

1958

The eschatology of the compiler of the Gospel according to Saint Matthew

<https://hdl.handle.net/2144/22534>

"Downloaded from OpenBU. Boston University's institutional repository."

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL

Dissertation

THE ESCHATOLOGY OF THE COMPILER OF
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO SAINT MATTHEW

by

Robert Luther Treese

(A.B., Lycoming College, 1950;

S.T.B., Boston University School of Theology, 1953)

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

1958

PHD
1952
tr

APPROVED

by

First Reader Edwin P. Booth
PROFESSOR OF HISTORICAL THEOLOGY

Second Reader Donald T. Rowleyson
PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT LITERATURE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Introductory Statement Concerning the Study	1
Eschatology in Current Thought	2
Previous Work Done in the Study of Eschatology	3
The Problem of This Dissertation.	9
The Method of Procedure	13
Sources Investigated	13
The Limitations of This Study	14
Method of Study	14
The Organization of This Dissertation	16
II. SOME ASSUMPTIONS CONCERNING THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW	17
Introductory Note	17
Assumptions Not Questioned	17
Authorship	17
Date	20
The Arrangement of Materials	21
Provenance	22
Assumptions Relevant to This Study	24
Sources Used	24
The Compiler's Purpose	34
Notes on the Eschatology of the Gospel	37
Summary	38
III. THE DEVELOPMENT OF JEWISH ESCHATOLOGY	40
Introduction	40
Pre-Exilic Roots	43
The Day of Yahweh	44
The Remnant	46
Future Life	46
Post-Exilic Developments	49
Prophetic Eschatology	51
Apocalyptic Eschatology	54
The Apocalyptic Period in Jewish History	61
Developments in the Second Century B. C.	62
Developments in the First Century B. C.	69
Developments in the First Century A. D.	74

The Eschatology of the Qumran Sect	77
Introduction	77
The Literature of the Sect	78
An Eschatological Community	86
The Eschatological Beliefs of the Community	89
Summary Notes on Jewish Eschatology	117
IV. THE ESCHATOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS IN THE WORK OF THE COMPILER	119
Introductory Note	119
The Compiler at Work	119
Chapters 1 and 2	119
Chapter 3	122
Chapter 4	123
Chapter 5	124
Chapter 6	130
Chapter 7	131
Chapter 8	133
Chapter 9	138
Chapter 10	142
Chapter 11	152
Chapter 12	157
Chapter 13	166
Chapter 14	172
Chapter 15	175
Chapter 16	177
Chapter 17	182
Chapter 18	183
Chapter 19	185
Chapter 20	189
Chapter 21	191
Chapter 22	196
Chapter 23	200
Chapter 24	202
Chapter 25	212
Chapters 26, 27, and 28	222
Detached Note A--Matthew's Use of Δικαιοσύνη	228
Detached Note B--The Uses of the Terms Διδασκαλος and κυριος Compared	232
Detached Note C--Matthew's Use of Ἐγγιζω	238
Detached Note D--Ἐκκλησία	241
Detached Note E--The Son of Man	248
Detached Note F--The Parousia	254
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	260
Introduction	260
Summary	260
Prophetic Elements Concern the Work of Jesus	260

Son of David	261
The Eschatological Prophet	261
The Christ	261
Suffering Servant	262
The Redactor's Chain of Eschatological Events	263
The Coming of Elijah	264
The Signs of the Messiah	265
The Days of the Messiah	266
The Birth Pangs of the New Age	269
The Consummation of the Age	270
The Parousia	272
The Final Judgment	272
The Resurrection	276
The World to Come	277
Conclusions	278
Implications for Further Study	283
The Redactor's Purpose	283
Parallels with the Qumran Literature	284
 BIBLIOGRAPHY	 285
 ABSTRACT	 301
 AUTOBIOGRAPHY	 304

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTIONIntroductory Statement Concerning the Study

Christian eschatology rests on the Church's interpretation of the mission of Jesus Christ as seen in the context of Jewish eschatology. Our knowledge of Jesus Christ comes to us from the New Testament, the major portion of which consists of testimony--in particular and universal terms--to the reality and meaning of the life and teachings of Jesus in the first century scene. The four gospels and certain portions of the Pauline writings contain about all that we have of historical reminiscence of the life and teachings of Jesus. It is commonly recognized by the world of critical scholarship that each of the gospels was composed for other than, or in addition to, biographical motives--which motives can be conjectured by internal and external criticism. Likewise it is generally agreed that the Gospel according to Matthew contains the greatest percentage of eschatological inferences and references. The question being posed by this dissertation is: Can there be discovered, in the Gospel according to Matthew, a consistent eschatological pattern which can be seen to be the work of the Compiler of the Gospel? If it can be shown that the Compiler has done his work, both by creative redaction and creative composition, on the basis of particular escha-

tological pre-suppositions or doctrines interpreted in light of events contemporary to his writing, it will be possible to hold the teachings of Jesus in a clearer perspective.¹

Eschatology in Current Thought

Several developments in current theology make the subject of eschatology of vital importance. The growing movement for Church unity not only brings into sharp focus the wide diversity of theological opinions on the relevance and relative importance of the doctrines of "the Last Things," but it has led to the recent and continuing attempt by the World Council of Churches to define the Christian Hope in universally acceptable terms.

The continuing activity of the extreme apocalyptic and millenarian groups also keeps the question of eschatology in the forefront of our thinking. Even some of the more liberal of the "Fundamentalists" tell us that we are living under the tension of the last days. In December, 1957, Evangelist Billy Graham, addressing the fifth International Student Missionary Convention, sponsored by the Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship, at Urbana, Illinois, said that this present generation may well be the last. He said, in his appeal for more students to become missionaries, "I have a feeling in my heart that God has called

¹The current trend in Biblical theology is often seen to ignore the question of the authenticity of passages used to construct or prove a theological tenet on the authority of Jesus. E.g. Oscar Cullman, Christ and Time, trans. Floyd V. Filson (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1950), uses, at two different places in important contexts, an eschatological phrase ("before the time") from Mt. 8:29 which is obviously an editorial addition to a Marcan passage (cf. Mk. 5:7 and Lk. 8:28).

me to evangelize the world in the last generation before the coming of Christ."¹

In the current trend in Biblical theology which emphasizes the transcendent nature of the primitive gospel, the tendency to concentrate attention on the Heilsgeschichte of the Christ-event makes the subject of eschatology central in its concern.²

Perhaps most influential in the contemporary theological scene is the real eschatological tension which grips the world. Because of the newly-acquired latent power for the destruction of the world by man, and the resultant race between East and West for supremacy and survival, eschatology has a new relevance, a new imperative. The Church is under the necessity of speaking in this crisis. Christianity, in the very near future, may well "be constrained for its very life" to

apply a process of historically sympathetic appreciation to the the whole domain of New Testament eschatology. . . . to make of this obsolete mode of thought an effective application.³

Previous Work Done in the Study of Eschatology

Investigation into the studies which have been made in the field of eschatology revealed many works of a general nature. Among the surveys of the doctrine of the future life the following seemed of greatest significance. Dr. William Alger studied the

¹Associated Press News Release, Quincy Patriot Ledger (Quincy, Mass.), January 2, 1958.

²E.g., the works of Rudolph Bultmann.

³B. W. Bacon, Studies in Matthew (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1930), p. 429.

concept of a future life in A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life (1889), a book which considers the development of the idea among all ethnic groups, in Hebrew and Christian thought. S. D. F. Salmond concentrated his study on the doctrine in the New Testament in The Christian Doctrine of Immortality (1897), as had Samuel Davidson before him in The Doctrine of Last Things Contained in the New Testament. Dr. Charles A. Briggs made a fine contribution to the field in his multi-volumed study of the Messianic Ideal; the first volume, Messianic Prophecy, being a critique of the Messianic passages of the Old Testament in their chronological development, and the second volume--more relevant for this study--The Messiah of the Gospels (1894), being a survey of the Messianic ideal of pre-Christian Judaism and of each of the four gospels.

Modern study of Jewish and Christian eschatology rests squarely on the monumental work of Dr. R. H. Charles. In his definitive work, A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, in Judaism, and in Christianity (1899), or as subtitled Hebrew, Jewish and Christian Eschatology from Pre-Prophetic Times Till the Close of the New Testament Canon, he not only made a critical analysis of the texts, as scholars before him had done, but he broke away from the "beaten track" by studying the developing concepts in light of historical and religious developments bringing to bear on the material relevant insights from Greek, Persian and other eschatologies as well. The two-volume translation and commentary by Dr. Charles, The Apocrypha and

Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament (1913) provides these primary materials in an easily accessible, accurate form in English--an indispensable tool.

A very valuable work by Paul Volz, in its second edition Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter (1934), provides a survey of the literature and a fine topical study of the elements of Jewish eschatology as they come to us in Rabbinic, apocalyptic, and apocryphal literatures. There is no English counterpart for this most useful volume.

With reference to the eschatological teachings of Jesus, the work of Albert Schweitzer stands as the pivotal point in the critical study of the problem. In The Quest of the Historical Jesus and in The Mystery of the Kingdom of God he presented his position of consistent or thoroughgoing eschatology developed after a study of the writings of scholars on the life of Jesus. He faced three alternative solutions to the problem of dealing with the eschatological elements in the teachings of Jesus: (1) that of David Strauss and the Myth-school which dispensed altogether with the Jesus of history; (2) that of the "Liberal Lives" culminating in the work of Oskar Holtzmann and Adolph Harnack--the historical approach which dismissed the eschatological elements as first-century accretions to the teachings of Jesus; and (3) that of Johannes Weiss who first took the position that the eschatological elements in Jesus could not be ignored. Schweitzer's position can be summarized briefly as follows: Jesus was always conscious of his Messiahship and opened his ministry proclaiming the imminence of catastrophic judgment and the Kingdom of God,

and calling men to repent. He looked forward to his own manifestation as the Son of Man. Under the immediacy of this expectation, he sent out the Twelve to proclaim the coming of the Kingdom expecting that before they made the rounds of the cities of Israel the End would be upon them, and the Son of Man would have come. Forced to re-evaluate and revise his concepts when, the mission accomplished, the Kingdom had not arrived, Jesus realized that he himself must bear the "pangs of the Messiah." He then determined on a daring stroke, he would take hold of the wheel of history and start it on its last revolution himself. Schweitzer's words tell the story best:

Jesus . . . in the knowledge that He is the coming Son of Man, lays hold of the wheel of the world to set it moving on that last revolution which was to bring all ordinary history to a close. It refuses to turn, and He throws Himself upon it. Then it does turn; and crushes Him. Instead of bringing in the eschatological conditions, He has destroyed them. The wheel rolls onward, and the mangled body of the one immeasurably great Man, who was strong enough to think of Himself as the spiritual ruler of mankind and to bend history to His purpose, is hanging upon it still. That is His victory and His reign.¹

Although it is recognized today that his conclusions were based on rather tenuous assumptions concerning the nature of the primary source materials, Schweitzer's work stands as the monument to the death of the modernizing trend of nineteenth century liberalism, and as the goad to the continued work of scholars giving serious attention to the problem of eschatology in the teachings of Jesus. His position has been tempered by other in-

¹Albert Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus, trans. W. Montgomery (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1956), p. 368.

vestigations, but none can avoid or sidestep his work.

Dr. Rudolph Otto in The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man affirms the eschatological significance of the teachings of Jesus but denies that He taught an "interim ethic," a position Schweitzer was forced to take because of the absolute nature of the claims of thoroughgoing eschatology. Otto shows that Jesus proclaimed the reign of God as present among men, but that its fullest realization was imminent; the world process was moving to its climax. Men are to live as if the world were to go on indefinitely.

Building on the work of Otto, Dr. Charles H. Dodd in his The Parables of the Kingdom (1935) resolves the antithesis between the ethics of Jesus and his eschatological sayings by claiming that Jesus, the eschaton, had arrived bringing salvation and judgment in his generation. This famous solution is known as "Realized Eschatology."

Other studies in English include: T. W. Manson's most significant analysis of The Teachings of Jesus (1931); C. J. Cadoux' examination of the eschatological teachings in the Synoptic Gospels, The Historic Mission of Jesus (1943); F. C. Grant, The Gospel of the Kingdom (1940); J. W. Bowman, The Intention of Jesus (1943). These scholars defend the now-prevalent view that Jesus taught both present and future aspects of the kingdom, but not the apocalyptic elements.

W. A. Guy wrote an excellent short survey study, The New Testament Doctrine of the Last Things (1948), dealing in some detail with the eschatological ideas in each part of the New

Testament, taking into account all the recent critical research. H. H. Rowley, in The Relevance of Apocalyptic (1944), summarizes the work done and the ideas developed in Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic literature with a view to its relevance to our contemporary scene.

Five works on the subject published within the last four years are of real significance. W. F. Stinespring has made available in English the study by Joseph Klausner, The Messianic Idea in Israel (1956 - translated from the Third Hebrew edition, 1949), of the concepts of the Messiah and the Messianic Kingdom along with related ideas, from their beginnings in Hebrew history until the completion of the Mishnah. From Norway comes the study of the Messiah idea and its development by Sigmund Mowinckel, He That Cometh (1954, trans. G. W. Anderson). This author concludes that the Jewish Messianic expectation had two facets, one a national, this-worldly, political figure, and the other a super-terrestrial, other-worldly figure. Helmer Ringgren, The Messiah in the Old Testament (1956), W. Zimmerli and J. Jeremias, The Servant of God (1957), and Werner G. Kümmel, Promise and Fulfillment (1957) are three brief but competent and thorough studies in the series, Studies in Biblical Theology.

Professor Amos N. Wilder, now of Harvard Divinity School, presented what has become a classic on the subject, Eschatology and Ethics in the Teachings of Jesus (revised edition 1950). The author takes a bold new direction. Facing frankly the eschatological conditioning of Jesus' ethic, he attempts, not to harmonize but to re-interpret the essential meaning of eschatology

at its best in Judaism and in Jesus' teaching. Eschatology must not be literalized but is to be treated as myth, as the symbolization of untranslatable ideas.

Creative eschatology, when ethically inspired and when springing from a true insight into the ways of God with man, constitutes a body of myth, a vehicle of profound and significant truth bearing immediately upon historical-social realities. It follows that when the purport of historical phenomena exhausts statement in immediate and realistic terms, it can only be adequately conveyed by the imaginative terms of faith, in this case by eschatological terms.¹

Thus Jesus announced the fulfillment of God's purposes for his people, the new order, the Kingdom of God, but he used the only terminology which could contain and convey this concept, the mythical. A new angle to the study of eschatology is taken in the book by Dr. Ray C. Petry, Christian Eschatology and Social Thought (1956), which studies the relation of eschatology to social responsibility and thought from the New Testament period to 1500 A.D. in an attempt to show that the vivid sense of living under eschatological tension has proved, not a deterrent, but a stimulus to social concern in Christianity.

The Problem of This Dissertation

That Matthew wrote the Gospel in the period following the catastrophe which proved to be so crucial that "Christianity was in a certain sense reborn as a result"² is a fact held in

¹Amos N. Wilder, Eschatology and Ethics in the Teachings of Jesus (rev. ed.; New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950), pp. 56f.

²The quoted phrase is from S. G. F. Brandon, The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church (London, S.P.C.K., 1951), p.249.

almost unanimous agreement by other than Roman Catholic scholars.¹ And while there is not as wide an agreement on the sources of the Gospel, most scholars support some form of the Four-Document hypothesis proposed by B. H. Streeter.² Likewise, in the question of the purpose of the Compiler of the Gospel, there is general accord centered around the conclusions reached by Streeter that Matthew wrote a conciliatory Gospel designed to resolve the controversy between Jewish- and Gentile-Christians by combining the traditions of Jerusalem, Antioch and Rome.³ A problem arises at the point of facing the necessity of accounting for the strong anti-Gentile elements in a context which is supposedly pro-Gentile, or better still, universal in its doctrine of the Church.

The common solution is one that is not flattering to the Redactor,⁴ but rather makes of him a somewhat clumsy "scissors-and-paste" editor, so to speak, who combines materials without critical examination of their contents or context. The position is well-stated by E. F. Scott,

Thus in Matthew we have an outlook which is narrowly Jewish and another which is universal. It seems to be maintained, on the one hand, that the Kingdom is only for Israel, and

¹Of twelve scholars consulted only Allen favored a date for Matthew earlier than 75 A.D., his suggested range was 65-75 A.D. Those supporting a date ranging from 75-90 A.D. are Barnett, Goodspeed, Goguel, Micklem; Streeter holds firm at 85 A.D.; those favoring the range of the last two decades of the century include McNeile, Moffatt; in the last decade, Scott, Bacon, Kilpatrick, S. E. Johnson; and ca. 110 A.D., Enslin.

²The Four Gospels (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1951).

³Ibid., pp. 226-270.

⁴In this study "Redactor" and "Matthew" are used interchangeably for the "Compiler."

on the other, that its destined heirs are the Gentiles. The truth appears to be that Matthew himself is not responsible for either of those views. He makes use of sources which had come to him from various quarters, some of them from the Palestinian church which opposed the Gentile mission, others from churches in which the influence of Paul was dominant.¹ (Italics mine.)

A particularly pointed quotation from Montefiore further illustrates this seeming tendency to ignore or undercut the purposes of the Compiler of the Gospel in favor of supporting a reasonable hypothesis. Commenting on the addition of the word "immediately" in the passage describing the coming of the Son of Man (24:29), Montefiore notes:

Notice the "immediately" which is only found in Matthew. The author of Matthew cannot have added this word, for it had been contradicted by history when he wrote. The destruction of the Jewish State had not been followed by the Judgment, the Parousia, the End. He merely copied the words which he found in his old apocalyptic source.² (Italics mine.)

Sherman Johnson solves the problem by concluding that Matthew was "an honest compiler" who recognized merits in both Jewish and Gentile Christianity and sought to preserve the best of both. "He had sources of various kinds, and for the most part reproduced them faithfully."³

S. G. F. Brandon, on the other hand, in a provocative

¹The Literature of the New Testament (New York: Columbia University Press, 1932), pp. 73f.

²C. G. Montefiore, The Synoptic Gospels (2 vols.; London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1927), II, p. 313. The author does qualify this absolute statement by offering the "more probable" explanation, that reference is not to the Fall of Jerusalem but to something yet to occur, but the statement of the position is well illustrated.

³S. E. Johnson, "Matthew," Interpreter's Bible (New York: Abingdon Press, VII, 1951), p. 235.

study, The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church, ascribes to Matthew a unity of purpose centered around the natural assumption that the Fall of Jerusalem was the judgment of God on Israel, a purpose which is rather consistently fulfilled:

Matthew develops a veritable philosophy of history, which finds expression mainly by way of a consistent emendation of Markan or Q materials. Its general theme is that the failure of the Jews to recognize the true nature of Jesus was the cause of their downfall . . . by a disastrous war [whose cause] was to be found in the advent of Jesus. . . . and that the Jewish Christians and probably those who, having fulfilled the necessary conditions, joined them are . . . to receive the Kingdom of God.¹

The problem of this dissertation can best be stated by first raising a series of questions concerning the purposes of the Redactor. Is it reasonable to assume that the Compiler of the Gospel according to Matthew had a coherent purpose or purposes? What of the anti-Gentile bias? How can the ambivalent treatment of the Gentile Christians be reconciled or explained? Is there any discernible pattern to be discovered from a study of the editorial changes, additions, deletions, alterations of order, which the Redactor made in the process of compilation? Is there any direct relationship between the redactions and the strongly eschatological tone of chapters 23-25?

The problem evolves into the attempt to discover whether the Compiler had a consistent eschatological point of view as one of the presuppositions for his compilation of the Gospel.

¹London: S.P.C.K., 1951, pp. 227-229.

The Method of Procedure

Sources investigated.-The subject of the dissertation was selected under guidance of the writer's major professor, Dr. Edwin P. Booth. The selection grew out of a long-standing interest in the period of Primitive Christian History immediately following the Fall of Jerusalem. Two sets of volumes of accepted dissertations were consulted: Doctoral Dissertations Accepted by American Universities published by H. W. Wilson Company, and that supplied by the Library of Congress, A List of American Doctoral Dissertations, at Boston University Libraries and at the Widner Library of Harvard University. Letters announcing the subject of the dissertation study were sent to the Bible or Religion Departments of eighteen universities and schools of theology which grant the Ph.D. degree in Religion or Biblical Literature. Answers were received from all those addressed to the effect that no doctoral dissertations in the field of New Testament eschatology were in process or were contemplated at that time.

Four doctoral dissertations on topics related to this study have been read. These are:

William Richard Bates, "The Relation of the Messianic Kingdom to the Kingdom of God in the Gospel of Matthew" (unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary), 1951.

James Freeman Rand, "The Eschatology of the Olivet Discourses" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary), 1954.

Ronald Myron Hals, *The Apocalyptic Faith from I Enoch to IV Ezra: An Analysis of the Basic Theological Perspectives of the Non-Biblical Apocalypses of 200 B.C. to 100 A.D.*" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation), 1953.

Wray Wilson Stickford, "The Eschatology of the Fourth Gospel and the Revelation" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Boston University Graduate School), 1953.

The limitations of this study.--This study will be limited to an investigation of the eschatological implications in the work of the Redactor. Aside from the statement of the consensus there will be no concern in the dissertation with problems of authorship, date, provenance, occasion or first readers except as they relate to the question of eschatological interpretation and the solution of the particular problem of the study.

A study will be made of the development of Jewish eschatology, including the eschatology of the Qumran Covenanters, for the purpose of showing the eschatological milieu within which the Compiler's task is set. This latter study will make no claims to being either exhaustive or definitive, but will merely serve to set in perspective the primary discussion of the Compiler's doctrine of "the Last Things."

