Satterthwaite, Philip E., Richard S. Hess, and Gordon J. Wenham, eds. *The Lord's Anointed. Interpretation of Old Testament Messianic Texts*. Carlisle and Grand Rapids: Paternoster and Baker, 1995.
- Schaefer, Konrad R. "Zechariah 14 and the Composition of the Book of Zechariah." *RB* 100 (1993) 368-98.
- _____. "Zechariah 14: A Study in Allusion." *CBQ* 57 (1995) 66-91.
- Schibler, Daniel. "Messianism and Messianic Prophecy in Isaiah 1-12 and 28-33." Pages 87-104 in *The Lord's Anointed. Interpretations of Old Testament Messianic Texts*. Edited by Philip E. Satterthwaite, Richard S. Hess and Gordon J. Wenham. Carlisle and Grand Rapids: Paternoster and Baker, 1995.
- Schneekloth, Larry Gilbert. "The Targum of the Song of Songs. Study in Rabbinic Biblical Interpretation." Ph. D. diss. University of Wisconsin (Madison), 1977.
- Schweizer, *The Good News According to Matthew*. Translated by David E. Green. London: SPCK, 1976.

- Schwemer, Anna Maria. *Studien zu den frühjüdischen Prophetenlegenden Vitae Prophetarum*. Band II. Die Viten der kleinen Propheten und der Propheten aus den Geschichtsbüchern. Übersetzung und Kommentar. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1996.
- Senior, Donald P. "A Case Study in Matthean Creativity: Matthew 27:3-10." *BR* 19 (1974) 23-36.
- _____. "Matthew 2: 1-12." *Int* 46 (1992) 395-98.
- _____. "Matthew's Account of the Burial of Jesus." Pages 1433-48 in *The Four Gospels 1992*. Edited by F. Van Segbroeck et al. Vol. 2. Leuven: Leuven University Press/Uitgeverij Peeters, 1992.
- _____. "Matthew's Special Material in the Passion Story: Implications for the Evangelist's Redactional Technique and Theological Perspective." *ETL* 63 (1987) 272-94.
- _____. "The Death of Jesus and the Resurrection of the Holy Ones." *CBQ* 38 (1976) 312-29.
- _____. "The Fate of the Betrayer: A Redactional Study of Matt. xxvii,3-10." *ETL* 48 (1972) 372-426.
- _____. *The Gospel of Matthew*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1997.
- _____. *The Passion Narrative according to Matthew: A Redactional Study*. Leuven: University Press, 1975.
- _____. "The Passion Narrative in the Gospel of Matthew." Pages 348-54 in *L'evangile selon Matthieu: Rédaction et théologie*. BETL, 29. Edited by M. Didier. Gembloux: Duculot, 1972.
- _____. *What are they saying about Matthew?* New York/Ramsey: Paulist, 1983.
- Sim, David C. *Apocalyptic eschatology in the gospel of Matthew*. SNTS 88. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Slingerland, H. Dixon. "The Transjordanian Origin of St. Matthew's Gospel." *JSNT* 3 (1979) 18-28.
- Smith, Ralph L. *Micah - Malachi*. Waco: Word, 1984.

- Smolar, Leivy and Moses Aberbach. *Studies in the Targum Johathan to the Prophets*. And Pinkhos Churgin, *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*. New York & Baltimore: KTAV, 1983.
- Soares Prabhu, George M. *The Formula Quotations in the Infancy Narratives of Matthew: An Enquiry into the Tradition History of Mt. 1-2*. AnBib, 63. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1976.
- Sparks, H. F. D. "St. Matthew's References to Jeremiah." *JTS* ns 1 (1950) 155-56.
- Stanton, Graham N. *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1992.
- _____. "Jesus of Nazareth: A Magician and a False Prophet who Deceived God's People?" Pages 164-80 in *Jesus of Nazareth. Lord and Christ*. Edited by Joel B. Green and Max Turner. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.
- _____. "Matthew: ΒΙΒΛΟΣ, ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ, or ΒΙΟΣ?" Pages 1187-1201 in *The Four Gospels 1992*. Edited by F. Van Segbroeck et al. Vol. 2. Leuven: Leuven University Press/Uitgeverij Peeters, 1992.
- _____. "Matthew 11.28-30: Comfortable Words?" Pages 364-77 in *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1992.
- _____. "Pray that your flight may not be in winter or on a sabbath (Matthew 24:20)." *JSNT* 37 (1989) 17-30.
- _____. "The Gospel of Matthew and Judaism." *BJRL* 66 (1984) 264-84.
- _____. "The Origin and Purpose of Matthew's Gospel. Matthean Scholarship from 1945 to 1980." Pages 1889-1951 in *ANRW* II. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1985.
- Stanton, Graham, ed. *The Interpretation of Matthew*. Philadelphia and London: Fortress and SPCK, 1983.
- Stegner, William Richard. "The Use of Scripture in Two Narratives of Early Jewish Christianity (Matthew 4.1-11; Mark 9.2-8)." Pages 98-120 in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, c1997.
- Stendahl, Krister. "Quis et Unde? An Analysis of Matthew 1-2," pages 56-66 in *Interpretation of Matthew*. Edited by Graham Stanton. Philadelphia and London: Fortress and SPCK, 1983. Repr as "Quis et Unde — Who and Whence? Matthew's Christmas Gospel." Pages 71-83 in *Meanings* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984).