Method of study.--Any study of the Synoptic Gospels necessarily begins with an analysis of the Greek synopsis. Following the plan somewhat as outlined by Streeter the writer worked carefully through the Huck-Lietzmann Synopse¹ underlining with red

¹Albert Huck, Synopse der drei ersten Evangelien (Hans Lietzmann, ed.; Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck] Zehnte Auflage, 1950).

pencil all agreements between Mt. and Lk.,¹ with blue pencil all agreements between Mt., and both Mk. and Lk., green pencil agreements between Mt. and Mk., and with brown pencil the matter peculiar to Matthew, including all editorial changes. The procedure was made even more efficient by the use of a solid underline only in those portions in which there was absolute agreement, and of a broken underline in those passages showing substantial agreement in essence, but with some differences in word order, or in grammatical construction, or even in the use of different words of similar meanings.

The text of the First Gospel was then studied carefully in conjunction with the following commentaries: Willoughby C. Allen, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Matthew, in the International Critical Commentary; Alan Hugh McNeile, The Gospel According to St. Matthew; Philip A. Micklethwait, St. Matthew, in the Westminster Commentary series; Sherman E. Johnson, "Matthew" (Introduction and Exegesis) in Interpreter's Bible; C. G. Montefiore, The Synoptic Gospels, 2 volumes; and in addition the very fine study of critical problems by Benjamin W. Bacon, Studies in Matthew. An effort was made to study the original meanings of words and phrases with particular emphasis on usages in this Gospel. The Compiler's redactional methods were studied for their relationship to eschatological doctrines.

An analysis was made of the eschatological implications

¹The abbreviations Mt., Mk., Lk., and Jn. will be used in this study to designate the four gospels when reference is made to material in the gospels. The names Matthew, etc., will serve to distinguish the particular writers of the gospels.

in the work of the Compiler, his alterations to the materials, his alterations in the order of events, his additions to narrative and teaching. This was followed by a compilation of the eschatological elements and a summation of the Compiler's eschatological doctrines revealed therein.

The Organization of This Dissertation

The results of the study will be presented in this dissertation as follows: following the chapter on introduction of the problem, two background chapters will present (1) assumptions concerning the Gospel which are taken for granted as presuppositions for the study, and (2) a study of the development of Jewish eschatology. The study of the methods and materials used in Matthew's redaction of the Gospel from the point of view of eschatology will be presented in detail (a number of problems are discussed more fully as detached notes), followed by the summation of the eschatological doctrines as revealed in this study. The dissertation is thus constructed on the following outline:

- I. Introduction
- II. Some Assumptions Concerning the Gospel According to Matthew.
- III. The Development of Jewish Eschatology.
- IV. The Eschatological Implications in the Work of the Redactor.
- V. Summary and Conclusions.

CHAPTER II

SOME ASSUMPTIONS CONCERNING THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEWIntroductory Note

It is not the purpose of this dissertation to be concerned with working out the solutions to many of the critical problems which a study of the Gospel according to Matthew contains. But some recognition of these problems must be made and the solutions proposed by a majority of contemporary scholars must be noted. Therefore, this chapter will list the primary assumptions concerning the Gospel upon which this dissertation is founded. These assumptions will be discussed in two groups: first, those problems whose solutions are generally accepted within certain limits, and in which any probable variations would be of no consequence to the results of this study; and second, those problems whose solutions are in a state of flux or in which variations might have direct relevance to this dissertation.

Assumptions Not Questioned

Authorship.-The early traditions concerning authorship state that Matthew, one of the Twelve, composed the Gospel in Hebrew (probably meaning Aramaic), but the view of modern critical scholarship is that it is neither the work of an Apostle, nor a translation from either Hebrew or Aramaic. This well-known problem is posed because of an out-of-context quotation recorded

by Eusebius from the writings of Papias which purports to contain the words of a "John the Elder" concerning the authorship of two gospels. The quotation is to the effect that Matthew composed τα λογία in Hebrew and "everyone interpreted them as he was able."¹

The three strongest reasons advanced by scholars for the conclusion that the author was not one of the Twelve are: (1) the direct dependence upon Mark which was not the work of an Apostle makes it highly unlikely, for why should one of the Inner Circle, an eye-witness, use a secondary source so completely? (2) the Gospel is obviously not a translation from Aramaic into Greek (in spite of the work of C. C. Torrey and others); (3) the late date of this Gospel makes it doubly unlikely that one of the Twelve could be its author.²

The identification of the "logia" (of Papias' quotation) is still an open question. Many scholars think that the Q document would fit the description, especially in light of Moffatt's qualification, "Matthew's gospel was so called, not because it was the first to make use of the Matthaean source, but because it em-

¹James Moffatt, An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament (2nd ed. rev.; Edinburg: T. & T. Clark, 1912) p. 187.

²"The Greek of the Gospel reveals none of the qualities of a translation." A. E. Barnett, The New Testament Its Making and Meaning (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1946), p. 148. Cf. on authorship also S. E. Johnson, "Matthew," Interpreters Bible, VII, p. 240; M. S. Enslin, Christian Beginnings (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1938), p. 400; E. F. Scott, The Literature of the New Testament (New York: Columbia University Press, 1936), pp. 66f; A. H. McNeile, The Gospel According to St. Matthew (London: Macmillan & Co., 1938), p. xxviii; and especially B. W. Bacon, Studies in Matthew (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1930), pp. 3-144 for a most thorough discussion of the problem.

bodied this συνταξις των λογιων with special thoroughness."¹ Some other attempts to make the identification are by Allen, who equates the "logia" with the material peculiar to Matthew,² and McNeile, who seeks to work within the framework of Papias' statement by postulating a very early Aramaic collection of Jesus' sayings written by Matthew, translated and re-worked many times, two different versions of which were used by the authors of the First and Third Gospels as source Q.³

Two recent theories have been advanced which contain solutions to the problem of authorship. G. D. Kilpatrick, in The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew, proposes that the Gospel was written deliberately by a commissioned scribe, to be used for liturgical purposes, but he sidesteps the problem of Papias' quotation by claiming it was in error.⁴ Professor Krister Stendahl, now of Harvard Divinity School, in The School of Matthew, proposes that the Gospel is the product of a school for

¹Moffatt, Literature, p. 194. Cf. also T. W. Manson, in H. D. A. Major, T. W. Manson, and C. J. Wright, The Mission and Message of Jesus (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1938), p. 221, notes that logia could refer either to "sayings of" or "testimony about" Jesus. Cf. also Johnson, Int. Bib., VII, p. 242.

²W. C. Allen, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Matthew (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913), pp. lxxvif.

³A. H. McNeile, Matthew, p. xxix. G. D. Kilpatrick, The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946), pp. 3-5, asks this pertinent question, "But if there were several translations of Q, how is it that Matthew and Luke independently used the same one, while of the others there is no sign." Both Bacon and McNeile point out that the testimonia in the Gospel are too small an element to be responsible for the title, but this is simply ungrounded conjecture. Cf. p. 32, n. 1.

⁴Kilpatrick, Origins, pp. 3-6.

teachers and church leaders; he sees it as a "manual for teaching and administration within the church." The "school" operated under an eschatological tension which saw scriptures being fulfilled.¹

Date.--According to tradition Mt. was the earliest of the gospels,² a position it maintained until the establishment of the priority of Mk. by the methods of Synoptic criticism.³ The date of the Gospel is held today, within rather wide limits, to be between 65 and 100 A.D. with a majority of the scholars consulted favoring the period from 75 to 95 A.D.

External evidence tends to set the limits: (1) the obvious dependence of Mt. upon Mk. makes the generally agreed-upon date of 65 A.D. for Mk. the terminus a quo for Mt.; (2) the use of the First Gospel by Ignatius (dated ca. 110-115) rather effectively fixes the terminus ad quem; (3) the use of Mt. in The Revelation (ca. 95)--if it be true⁴--would further limit the date.

¹Stendahl, The School of Matthew and its Use of the Old Testament, (Copenhagen: Ejner Munksgaard, 1954), p. 35. It is of interest to note that Bacon, Studies, p. 37, quotes Godet's English edition (1899) that the author could not have been a single individual. F. C. Grant, The Gospel of the Kingdom (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1940), p. 30, suggests that the Gospel "probably has a 'school' behind it rather than an individual author."

²"Matthew published his gospel among the Hebrews in their own tongue, when Peter and Paul were preaching the Gospel in Rome After their departure Mark, . . . himself handed down to us in writing the substance of Peter's preaching." Irenaeus, Adv. her., III. 1. 1. (Quoted from Bettenson, Henry, Documents of the Christian Church [New York & London: Oxford University Press, 1947], pp. 39f.

³The work of H. J. Holtzmann (1863) building on the studies by Karl Lachmann (1835), C. H. Weisse (1838), and C. G. Wilke (1838).

⁴Cf. Goodspeed, Introduction, p. 177, n.2. Examination of the references which Goodspeed feels are dependent upon Mt. shows

Internal evidence tends to support the limits fixed by external evidence. The factors in the Gospel which allude to late dating include: (1) two occasions (27:8 and 28:15) in which reference is made to certain things being continued "to this day" implying a considerable lapse of time; (2) the Redactor tries to deal directly with the disappointment over the delay of the Parousia (e.g. 24:48 and 25:5); (3) the Redactor's intense interest in the Fall of Jerusalem; and (4) the several references to the immediate coming of the Son of Man within the lifetime of some of the disciples (10:23; 16:28, and 26:64).

The Arrangement of Materials.--It is noted that scholars are in general agreement on the identification of the way in which Matthew has grouped the teachings or sayings of Jesus into large, composite discourses.¹ Each of five composite or conglomerate discourses ends with a colophon or formula which effectively closes the teaching section and leads into the succeeding narrative. The five discourses are as follows: chapter 5-7, ending with the formula at 7:28, "And when Jesus had finished these sayings, the crowds were astonished at his teaching;" chapter 10, ending at 11:1, "And when Jesus had finished instructing his twelve disciples, he went on from there to teach and preach in

them to be of the character of allusions or reflections rather than such as to prove direct dependence.

¹Enslin, Beginnings, p. 396, says "It is widely conceded that the five discourses are composite." Cf. also Scott, Literature, p. 70; Johnson, Int. Bib., VII, p. 235.

their cities"; chapter 13 ending at 13:53 with "And when Jesus had finished these parables he went away from there"; chapter 18 closing at 19:1, "Now when Jesus had finished these sayings, he went away from Galilee" and chapters 24 and 25 ending at 26:1, "When Jesus had finished all these sayings, he said to his disciples . . ."1

Dr. Bacon has worked out the scheme of arrangement which provides for a preamble, chapters 1 and 2, then five books each consisting of narrative material culminating in a discourse, and the epilogue, chapters 26-28.² While it is true that Matthew follows the Markan order, inserting in it teachings combined from Q and his other sources, it may also be true that he has deliberately arranged the discourses so that the materials in them would be coincident with the matter in the narrative. Barnett observes that the function of the narrative is "to focus attention on the teaching section."³

Provenance.-The question of the provenance of this Gospel is not settled, although there are strong arguments in favor of

¹E. J. Goodspeed, An Introduction to the New Testament (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937), p. 164, and D. W. Riddle and H. H. Hutson, New Testament Life and Literature (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1946), p. 161, decide in favor of "six sermons" because of ch. 23. This chapter, the polemical "woes against the Pharisees," does not end with the formula. Bacon considers it a part of the fifth discourse (Studies, p. xvii), while Johnson, Int. Bib., VII, p. 528, thinks it likely Matthew looked on this chapter as the transition section "between the controversies and the apocalyptic discourse." It does serve to heighten the effect of the apocalyptic discourse.

²Bacon, Studies, xvii.

³Barnett, Making and Meaning, p. 156.

Antioch on the Orontes. Streeter has marshalled the evidence, summarized in three statements: (1) the basic argument for Antioch is seen in the numerous passages in the letters of Bishop Ignatius of Antioch which show an acquaintance with this Gospel, (2) the strong secondary argument is seen in the high esteem in which Matthew holds Peter, because Antioch was supposedly a center which looked to Peter for leadership, and what would be more natural than that the city church should produce a gospel advancing his claims to leadership? (3) the fact of the Gospel's anonymity suggests that it must have been written for a very influential church, else how could it have received acceptance as rapidly as it did; Antioch was one such great church.¹

G. D. Kilpatrick, advancing the theory that Matthew wrote the Gospel for liturgical as well as apologetic uses, favors "a Phoenician port," a Syrian coastal city, perhaps Antioch except that Ignatius shows no evidence of the strong Jewish influence which is evident in the Gospel; if Antioch was really the center of the Gentile mission (as in Acts 11:19-26) then both Peter and the Gospel according to Matthew would be elsewhere.²

¹Streeter, Four Gospels, pp. 500ff. Enslin, Beginnings, p. 402, and Barnett, Making and Meaning, p. 146, favor Antioch because of the testimony of Ignatius; Goodspeed, Introduction, p. 176, because of the strong emphasis on Peter in the Gospel. Scott, Literature, p. 76, says perhaps Antioch, but that it is hazardous to state categorically. Johnson, Int. Bib., VII, p. 241, feels that the weight of tradition favors Antioch, but "there is no evidence to justify locating it so precisely" as does Streeter. Johnson favors Syria or northern Palestine. Bacon, Studies, p.36, in his vigorous individualistic manner, favors a city of Syria such as Edessa, an hypothesis based on such internal evidences as the reference to "star worship" in Mt. 2.

²Kilpatrick, Origins, pp. 133f.

S. G. F. Brandon makes a strong case for Alexandria as the scene of the work of Matthew, the great church for which the Gospel was written. In his hypothesis the Gospel was written as an apology for Jewish Christianity, after the Fall of Jerusalem--which catastrophe greatly increased the number of Jewish Christians in Alexandria--and "a polemic against the recrudescence of Pauline teaching. The Gospel represents the apogee of Jewish influence in the Alexandrian Church."¹

Assumptions Relevant to This Study

Sources used.--Study of the Gospel according to Matthew in comparison with Mk. and Lk. reveals at once that there are basically three different groups of materials: that material dependent upon Mk. (blue and green pencil underlinings in the Synopse), that showing remarkable parallels to Lk. (red pencil underlines), and that material peculiar to Mt. (brown pencil underlines). There is almost universal agreement on the sources used by the Redactor for the first two groupings. The primacy of Mk. is the foundation of the solution to the "Synoptic problem." C. J. Holtzmann (1863), building on the groundwork of K. Lachmann (1835), C. Weisse and C. Wilke (1838), established the priority of Mk. and the dependence of both Mt. and Lk. upon it. No attempt will be made to reconstruct the proof for this theory. Critical scholarship is in almost unanimous agreement on this score. One has only to study the Greek synopsis to dis-

¹S. G. F. Brandon, The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church (London: S.P.C.K., 1951), p. 242.

cover for himself the identical word orders, exact grammatical usages, chronological dependence of the two later gospels upon Mk. The second source, likewise rather solidly supported by critical scholarship, is a postulated document said to contain at least that material held in common by Mt. and Lk. This source was named Quelle (German for "source") by Wellhausen and the letter Q has taken hold as the designation.¹ Document Q, extant in only about 250 verses, contains sayings of Jesus and extends from the appearance of John the Baptist approximately to the Parable of the Great Banquet (Lk. 14:16-24). It contains very little narrative material and almost no polemical matter, ninety percent of it being "positive religious and moral teaching."²

The Gospel according to Matthew is thus seen to be made up largely of narrative material from Mk.³ and teaching material from Q.⁴ Matthew reproduces 606 of Mk.'s 661 verses, but because

¹D. M. Beck, Through the Gospels to Jesus (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954), p. 51, reminds us that English scholarship also claims the origin of the designation "Q" because of the work of J. A. Robinson who differentiated these sayings from the narrative material, which he had designated P, as having come from Peter, by using the next letter of the alphabet.

²Manson, Mission and Message, p. 308.

³Enslin, Beginnings, p. 392, notes that all narrative material, save only the genealogy and birth stories, and the incident of the coin in the fish's mouth, are from Mk. All other additions are "simply haggadic expansions of the Markan narrative and indicate no independence of origin."

⁴For recent discussions of the Synoptic problem see F. C. Burkitt, The Gospel History and Its Transmission (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1906); J. Moffatt, Literature, pp. 177-217; B. S. Easton, The Gospel Before the Gospels (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928), pp. 3-27; A. Barr, A Diagram of Synoptic Relationships (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1938); A. M. Hunter, Interpreting the New Testament (London: S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1951) pp. 34-48;

of his methods of revision and compression, the material amounts to about 500 verses in Mt. Thus of the total of 1,068 verses in Mt. 500 are from Mk. and 250 from Q.¹ This leaves about 318 verses for the third grouping.

Moving from the "Two-Document" hypothesis, which has a wide acceptance, we come now to consider the third grouping of materials in the Gospel the sources of which are still the subject of much scholarly debate. Examination of this material reveals that it is of several different kinds. (1) Narrative materials involving fifteen incidents which, with the exception of three incidents (3:14-15, John hesitating to baptize Jesus, 14:28-33, Peter walking on the water, and 17:24-27, the coin in the fish's mouth), can be collected under two heads, the birth and infancy stories, and stories about the events in Jerusalem from Jesus' entry to his resurrection.² (2) A group of

Enslin, Beginnings, pp. 426-436; R. Heard, An Introduction to the New Testament (New York: Harper & Bros., 1950), pp. 30-52; D. T. Rowlingson, An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament (New York: Macmillan & Co., 1956), pp. 57-73. Dr. Wilfred Knox, The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels, Vol. II, ed. H. Chadwick (Cambridge: University Press, 1957) is a recent work which tries to replace the Q hypothesis, because of inherent difficulties in its reconstruction, with a theory which sees the matter common to Mt. and Lk. as stemming from collections of short tracts.

¹E. B. Redlich, The Student's Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels (London: Longmans Green and Co., n.d.), p. 17.

²This narrative material comprises 89 verses as follows: 1:1-25, genealogy and birth; 2:1-12, Visit of Magi; 2:13-18, Flight into Egypt; 2:19-23, Return to Nazareth; 3:14-15; 14:28-31; 17:24-27; 27:3-10, Judas' repentance and suicide; 27:19, Pilate's wife's dream; 27:24-25, Pilate washes his hands; 27:52-53, Resurrection of the Saints; 27:62-66, the Guard at the Tomb; 28:2-4, the Angel rolls back the stone; 28:11-15, the Bribing of the Guards; and 28:16-20, Jesus in Galilee, the Mission Charge. This material includes six testimonia.

eleven proof texts which give scriptural foundation to the Messiahship of Jesus. These are commonly called the testimonia. Each one is introduced by a formula "this took place in order that it might be fulfilled which the Lord spoke by the prophet saying . . ."¹ (3) Teaching material, some of which may well be genuine sayings of Jesus, arranged topically throughout chapters 5-25.² (4) Material which can be seen to be the work of the Redactor including the re-writing and expanding of parables,³ editorial additions and transitions, and additional proof texts from Scripture without the introductory formula.

The source or sources of these materials peculiar to the Gospel of Matthew have been the continuing subject of scholarly debate. Before the publication of The Four Gospels by Canon B. H. Streeter it had been customary to assign most of this material to different versions of Q or to various cycles of oral tradition. The Four-Document Hypothesis proposed by Streeter represents an enlargement of the accepted Two-Document theory so that it would include more of the facts. When one has acknowledged the Markan and Q sources in the other two Synoptics, there remains unaccounted for a very large proportion of teachings or discourse material. Streeter, following the lead of B. Weiss

¹The eleven testimonia are 1:22-23; 2:5-6, 15, 17-18, 23; 4:14-16; 8:17; 12:17-21; 13:35; 21:45; 27:9. The underlined passages indicate the six testimonia which are encased in the narrative sections and have been counted in note 1. This leaves a total of 15 additional verses in this material.

²Manson, Mission and Message, pp. 331f.

³E.g. The Parable of the Tares (13:24-30) was most likely constructed around the core of the Parable of the Seed Growing Secretly (Mk. 4:26-29).

and B. S. Easton, proposed that these materials peculiar to Lk. ("L"), and peculiar to Mt. ("M"), are evidence of the use of special documentary sources, the L source perhaps from the Caesarean tradition, and the M source from a Jerusalem-Sayings tradition.

The theory of "M" as a source document was an outstanding attempt to account for the discrepancies between Lukan and Matthean versions of teachings material.¹ It has gained rather wide acceptance, with some qualifications. Scholars tending to follow Canon Streeter include: C. H. Dodd, Vincent Taylor, E. B. Redlich, T. W. Manson, A. H. McNeile, E. D. Burton, F. C. Grant and G. B. Kilpatrick.² Scholars opposing Streeter's theory are headed by B. W. Bacon in this country, M. Goguel, E. F. Scott, C. Montefiore, and, most recently, W. L. Knox and Pierson Parker.³

¹D. T. Rowlingson, "Research in the Synoptic Gospels since 1918" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Boston University Graduate School, 1938), evaluates the status of the hypothesis as of 1938.

²Redlich and Manson, building on Streeter, have treated the theory as if such a document were as firmly established as the existence of Mk. and Q. A. M. Hunter hesitates to conclude that M was a document, as such, but rather a cycle of tradition. (It is of interest that Hunter points out in Interpreting, p. 43, n. 1, that in 1904 E. D. Burton had proposed a four-document theory--of somewhat different source documents from those of Streeter--which never gained recognition.) F. C. Grant, an American exponent of Formgeschichte, includes M--as a source, but not necessarily as a document--in his multiple-source theory of origins; Kilpatrick concludes that M was a written document.

³These scholars all support other solutions to the problem. E.g. Bacon, Studies, postulates a document "S" which would have included Q and much of the material peculiar to Mt. and Lk. This "primal S" was used by all three Synoptists, thus "M is not required in the source-analysis of Mt. as we conceive it," (p. 510); W. L. Knox, an English form critic, works on the theory that the oral tradition was first preserved in a series of short tracts, some of which were used by the writers of our gospels (Sources, II); most recently Pierson Parker, The Gospel Before Mark (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1953) advanced an intriguing theory of an early Jewish Christian Gospel, "K", used by both Mark and Matthew,

When one begins to try to isolate the material in Mt. which can definitely be assigned as having come from M, it is discovered that wide discrepancies in the various listings of the verses exist. There is such a diversity of materials, even within the teaching matter peculiar to this Gospel that a definite assignment of verses to a particular documentary source is difficult. Dr. Alfred M. Perry, writing in volume VII of Interpreter's Bible, notes that the "M" material shows rather definitely "the diversity of several lines of development." He concludes that the sources designated L and M serve the purposes best if they are seen as bodies of material rather than as actual documents. "Though considerations of simplicity favor limitation of the number of common sources, the separate sources may have been numerous and either written or oral."¹

For the purposes of this study it is not important to decide whether or not M, as such, is satisfactory as a theory for the source of the teachings in the matter peculiar to Mt., although

Mark excising the anti-Gentile portions which Matthew, writing at a time when the Jewish-Gentile controversy had abated, included. In Parker's reconstruction Matthew combined K and Q while Luke worked with canonical Mk. rather than with its Jewish-Christian forebear.

¹A. M. Perry, "The Growth of the Gospels" Int. Bib., VII, p. 66. Perry does not deny the possibility of M, in fact he notes in an earlier article that the Sermon on the Mount "furnishes real proof of at least a nucleus of the M document, and presumptive evidence for its existence in greater extent"; ("The Framework of the Sermon on the Mount," JBL, 54, [1935], p. 115); but does insist that the source "cannot be clearly identified elsewhere" (Int. Bib. VII, p. 66). F. C. Grant, The Gospels: Their Origin and Their Growth (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), pp. 48f, supports Perry at this point, noting that "it may turn out that M is not more than an algebraic symbol for the peculiar flavor and tendency, or interests of the author," but that Perry's work "points to a document" in Mt. 5-7.

decision must be made on the extent of the Redactor's work. As a starting point in the study of the sayings, T. W. Manson's listing of the teachings which can be assigned to M was used.¹ Several steps were then followed in the study: (1) only those M-passages which contain eschatological matter or whose position in the chronological pattern bears eschatological implication were considered; (2) the eschatological passages were examined for evidences of references contemporary to the Redactor's period of activity, that is following the Fall of Jerusalem; (3) if it could be shown that a parable or saying bears the marks of re-interpretation, the passage was considered to be from his hand; (4) the designation M was reserved for those passages which can most defensibly be assigned to the primitive sayings tradition, in the opinions of the many supporting scholars, and hence would not be the primary subject for this study. By way of illustration, the Parable of the Marriage Feast is listed as the product of the Redactor's pen in this study because the eschatological elements are definitely late and, while they may well have been superimposed on an original parable of Jesus, one cannot be certain of the extent of that core material. Since the re-working of the parable served the Redactor's purposes, it can justifiably be charged to his hand.²

The determination of the materials to be assigned to

¹Manson, Mission and Message, pp. 451-544.

²It can readily be seen that this method tends to ignore the re-casting and re-interpreting of Jesus' sayings which undoubtedly occurred in the oral tradition, but it is felt that the fact of selection and use of the materials by the Compiler is evidence that they served his purpose. The detailed study appears in chapter IV.

source M and to the work of the Compiler by the methods outlined above is documented in Chapter IV of this dissertation. It remains now to list the passages which are considered to be in these two groupings, as follows: the teachings peculiar to Mt. (M), 5:5, 7-10, 13-16, 17, 21, 24, 27-30, 33-37, 38, 39, 41, 43, 45; 6:1-8, 16-18, 19-20; 7:6, 13-14, 15; 9:13a; 10:5-8, 13, 23-25, 36, 40-42; 11:12, 14-15, 28-30; 12:5-7, 11-12, 34a, 36-37; 13:44-46, 47, 51-52; 15:12-13, 22-25; 16:2-3, 17-19; 18:10, 12, 14, 15-20, 23-35; 19:10-12, 28; 20:1-15; 21:14-16, 28-32; 22:40; 23:2-5, 13, 15-22, 24, 25-26, 27-28, 30-32; 24:30a. This comes to an approximate total of 159 verses.

The verses which are considered to be the work of the Compiler, including editorial transitions are 3:7; 4:23-24; 5:1-2, 18, 19-20; 6:34; 7:21-23, 28-29; 8:1, 18, 23; 9:26, 27-31, 35, 36; 10:1b, 27; 11:1, 20, 23b, 24; 12:15, 23, 32c, 38, 40, 45c; 13:24-30, 36-43, 48-50, 53, 58; 14:13a, 14b, 33; 15:29-31; 16:11-12; 17:6-7, 13, 14-15, 20-21; 18:1; 19:1; 20:16; 21:10-11, 20, 43; 22:1-10, 11-14, 33, 34, 41, 46; 23:1, 7b-10, 33; 24:10-12, 26-27, 30b, 31c, 39b-40, 51b; 25:1-13, 14-30, 31-46; 26:1, 3, 15, 25, 44, 52-54, 60; 27:36, 43; 28:9-10, comprising a total of approximately 166 verses.

The total material found to be peculiar to the Gospel according to Matthew is thus seen to be divided by sources as follows: from a Narrative ("N") source, 89 verses;¹ additional

¹See p. 26, n. 2. Streeter, Four Gospels, pp. 266f, assigns the narrative additions to the local church tradition at Antioch. For the most part, these additions are "haggadic" expansions, if one discounts the Infancy narratives, and perhaps the Petrine cy-

testimonia, 15 verses;¹ from a "Sayings" ("M") source, 159 verses;² and the work of the Redactor, 166 verses. It is noted that this comes to a total of 429 verses peculiar to Matthew.

This would seem unreasonably high in light of the quotation from Redlich above to the effect that approximately 318 verses are in this category.³ But, as will be discovered in Chapter IV of this

cle. Bacon, Studies, chap. XI, especially pp. 161ff. sees certain of the narrative incidents as being derived from a "Nazarene Targum" from the region of northern Arabia, between Antioch and the Euphrates whence our first Gospel "received its infusion of Jewish-Christian coloration." Kilpatrick, Origins, p. 37, suggests that the Nativity stories, the Petrine stories, the special narratives peculiar to Mt. were not in written form but were composed by the Redactor. He concludes, with characteristic vigor, "These contents are but scraps left over and to postulate a document N for them shows how completely the documentary hypothesis has engrossed the minds of some scholars." Perry, Int.Bib., VII, p. 66, likewise feels that these narratives are from the oral tradition. Final decision on this problem will not affect the present study either way.

¹See p. 27, n. 1. Perry, Int.Bib., VII, p. 66, concludes that, while it is possible that the Redactor drew these proof texts from the Old Testament directly, it is more likely, in view of the prevalence of such "testimonies" in early Christian circles, "that Matthew's source was one of these pamphlets." McNeile, Matthew, p. xi, suggests that the testimonia are from a Greek translation of an Aramaic collection, made originally from a Hebrew text which was not identical with the Masoretic. Burkitt, Gospel Transmission, p. 127, postulates, "We may . . . conjecture that the original collection of Messianic proof texts was made by Matthew the Publican in Hebrew and that it is the use of this document by our Evangelist which gives his work the right to be called the Gospel." F. C. Grant, Gospel Origins, pp. 65, 144, takes a position which substantially agrees with that of Burkitt and McNeile.

²Streeter, Four Gospels, p. 232, notes that the M source probably developed around Jerusalem because of the conspicuously Jewish atmosphere of the teachings. Manson, Mission and Message, p. 313, sees significance in the fact that most of the special narrative material of Mt. is concerned with events in and about Jerusalem; perhaps it is an argument in favor of Jerusalem as the source of the discourse material as well.

³See p. 26, n. 1. Sir John Hawkins, Horae Synopticae (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1899), p. 10, notes that 338 of the 1,068 verses in the Gospel are peculiar to Mt.

dissertation, a number of parables which admittedly are based on an authentic core of Jesus' teachings, have been reworked to such an extent with late eschatological elements that in some cases whole parables¹ have been included under the category of the work of the Compiler.² A check of the listing by Dr. W. C. Allen of the Matthaean materials shows that the writer's list agrees with his in the major passages and that there are only minor variations from it amounting to single verses and portions of verses. A count made of his listings shows that he included a total of approximately 404 verses.³ This agrees favorably with the above figure of 429 verses.

In this dissertation, in addition to the assigned designations of source materials already noted--special Narrative source as N, the Old Testament proof texts as testimonia, and the teachings as M--the material laid to the pen of the Compiler will be identified variously as the work of Matthew, or of the Compiler, or of the Redactor.⁴ The primary source material for

¹E.g. 13:24-30, The Parable of the Tares; 22:1-14, The Parables of the Marriage Feast and of the Wedding Garment; 25:14-30, The Parable of the Talents.

²Bacon, Studies, pp. 129-130, discusses with convincing skill the ability of the Redactor to construct or to re-construct a parable or allegory from an original teaching or parable. L. E. Elliott-Binns, Galilean Christianity (Chicago: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1956), p. 11, n. 2, notes that some parts of M seem to reflect "not a primitive Jewish Christianity but a later Judaistic reaction against Petro-Pauline liberalism." He suggests that certain passages are from the pen of the editor, not from M as such. The creative activity of the Compiler of the Gospel is one of the presuppositions of this dissertation study.

³Allen, Matthew, pp. 1-1111.

⁴See p. 10, n. 4.

this study will be almost exclusively the last group--the 166 verses which have been credited to the Redactor--plus all of the minute and uncounted editorial changes and additions. However, mention will be made of certain passages in the other three categories as well, when they seem to reflect an effort by the Compiler to create an eschatological design. Thus, not only will the material which Matthew has added to the Gospel be studied, but his particular use of the known sources with reference to the arrangement of the incidents, the omission of certain materials, and the pattern of the alternation of Markan with Q materials will be investigated for the eschatological implications and design. In this way, within the limitations of the study, a picture of the Compiler's eschatology can be ascertained.

The Redactor's Purpose.--E. F. Scott summarizes the generally accepted view of the purposes for which this Gospel were written: (1) to expand and revise Mk., re-interpreting the narrative in light of given beliefs and needs; (2) to show that Jesus Christ and the Church fulfill Old Testament prophecies; (3) to contrast the teachings of Jesus and the ancient Law, perhaps to suggest "the replacement of the old law by the new"; (4) to show the ways in which the teachings of Jesus speak to the needs of the Church of his day. This last motive was so strong in Matthew that he tended to distort the teachings and "the Kingdom which he proclaimed is confused, as it was in the later theology, with the visible church."¹ Scott summarizes

¹Scott, Literature, pp. 71f.

by stating that the Compiler's governing motive in writing was to lay the foundation for a church

which is broad enough to include diverging views . . . the inconsistency [inclusion of both pro- and anti-Gentile elements] is deliberate . . . [for] he believes that within the one church there is room for all types of disciples-- for those who would cling to the Law and for those who have discarded it This catholicity of spirit has made Matthew the representative Gospel, and is also our best guarantee that it has preserved the facts with fidelity.¹

Perhaps the most radical statement with regard to Matthew's purpose is that by Barnett,

The author never makes the slightest effort to win Jews over to Christianity He thought Christian Missionaries should devote their undivided attention and energy to the evangelization of Gentiles.²

Scholars agree that Matthew's Gospel is catholic or universal. Professor Enslin suggests, "He knew how to write a catholic gospel, expressing the emancipated spirit of the growing universal church."³

Not all scholars have joined this bandwagon, however. Professor Francis Crawford Burkitt, lecturing in 1906, was not so convinced of the pro-Gentile or catholic spirit of the Redactor. He says that Matthew sets forth the life of Christ with reference to

¹Ibid., pp. 74f.

²Barnett, Making and Meaning, p. 150. He goes on to state even more categorically that since Christianity had broken out of Judaism it "had lost its appeal to Jews" and the situation did not seem to warrant continuing evangelistic efforts among them (p. 153). Goodspeed advances a similar conclusion, (Introduction, p. 178). Enslin, Beginnings, p. 395, notes that Matthew is so bitterly anti-Jewish that he must have been a converted scribe "for it is always the convert who is the bitterest about the faith he has left."

³Beginnings, p. 395. So also Johnson, Int. Bib. VII, p. 234.

the questions that most nearly concerned a Church composed of Palestinian Christians. No doubt the Evangelist feels himself and his brethren separated from the mass of his unbelieving fellow-countrymen. The Christians form an Ecclesia, a Society of their own (18:17), distinct from ordinary Jews (28:15). The separation had been made absolute when 'all the people' had answered Pilate by saying 'His blood be on us and on our children!' (27:25). But even so, the unbelieving Jew is nearer than the Gentile and the taxgatherer (18:17); he that is outcast to the Jew is outcast also to the Evangelist.¹

Philip A. Micklem, in the Westminster Commentary on St. Matthew (1917) also suggests that the author of the Gospel was writing primarily for "Jews of Palestine" both Christian and non-Christian, "who saw in the destruction of the Holy City the destruction of Israel as a nation." Professor Micklem goes on to discuss the two-pronged purpose of the message to the Jews: to the Christian Jews he wrote to explain the Fall of Jerusalem as representing the birth pangs of a new order, and to give them a rule of life such as other Jews had, a rule which was superior to the Mosaic because it brought this ancient Law to fulfillment; to the non-Christian Jews Matthew wrote a polemic, an apology, and a warning that the privileged nation itself, along with its leaders, would be rejected by God unless they accepted Jesus, the Messiah of prophecy.²

The study presented in this dissertation will bear directly upon the question of the Redactor's purpose, although that is not the primary topic of investigation. A view very similar to that suggested by Micklem finds some little support.

¹Burkitt, Gospel Transmission, p. 191.

²Micklem, St. Matthew (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1917), pp. ix-x.

Notes on the Eschatology of the Gospel.-The Gospel

according to Matthew is admittedly rather strongly eschatologically oriented. F. C. Grant notes that Matthew writes from a "high apocalyptic eschatology."¹ Bacon points out that whereas Mk. aims to repress apocalyptic excitement following the example of Paul in I Thessalonians, "Mt. aims to rekindle its sinking fires," and concludes that Mt. is the "most apocalyptic of our Gospels."²

There are two interpretations of this heightened apocalypticism. Adolph Harnack notes that the changes to the Lament over Jerusalem (23:37-39) suggest the destruction of the Holy City, and that the uses of "immediately" in 24:39 and "soon" in 26:64 show the author's expectation that the Parousia would follow shortly after the destruction. It is evident, he feels, that Matthew expected the Parousia at once.³ Bacon would support this also, for he points out that each of the discourses ends with references to the rewards and punishments of Judgment Day and that

in addition every opportunity afforded by the material is availed of for heightening the colors of the apocalyptic judgment scenes or emphasizing their nearness.⁴

On the other hand many scholars feel that the ecclesiasti-

¹Grant, Gospel of Kingdom, p. 15.

²Bacon, Studies, p. 412.

³A. Harnack, Chronologie, I, pp. 653-54, quoted by Barnett, Making and Meaning, p. 151, n. 34. Goodspeed, Introduction, p. 159, 176-77, and Allen, Matthew, pp. lxxxivf.

⁴Studies, p. 412.

cism of the Gospel is most important and that the eschatology is "didactic rather than realistic, that the atmosphere of imminence is gone."¹ Barnett feels that Matthew used the heightened apocalyptic tension as a theological framework for the teachings of Jesus. He does, however, qualify this somewhat by adding that the eschatology is not entirely to be charged to its presence in the source materials or to his didactic purposes, but "it expresses the author's sincere conviction of the nearness of the end."²

Micklem suggests that there is a tendency from the less-apocalyptic to the more-apocalyptic thought developing from Q to Mk. to Mt., the First Gospel representing "the limit in one direction" of this tendency.³

Summary.-This chapter has attempted to set the First Gospel in perspective with regard to critical opinion on the problems discussed. The "Assumptions Not Questioned" will have little direct relationship to this study, but the problems discussed under the heading "Assumptions Relevant to This Study" --Sources Used, Redactor's Purpose, and Notes on the Eschatology of the Gospel--are directly affected by the purpose of this dissertation. The relatively full discussion of the Compiler's use of the source materials was deliberate, in order that the

¹Barnett, Making and Meaning, p. 152, n. 35; cf. also McNeile, Matthew, p. xvi, who speaks of "spiritual eschatology."

²Barnett, Making and Meaning, pp. 153f.

³Micklem, Matthew, p. xiv.

method of determination of the primary materials for this study could be shown. In the light of this study, the Redactor's purposes in writing this Gospel will come up for re-evaluation. A position somewhat in line with that of Harnack and Bacon--that the heightened apocalypticism of the First Gospel is not merely didactic but is realistic and a lively hope--will find documentation in this dissertation.

CHAPTER III

THE DEVELOPMENT OF JEWISH ESCHATOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

Before we can begin to study the eschatological doctrines revealed in the work of the Compiler of the First Gospel, we must examine with care the development of the doctrines in Judaism. This will be the task of this chapter.

One cannot rightly assess the eschatological climate of the first century without studying the conditions which produced that climate. "For a right understanding of what the Gospels teach concerning the 'last things' it is indispensable that the antecedents upon which that teaching was . . . based should be studied."¹ Consequently, this study will trace the major themes of eschatology from the origins in pre-exilic Israel, down through post exilic Judaism, the rise of apocalyptic thinking, to the beginning of the Christian era. This, of necessity, will not be an exhaustive treatment because it is not the major emphasis of this paper, but it is hoped that the preliminary study of Jewish eschatology will be adequate preparation for the task at hand.

T. W. Manson, introducing a chapter on the eschatological teachings of Jesus, states two fundamental propositions, the second of which is:

¹W. O. Oesterley, The Doctrine of the Last Things (London: John Murray, 1909), p. ix.

The nature of the future hope is determined through and through, both as to its content and as to the manner of its realization, by the nature of the God who is believed in.¹

This proposition applies certainly to the development of eschatology in Israel. From the very beginning Yahweh was seen as a God whose character required justice and purity in his people; he was war-like toward Israel's enemies, ethical in his dealings with his chosen people. In addition, the experience of deliverance from Egypt was a vital center in the developing religion of redemption.² These are the elements which produced eschatology. Yahweh, who seeks to redeem His chosen people from the miseries of life inappropriate to a chosen people, nevertheless demands of his people justice and purity. In the early days, before the 8th century B.C., Yahweh's sovereignty extended only over his own land and people, but with Amos and Isaiah the idea that God is master of history began to develop. This development gradually made it possible for God to control Israel's enemies, in fact all peoples, for the purposes of exalting His people.

McGiffert notes that a factor which controlled the development of all the religious thought of the Jews was their consciousness of standing in a peculiar covenantal relationship to the God of Israel. While He was creator and Lord of the whole world he was, at the same time, believed to have chosen the children of Abraham from among the people of earth for His choicest blessings. This was be-

¹T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus (Cambridge, England: University Press, 2nd ed.; 1951), p. 247.

²R. H. Charles, A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life (2d ed. rev.; London: Adam and Charles Black, 1913), pp. 9-11.

lieved "not by prophets alone, but by the people in general."¹

Old Testament eschatology is rooted deeply in a living, vital faith in the purposes of Yahweh for His people. Manson's first proposition (see above) adequately describes the situation as it developed:

Eschatology arises from the clash of what is with what ought to be, if faith in a God of righteousness is to be maintained.²

As the centuries rolled on and as Israel seemed to become mired more deeply in the world of suffering and of servitude, the hope for ultimate requital or vindication for righteousness burned ever more brightly.

Davidson divides Old Testament eschatology into two branches which developed concurrently. (1) Eschatology of the People (or Nation) which is the developing idea of the Kingdom of God on earth, and (2) the Eschatology of the Individual, which is the developing doctrine of immortality, or life after death.³ These two strains are recognized by most scholars. Mowinckel, following Moore, names them "National" and "Eschatological" respectively.⁴ For the writer's purpose these two strains of eschatology will be identified by more descriptive titles: (1) "Prophetic" seems more nearly to delineate the developing idea of Israel's glorification on this earth; and (2) "Apocalyptic" more adequately describes the later strain

¹A. C. McGiffert, A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897), p. 1

²Manson, Teachings, p. 247.

³A. B. Davidson, "Eschatology," Dictionary of the Bible, ed. James Hastings, I (1898), p. 735.

⁴S. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, trans. G. W. Anderson (New York: Abingdon Press, 1954), p. 268.

which, though it began with the doctrine of the future life, developed universal and apocalyptic tendencies even within the Old Testament.¹

PRE-EXILIC ROOTS

In pre-exilic Old Testament literature one discovers the beginnings of eschatology in one fundamental idea, the "Day of Yahweh", an idea which developed into what we have distinguished as prophetic eschatology; and a prophetic modification of this fundamental idea to provide the source for the later apocalyptic eschatology. The doctrine of the "Remnant" is seen in this context as the prophetic modification or reaction to the absolute judgment of the Day of Yahweh, providing the hope of restoration which eventuated in the "Doctrine of Future Life."

Pre-exilic eschatology can be characterized simply by the phrase "this world," because the Hebrews thought of rewards and punishments "generally as operating in this world".² Of the two basic ideas we see rooted in this era, one, the "Day of Yahweh" is firmly grounded in this world, and the other, "Future Life" while but a hazy nucleus of the later doctrine, is beamed at this world also.

¹At this point we must take as a warning the statement by G. F. Moore in Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927), II, p. 327, that especially in the earlier period "the two are not sharply distinguished, but run into each other and blend like the overlapping edges of two clouds."

²H. A. Guy, The New Testament Doctrine of the "Last Things" (London: Oxford University Press, 1948), p. 11.