- _____. *The School of St Matthew and its use of the Old Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967 [reprinted, Ramsey, NJ: Sigler, 1991.]
- Stuckenbruck, L. T. "'One like a Son of Man as the Ancient of Days' in the Old Greek Recension of Daniel 7,13: Scribal Error or Theological Translation?" *ZNW* 86 (1995) 268-76.
- Stuhlmüller, Carroll. *Haggai & Zechariah: Rebuilding with Hope*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.
- Suggs, M. Jack. *Wisdom, Christology, and Law in Matthew's Gospel*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu. "The Concepts of מָשִׁיחַ and Messianism in Early Judaism." Pages 79-115 in *The Messiah*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Telford, W. R. *The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree: A Redaction-Critical Analysis of the Cursing of the Fig Tree Pericope in Mark's Gospel and its Relation to the Cleansing of the Temple Tradition*. JSNTSup 1. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980.
- Thompson, Thomas L. "If David Had Not Climbed the Mount of Olives." *BibInt* 8 (2000) 42-58.
- Tollington, Janet E. *Tradition and Innovation in Haggai and Zechariah 1-8*. JSOTSup 150. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Torrey, Charles C. "The Foundry of the Second Temple at Jerusalem." *JBL* 55 (1936) 247-60.
- Trocme, Étienne. "L'expulsion des Marchands du Temple." *NTS* 15 (1968-69) 1-22.
- Troxel, Ronald L. "Matt 27:51-4 Reconsidered: Its Role in the Passion Narrative, Meaning and Origin." *NTS* 48 (2002) 30-47.
- VanderKam, James C. "Joshua the High Priest and the Interpretation of Zechariah 3." *CBQ* 53 (1991) 553-70.
- Van Segbroeck, F. "Les citations d'accomplissement dans l'Évangile selon saint Matthieu d'après trois ouvrages récents." Pages 107-30 in *L'Évangile selon Matthieu. Rédaction et théologie*. BETL 29. Edited by M. Didier. Gembloux: Duculot, 1972.
- Van Segbroeck, F., ed. *The Four Gospels 1992*. Vol. 2. Leuven: Leuven University Press/Uitgeverij Peeters, 1992.

- van Tilborg, Sjef. "Matthew 27.3-10: an Intertextual Reading." Pages 159-74 in *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings*. Edited by Sipke Draisma. Kampen: Uitgeversmaatschappij: J. H. Kok: 1989.
- van Unnik, Willem C. "The Death of Judas in Saint Matthew's Gospel." *ATR* 3 (1974) 44-57.
- Vermes, Geza. *Jesus the Jew. A Historian's Reading of the Gospels*. Second Edition. London: SCM, 1983.
- _____. *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies*. 2nd revised edition. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973.
- _____. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective*. London: Collins, 1977.
- Verseput, Donald J. "Jesus' Pilgrimage to Jerusalem and Encounter in the Temple: A Geographical Motif in Matthew's Gospel." *NovT* 36 (1994) 105-21.
- _____. "The Davidic Messiah and Matthew's Jewish Christianity." *SBLSP* 1995, 102-16.
- _____. *The Rejection of the Humble Messianic King: A Study of the Composition of Matthew 11-12*. New York/Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1986.
- _____. "The Role and Meaning of the 'Son of God' Title in Matthew's Gospel." *NTS* 33 (1987) 532-56.
- Visser 't Hooft, W. A. "Triumphalism in the Gospels." *SJT* 38 (1985) 491-504.
- Walker, Norman. "The Alleged Matthaean Errata." *NTS* 9 (1963) 391-94.
- Walker, William O. "'Nazareth': A Clue to Synoptic Relationships?" Pages 105-18 in *Jesus, the Gospels, and the Church*. Edited by E. Sanders. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1987.
- Weaver, Dorothy Jean. "Matthew 28: 1-10." *Int* 46 (1992) 398-402.
- _____. *Matthew's Missionary Discourse: A Literary Critical Analysis*. JSNTSup 38. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.
- Wenham, David. "The resurrection narratives in Matthew's Gospel [Matt 28]." *TynBul* 24 (1973) 21-54.
- Weren, Wim. "Quotations from Isaiah and Matthew's Christology (Mt 1, 23 and 4, 15-16)." Pages 447-65 in *Studies in the book of Isaiah*. Edited by J. van Ruiten et al. Leuven: Leuven University Press/Uitgeverij Peeters, 1997.

Wilcox, Max. "Text Form." Pages 193-204 in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture*, Edited by D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson, 193-204. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

_____. "The Denial-Sequence in Mark xiv. 26-31, 66-72." *NTS* 17 (1970-71) 426-36.

Wischnitzer-Bernstein, R. "The Conception of the Resurrection in the Ezekiel Panel of the Dura Synagogue." *JBL* 60 (1941) 43-55.

Wright, C. H. H. *Zechariah and His Prophecies*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1879.