The Day of Yahweh

Whether the majority of scholars, following Charles, are right in seeing the origin of the idea of the Day of Yahweh in the early days when Yahweh was the War-God of Israel and His Day would be the time when he would finally defeat Israel's enemies,¹ or the Swedish school of scholars, of whom Mowinckel is a representative, who claim that the Day originally meant "the day of Yahweh's manifestation in the festal cult at the New Year festival,"² is a moot question not to be decided here. Suffice it to say that the Day of Yahweh was apparently already a popular concept in Amos' time. It appears the primitive concept (from Amos 3:2, 4:5, 5:5, etc.) was that if the people were faithful in their duties of worship and sacrifice and tithing they could confidently expect the day when Yahweh, their God, would vindicate Israel against her enemies and His enemies. Yahweh would deliver Israel from "external hostile oppression and from internal social miseries."³ But Amos (5:18) and Isaiah (1:24-26) saw the Day as one in which Yahweh would vindicate Himself against his people. It would be a day of darkness and of judgment; in comparison to it the sufferings of the present age were as nothing (Amos 5:19). The eighth century thus saw the Day as one of judgment against Israel as well as against other nations.

This concept of the Day of Yahweh exists and exerts

¹Charles, Future Life, pp. 86-88.

²Mowinckel, He That Cometh, p. 132f.

³Davidson, Hastings DOB, I, p. 736.

influence in every period of Israel's history thereafter. Its course is irregular and its content varied. Sometimes it is nationalistic, sometimes universal; eventually it becomes Messianic. It would be correct to say that the eschatological ideas of Israel begin with this conception.¹

Charles sees in Nahum (1:12, 15) that the seventh century prophets saw the Day as marking the setting up of the Messianic kingdom, but Pfeiffer² and others date these verses to post-exilic times. Here is "the beginnings of the thought that Israel is right, over against the world" which is wicked.³ Beginning with Jeremiah and Ezekiel, the post-exilic prophets developed the idea of the Day of Yahweh as the judgment day preceding the establishment of the Messianic Kingdom. Jeremiah and his successors taught that the judgment on the Day of Yahweh would have a corrective or disciplinary character to prepare the way for the kingdom in which all nations should take part. Only those individuals who were finally impenitent were doomed to destruction. Ezekiel and his successors taught that the judgment of the Day of the Lord would serve the purpose of purging Israel of her evil element so that the Messianic Kingdom might be established.⁴

¹It is interesting to note that when the prophets speak of the Day of the Lord they almost always think of it as imminent (e.g. Is. 13:6; Joel 1:15; 2:1). Cf. Davidson, Hastings DOB, I, p. 736.

²R. H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1948), p. 594.

³Charles, Future Life, p. 99.

⁴Ibid., pp. 103-104.

The Remnant

In pre-exilic Israel the Day of Yahweh and the Judgment of God concerned only the nation, not the individual. This concept can rightly be seen as constituting the embryonic stage of the national or prophetic eschatology. However, the prophet Isaiah introduced a new concept which, while it was primarily an eschatological idea, proved to be a "decisive step towards the individualizing of religion."¹ Amos' pronouncement of absolute doom for Israel was without hope.² Isaiah modified it by introducing the idea of the "remnant" which because of faithfulness would be preserved and would return after the Day of Yahweh to constitute the nucleus continuing God's righteous people. Thus righteousness shall be justified, for not the nation but only this remnant, will survive the judgment of the awful Day, and be vindicated by God. Membership in the righteous remnant comes not by birth but by personal choice, and is the decision of the individual. This idea is more highly developed in the post-exilic Judaism. Thus

Jewish eschatology is the ultimate step in the individualizing of religion Every man is finally judged individually, and saved or damned by his own deeds.³

Future Life

When George Foot Moore says the "primary eschatological doctrine of Judaism is the resurrection, the revivication of the

¹Manson, Teachings, p. 177.

²Assuming the section 9:8-10 to be a later addition.

³Moore, Judaism, II, p. 377.

dead,"¹ he is using the term "eschatological" in the sense which has been designated "apocalyptic" in this dissertation. The rudimentary stage of the concept of resurrection, which is central to apocalyptic eschatology, can be discerned in pre-exilic Israel as the idea of a future life for the individual Israelite. (In tracing the developing idea of a future life, Charles is followed closely.)

The oldest portions of our Old Testament abound with passages vaguely reminiscent of the primitive ancestor worship which evidently ante-dated Yahwism among the Hebrew people. (E.g., the references to the death of the patriarchs as being "gathered to his fathers" or to "his people," Gen. 25:8; 35:29; 49:33; as well as Jacob's insistence that he be buried with his fathers back in the homeland, Gen. 49:29f.) Charles says that the primitive Hebrew idea of the family grave was a vestigial element of ancestor worship. The idea provides an early indication of a latent conception of the doctrine of a future life. The family grave was the abode of the departed members. Later there was a tribal grave, and finally the development of the idea of the common abode for all those who died, that is, Sheol.²

¹Moore, Judaism, II, p. 379.

²An understanding of the O. T. doctrine of the soul is necessary at this point. Soul (nephesh) is identical with the blood; such identification was made because of the very obvious fact that death follows the loss of much blood. The soul is the seat of feeling and desire, of intelligence, love, joy, fear, hate. It also becomes "an expression for the individual conscious life" (e.g., "so many souls" means "so many persons," and "my soul" of the Psalms means "I"). Thus the soul is the personal factor, the personality. At death, the soul leaves the body but does not perish in the absolute sense, according to primitive Hebrew ideas. The earliest view credits a "comparatively large measure of life, movement, knowledge, and likewise power . . . to the departed in Sheol." A later view,

These are primitive conceptions unrelated to Yahwism.

Yahwism in its earlier stages had no eschatology relating to the individual because it was exclusively a religion built on the covenantal relationship between Yahweh and the people, Israel. Ancestor worship disintegrated under Yahwism,¹ but some concepts persisted for centuries (e.g., the idea of life in Sheol was only gradually eliminated).²

Charles points out that there were two beliefs in pre-exilic Israel which served as preludes to the doctrine of immortality: (1) the translations of Enoch and Elijah (Gen. 5:22-24 and II Kgs. 2:11); and (2) the conception of Yahweh's power as extending into Sheol in order to bring back a soul (cf. I Kgs. 17:22 and II Kgs. 4:35; 13:21). Of the first, Charles points out that these two translations come to us out of the period when Yahweh's authority was seen as limited to life processes only. "The dead were beyond recall, but the living could be raised to immortality--that is to

under the influence of Yahwism, introduced the idea of Spirit (ruach) as "the impersonal basis or force of life common to men and brutes, coming from God and returning to God at death" (cf. e.g., Gen. 2:7). With this conception the soul (nephesh) as "the personal factor in man . . . the supreme function of the quickened body, perishes on the withdrawal of the spirit." This view denies knowledge and life to the inhabitants of Sheol. Charles, Future Life, pp. 37-39.

¹In the process of the destruction of the primitive ancestor worship by the emerging Yahwism, one of the stages necessary before the emergence of a doctrine of individual immortality was the elimination of all vestiges of immortality residual in ancestor worship. This intermediate stage was a period when no immortality whatsoever was posited. "A large body of the nation . . . took the provisional stage . . . to be one of true and eternal significance. This defective view, named in later times the Sadducean, arose in the fifth century B.C. and maintained itself down to the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D." Ibid., p. 53.

²Ibid., p. 50.

an immortality with the body, not without it, before death not after it."¹

As can be seen the idea of the future life in pre-exilic Old Testament is but a "hazy nucleus of the later doctrine."

POST-EXILIC DEVELOPMENTS

It goes without saying that the Babylonian Exile constitutes a critical "watershed" in the history of Hebrew religion. Jerusalem, the inviolate, had not only been violated but the temple had been destroyed; the chosen people had been scattered and her leaders carried off into exile; the Davidic dynasty had been halted; national sovereignty was at an end. The direst predictions of Amos had come to pass. What of the purposes of Yahweh?

The two great prophets of the period of Jerusalem's destruction, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, tried, each in his own way, to interpret the experience of the catastrophe and from these two men stem the two lines of interpretation and expectation which were to dominate Judaism until the dawn of the Christian era. Both are monotheistic, conceiving God in universal terms, but the God of Ezekiel is the God of Israel who employs his universal powers for the exclusive benefit of his chosen people, Israel; while Jeremiah, following Deutero-Isaiah, sees God using Israel in fulfilling his purposes for all the nations of the world. T. W. Manson has coined two apt phrases to contrast these opposing ideas: Ezekiel preaches a message of Israel as the "saved community" while Deutero-Isaiah,

¹Charles, Future Life, pp. 56-58.

following Jeremiah's lead, speaks of Israel as the "saving community."¹

The eschatological doctrines which were developed by those prophets who followed in Jeremiah's train were, generally universal as well as nationalistic in scope. The nations will be converted so that they too may share in the blessings of the kingdom; only the impenitent will be destroyed (Jer. 12:14-17). Israel will be restored and the dynasty of David will be continued after Israel repents (Jer. 3:13, 19-25). This line of thinking continued the prophetic or national eschatology, the hope of Israel's restoration in this world.²

Those prophets which followed the lead of Ezekiel were more numerous. These too look forward to the restoration of Israel under the dynasty of David, but the hope is particularistic and not universal. The ultimate destruction of the Gentile nations, and the glorification of the chosen people were concomitant. For example, in Zechariah (chaps. 1-8) the "nations" being hostile to Israel must be destroyed as a pre-condition of the Messianic kingdom (2:8-10); and in Joel all the enemy nations will be gathered in the Valley of Jehoshephat, the place of judgment, to be judged and annihilated. Yahweh will sit in judgment. In this latter prophet the Day of Yahweh takes on its pre-prophetic coloring as once more it becomes the day for the vindication of Israel by the punishment of her enemies. This line of eschatological thinking leads naturally

¹Manson, Teachings, p. 181.

²Charles, Future Life, p. 110ff.

to the book of Daniel. Daniel represents the classical expression of Ezekiel's view that the world's history will end in a climax of evil from which Israel will be rescued by supernatural intervention in the hour of her greatest need.¹

Thus from Jeremiah and Ezekiel stem the two major and parallel emphases of later Judaism's eschatology, the prophetic which is essentially this-worldly, looking toward the restoration of the kingdom of Israel under a ruler from the House of David; and the apocalyptic which is essentially other-worldly looking forward to the destruction of this world and the reign of Yahweh in a new world. The Ezekiel line of thinking proves to be dominant, however. T. W. Manson can rightly observe of this,

The history of Hebrew religion after the Exile is the story of how, despite some protests, the conception of Jehovah's people as an exclusive body developed and penetrated the whole life of the community.²

Prophetic Eschatology

The Scion of David and Restoration of the Kingdom.- Prophetic eschatology as it developed in the post-exilic period is mainly concerned with the restoration of Israel to its former glory, through the work of a scion of the house of David. Dr. Pfeiffer marks the beginning of the Davidic hope in Jeremiah 23:5 (cf. also 33:14-33). He cannot conceive of a prophecy of the Davidic dynasty or the restoration of the Israelite kingdom until after the fall of

¹Charles, Future Life, pp. 107ff, 126f.

²Manson, Teachings, p. 181.

Judah, until the Davidic dynasty had been destroyed.¹ These verses in Jeremiah:

"Behold, the days are coming," says the Lord, "when I will raise up for David a righteous Branch ["true shoot" or "Scion" of the old Davidic stock] and he shall reign as king and deal wisely, and shall execute justice and righteousness in the land. In his days Judah will be saved and Israel will dwell securely. And this is the name by which he will be called: 'The Lord is righteousness'."²

are seen as the source of the hope for the restoration of Israel.³

The further the Jews get from the Davidic dynasty, and the more hopeless seems the possibility of ever achieving national sovereignty again, the more glorious seems the era of David. The era of David, as seen through the rose-colored glasses of racial memory, glasses framed in faith in the purposes of God and tinged by disappointment and suffering, becomes the Golden Age of the future, the goal of history.⁴

¹From lecture notes from one of Professor Pfeiffer's classes. Cf. also Pfeiffer, N.T. Times, p. 50.

²Jer. 23:5, 6.

³Dr. Pfeiffer feels that Isa. 11:1f is post-exilic and might well be patterned after this passage in Jeremiah.

⁴J. Klausner, The Messianic Idea in Israel, trans. W. F. Stinespring (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1956), pp. 14-16, develops the thesis that the longing for the Golden Age is pre-exilic in origin. Other ancient peoples have always exalted the Golden Age already past for them, but Israel alone sang of the Golden Age yet to come. He finds support for this thesis in the long history of suffering--beginning with the wanderings of Abraham in a foreign land--from famine, tyranny of local chieftains, and bondage, which made them look toward and long for a time of deliverance, a "golden age." Their longings for a deliverer were fulfilled in Moses. The exalted picture of Moses necessarily, therefore, impressed itself upon the spirit of the nation and became the symbol of the redeemer in general. (A contradiction is only apparent here. The longing for a Golden Age would pre-date its being caught and focussed in the hope for the restoration of the Davidic dynasty. Out of the matrix of suffering and disappointment in her kings Israel gave birth to the hope for the ideal.)

This hope for the restoration of Israel under a descendent of David dominates the post-exilic Old Testament. The beginnings of the hope of future restoration lie quite naturally in the unfulfilled and unrealized elements in Israel's ideal of kingship, according to Mowinckel. The ideals he lists as constituting the essential requirements of a king were, for the most part, "either idealized descriptions of the great kings of the past (which, in effect, means David) or wishes and promises for the new king." This author sees the beginnings of the hope for the ideal king before the Exile. Living experience proved that the king's goodness or righteousness did not always avail to keep the people safe from pestilence, from marauding enemies, from civil dissensions and from injustice. This would be interpreted to be due to the fact that "there must be something wrong with the king himself." It naturally follows that the hope of fulfillment came to be thought of in terms of the next king, or the new king; eventually of an ideal king.¹

The Messianic Hope.-In the somewhat latent hope for the ideal king in pre-exilic times, and in the poignant longing for the scion of David of the post-exilic era, lie the roots of the later belief in the coming of the Messiah and the hope for the Messianic Kingdom. The word "Messiah," as such, does not appear in the Old

¹Mowinckel, He That Cometh, pp. 96f. Klausner's position agrees, in essence, with that of Mowinckel. David the King was the "true prototype of the Messiah." In the prophets, who were "by necessity great masters of negation," we see the ideal contrasted with the actual. The contemporary situation was always bad in their eyes because it never measured up to what it should be; the future represented the good yet to be attained. "The hoped-for good, the ideal, which will be the actuality in the future--this is the Messianic expectation in its full depth." Klausner, Idea, pp. 22f.

Testament in passages which look forward to the coming of the scion of David. "Messiah" is the anglicized transliteration of the Greek form (Messias) of the Aramaic M'shiha which is an equivalent of the Hebrew Mashiah, meaning "anointed one." The term is used in the Old Testament to speak of the reigning king, or of the high priest, and once of the king of a foreign land (Cyrus in Isa. 45:1). But it was not until the inter-testamental period that the word "Messiah" became attached to the hope for the coming of the stem or branch out of the stump of Jesse. "There is no evidence to show that in the Old Testament times the term "Anointed One" was used as a technical synonym for the expected Davidic leader."¹

Apocalyptic Eschatology

The destruction of the nation, the dispersion of her peoples, the disappointment of hopes for political sovereignty, the unexplained indignity of the suffering and tragedy which characterized the post-exilic years led to a "deepening of Israel's prophetic consciousness." The profoundly pious, ardently faithful Jew, gripped inexorably by the inscrutable faith that the events of history are an expression of God's purposes, and possessed equally by the sure knowledge that the Holy Scriptures contain knowledge of God's purposes, bored deep into the past for interpretations of the present. Coupled with new concepts from Persia this piety produced apocalyptic thinking crystallized in apocalyptic literature. Muilenberg says that the apocalyptic literature and thought do not represent an aberration in Israel's religion, but on the contrary "the theology of the apoca-

¹H. H. Rowley, The Re-Discovery of the Old Testament (London: James Clarke and Co., Ltd. n.d.) p. 188f.

lypses may be accounted for by elements deeply embedded in prophecy itself."¹

"Apocalyptic has one of its roots in the preoccupation of scholars with the prophetic tradition and the prophetic books, and in the professional 'wisdom' of the times"² as well as being rooted in the longings of the people. Because of later Judaism's practise of treating the Old Testament as a unified revelation of God's purposes, the scholars were able to use the prophecies indiscriminately as predictions of eschatological happenings.

Apocalyptic thought has its roots in the Old Testament.

When Deutero-Isaiah envisioned the "new times"

Behold the former things have come to pass, and new things
I now declare; (Isa. 42:9)

he was laying the cornerstone, so to speak, for later eschatology.

He did not himself envision the end of history, nor did he, in any sense announce this as the last age, but he announced the

national, religious, and moral restoration of Judah and Israel by the power of God in terms and conceptions which ultimately divorce that restoration from earthly reality and lift it up among the miracles of the divine world. In him all the pre-suppositions of later apocalyptic are present.³

Beginnings in unfulfilled prophecy.-One of the primary impulses to apocalyptic thinking was the problem of unfulfilled prophecies. The prophets had repeatedly warned of a period of trial which would be followed by the time of blessedness and peace

¹J. Muilenberg, "The History of the Religion of Israel," The Interpreter's Bible, ed. G. A. Buttrick, I (1951-57), p. 340.

²Mowinckel, He That Cometh, p. 417.

³Ibid., pp. 261-63.

for the righteous. The events of their day seemed to be overburdened by the former and with not much sign of the coming of the latter.

John Bright has aptly characterized the desperate longing:

. . . the confidence in the ultimate divine victory was so integral to Israel's faith that it could not be given up without surrendering faith itself. Faith had, by its very nature, continually to cry for its fulfillment. Frustration and disappointment only intensified the yearning. So it was that as the present scene, as earth itself, continued to deny all hope, hope was pushed beyond earth and became a desperate longing for the catastrophic intervention of God.¹

One of the characteristic moods as well as methods of apocalyptic eschatology is seen in the re-interpretation of some of the unfulfilled predictions of the prophets.

Borrowings from Persian Thought.--Several concepts from Persian thought have been integrated into apocalyptic thinking. Of great importance is the idea of the cataclysmic end of the present age. This is based on the Oriental cyclic interpretation of history. When catastrophe struck or when some major public tragedy occurred it was always supposed that the cycle of order was coming round to complete its full orbit and the great year when the cosmic order would revert to chaos was at hand. This cyclic concept is based on the idea that the primal forces or energies which were ordered and regulated by the restraint imposed on them by the Creator at the beginning of the cosmic world order would in their turn be unleashed.

All things would dissolve in an overwhelming deluge or be burned in that everlasting fire which rages in the depths of the earth. Then the cycle would begin again; a new world would be brought to birth."²

¹J. Bright, the Kingdom of God, (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1953), p. 167.

²T. H. Gaster, The Dead Sea Scriptures in English Translation, (New York: Doubleday & Company, Ind., 1957), p. 7.

Another concept which infiltrated and was adapted from Persia was the dualistic view of reality. The universe is the scene of a cosmic battle between two eternal spiritual beings, the outcome of which will determine whether good or evil will ultimately prevail on earth. Ahura Mazda, spirit of light, the heaven god embodying cosmic order is locked in struggle with Angra Mainya (Ahriman), spirit of darkness, prince of evil. All living beings are involved in this struggle and can choose the side with which they will be aligned. Before Ahura Mazda can triumph there must be the reign of chaos, the destruction of the present order by fire, the purification of all souls by fire, the supernatural judgment, and finally the creation of a new heaven and a new earth, the eternal kingdom of righteousness and peace.¹

Manson points out that from primitive times there had been in existence among the Hebrews beliefs in the presence of evil spirits or demons responsible for disease, mental disorders, evil and misfortune. These superstitions prevailed in the popular mind "long after the formulation of a monotheistic faith, which, strictly interpreted, left no room for them." The influence of the Persian concept of the two opposing realms of good and of evil helped the minds of the apocalypticists to impose an order on this "mob of evil spirits." They were organized into a spiritual kingdom of evil under the rule of an arch-fiend soon to be known as Satan. Satan develops the attributes of God's arch-enemy from his original Old Testament character as "public prosecutor in the heavenly court" (Zech. 3) or the agent

¹V. Ferm (ed.) An Encyclopedia of Religion (N.Y.: The Philosophical Library, 1945), p. 842f.

provocateur as he appears in Job.¹

The Nature of Apocalyptic Eschatology.-Apocalyptic can be further characterized by examination of the name itself. Apokalupto in the Greek means "to uncover, disclose, reveal or unveil." The Latin equivalent is "Revelation." Apocalyptic writings are usually in the form of visions granted as divine revelations to a noted Biblical character (from Adam to Ezra). The visions are interpreted by an angel, or the author is conducted on a tour through the heavens where he sees the future plans being worked out before him. By means of the visions the author is able to re-interpret prophecy in order to predict the imminent arrival of the eschaton, the end of time.

Apocalyptic thinking develops in times of great crisis; it is a fresh statement of the prophetic faith in God's ultimate purpose and a positive assertion of His sovereignty. There is a sense of immediate urgency about the message because the writer sees the days in which he lives as being the last days.

It is difficult to extract a consistent picture of the apocalyptic development for there does not seem to have been any standard scheme of future events. Some of the elements which most apocalypses contain can be listed briefly:

1. The "wise" can calculate the end of the evil age. (E.g. Dan. 9:22ff "He came and he said to me, 'O Daniel, I have come out to give you wisdom and understanding . . . therefore consider the word and understand the vision!").

¹Manson, Teachings, pp. 152-155.

2. Signs of the fast-approaching end.

a) Abnormal phenomena in nature, e.g.:

"And in the days of the sinners the years will be shortened, and their seed will be tardy on their lands and fields, and all things on earth will alter and not appear in their season: the rain will be kept back and the heaven will withhold it . . . the fruits of the earth will be backward and not grow in their season,

.
And the moon will alter her order and not appear at her (appointed) time!¹

b) Abnormal human behavior, e.g. loss of parental love:

And in those days those who are reduced to want will go forth and mangle their children, and they will cast them away, and there will be miscarriages; and they will cast away their sucklings, and will not return unto them, and will have no pity on their beloved ones.²

c) World-wide rebellion and war.

d) Sin, wickedness and suffering will reach a climax.

3. Calculation of the end by cycles of time. This method of predicting the end of the present age is based on cyclic concept of history. It starts with a certainty that the world will last a certain number of years, and that Scriptures contain the key to this knowledge.

a) Daniel re-interpreted Jeremiah's reference to the length of the Exile as 70 years to mean 70 weeks of years so that the end would come in the writers time.

b) In Enoch the world will endure 10,000 years, and it

¹Enoch 80:2-5.

²Enoch 99:5.

is approaching the last thousand now, which will be the millenium, or the thousand years of peace before the final cataclysm.

4. Final Judgment is of a forensic nature. God himself sits in judgment over men and angels; finally He will pass sentence on Satan himself.

5. The new heaven and new earth, the scene of an eternal age of bliss, life, light, joy, peace, blessedness. "Die Seligkeit der Endzeit is die Rückkehr des goldenen Zeitalters der Urzeit."¹

Other elements will be discussed more fully in the remaining sections of this chapter. This listing is provided merely as an introduction to the nature of apocalyptic.

¹Paul Volz, Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter (Tübingen: Verlag von J.C.B.Mohr, 1934) p.359.

THE APOCALYPTIC PERIOD IN JEWISH HISTORY

The apocalyptic period is generally dated from 200 B.C. to 100 A.D. (Pfeiffer dates the literary period from 165 B.C. to 90 A.D.)¹ After this era, normative Judaism ignored apocalypse as a valid religious concept, no doubt because of the vigor of Christian apocalyptic thought--which claimed to have fulfilled the Jewish hopes--and also because of the tragedy of the attempted revolt (66-70 A.D.) caused, in part, by apocalyptic messianism. Most apocalyptic writings are extra-canonical, but there are several examples included in the Old Testament: Isaiah 24-27, Zechariah 9-14, portions of Joel, and the book of Daniel.²

The following discussion of the Literature of Apocalyptic is dependent upon the summaries by R. H. Charles, R. H. Pfeiffer, H. H. Rowley, and W. O. E. Oesterley; some reference is made to Charles' translations in The Book of Enoch and in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. An attempt will be made in this discussion to present the literature in groups according to dating of the above scholars. Because the subject matter of this dissertation is eschatology of the Jewish-Christian Church and because there was naturally a reaction in Jewish apocalyptic to the doctrines and teachings of the early church, the consideration of the first century A.D. apocalypses will be limited to those which were written before 70 A.D.

¹R. H. Pfeiffer, History of New Testament Times with an Introduction to the Apocrypha (New York: Harper & Bros., 1949), p. 74.

²Dr. Pfeiffer says that Daniel is "the earliest and best specimen of this literature." Ibid., p. 74.

Developments in Second Century B.C.

Historical Setting.-Apocalyptic eschatology properly begins in the second century B.C. when the cumulative frustration at the increase of evil, rather than the realization of the ideal kingdom, came to a head in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes. The anticipated fulfillment of the promises of Ezekiel and Deutero-Isaiah in the consummation of the kingdom did not arrive with the completion of the second Temple, as Haggai had promised (Hag. 1:9). In fact as time wore on the situation grew worse. Instead of the power of heathen empires over Israel being broken forever, there was a steady succession of overlords. The Persian Empire was replaced, not by the Kingdom of God, but by Alexander the Great. Then, when his empire split, Israel became one of the pawns in a perpetual struggle for power between the Seleucids and the Ptolemies. The urge to accept Hellenistic customs and practises was powerful; it caused division within Judaism. Antiochus IV Ephiphanes (175-164 B.C.) seriously attempted to Hellenize Judaea. The depths of infamy as well as the last full measure of insult was reached when he tried, by force of arms, to suppress the religious expression of the Jews by desecrating the sacred altar in Jerusalem. He had erected on the high altar of sacrifice a small altar to Zeus on which swine were sacrificed. (168 B.C.). This is the "abomination which makes desolate" (Dan. 9:27, 11:31). It drove the pious, anti-Hellenistic, faithful segment of Judaism, the Hasidim, to revolt under the leadership of Mattathias and his sons, most notable of whom was Judas the Maccabeus. Judas succeeded in breaking the back of the Syrian overlord's army in Palestine so that he could cleanse the temple, rebuild the altar and re-kindle the fires on that

altar on December 25, 165 B.C. The hopes of national restoration surged hot and high in the breast of every loyal Jew. Surely this was the beginning of God's entrance into history for vindication of his righteous people. The book of Daniel was produced shortly before this tidal wave of hope, during the lowest ebb of despair since the Fall of Jerusalem in 587 B.C.

Daniel.--The book of Daniel is a good representative of a-pocalyptic. It purports to have been written by the prophet Daniel who lived during the first of the four world ages which culminated in the "abomination of desolation." The four kingdoms, Babylonian, Median, Persian, and Greek-Seleucid are represented respectively by four beasts which rise out of the sea: a lion with eagle's wings, a bear with three ribs in its mouth, a leopard with four wings and four heads, and a terrible beast with iron teeth, claws of bronze, and ten horns. The symbolism is continued by the representation of Antiochus Epiphanes as "the little horn . . . [with] eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great things" (7:8). The righteous ones of Israel are represented--in contrast to the four beasts--by the figure of "one like a son of man" (7:13). These shall be rewarded in the final judgment. The seventy years of Jeremiah's prophecy (Dan. 9:2) are re-interpreted to mean that for seventy weeks of years (490 years) the kingdom shall delay, but sixty-nine weeks have now gone by. The last week is at hand. The first half of the last week ($3\frac{1}{2}$ years) is about to close. This is the period of the "abomination of desolation" (9:27) meaning that one-half week or three and one-half years remain before the final

judgment. God will sit in judgment and then "everyone whose name shall be found written in the book shall be delivered." (12:1)¹

Thus we see in Daniel characteristic features of apocalyptic literature: visions, excessive symbolism, beasts, horns, numbers, a definite prediction of the date of the end of the present age. (Later apocalypses wax even more fantastic as they seek to describe in mythical imagery the last war between God and Satan, or the blessed new earth and new heaven. But then the apocalyptic vision of the end of time can only be expressed in myth. "The myth is religion's authentic mode of speech, to express the truth about the invisible realities by visible media.")²

The major ideas of Daniel are as follows: (1) The Kingdom of God is seen as a political kingdom, on this earth administered by the Jewish saints. In it the will of God will be unchallenged forever. (2) Future life: there will be a resurrection of some of the evil or unfaithful Israelites "to shame and everlasting contempt," as well as all the faithful ones to "everlasting life" (12:2). There is no concept of a general resurrection, nor is there any development of the idea of the destruction of the world and the creation of a new heaven and earth.³ In Daniel the main concern is for the realization of the world empire of Israel, the Messianic Kingdom. "The claims of the individual are only very partially

¹Pfeiffer's interpretation is followed at this point. (Int. O. T., pp. 750ff.)

²Mowinckel, He That Cometh, p. 262.

³H. H. Rowley, The Relevance of Apocalyptic (2d ed.; London: Lutterworth Press, 1947), pp. 52-54.

recognized."¹ Thus, in one sense Daniel rightly is seen as being in transition between prophetic and apocalyptic eschatology.

The Book of Enoch.-Known variously as I Enoch or the Ethiopic Book of Enoch, this symposium of apocalypses is largely a product of the second century B.C., although its various sections were written at various times from about 150 to 80 B.C.

I Enoch 6-36 is concerned with the individual and with individual retribution. (1) Resurrection is the experience of two classes of people: the righteous will rise with their bodies to enjoy the Messianic Kingdom, and the sinners who had died without suffering retribution will be resurrected for consignment to eternity in Gehenna. Sinners who had suffered retribution in life will remain forever in Sheol. (2) The Messianic Kingdom is on a purified earth, with no Messiah, but God Himself immediately present with men. The picture is sensuous with fantastic increases in fertility and productivity of nature: e.g., every seed shall bear 10,000 grains, a man shall beget 1,000 children, a vine shall have 10,000 branches each of which shall have 10,000 twigs each bearing 10,000 clusters of 10,000 grapes.²

I Enoch 83-90 is more spiritual than its predecessor: (1) At the successful conclusion of the Maccabean wars God will set up the judgment seat from which He will consign the treacherous angels to the abyss of fire, the apostate Jews to Gehenna; (2) He will then set up the New Jerusalem, (3) the dispersion will be returned, (4) the

¹Charles, Future Life, p. 212.

²Ibid., pp. 214-220.

righteous dead of Israel will arise and (5) the Messiah will appear to reign. Note that the Messiah is here a human figure (actually the word "Messiah" is not used), more of a literary reminiscence since he does not perform any specific function in the scheme of things.¹

The Sibylline Oracles.-In this work of Hellenistic Jews, "abundantly edited" by Christians it is difficult to distinguish pure second century B.C. elements. (1) Messiah will come to bring prosperity to Jews and aliens will be led to accept God. (2) The Messianic Age will be an endless era of material prosperity and peace, centering in Jerusalem. (3) The beginning of the idea of the incarnation of Beliar (Prince of Demons, Satan) in human form is seen here. (Beliar in this work is Simon Magus re-incarnated.)²

The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs.-Written (ca. 109-106) by a Pharisee during the reign of John Hyrcanus before the break between the Maccabees and the Pharisees which came in the reign of Alexander Jannæus, this book purports to be the last words of the twelve sons of Israel addressed to their children. Each combines history, exhortation and prophecy. The Messiah, after the successes of the Hasmoneans, is of the tribe of Levi. (1) Messiah ben Levi is meek, righteous, sinless (Judah 24:1). He will establish a new priesthood; act as a mediator for the Gentiles (Levi 8:14); open the gates of Paradise for the righteous (Levi 18:10; Dan. 5:12); make war against Beliar (Levi 18:12; Dan. 5:10) and cast him forever

¹Charles, Future Life, pp. 222-223.

²Rowley, Rel. Apoc., p. 69.

into the fire ending sin forever. (2) Beliar is the personification of iniquity, the supreme adversary of God, the Lord of darkness. (3) Resurrection - "Enoch, Noah, Shem, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob shall arise in gladness followed by the twelve sons of Jacob, followed by all men, some of whom shall rise to glory, others unto shame."¹ (4) The Last Judgment will follow the resurrection; Beliar will be destroyed. (5) The Messianic Kingdom will last forever on this earth.²

The Apocalypse of Weeks.-(I Enoch 93:1-10; 91:12-17) This strange work reminds one of Daniel's interpretation of the seventy-year prophecy. In this document the history of the world is divided into ten periods, seven of which have already passed. The remaining are as follows: the seventh week (the present) is marked by apostasy; the eighth week will be an era of judgment in which "judgment and righteousness may be executed on those who commit oppression, and sinners will be delivered into the hands of the righteous" (91:12); the ninth week will see "all the works of the godless . . . vanish from the whole earth: (91:14) and the tenth week will be

the great eternal judgment, in which He will execute vengeance amongst the angels. And the first heaven will depart and pass away, and a new heaven will appear . . .and after that there will be many weeks without number forever in goodness and righteousness, and sin will be no more mentioned." (91:15-17)³

The Book of Jubilees.-Also called the "Apocalypse of Moses,"

¹Rowley, Rel. Apoc. pp. 65-68 (direct quote from p. 67).

²Charles, Future Life, pp. 232-234.

³R. H. Charles (ed.) The Book of Enoch (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1893) pp. 268f, 272f.

this is a revelation to Moses at Sinai. It divides history into Jubilee periods of forty-nine years each with a jubilee year the fiftieth, following seven sevens of years. (1) Messianic Age has already begun; there will be no catastrophic end, but the kingdom will come gradually. Men's days will grow longer until he shall live 1,000 years. (2) There is no hint of resurrection. (3) Passing mention is made of the Messiah from the tribe of Judah, but he has no role to play; the tribe of Levi is central and is promised both civil and ecclesiastical authority.¹

Summary of Developments in Second Century B.C.-We can quickly summarize the development of apocalyptic eschatology in the second century B.C. in the following way: there is a certainty, in the face of the desperate hopelessness of the historic situation, that there will be very soon a Judgment and destruction of the forces of wickedness; there is also a certainty that the kingdom of Israel, the Messianic Kingdom, will be realized on this earth, when sin shall be no more. Note also that the Messiah, as such is not a necessity during the Maccabean-Hasmonean era because political sovereignty had been achieved. This accounts for the idea of the Messiah ben Levi, for Mattathias, founder of the Hasmonean dynasty, had been a priest, hence of the Tribe of Levi. We note also that in the second century B.C. there were the beginnings of several ideas: (1) resurrection;(2) reward and punishment for individuals, the Old Testament doctrine of retribution carried beyond the grave; (3) the personification of the prince of evil and darkness; (4) and the concept of

¹Rowley, Rel. Apoc., pp. 60-63.

the Messiah actively warring against the forces of evil.

Developments in the First Century B.C.

Historical Setting.-The next task is to consider the developments in the first century B.C. There had been a gradual and growing disillusionment with the Hasmonean dynasty. Jews on the throne had not brought--nor even heralded--the Messianic Kingdom but, instead, political intrigue, war between rivals for the throne, suffering and terror, resulted. The Hasmoneans, following Simon (142-134 A.D.) combined in one person both the office of king and that of high priest. During the reign of John Hyrcanus (134-104 B.C.) apparently the apocalyptists, or the pious ones, began to lose faith in the dynasty. Interesting and significant features developed because of this. The middle of the century saw such internecine strife that Pompey accepted the invitation to enter Jerusalem and establish Roman rule and peace (63 B.C.).

I Enoch 91-104.-(Minus the Apocalypse of Weeks) These chapters are dated at 100-80 B.C. by Dr. Pfeiffer. In this document the gradual realization that man was too sinful and the earth totally unfit for the Messianic Kingdom dawned as an explanation for the delay of its coming. It would surely be impossible for the utterly pure God to dwell with defiled humanity on the battle-scarred, blood-soaked earth so, Charles says, "divine immanence gave way to divine transcendence." The hope of the eternal Messianic Kingdom to occur on this earth and to be ruled over by an immediately-present deity was abandoned. Charles lists several changes in the eschatology which

occurred because of this abandonment of earth. (1) The Messianic kingdom is not the final state of affairs but of temporary duration; (2) resurrection and final judgment occur at the close of the Messianic kingdom; (3) the hopes of the righteous should be for blessed immortality in heaven itself; and (4) following the final judgment, the present heaven and earth will be destroyed and a new heaven will be created as the abode of the risen righteous.¹

I Enoch 37-71.--Variously known as the Similitudes of Enoch or the Parables of Enoch, this is a most important book, for it develops the concept of the "Son of Man" as a supernatural agent of God.

And there I saw One who had a head of days, and His head was white like wool, and with Him was another being whose countenance had the appearance of a man and his face was full of graciousness, like one of the holy angels. And I asked the angel who went with me and showed me all the hidden things, concerning that Son of Man, who he was, and whence he was, and why he went with the Head of Days? And he answered and said unto me, "This is the Son of Man who hath righteousness, with whom dwelleth righteousness, and who reveals all the treasures of that which is hidden, because the Lord of Spirits hath surpassed everything in uprightness forever. And this Son of Man whom thou hast seen will arouse the kings and the mighty ones from their couches and the strong from their thrones, and will loosen the reins of the strong and grind to powder the teeth of the sinners. And he will put down the kings from their thrones and kingdoms because they do not extol and praise him.

Enoch 46:1-5

And at that hour that son of man was named in the presence of the Lord of Spirits . . . before the stars of the heaven were made his name was named before the Lord of Spirits.

48:2,3

. . . and pain will seize them when they see that Son of Man sitting on the throne of his glory. 62:5²

The Messiah is not of human descent, but a supernatural

¹Charles, Future Life, pp. 250-259.

²Quotes from Charles, Book of Enoch.

being pre existent with God. Four titles are applied to him: His Messiah (or God's Anointed), the Righteous One, the Elect One, and the Son of Man. His role in the apocalyptic scheme is as world-judge, revealer of all things hidden, champion of the righteous. He possesses all dominion and power, and pronounces all judgment.

The general resurrection of all Israel will precede the Day of Judgment.

And in those days will the earth also give back those who are treasured up within it and Sheol also will give back that which it has received, and hell will give back that which it owes. And he will choose the righteous and holy from among them: for the day of their redemption has drawn nigh. (51:1-2)

The Son of Man presides at the Final Judgment:

And he sat on the throne of his glory, and the sum of judgment was committed unto him, the Son of Man, and he caused the sinners and those who have led the world astray to pass away and be destroyed from off the face of the earth. (69:27)

Following the Judgment and the elimination of sinners, the heaven and earth will be transformed so that the coming Kingdom is not in Jerusalem but in a new heaven and a new earth.

And on that day I will cause mine Elect One to dwell among them, and I will transform the heaven and make it an eternal blessing and light. And I will transform the earth and make it a blessing and cause mine Elect Ones to dwell upon it. (45:4,5).

The Psalms of Solomon.--Psalms 17 and 18 of this collection (dated ca. 50 B.C.) have a very vigorous Messianic hope. It almost seems that this bit of devotional poetry was written in reaction to the Parables of Enoch, its contemporary. The Psalms continue, with some development, the prophetic eschatology, for they look for the coming of the Messiah of David's line (post-dating the Hasmonean dynasty), and the restoration of the kingdom at Jerusalem.

Behold, Lord, and raise up for thy people their king, the son
of David,
At the time which thou, God, hast appointed, to hold sway over
Israel, thy servant.
Gird him with strength to shatter the wicked rulers,
Cleansing Jerusalem from the Gentiles who trample it to destruc-
tion;
In wisdom and righteousness to drive out the evil men from our
inheritance,
Crushing their arrogance like the vessels of the potter.
Shattering all their substance with a rod of iron,
Destroying the ungodly nations with the word of his mouth.¹

The Messiah of David will be wise and righteous, sinless, made strong by the Holy Spirit, a definitely human figure. He will reign over Israel and no alien will be admitted. Nations will be judged and subjected to his yoke. The Messianic Kingdom is earthly, centered in Jerusalem. There is no suggestion of resurrection. Psalm 18 uses the term "Messiah" where Psalm 17 (above) uses "son of David."

This book seems to revive the prophetic conception of the hope of a restored Israel under a Davidic king, without supernatural implications.

Summary of Developments in First Century B.C.-The first century B.C. saw a number of significant developments in the eschatological hope of Judaism.

(1) Hope for the coming of the Messiah rose to new and vigorous proportions, but there is a definite dichotomy rather fully developed: the idea of the supernatural Son of Man; and the reaffirmation of the Old Testament hope of the Davidic Messiah, a militant Messiah more fully developed than that seen in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs of the preceding century.

¹Psalms of Solomon 17:23-27. Quoted from C. C. Torrey, The Apocryphal Literature (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1945) p. 107.

(2) The dichotomy seems to persist in the conceptions of the Messianic Kingdom. The Psalms of Solomon retain the Old Testament hope for restored Jerusalem, while the Parables of Enoch, seeing the present earth as unfit for divine habitation, postulate a new heaven and a new earth as the scene of the eternal kingdom.

(3) A general resurrection of all Israel is seen coming at the close of the earth's historical existence, just preceding the final judgment. Even here there are two views of the nature of the resurrection. I Enoch 91-104 speaks only of spiritual resurrection:

All goodness and joy and glory are prepared for them and are written down for the spirits of those who have died in righteousness . . . And your spirits - (the spirits) of you who die in righteousness, will live and rejoice and be glad (I Enoch 103:3,4).

The Parables of Enoch (37-71) speak of a resurrection of the body, but a body clothed in garments of glory and light, imperishable:

And the Lord of Spirits will abide over them, and with the Son of Man will they eat and lie down and rise up forever and ever. And the righteous and elect will have risen from the earth, and ceased to be of downcast countenance, and will have been clothed with garments of glory . . . and your garments will not grow old, and your glory will not pass away before the Lord of Spirits.
(I Enoch 62: 15, 16)

(4) Final Judgment will occur either at the close of the temporary Messianic Kingdom, or at the close of the age preceding the eternal kingdom.

Developments in First Century A.D.

The first century A.D. saw several events which affected the apocalyptic writings of the period: the rise of Christianity and especially its break with Judaism following the destruction of Jerusalem, and the Fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. For the purpose of this study we shall try to limit the discussion to those writings which pre-date these influences.

The Assumption of Moses.-A document which emerged during the lifetime of Jesus. Dated by internal means, in the period following the death of Herod the Great, but before the death of Herod Antipas, thus the limits are 4 B.C. to 34 A.D.; scholars generally place it between 6 and 30 A.D. Cast in the form of Moses' final charge to Joshua, it purports to see the end of history as being during the years immediately following Herod the Great's death. Its main elements are as follows: no Messiah appears. "The eternal God alone . . . will punish the Gentiles."¹ The Kingdom of God will appear suddenly when the heavenly One shall arise from his throne, destroy Satan and avenge Israel by consigning the Gentiles to eternal punishment in Gehenna. There is no moral discrimination in this Final Judgment; Israel will abide in Paradise and the Gentiles in Gehenna. There is no resurrection, either of the wicked or righteous dead; Israel shall be happy forever, being exalted to heaven and shall see her foes suffering in Gehenna, "a form of eternal

¹Charles, Future Life, pp. 301-303 (Quotation is from Assumption of Moses 10:7).

amusement which may not appeal to everyone."¹ The work is further noted for the urgency of its claims. It represents the kingdom as imminent, as evidenced by countless signs of the end.

Alexandrian Judaism.—Four documents produced by Alexandrian Judaism in the first century prior to 70 A.D. are of some interest at this point, although the writings are influenced more strongly by Hellenistic concepts than are the writings of Palestinian Judaism. The Book of Wisdom is to be noted for the idea that Final Judgment is not necessary because the judgment of the individual occurs at death. No Messiah is postulated in this work, although God will institute a period of the Messianic Kingdom for the vindication of Israel and the execution of his wrath on the wicked.² In the writings of Philo we find that, on repentance, Israel will be set free and returned to her land under the guidance of a Messiah, of divine superhuman appearance, "visible only to the delivered." The Messianic Kingdom is earthly and nationalistic. There is no final judgment postulated nor any resurrection, but the souls of the righteous enter paradise.³ In II Enoch ("The Book of the Secrets of Enoch" or "The Slavonic Enoch") we find the first conception of the Messianic Kingdom as a Millenium. Earth's history is to continue 1000 years for each day of creation, followed by 1000 years of peace and blessedness before the final judgment. There is no Messiah or any details of the Messianic period. "Here is an example of apocalyptic which

¹Pfeiffer, Hist. N. T. Times, p. 80.

²Charles, Future Life, pp. 307-312.

³Ibid., pp. 313-314.

betrays no consciousness of crises, but written in calm detachment." ¹

The writings of Alexandrian Judaism can be seen to contain three fundamental doctrines which differ from those of the homeland;

1) The essential evil nature of matter destroys the need for any doctrine of resurrection.

2) The pre-existence of the soul naturally leads to the concept of the immortality of the soul, either in punishment or in bliss.

3) Judgment occurs at death, and souls enter final reward or punishment immediately. ²

¹Rowley, Rel. Apoc., pp. 95-98.

²Charles, Future Life, pp. 303-306.

ESCHATOLOGY OF THE QUMRAN SECT

Introduction

The discovery in 1947 of the manuscripts by a wandering Bedouin in one of the myriad caves in the cliffs in the wilderness of Judea overlooking the Dead Sea, and the subsequent finding of the remains of five caches of manuscripts in five more caves, as well as the excavation of Khirbet Qumran stimulated by these discoveries, are "easily the most important (finds) of their kind in the history of archaeology, and they promise a cascade of revolutionary advances in many fields of biblical study."¹ To this statement by Dr. Frank Cross we might append, "not the least of which will certainly be in our understanding of the eschatology of the first Christian century."

The Dead Sea Scrolls, as they are commonly called, introduce us to a community of people which lived in the caves in the vicinity of Wadi Qumran at which was located the central cluster of buildings now known as Khirbet Qumran. From evidence of coins found within this central building it is definitely known that this site had been continuously occupied from circa 125 B.C. until 68 A.D., except for a break between 31 B.C. and 5 B.C.² From all indications this people was a religious sect within Judaism.

This Sect knew itself primarily as the 'Covenant' (Berith), and specifically as the 'New Covenant' (berith hadashah). Other names were the 'Congregation' ('edah), 'Assembly' (cahal), 'Party',

¹F. M. Cross, "The Scrolls from the Judaean Wilderness," The Christian Century, Aug. 3, 1955, p. 889.

²Gaster, Dead Sea, p. 2f.

('esah, sometimes also meaning 'Council'), and 'Community' (yahad), a word conveying the idea of 'unity', and these last two are often combined into 'Party of the Community' ('esath ha-yahad).¹

Literature of the Sect

The sect possessed many books in addition to the Old Testament, as the study of the fragments reveals.² Many of the books of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha are represented in the fragments, as well as remains of some books of pseudo-prophetical literature about which we had no previous knowledge. The Fragments in the Hebrew of the book of Ecclesiasticus, two copies of Tobit, one in Hebrew and one in Aramaic, are examples of such finds. The Book of Jubilees and the book of Enoch were evidently favorites with the Sect as the first appears in five different MSS and the second in eight. Portions of the Testament of the Twelve Patriarch have been found including pieces of various copies of the Testament of Levi including one section (ch. 14) which has generally been considered to have been a Christian interpolation.³

A brief discussion of the major documents will serve to introduce us to the beliefs of the Sect. The first cave, that discovered in 1947, gave up the largest number of complete manuscripts. There were eleven more or less complete scrolls representing six distinct

¹J. M. Allegro, The Dead Sea Scrolls (Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, Ltd., 1956) p. 101.

²Gaster says that the Book of Esther is the only Old Testament book which has not been found in Qumran fragments, although he lists no quotations and parallels in the Scrolls from five books besides Esther.

³Allegro, Scrolls, p. 119f.

compositions:

Isaiah.--Two complete manuscripts of Isaiah represent the largest and oldest manuscripts of the Old Testament. Study of this text confirms other evidence of the eschatological nature of this community. John Chamberlain in a recent article has shown that "the sect was apocalyptically and messianically sensitive to a degree which caused warping of their text of Isaiah." He then cites a number of examples among which is Isaiah 51:5 wherein the first person singular pronoun referring to the Lord is consistently changed to the third person singular. Chamberlain translates as follows: (Pronoun in parentheses replaces pronoun underlined in the Qumran text).

and my arms will rule the peoples;
the coastlands waite for me,
and for my arm they hope.

and my (his) arms will rule the peoples.
In me (him) the coastlands trust,
and for my (his) arm they wait.¹

Commentary on Habakkuk.--This find introduces us to the method of Bible study employed by the Sect. Like the apocalyptists, mentioned above, the members of the Sect considered the Scripture in all its parts, as revealing knowledge of the end of days. They were especially interested in carrying on a diligent search of the holy Scriptures for such knowledge, for they firmly believed they

¹J. V. Chamberlain, "The Functions of Gods as Messianic Titles in the Complete Qumran Isaiah Scroll," Vetus Testamentum, 5 (1955), 372. (I would think that Chamberlain's conclusion that the text is "warped" by Qumran by reason of Apocalyptic interests would be open to question; whether the Council at Jamnia chose a text with less "Messianic" significance might well be a moot question.)

were standing on the "threshold of the New Age."¹ Consequently their commentaries are not the objective expositions to which we are accustomed in this day. The method of the Qumran commentator is to quote a few words of the text and follow with an explanation in terms of the history of the Sect in which he sees fulfillment of prophecy.

In the process of arriving at its import for his own day, nothing is barred to the commentator: any twisting of the meanings of words, reference to variant traditions known to the author although not included in the text before him, word plays, and even rewriting the passage to suit his interpretation, all is legitimate to the Qumran writer who is himself fired with the spirit of prophecy.²

The Manual of Discipline.--So named by Dr. Millar Burrows in March 1948 because of its combination of liturgical directions with rules concerning procedure reminded him of the Discipline of The Methodist Church,³ this document appears in eleven different manuscripts. Perhaps the name proposed by Professor Sukenik might be more descriptive of the contents of this scroll, i.e., "The Order of the Community,"⁴ for it contains detailed instructions for entrance into and maintenance of membership in the Sect. This scroll⁵ is valuable as a source for the beliefs and purposes of this community, as

¹Gaster, Dead Sea, p. 229.

²Allegro, Scrolls, p. 94.

³M. Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls (New York: The Viking Press, 1956), p. 24.

⁴A. P. Davies, The Meaning of The Dead Sea Scrolls (New York: The New American Library, 1956), p. 21.

⁵The Scroll was found in two pieces but appears to have been unrolled and torn in two.

well as its nature.

The Lamach Scroll.-At the time of the publication of Burrows' book, The Dead Sea Scrolls (Nov. 1955), this scroll had not yet been unrolled; since that time the badly compressed and coagulated parchment has been opened and large parts of it have been preserved. It turns out to be a collection of apocryphal stories which enlarge the patriarchal narratives from Genesis 12-15. Howlett says it has been re-named "The Genesis Scroll."¹

The War of the Sons of Light with the Sons of Darkness.-This is a manual of arms or a detailed plan of campaign for the final forty years of war which will see the elimination of evil. Gaster characterizes it as ". . . a kind of G.H.Q. manual for the guidance of the brotherhood at Armagaddon."²

Thanksgiving Psalms.-Gaster calls these "Hymns" and notes that they "represent the most original literary creation in the Dead Sea Scriptures."³ Many of these are apocalyptic in tone and content: the opening lines are usually lines of thanksgiving in which the writer expresses thanks for salvation from the evil powers in control of the world, or thanks for the power to persevere in the face of much suffering, and thanks for deliverance--even though unworthy of it--from that which is to occur in the very near future; then

¹D. Howlett, The Essenes and Christianity (New York: Harper & Bros. 1957), p. 25.

²Gaster, Dead Sea, p. 276.

³Ibid., p. 112.

follow vivid descriptions of the cataclysmic end of the present age. Perhaps the best example of this type of Hymn is Gaster's number six (Burrows' #VI) which describes in colorful detail the river of fire which will consume everything and everybody save the righteous.¹

Manuscript Fragments.—The above listed six documents comprise the major portion of the discoveries unearthed in Cave One. In addition to these, several manuscripts have been partially reconstructed from the bushels of fragments found in the six caves, some of which are listed below:

1. The small fragment of the Commentary on Micah which is preserved contains only a general accusation that the "Jerusalemite priests . . . are leading God's people astray."²

2. The Commentary on Nahum contains the disputed passages referring to Demetrius, King of Greece and his dealings with "the lion of wrath." Gaster, following Allegro who made the first reconstruction as reported in JBL (75, 89-95), says this refers specifically to Demetrius III who, during the reign of Alexander Jannaeus and at the invitation of the Pharisees, defeated Jannaeus, the priest king, circa 88 B.C.³ But when Demetrius tried to enter Jerusalem some six thousand Jews went over to the side of Alexander Jannaeus and the Greek king was forced to withdraw. Subsequently, Alexander Jannaeus executed eight hundred Pharisees in the vilest

¹Gaster, Dead Sea, p. 138f; cf. Burrows, Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 404f.

²Gaster, Dead Sea, p. 239.

³Ibid., pp. 230, 243.

performance of sadistic immorality, earning for himself the title "the lion of wrath" in the Qumran scrolls. Rowley takes issue with Allegro's too-easy identification of the Greek king. "It requires but little examination," he says, "to see how slender is the basis it provides for the theory that has been built upon it."¹ The Lion of Wrath, according to Rowley who argues rather convincingly that the Demetrius referred to in this commentary is more defensibly seen as Demetrius I who did try to take Jerusalem during the Maccabean revolt, is possibly Antiochus IV Ephiphanes. This debate is not of particular importance for the uses of this study and hence will be carried no further.

3. The Two-Column Fragment found in Cave One was apparently a part of the Manual of Discipline, although probably not a part of the original composition but rather having been copied at the end of the "Manual" because both documents were accepted by the group. In this connection Burrows comments that "the lack of unity or logical order in the contents of the Manual of Discipline itself suggests that it was compiled gradually in scrapbook fashion from various sources."² Gaster calls this fragment the Manual of Discipline for the Future Congregation of Israel because he says it is a small portion of a "blueprint" describing the life in the "Era of Favor" following the elimination of Beliar, Prince of Darkness. This is the fragment containing the much-disputed passage which some scholars have interpreted as a description of the Messianic Banquet referred

¹H. H. Rowley, "4QpNahum and the Teacher of Righteousness," JBL 75 (1956), 189-193.

²Burrows, Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 26.

to in Talmudic literature. The passage is as follows:

The (high) priest, as head of the entire community of Israel, is to come first, and the heads of the Aaronid priestly families and the dignitaries--that is the men eligible for summons to meetings of the general council--are to take their seats before him in order of rank. After that, the anointed (king) being a layman, is to come, and the chiefs of the armed forces are to take their seats before him in order of rank . . .

If they happen to be foregathering for a common meal or to drink wine together, when the common board has been spread or the wine mixed for drinking, no one is to stretch out his hand for the first portion of the bread or wine prior to the priest. It is he who is to pronounce the blessing over the first portion of the bread or wine, and it is he that is first to stretch out his hand to the bread. After that, the anointed (king), a layman, is to stretch out his hand to the bread; and after that the members of the community in general are to pronounce the blessing, in order of rank.

This rule is to obtain at all meals where there are ten or more men present.¹

From the study of the above translation this writer is led to agree with Gaster when he says this reference to a meal is simply a "pertinent illustration" serving the author's purpose of showing that in all things the priest is in supreme authority.

The high priest . . . is to occupy the supreme position and to be superior to any layman. He then gives a pertinent illustration. If, he says, the anointed king himself . . . should attend a communal banquet, the high priest is nevertheless to be seated first."²

4. Two small fragments which Gaster says refer to the Future Age: The New Covenant is obviously a "homiletic exposition of the famous prophecy in Jeremiah 31:31-33" concerning the new covenant written on the hearts of men; the Coming Doom is a discourse made

¹ Gaster, Dead Sea, p. 309f.

² Ibid., pp. 278f.

up of a "string of similes relating to the Last Days."¹

The Damascus Document.—One more document of great importance must be briefly identified at this point. In 1896 in the ruins of a genizah (a repository for worn-out, sacred manuscripts which cannot be destroyed) in a synagogue in Old Cairo a document written on papyrus leaves was discovered. The document was in two forms or editions, a long form comprising eight leaves and known usually as manuscript A, and a short, single-leaf form known as B, dated between tenth and twelfth century A.D. This document concerns the "Covenanters of Damascus," a sectarian movement in Judaism. According to this document the "Covenanters" broke away from the main body of Judaism and migrated to Damascus in order to maintain purity.² This schism occurred in the second century B.C. Pfeiffer dates the document from 100 B.C. to 70 A.D.³

This document variously named The Damascus Document (by Allegro and Burrows) and the Zadokite Document (by Gaster and Rowley), has appeared among the fragments of the Dead Sea Scrolls in even different manuscripts. Not only does this link it directly with the Qumran community, but the contents of the document have so close

¹Gaster, Dead Sea, p. 279.

²With respect to the migration to Damascus Rabinowitz, writing in JBL, argues rather convincingly that Damascus is only a symbolic word in this document and that the Covenanters never made a pilgrimage there. The historical allusions to Damascus refer to the Babylonian Captivity. Consequently, "they (the Covenanters of Damascus) are in all respects the identical Jews by and for whom the DSS were written." Rabinowitz, "A Reconsideration of 'Damascus' and '390 Years' in the 'Damascus' (Zadokite) Fragments," JBL, 73, I, Mar. 1954, 11-35. Gaster agrees with this interpretation, (Dead Sea, 101, note 23).

³Pfeiffer, N. T. Times, p. 57f.

an affinity with the Manual of Discipline, a similarity of language and of thought, that there is little doubt that the Damascus Document should be considered a part of the total Dead Sea Scroll collection.

An Eschatological Community

Who were the Qumran sectarians? Can we relate them to any of the known groups within Judaism? Millar Burrows discusses at length the work of identification which has been done by many scholars. He shows rather conclusively that the Covenanters of Qumran are not to be identified with the Sadducees, or with the Pharisees,¹ although a good case, it seems to me, can be made for Howlett's claim that the Covenanters of Qumran developed out of the Hasidim, the pious ones of Maccabean days, being the reactionary wing, so to speak;² and it is generally accepted that the Pharisees are an outgrowth of the Hasidim so that there may be a unity of origin implied.

Burrows points out that there is rather general acceptance of identification of the Covenanters with the Essenes. But in his characteristic scholarly caution he concludes that because of the paucity of our knowledge about the Essenes (sources are Josephus, Pliny the Elder, and Philo) and because of certain points of difference in matters of belief and custom, it is better not to make such a direct statement as to say that the Covenanters were the Essenes.

It (the sect) may probably accurately be included under the term Hasidim, but that does not indicate a specific sect. In many ways it was akin to the Essenes, as we know them from the Roman period. If this term is used in a broad, comprehensive sense, we may legitimately call the Qumran sectarians Essenes. For the

¹Burrows, Dead Sea Scrolls, Chap. VIII.

²Howlett, Essenes, p. 46.

present, however, in order not to prejudge the case, it seems better to reserve that name for the group described by Philo and Josephus. . . . As a matter of convenience we may still designate the latter by the term "covenanters," which implies neither acceptance nor the rejection of their identification with the Essenes. At any rate, it is clear that the sect of Qumran was more closely related to the Essenes than to any other group known to us.¹

From the brief survey of the major documents of the Covenanters of Qumran, it would appear that they formed an eschatologically-oriented community which separated itself from the main body of Judaism, throughout the course of the first century B.C. and up until the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. The beliefs of this group are thus of the utmost importance to the background of this dissertation.

The Qumran community was essentially a priestly community, founded, it appears, by priests dissenting from the practises of the priestly party in Jerusalem. It was ruled by priests, with laymen participating in communal life; it sought, by isolation from society, to achieve ritual purity and the simplicity of the desert existence of the followers of Moses.² The community believed that the times in which they lived were so evil, so filled with apostasy from the true religion as revealed in the Law given through Moses, and that their leader, the Teacher of Righteousness, had been divinely commissioned to gather himself certain priests out of Jerusalem and form a close-knit community of the faithful, a righteous remnant pure and undefiled, so that at the end of the age God would have a nucleus for the new Israel.³ They felt that their specific duty was to search the Scriptures for en-

¹Burrows, Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 298.

²Allegro, Scrolls, p. 139.

³Ibid., p. 95.

lightenment for the present scene. In a discussion of the nature of the community the Manual of Discipline speaks of the men who "have undergone with blamelessness of conduct, a two-year preparation in the fundamentals of the community, they shall be . . . sacred among the formal members of the community." The Manual goes on to describe the function of such a community of holy men:

When these men exist in Israel, these are the provisions whereby they are to be kept apart from any consort with froward men ["men of error" in Burrows], to the end that they may indeed 'go into the wilderness to prepare the way' i.e. do what the Scripture enjoins when it says, 'Prepare in the wilderness the way . . . make straight in the desert a highway for our God! (The reference is to the study of the Law which God commanded through Moses to the end that, as occasion arises, all things may be done in accordance with what is revealed therein, and with what the prophets also have revealed through God's holy spirit.) [Burrows does not have the sentence in parenthesis.]¹

Thus it is seen that the Covenanters believed they had a specific role to play in the Last Days. They believed "they had been granted a new revelation that made clear the true meaning of Scriptures . . . (and that) the teacher of righteousness (was) the inspired interpreter of the divine mysteries."² All people outside their own community were utterly defiled, belonging to Belial; they themselves, in their avid searching of the Scriptures, their religious strictures, and their many ritual ablutions, were the true Israel. They had their own priests, since they could not worship

¹Manual of Discipline viii, 1-19; Gaster, Dead Sea, p. 56.

²Burrows, Dead Sea Scrolls, pp. 271, 272. Gaster makes an interesting statement on the reasons for the Covenanters withdrawal. The Dead Sea Covenanters were inspired, he says, not only by nostalgia for the days that are past, or by the corruption in the priestly caste, or by the unsettled political conditions of their land, but by the "widespread and well-attested contemporary belief that the great cycle of the ages was about to complete its revolution." (Gaster, Dead Sea, p. 7.)

at the Temple because those priests were corrupt.

The Levites . . . are to invoke a curse on all that have cast their lot with Belial, and to say in response: Cursed art thou for all thy wicked guilty works. May God make thee a thing of abhorrence at the hands of all who would wreak vengeance, and visit thine offspring with destruction at the hands of all who would mete out retribution. Cursed art thou, beyond hope of mercy. Even as thy works are wrought in darkness, so mayest thou be damned in the gloom of fire eternal. May God show thee no favor when thou callest, neither pardon to forgive thine iniquities. May He lift up an angry countenance towards thee, to wreak vengeance upon thee. May no man wish thee peace. . . . And all that enter the covenant shall 'say alike after them that bless and after them that curse, Amen, Amen. [This is from the rite of initiation into the Community.]¹

In any consideration of the eschatological beliefs of this community, it must always be kept in mind that most conclusions regarding the nature and beliefs of the Qumran community are somewhat tentative pending completion of the studies now being carried on by scholars in various disciplines. The statement with which Gaster closes his introductions is no doubt an accurate as well as colorful forecast:

At the moment it may be said the darkness of the Dead Sea Caves has not yet been dissipated, and scholars are really in the position of eager readers guessing the solution of a serialized 'whodunit' before the final installment has been published.²

The Eschatological Beliefs of the Qumran Community

Dualism of Good and Evil.-The simplest explanation for the presence of evil in man and in the world is dualism. It is not the metaphysical dualism of Persia that is believed by this community, but the modified type which sees God as the author of both good and evil, according to His plan.

¹Man. Disc. ii, 8f; Gaster, Dead Sea, pp. 40f.

²Gaster, Dead Sea, p. 29.

Now this God created man to rule the world, and appointed for him two spirits after whose direction he was to walk until the final Inquisition. . . . The origin of truth lies in the Fountain of Light, and that of perversity in the Wellspring of Darkness. All who practice righteousness are under the domination of the Prince of Lights . . . all who practice perversity are under the domination of the Angel of Darkness.¹

The "Angel of Darkness" who is prince over the kingdom of evil is named in several sections as Belial.²

Moreover, all who would join the ranks of the community . . . (are) not to turn away from Him through any fear or terror or through any trial to which they may be subjected through the domination of Belial.³

Belial, the Angel of Darkness is not only responsible for the evil actions of those who choose to live by the spirit of perversity which is in them, but is also responsible for the sins, deeds of transgression, and errors of those "who practice righteousness." Indeed all afflictions to which man is heir as well as the tribulations which he must endure are "due to this being's malevolent sway."⁴

Era of Wickedness.-The present age is the Era of Wickedness in which Belial reigns. It is the last age before the appearance of the Messiah:

Here, however, is the rule for such camp-communities as may come into existence throughout the Era of Wickedness - that is

¹Man. Disc. iii,13-iv,26; Gaster, Dead Sea, p. 43.

²Gaster points out that in the Testament of Levi xix and in the Testament of Joseph vii, xx, Belial is also named "the spirit of darkness." (Dead Sea, p. 95, n. 28)

³Man. Disc. i,18; Gaster, Dead Sea, p. 40, (cf. also Man. Disc. i, 23-24; Dem. Doc. iv,13, 15; v,18; vii,2; xii,2).

⁴Man. Disc. iii,13-iv,26; Gaster, Dead Sea, p. 44.

until the priestly and lay 'messiah again assume office.¹

And these, in specific form, are the regulations which they are to follow throughout the Era of Wickedness, until the priestly and lay 'messiahs' enter upon their office and expiate their iniquities.²

The Final Era.-The end of the age will see the defeat of the forces of Belial, paving the way for the Era of Divine Favor, the Final Era.

Howbeit, God in His inscrutable wisdom has appointed a term for the existence of perversity, and when the time of Inquisition comes, He will destroy it forever. Then truth will emerge triumphant for the world.³

There apparently was more than one conception of the way in which Belial would be overcome. One was the Messianic War between the forces of good and evil. The war would be fought over a period of forty years⁴ (actually there would be thirty-five years of warfare and five sabbatical years, or years of release). This period of time is mentioned in the Damascus Document.

About forty years will elapse from the death of the teacher of the community [Burrows - "unique teacher"] until all the men who take up arms and relapse in the company of the Man of Falsehood

¹Dam. Doc. vii,23; Gaster, Dead Sea, p. 81. (Burrows' translations may be clearer at this point: "Those who walk in these ways during the period of wickedness until arises the Messiah of Aaron and Israel." Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 361.)

²Dam. Doc. xiv,18-19; Gaster, Dead Sea, p. 83. (This section does not appear in Burrows' translation.)

³Man. Disc. iv,18-25; Gaster, Dead Sea, p. 43f.

⁴Gaster says that Rabbinic tradition "assigns a period of forty years for the 'ministry of the Messiah before the final restoration of Israel'" (Dead Sea, p. 103, n. 41). This statement is confusing to me, first because the reign of the Messiah is usually considered to be over the restored Israel. Actually the "forty years" in the Scrolls refers to "Messianic travail" which precede the coming of the Messiah rather than to a forty-year reign.

[Burrows - "man of the lie"] are brought to an end. At that time the wrath of God will be kindled against Israel.¹

The document entitled The War of the Sons of Light with the Sons of Darkness presents a detailed plan of campaign as well as a picture of the outcome of each of the battles.² There will be seven battles, three won by the forces of Light, three won by the forces of Darkness after which

the power of God shall strengthen their [Sons of Light] hearts, and on the seventh occasion the great hand of God shall finally subdue (the army of Belial.)³

This will be the time of salvation for the righteous and extinction for the wicked:

This, however, will be the time of salvation for the people of God, the critical moment when those that have cast their lot with Him will come to dominion, whereas those that have cast it with Belial shall be doomed to eternal extinction.⁴

The war will include all nations:

(For it is a time of trouble for Israel), and of the (visita)tion of war upon all the nations. They that have cast their lot with God shall (be blessed) with everlasting redemption, but annihilation shall overtake all the wicked nations.⁵

¹Dam Doc. vii,9-viii,21; Gaster, Dead Sea, p. 73. (While attempts have been made to identify the "man of the lie" or "man of falsehood" with some specific person in history, Gaster says it is not possible because the reference is general and means "Belial" (p. 103, n. 41.).

²The Exile of the dispersion will return to participate in this War: "When the Sons of Light who are now in exile return from the 'desert of nations' . . . (some of which) will wage war against (Belial). War 1,1-2; Gaster, Dead Sea, p. 281.

³War 1,15-17; Gaster, Dead Sea, p. 282. (Portions in parenthesis are restorations made by Gaster.)

⁴War 1,1-3; Gaster, Dead Sea, p. 281.

⁵War xv,1-2; Gaster, Dead Sea, p. 301.

The "Day of Vengeance"¹ would be at hand at the time of the victory of God in the seventh battle, Belial and all the hosts of darkness will be annihilated and there will be no survivors of all the Sons of Darkness.

There is the expectation that at the victory of God over Belial and the destruction of evil, that God will renew the world, or bring it to re-birth. It has echoes of the concept of "a new heaven and a new earth" of the Parables of Enoch.

Thus far, the spirits of truth and perversity have been struggling in the heart of man. . . . For God has apportioned them in equal measure until the final age, until 'He makes all things new.'²

Another conception of the end of the Era of Wickedness is the torrent of fire which will purge all things on earth and only the righteous will be able to withstand. This is an Iranian conception, and its existence in the thought of the Qumran community may well provide the long-sought for source for the presence of the concept in the preaching of John the Baptist. The Book of Hymns contains a most vivid description of this judgment by fire:

I, whose every step has been amid ruin and rout -
on what strength of mine own may I count
when Corruption's snares are laid,
.
when the hour of judgment strikes,
when the lot of God's anger is cast
upon the abandoned,
when His fury is poured forth upon dissemblers,
when the final doom of His rage
falls on all worthless things;
when the torrents of Death do swirl,
and there is none escape;
when the rivers of Belial
burst their high banks

¹Man. Disc. ix,23; Burrows, Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 384.

²Man. Disc. iv,25; Gaster, Dead Sea, p. 46.

- rivers that are like fire
 devouring all that draw their waters,
 rivers whose runnels destroy
 green tree and dry tree alike,
 rivers that are like fire
 which sweeps with flaming sparks
 devouring all that drink their waters,
 - a fire which consumes all foundations of clay
 every solid bedrock;
 when the foundations of the mountains
 become a raging blaze,
 when granite roots are turned
 to streams of pitch,

 when with His mighty roar
 God thunders forth,

 when warfare waged by the soldiers of heaven
 sweeps through the world
 and turns not back until final doom
 - warfare the like of which
 has never been?¹

This might very well be a poetic description of the vindication of God in the final War which defeats Belial, rather than an actual conception of an all-destroying fire. However, the idea of destruction by fire runs through late Jewish apocalyptic thought.

The future age is defined as the time of God's "good pleasure" that time which will come when and as He decrees and in which His purposes for His chosen people shall be fulfilled. From the Book of Hymns, this one passage is of interest:

Thou alone it is
 that hath created the righteous
 preparing him from the womb
 for the time of Thy good pleasure

 The wicked also hast Thou created
 for the time of Thy good pleasure,
 reserving them from the womb
 for the day of slaughter.²

¹Hymns, iii,3-18; Gaster, Dead Sea, pp. 138-140.

²Hymns xv,15f; Gaster, Dead Sea, p. 337.

This "time of Thy good pleasure" is, according to Gaster, a technical expression used by this community for the future age; it corresponds to the Samaritan term "Era of Favor." From the New Covenant in Gaster's translation we find the belief that in the future age God will again choose a people and set them apart to be holy and blessed:

Howbeit, in the time of Thy good pleasure Thou wilt (again) choose unto Thyself a people, for Thou hast remembered Thy covenant; and Thou wilt make them to be set apart unto Thee as an holy thing distinct from all the peoples; and Thou wilt renew Thy covenant unto them with a show of Glory and with words of Thy holy (spirit) with works of Thy hand and with a script of Thy right hand, revealing unto them both the basic roots of glory and the heights of eternity.¹

The Last Torah.-One copy of the Damascus Document ends with the sentence:

and this is the explanation of the ordinances which they shall carry out throughout the whole of the period of (. . .) concerning the interpretation on the Last Torah.²

This implies, says Allegro, that the Covenanters believed that the coming One would make a final interpretation of the Law, or would set up the Last Torah for the new age.

This is interesting in light of other passages which imply that the Covenanter's interpretation of the Mosaic Law would suffice until the end of the Era of Wickedness:

They ["men of the community"] shall not depart from any counsel of the law, walking in all the stubbornness of their hearts; but they shall be judged by the first judgments by which the men of the community began to be disciplined, until there shall come a prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel.³

¹New Covenant, col. ii; Gaster, Dead Sea, pp. 312, 321.

²Allegro, Scrolls, p. 120.

³Dam. Doc. ix, 8-11; Burrows, Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 383.

In the Damascus Document the same idea seems to be behind two passages: all members of the community

must do according to the explanation of the Law in which the forefathers were instructed until the completion of the period of these years.¹

The "period of these years" is made even more explicit in column vi, where it is seen that they must

observe to do according to the explanation of the law for the period of wickedness.²

The Messiahs of Aaron and Israel.—The expectation of a Messiah in the Qumran community has occasioned not a little controversy among scholars. It is difficult to delineate the several beliefs which are revealed in the documents. Apparently these documents cover a wide enough range and include enough variety of expectation that there is some development or at least some change discernible in the nature of the Messianic expectation.

In the Damascus Document the favorite testimonium is Numbers 24:17; from the Oracle of Balaam:

a star shall come forth out of Jacob,
and a scepter shall rise out of Israel...

In Dam. Doc. vii,19f, the prediction of the star out of Jacob is combined with the reference to "star of your God" in Amos³ to provide Scriptural foundation for identification of their leader who "led them to Damascus" as the "Star." The "Star" is seen as the "Interpreter of the Law."

¹Dam. Doc. iv,6-12; Burrows, Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 352.

²Dam. Doc. vi,14; Burrows, Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 354.

³Amos 5:26 in which the prophet is predicting exile as punishment for idolatry.

The star is the interpreter of the law who came to Damascus, as it is written, "A star shall come forth out of Jacob, and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel." The sceptre is the prince of the whole congregation. [Gaster - "leader of the community"] (who) "shall break down all the sons of Seth"¹

Bruce in a recent article points out that a fragment of testimonia from Cave Four cites Balaam's prophecy (Numbers 24:17) and states that this was "plainly a favorite testimonium from the Qumran community."² This makes it apparent that the Qumran Covenanters at one point in their history expected a two-personed deliverer, the Teacher or Interpreter of the Law, and the Prince of the Congregation who would be a military-political leader.

Only the sons of Aaron shall administer judgment and wealth, and as they direct the lot shall determine for every regulation of the men of the community. As for . . . the holy men, who conduct themselves blamelessly . . . they shall not depart from any counsel of the law, walking in all the stubbornness of their hearts; but they shall be judged by the first judgments by which the men of the community began to be disciplined, until there shall come a prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel.³

The last portion of this passage from the Manual of Discipline is one of the most controversial because it mentions a prophet and not one but two Messiahs. Let us begin the process of untangling as much of this debate as is necessary for an understanding of the eschatological hope of the community by considering first the belief in the coming of "a prophet."

The belief in the coming of a prophet is based on exegesis of Deut. 18:15-18, a passage in which Moses is speaking to the Children

¹Burrows, Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 355, from Dam. Doc.

²F. F. Bruce, "Qumran and Early Christianity," NTS 2 (1955), p. 179.

³Man. Disc. ix,7-11; Burrows, Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 383.

of Israel; he tells them of a promise God had made to him:

And the Lord said to me . . . "I will raise up for them a prophet like you from among their brethren; and I will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak to them all that I have commanded him (vs. 18).

The quotation from the Manual of Discipline (ix,11) above represents the only reference to this expected prophet, but it is a significant passage. Professor Kuhn shows that the expectation of the coming of a "prophet" was a part of the complex eschatological hope in Judaism. He traces the idea as originating in Deut. 18:15ff, and being mentioned in an eschatological context in the Testament of Benjamin 9.2. Kuhn also points out two passages in I Maccabees which mention the "coming prophet," 4:46 and 14:41, the latter of which is quoted below:

Also that the Jews and priests were well pleased that Simon should be their governor and high priest forever, until there should arise a faithful prophet.

So much for the possible origin of the idea.¹

Gaster notes that one small fragment, which he fails to identify, containing a listing of Scriptural quotations which served to justify the Messianic beliefs of the community, is headed up by the verse from Deut. 18:18, and that in context the verse is associated with Moses' final blessings on the Levite tribe (Deut. 33:8-11). Further than this, Gaster finds here the source of the technical term "teacher" used by the Qumran community.² In Moses farewell blessings

¹Karl G. Kuhn, "Die beiden Messias Aarons und Israels", NTS, 1 (1954 s)178f. Kuhn also points out that the idea of the Prophet is reflected in the New Testament in Mark 8:28, John 1:20 and 7:40f. In addition the expectation of "a prophet" is connected with Jesus in Lk. 7:16; Jn. 7:52; 9:17; and Acts 3:22; 7:37). Cf. also the excellent Monograph by Howard M. Teeple, The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet, (JBL Monograph Series Vol. X, 1957) for a competent discussion of this whole problem.

²Gaster, Dead Sea, p. 5f.

on the tribe of Levi he says:

They shall teach Jacob thy ordinances,
and Israel thy law; (Deut. 33:10a).

and since the Levites are the priests it is natural to associate the teaching function with the duties of the priests. The implication to be drawn from this realization is that the expectation of "a prophet" and that of "a teacher" may well be the same hope. This makes necessary a discussion of the "Teacher of Righteousness."

Frequent reference is made in the Scrolls to a "teacher of righteousness" and much discussion as to identification has already taken place. It is difficult to connect the references to such a teacher with any one specific person who is known in history because of the confusing and varied historical illusions. Some references, such as that at the beginning of the Damascus Document,

And God observed their works, that they sought him with a perfect heart; and he raised up for them a teacher of righteousness to lead them in the way of his heart.¹

seem to point definitely to an historical person, perhaps the founder of the Sect; another example is:

from the time the teacher of the community is gathered to his rest until that in which the lay and the priestly Messiah assume their office.²

Other passages might be taken to refer to a person living contemporary with the writer, a person revered for his teaching of the correct interpretation of the Law. Such a passage is from manuscript B of the Damascus Document:

Howbeit, all that hold fast to these enactments, going and

¹Dam. Doc. i,1-4; Burrows, Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 349.

²Dam. Doc. vii,20; Gaster, Dead Sea, p. 72.

coming in accordance with the Law; that hearken to the voice of the Teacher; . . . all who give ear to him who imparts the true interpretation of the Law . . . all of these shall rejoice . . . and shall prevail over all that dwell in the world.¹

The Commentary on Psalm 37 makes a positive identification of the teacher as a priest,

This refers to the priest, the man who expounds the Law correctly. [Usually translated as "teacher of righteousness" according to Gaster.]²

The other references to the Teacher of Righteousness are in the Commentary on Habakkuk. These are vague allusions and are of little value for linking the Teacher with any particular person or time in history. (It is interesting to note, at this point, that there are no references to the Teacher in the Manual of Discipline, but only the reference to the "prophet" which, according to Gaster, connotes the same expectation.)

Burrows makes a summary of the different points of view advanced by various scholars in their attempts to locate in history the person who fits all the allusions and descriptions of the Teacher of Righteousness. He concludes that about all we can deduce concerning the teacher is that "he was a priest who was believed by his disciples to be endowed with power to interpret the words of the prophets."³

Scholars who have tried to locate the "teacher in the pre-Maccabean period generally settle on Onias III, high priest during the reign of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, but not enough is known about

¹Dam. Doc. B. ii, 27-34; Gaster, Dead Sea, p. 74.

²Com. Psalm 37, Fragment A, col. ii; Gaster, Dead Sea, p. 261.

³Burrows, Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 146.

him and too many of the allusions are vague beyond identification. The problems are similar for those who would locate him in the Maccabean or Hasmonean period; several persons have been suggested any one of which fits some of the facts. For example, a dual identification settles on Mattathias and Judas as best fitting the facts; another identifies one Jose ben Joezer, a little known Hasid who was persecuted by the high priest Alcimus. Others tend to date the career of the "Teacher" after the actual founding of the sect as the facts seem better to fit, for example, the reign of Alexander Jannæus (103-76 B.C.), while several Jewish scholars make identification with Jesus and/or Paul. Burrows sums up the whole question of identification of the various persons mentioned in the Qumran scrolls very aptly:

For one who considers all these theories without prejudice, and with no sense of obligation to propose a new theory to end all theories, it will hardly seem that the result of the debate can be stated with a confident Q.E.D. Perhaps not even one individual, group or event has been identified with certainty . . . The scholars who have discussed these problems have all been more successful in refuting one another's theories than in establishing their own.¹

This leads to the belief that perhaps Gaster is not too far from wrong when he says that it is folly to attempt to identify the "teacher of righteousness" with any known historical person because that was not the original intent of the passages. He claims that this Qumran sect considered itself as the true interpreters of the Law, such interpretation being done by a series of men in a "kind of apostolic succession begun by the prophets and continued by a

¹Burrows, Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 184f.

series of inspired leaders."¹ He points out that each of these revered leaders was known as "the correct expositor" or the "orthodox expounder" of the Word; thus he always translates the Hebrew moreh zedeq as "the right guide" or the "correct interpreter" meaning the "true expounder of the Law," rather than "Teacher of Righteousness." There is no need," he says, "to assume that all references refer consistently to a single historical figure."²

From this we might assume that the Sect, having been founded by one "correct interpreter" of the Law (perhaps the "star who is the interpreter of the Law," Dam. Doc. vii, 19), was led continually (or intermittently) by other inspired interpreters or teachers, and that they looked forward to the teacher whose coming, or whose death, might herald the arrival of the Golden Age. Thus has Gaster phrased this hope:

Just as Israel had been led of old by these prophets and teachers, so, it was held, a new Prophet and a new Teacher (perhaps indeed one and the same person) would arise at the end of the present era to usher in the Golden Age, when the scattered hosts of Israel would be gathered in, a duly anointed high priest and a duly anointed king ('the Messiahs[anointed]of Aaron and Israel') installed, and 'the earth filled with the knowledge of the Lord like the waters which cover the sea.'³

With this recognition that there was an expectation of a

¹Gaster, Dead Sea, p. 5.

²Ibid., p. 333.

³Ibid., p. 5. In line with this thought there is the badly mutilated ending on the fragment which Gaster has named "The New Covenant" referring to the time of God's good pleasure when (He "will appoint) for them a faithful shepherd, one who will () the lowly and () the ()." (Col. ii; Gaster, p. 312.) Gaster says the "faithful shepherd" refers to "a new Moses." "The lawgiver was known in later Jewish literature as the faithful shepherd." (Cf. Ex. 3:1, also Jn. 10:14.) Gaster, p. 321.

prophet or teacher who would be a fore-runner or herald of the Messianic Age, we are now ready to discuss the "two Messiahs" expected. We return to the quotation from the Manual of Discipline (ix,11) as a starting point: ". . . until there shall come a prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel."

Again there is a division of scholarly opinion, but in this case it is possible to come to a defensible conclusion. Burrows, in an article in 1952 entitled "The Messiahs of Aaron and Israel," concludes that the sect "had a doctrine of two Messiahs as well as a coming prophet."¹ But H. H. Rowley takes the opposite view that the references to two Messiahs are not really as we interpret them:

The sect . . . represents Israel and Aaron, and the title of the Messiah has reference to the character of the sect and not his personal descent. The Messiah who shall arise from Aaron and Israel is thus the Messiah who shall arise from the sect.²

Writing in Vetus Testamentum L. H. Silberman takes a position somewhat in agreement with Rowley. He recalls the same debate taking place a generation ago between Aptowitzer, who held that the reference in the Zadokite (Damascus) Document was to one Messiah "a descendent of both Levi and Judah," and Ginzberg, who held the contrary view that the document "conforms to the rabbinic doctrine of two Messiahs, a priestly and a Davidic redeemer."³ But Silberman goes on to deny that there are any eschatological overtones to the

¹ Millar Burrows, "The Messiahs of Aaron and Israel," ATHR 34 (1952), 202-206.

² H. H. Rowley, The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1952). p. 41.

³ L. H. Silberman, "The Two Messiahs of the Manual of Discipline," VT, 5, (1955), 77.

references to the "Messiahs of Aaron and Israel." He says the tendency to capitalize prevents objective interpretation, consequently he translates the passage as follows: ". . . until the coming of a prophet and the anointed High Priest and the Davidic king." He then bases his interpretation on the fact that the high priests were not "anointed" in this period of Jewish history and claims that this hope looks forward to the time when once more a prophet shall arise who shall anoint the high priest. Thus his translation is interpreted to mean

The status quo will remain and the community will maintain its isolation until a prophet will come who will set an anointed, not a garment-laden, High Priest in office and will re-establish the Davidic dynasty on the throne of Israel.¹

Gaster's position is very similar although he does not deny the eschatological significance of the references. He points out that the passage says literally "The Messiahs (i.e. the anointed) of Aaron and Israel" and it means that the prophet will usher in the Golden Age when, among other things, an anointed High Priest and an anointed king will rule over restored Israel.² Here too, as in the case of Silberman (see note 1 below), the eschatology is of the Prophetic type which looks forward to the restoration of Israel and the glorification of His Chosen People on this earth, although Gaster tacitly admits of such a conclusion while Silberman denies it categorically.

¹Silberman, VT, 5, p. 82. (While this may not be apocalyptic eschatology, as such, it does have the earmarks of the Messianic hope in the Old Testament sense of the hope for the restoration of the kingdom.)

²Gaster, Dead Sea, pp. 307-310.

Professor Karl Kuhn, in an excellent article entitled "Die beiden Messias Aaron und Israels" in 1954 takes a position in agreement with Burrows.

Die Lesung des Wortes als Plural 'die Gestalteten Aarons und Israels' ist sprachlich nicht zu umgehen.

He goes on to find support for his contention that the Sect did believe in the coming of two Messiahs in a new document from Qumran known as 1QS_a, entitled "Ordnung der Volksgemeinde."¹ This is the same document which Gaster has translated under the title "Manual of Discipline for the Future Congregation of Israel." The passage to which Kuhn refers is the discussion of the protocol at meals (discussed above, p. 81) wherein no one, not even the Davidic Messiah, can eat until the Priestly Messiah has blessed the food and begun to eat. This, in itself, should be convincing enough, Kuhn contends, for the existence of an actual belief in the coming of two Messiahs.²

Professor Kuhn goes on to show that the concept of two different Messiahs for two basically different functions, one for the political-military role and one for religious leadership, was present in the eschatological thinking of the period. He quotes from the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs to show that R. H. Charles had misunderstood a passage in Test. Reub. (6:7-12) which discusses the "anointed high priest out of Levi" and, in the same context, "the eternal king out of Judah"; Charles had concluded that the Messiah would descend out of Levi, not out of Judah, and would be first of all a Priest.

¹Karl G. Kuhn, "Die Beiden Messian Aarons und Israel," NIS, 1 (1954s) 168f.

²Ibid.

Wir haben hier also die gleiche Form messianischer Erwartung wie in den zu Anfang besprochenen neugefundenen essenischen Texten aus Qumran, die Erwartung der 'beiden Messias Aarons und Israels.'¹

The separation in the functions of the rulers can be traced to Ezekiel 44-46 and more directly to Zechariah 5:14 where Joshua, the Aaronidic priest, and Zerubbabel, the Davidic leader of the Community, rule together in Jerusalem. Thus the concept of the division of labors pre-dates Qumran.² That it also post-dates it is shown by Kuhn as he points to the days of Bar Kochba (132-135 A.D.) when Bar Kochba was the "politisch-messianischen Führer des Aufstandes" and Eleazer was High Priest. The only distinction in this latter example is that the political head had the first position of authority and the high priest the second position, which is the reverse of that in the Qumran scrolls.³

¹Kuhn, NTS, 1 (1954), 173.

²Howlett points out that after the bloody exchanges between the forces of Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II (67-63 B.C.) during which time the high priesthood changed hands three times, the Essenes gave up ever expecting redemption through the rise of a political power in Israel. At the time of the negotiations with Pompey, this author argues, rather convincingly, the third party represented in the court of Pompey, along with the Sadducees favoring Aristobulus II and the Pharisees supporting the claims of Hyrcanus II, were the Essenes who, repudiating both, asked for rule by Roman authority with the high priesthood in Israel's hands as it had been under the Ptolemies. They sought an end to rule by priest-kings. "They now hoped for a true and worthy high-priest at the Temple in Jerusalem and an Israel dwelling under Mosaic Law beneath the civil arm of Rome. . . . they never again looked for a Jewish king on the throne of David." Howlett, Essenes, p. 99.

³Kuhn, NTS, 1 (1954), 174f. On the relationship of this concept to the church's developing doctrines about Jesus, Kuhn finds evidence, in the writings of Hippolytus, for the existence of the idea in the early Church: "Jesus sei beides in einer Person, König und Priester, da er einerseits aus dem Stamm Juda, hervorgegangen sei und andererseits aus dem Stamm Levi." (P. 179.)

This question has been rather decisively settled according to Frank Cross:

The existence of two Messiahs in Essene Doctrine has been disputed; but newly published manuscripts and some unpublished manuscripts establish a two-Messiah doctrine with finality.¹

Dr. John Allegro, writing in JBL in 1956, has published several hitherto unpublished fragments of manuscripts which have Messianic significance. The document labeled "4Q Florilegium," reconstructed from twenty-one fragments, comprises about nineteen lines mainly concerned with the re-establishment of the House of David in the last days. Portions of that translation follow:

And) the Lord (tel)ls you that he will build a house for you and I will set up your seed after you, and I will establish his royal throne

for eve)r. I (will be) to him as a father and he will be to me as a son. He is the Shoot of David who will arise with the Interpreter of the Law, who

. . . as it is written, And I will raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, That is the tabernacle of David which is falle(n and after)wards He will arise to save Israel.²

Note the striking identification, in line 2 above, of the Davidic Messiah and the Interpreter of the Law. This confirms the existence of the doctrine of two Messiahs; it also brings to mind Gaster's statement on the priests as the teachers or interpreters of the Law. Note also the implication in the same line above of the "sonship of the Davidic Messiah," "I will be to him as a father, and he will be to me as a son."

¹Frank M. Cross, Jr., "The Essenes and their Master," The Christian Century, Aug. 17, (1955), p. 945.

²John M. Allegro, "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature," JBL, 75 (1956) 174-187.

Document 4QpIsa, presented by Allegro in JBL consists of four fragments which seem to be describing the Messiah and the Messianic War. It is a commentary on Isaiah 10:22-27. The point of departure for the "triumphal march to Jerusalem" seems to be Acco (Ptolemais), and at Jerusalem the Davidic Prince will receive his "throne of glory, a holy crown, and garments of variegated stuff."

. . .)in his hand, and over all the (Gentile)s he shall rule and Magog (. . .

. . . al)l the peoples his sword shall judge.

This Messiah will be a descendent of the Stump of Jesse concludes Allegro.¹

Allegro presents also Document 4Q Patriarchal Blessings some of which is quoted below:

The families of Israel are the feet
Until the Messiah of Righteousness
shall come, the shoot of

David, for to him and to his seed has been given
the royal mandate over his people for everlasting
generations; which

has awaited (. . . the Interpreter of ?) the Law
with men of the Community, for

If Allegro's reconstruction of the last line is correct, then once more the allusion to the two Messiahs can be seen.

In summarizing this discussion of the conception of the Messiahs in the Qumran community we conclude that they expected, first of all, the coming of a "Priestly Messiah" whom they called "Teacher

¹Allegro, JBL, 75 (1956) 177-181.

²Ibid., 175f.

of Righteousness"¹ or "Interpreter of the Law;"² second, and at the same time, they looked forward to the "Lay Messiah" or the "Davidic Messiah" who would be the warrior of God, the means by which God would restore the kingdom to his people. Both of these seem to be referring to the restoration of Israel on earth, the Golden Age.³

It is valid to say that the Qumran doctrine of the two Messiahs has Scriptural roots which, by the Sect's methods of exegesis, provided the answer to the perplexing problem occasioned by their keen disappointment with the priest-kings of the Hasmonean line whose wickedness and inefficiency made necessary the separation of church and state in the coming new age.

Corporate Servant.-We are now ready to consider another very crucial problem occasioned by the finding of the Dead Sea Scrolls. The idea of the expiatory nature of suffering and the work of the Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah are determinative influences in the eschatology of Jesus. This has long been recognized, but most scholars before Qumran, agree with H. H. Rowley that the concepts of the Suffering Servant and the Davidic Messiah were brought to-

¹This would agree in essence with the conclusion reached in agreement with Gaster (cf. supra, p. 102) that "they looked forward to the teacher whose coming . . . might herald the arrival of the Golden Age."

²Allegro finds little support from other scholars in his claim that the Sect expected "none other than their resurrected Teacher . . . imminently," the founder of the Sect as the Priestly Messiah (Scrolls, p. 148). There seems to be little justification for his claim that the Teacher had been crucified and would rise again.

³The terms "Priestly Messiah" and "Lay Messiah" are Allegro's, although Gaster uses very similar terms with somewhat different expectations. Allegro states that "it is with this Lay Messiah that we may expect to find correspondence with Christian ideas." Scrolls, p. 151.

gether for the first time in Jesus. But proof is lacking. Rowley asks a weighted question, and answers it with what seems an unreal assumption about the nature of the Gospel sources:

If there existed a small group of people who awaited a Suffering Messiah, from whom Jesus received the idea, is it not surprising that not one of His disciples should have come from that group? For it is clear that not one of the disciples did come from such a group, since no exception to the bewilderment that reference to His sufferings produced is recorded.¹

This is a very complex problem about which many books have been written, and it will not be the purpose here to do more than try to discover what the concept was in the Qumran community. Brownlee takes issue with Rowley saying that "one cannot abstract the Son of Man from all connection with the Suffering Servant as Rowley believes possible."² He sees the book of Daniel combining the Suffering Servant concept with the Son of Man concept, but in its incipient stages only.

An excellent article by F. F. Bruce appearing recently in New Testament Studies, discusses this very problem, in agreement with Brownlee. Daniel's visions were originally dependent upon the Servant passages. The "one like unto a son of man" is explicitly interpreted as "the saints of the Most High" (7:13,18). Daniel also identifies these "saints" with those "wise" (maskilim) who will make "the many" righteous (12:3). These maskilim shall suffer because of their faithfulness, even as does the Servant in Isaiah.

¹H. H. Rowley, "The Suffering Servant and the Davidic Messiah," Oudtestamentische Studien, ed. P. A. H. DeBoer, Vol. III (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1950) 100-136.

²William H. Brownlee, "The Servant of the Lord in the Qumran Scrolls" BASOR, 132 (Dec. 1953); 135 (Oct. 1954), 132, 8-15.

And those among the people who are wise (maskilim) shall make many understand, though they shall fall by the sword and flame by captivity and plunder, for some days. When they fall, they shall receive a little help. And many shall join themselves to them with flattery; and some of those who are wise shall fall, to refine and to cleanse them, and to make them white until the time of the end.¹

In other words Bruce is saying that the Son of Man ("saints of the Most High") in Daniel was seen as suffering somewhat, in order that redemption would be available to those who sought it. He goes on to apply this belief to the Qumran sect in these words: "The Covenanters of Qumran are now known to have interpreted the Old Testament thus." The Covenanters of Qumran "regarded themselves as in the succession of Daniel's maskilim," making the many righteous.²

This is for the man who would bring others to the inner vision, so that he may understand and teach to all the children of light the real nature of man.³

W. H. Brownlee's translation of a particular passage in the Man. Disc. is crucial for this study at this point:

¹Daniel 11:33-35.

²F. F. Bruce, "Qumran and Early Christianity," NIS 2 (1955), 176f. Bruce goes on to point out that Jesus recognized the dependence of Daniel upon the Servant passages, and that he considered he himself had fulfilled the passages in his own ministry.

³Man. Disc. iii, 13; Gaster, Dead Sea, p. 43.

Now God, in the mysteries of His understanding and in His glorious wisdom, has appointed an end to the existence of perversity; and at the season of visitation. He will destroy it forever; and then the universal truth will appear forever; for it has become contaminated with the ways of wickedness, under the dominion of perversity, until the season of the decreed Judgment. And at that time God will purify by his truth all the deeds of a man(*) and He will refine him more than the sons of men,** in order to consume every evil spirit from the midst of his flesh, and to cleanse him through the Holy Spirit from all wicked practices: and He will sprinkle upon him the Spirit of Truth as purifying water so as to cleanse him from all untrue abominations and from being contaminated with the Spirit of impurity, so that he may give the upright insight into the knowledge of the Most High and into the wisdom of the sons of Heaven, in order to make wise the perfect of way. For God has chosen them*** to be an eternal covenant and all the glory of Adam (and/or of mankind) will be theirs; and there will be no more perversity, all works of fraud having been put to shame.¹

¹Brownlee, BASOR, 135(Oct. 1954) 36-38; (underlining is mine). Man. Disc. iv, 19-23 (Burrows' translation is substantially in agreement with the above, p. 375f.)

(*)Gaster translates this passage in general agreement with Brownlee with the exception of a couple of crucial points. This particular sentence is in question: Gaster has rendered it "and (God) will refine for Himself all the fabric of man," (generic) instead of, as above, "all the deeds of a man."

It seems to me that Brownlee's translation and interpretation are linguistically defensible; he sees gebher (meaning man, as opposed to women and children) being used as a messianic designation in II Samuel 23:1 and Zech. 13:17. This word for man (gebher) is used in the above passage from Man. Disc., as well as in one of the Hymns (concerning the birth of a Wonderful Counselor) where "a man (gebher) is delivered from the birth canal of His pregnant one."

(**)The Servant's sufferings are seen as refining him. (Cf. Man. Disc. viii,4; Isa. 48:10; Zech. 13:9; Dan. 11:35; 12:10). Brownlee says, in another article, that the Messianic candidate cannot be recognized from other men until this refining process is complete and he is "sprinkled with the Spirit of Truth," and he becomes "the perfect medium for the revelation of truth." INTERP., 9 (1955) 88.

(***)Here in this passage, says Brownlee, is the conception of the Corporate Servant for the first time.

Another passage in the Manual of Discipline, one to which Brownlee has referred (in note 1 above), gives real support, it seems to me, to Brownlee's contention that the Sect viewed itself, or a portion of itself as the "corporate Servant," suffering in order that redemption would be possible:

In the formal congregation of the community there shall be twelve laymen and three priests schooled to perfection in all that has been revealed of the entire Law. Their duty shall be to set the standard for the practice of truth . . . to show how . . . by active performance of justice and passive submission to the trials of chastisement iniquity may be cleared. . . .

So long as these men exist in Israel, the formal congregation of the community will rest securely on a basis of truth. It will become a plant evergreen.¹ . . . The members of the community will be in all justice the witnesses of God's truth and the elect of His favor, effecting atonement for the earth and ensuring the requital of the wicked.²

Here it is plain to see that the community, by its action under the leadership of laymen and priests who teach them that suffering will eliminate sin, shall effect atonement for the earth and the redemption of the wicked. This seems to me to be conclusive. Brownlee says that this passage describes the function of the Corporate Servant in bringing in the Messianic Age.³

Getting back to the article by F. F. Bruce, he points out that the idea that the whole community shared in the responsibilities of expiatory work of the Servant "confirms the suggestion that they

¹"That suffering is frequently the source of greatness is an authentically Jewish doctrine." One Midrashic passage compares Israel to an olive; the more it is crushed, the more oil is produced. And oil in lamps produces light." (Jacob B. Angus, "Toynbee and Judaism," Judaism, 4(1955) 330.)

²Man. Disc. viii,1-8; Gaster, Dead Sea, p. 55.

³Brownlee, BASOR, 135 (Oct. 1954) 34-35.

regarded themselves as the maskilim of Daniel."¹

Another passage also seems to say substantially the same thing; with one addition:

And this is the order for the men of the community who have offered themselves to turn from all evil and to lay hold of all that he commanded . . . to become a community in law and in wealth . . . to lay the foundation of truth for Israel for the community of an eternal covenant, to atone for all who offer themselves for holiness in Aaron and for a house of truth in Israel, and those who joined with them for community and for controversy and for judgment, to condemn all who transgress the statute.²

It is noted that in addition to atonement, the community is to condemn all who transgress.

The propitiatory activity is not inconsistent with the execution of judgment upon the wicked; the Servant who justifies the many is also the Son of Man to whom has been given authority to execute judgment.³

It was indeed a solemn responsibility which the Qumran Covenanters took upon themselves, a responsibility requiring a strict discipline and a complete dedication. They felt that it was only by keeping the Law perfectly that their task of propitiation or expiation could be accomplished.

On page 112 above in note 1, Brownlee made mention of one of the Hymns which described the birth of a "Wonderful Counsellor." This lends itself well to the formation of our conclusion that the Qumran community had a concept of the propitiatory role of the "Corporate Servant," for the Covenanters believed that the sufferings

¹Bruce, NTS, 2 (1955-56) 185. (He reminds us further of the affinity here with T. W. Manson's societal interpretation of the Son of Man.)

²Man. Disc. , v,1-7; Burrows, Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 376.

³Bruce, NTS, 2 (1955-56) 185; (cf. Is. 53:11; Dan. 12:3).

of the community would produce the deliverer, that they in fact were undergoing or experiencing the Messianic travail or the "pangs of the Messiah." The Hymn, numbered V in Burrows translation, is quoted here in part:

I am in distress
 like a woman in travail with her firstborn,
 when her pangs come,
 and grievous pain on her birth-stool,
 causing torture in the crucible of the pregnant one;
 for sons have come to the waves of death,
 and she who conceived a man suffers in her pains;
 for in the waves of death she gives birth to a man-child;
 with pains of Sheol he bursts forth
 from the crucible of the pregnant one,
 a wonderful counselor with his power.¹

John V. Chamberlain, in an article entitled "Further Elucidation of a Messianic Thanksgiving Psalm from Qumran" translates the last three lines above as:

And through hellish pains there bursts forth
 from the womb of her who is pregnant
 a Wonderful Counselor with his might.²

He concludes that this is specifically a Messianic Psalm heralding the birth of the Messiah.

The Resurrection.—The doctrine of Resurrection is not mentioned, as such, in the writings of Qumran. The primary concern of the Sect was with the hope of the restoration of the kingdom

¹Burrows, Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 403. (Gaster translates part of it thus:

"Now, amid pangs of hell,
 there will burst forth from the womb
 that marvel of mind and might,
 and that man-child will spring from the throes."
Dead Sea, p. 136, Book of Hymns iii, 3-18).

²J. V. Chamberlain, "Further Elucidation of a Messianic Thanksgiving Psalm from Qumran," JNES, 14 (1955), 181.

of Israel on this earth. Some of the Hymns do speak of the renewal of the world after the destruction of evil, and of the renewal of man:

Thou hast granted it unto man
 to be purged of transgression,
 that he may hallow himself
 and be free from all taint of filth

 to be one with them that possess Thy truth
 and to share the lot with Thy Holy Beings,
 to the end that this worm which is man
 may be lifted out of the dust
 to the height of eternal things
 and rise from a spirit perverse
 to an holy understanding,
 and stand in one company before Thee

 to be for ever renewed
 with all things that are.¹

Gaster claims that the ultimate goal of the Sect was mystical union with God and therefore bodily resurrection would be meaningless. Theirs was a hope that "given the right spiritual posture, given the victory over that darkness which is set before him along with the light, man may live even on earth in a dimension of eternity." The hope that "that which is molded of clay (might) have converse with things everlasting" is not belief in bodily resurrection, nor even in "mere immortality of the soul" but rather in mystical union with God.²

Allegro works at the problem logically. Since the Sect looked forward to the Messianic kingdom when in the "Last Days" the wicked would be punished and their "beloved Teacher" would be vindicated they must therefore have believed in a general Resurrection of

¹Hymns, xi,3-14; Gaster, Dead Sea, p. 177f.

²Gaster, Dead Sea, p. 6.

the dead in the last days.¹

The belief is not strong, nor is it of paramount importance to the Sect. The fulfilling of the purposes of the community in setting up the conditions which would make possible the coming of the Messiahs was the sole concern, it seems to me, of this community.

SUMMARY NOTES ON JEWISH ESCHATOLOGY

An attempt has been made, in this survey of Jewish Eschatology, to show the chronological development of certain fundamental eschatological concepts. It is manifestly true, as most scholars claim, that it is impossible to define the eschatological program, per se, to which a majority of the Jews of the first Christian century would ascribe. Guignebert states what seems to be the correct conclusion, "The contemporaries of Jesus had neither evolved a fixed eschatological doctrine nor systematized the various beliefs that were current among them."² But one thing is certain--a fact made more positive by the discovery of the nature of the Qumran community--there was a decided air of eschatological tension in the first century A.D., an air of expectancy unparalleled in Jewish history.

It is no exaggeration to say that just before the birth of Jesus speculations as to the date and duration of the Messianic reign, the coming of the Messiah, the Day of Yahweh, the Resurrection, and the Last Judgment, were central in

¹Allegro, Scrolls, p. 149.

²C. Guignebert, The Jewish World In the Time of Jesus, trans. S. H. Hooke, (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1939), p. 122.

Jewish thought.¹

There is a certainty, in the face of the desperate hopelessness of the historic situation, that there will very soon be a Judgment and the destruction of the forces of wickedness, the time of the vindication of the Jews, God's people.

While the prophetic eschatology was nationalistic in its origin, and apocalyptic eschatology was individualistic in origin, both never lost their essential nationalistic emphasis. At the beginning of the Christian era, the center of eschatological thought, as it always had been, was Palestine.

In every case it was in Palestine and for Palestine that the Messianic Kingdom was to be instituted, and in Palestine that the great eschatological drama was to be staged.²

The two major eschatological schemes can still be distinguished, however: (1) the prophetic strain expected the Messiah's advent, followed by revolt and destruction of the wicked, the immediate resurrection and judgment of Israel, and the eternal reign of the Messiah, or of God on earth, an era of material prosperity beyond the wildest imaginings; (2) the "apocalyptic" scheme included the reign of the Messiah in a temporary Messianic Age on earth, followed by the general resurrection, Final Judgment with God or Son of Man presiding, and the eternal reign of God in a new heaven and a new earth. In most cases the Gentiles were destroyed, or became subservient to Israel. This last refers to Palestinian Judaism, as Alexandrian Judaism had developed a much more universal outlook.

¹Ibid., p. 151.

²Ibid., p. 157.

CHAPTER IV

THE ESCHATOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS IN THE WORK OF THE COMPILER

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

Did the Compiler of the Gospel according to Matthew have a consistent eschatological doctrine in mind as he wrote the Gospel of Jesus Christ? Is such a doctrine discernible from a study of this Gospel? The answers to these basic questions will be sought in this chapter by an orderly, verse-by-verse study of the way in which the canonical Gospel was constructed from the materials the Compiler had at hand, of the matter peculiar to this Gospel, and of any editorial changes or additions. No attempt will be made, in this chapter, to summarize or otherwise group the findings; this task will be reserved for chapter five in which the Matthaean materials revealing eschatological content or implication will be brought together in a topical summary in order to determine if a consistent doctrine of eschatology can be discovered.

THE COMPILER AT WORK

Chapters 1 and 2.—Four presuppositions on which the Compiler based his Gospel are stated in chapters 1 and 2: (1) That Jesus is the Son of David (1:1). Implicit in this presupposition are two important ideas. First, the numerical value of the Hebrew

consonants in David[7) 7 = 4 + 6 + 4]is fourteen; the genealogy divided into three groups of fourteen generations each suggests that "each section of the pedigree enshrines the Davidic descent of Jesus."¹ The second idea is more important. It involves the deliberate use of the number seven, not only a "favorite round number" in the Old Testament and Apocalyptic Writings, but also a number sacred to the Jews.² In Jewish writings, especially in the Apocalyptic period, seven signified completeness or perfection.³ For example, in the Book of Jubilees the whole period from Adam to the giving of the Law is divided into seven times seven jubilees, "the interval between two jubilees being 7 times 7 years."⁴ It would appear that Matthew is saying, by this deliberately constructed genealogy that, not only is Jesus a direct descendent of David, but his birth marks the completion or fulfillment of Israel's hope in the seed of David, because he was born in the seventh group of generations after the

¹H.D.A. Major, "Incidents in the Life of Jesus" in Major, Manson and Wright, The Mission and Message of Jesus, (New York: E.P. Dutton Co.1938), p. 229.(Hereafter designated as Mission and Message) Actually there are only 40 ancestors listed. A. Loisy in The Origins of the New Testament, trans. L.P. Jacks (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1950), p. 114, suggests one solution is to count David twice, once as "last of the first series" and once "as first of the second," and the same with Josiah between the second and third series. He says of the three sets of fourteen, that it is "a mystical number play intended to show that Jesus was the Messiah promised to Israel."

²Professor Ed. König in Hastings DOB, III, p. 565 notes that "the number 7 had a measure of sanctity attached to it." From Genesis the seventh day is the best day, Sabbath; the second most sacred of the fittings in the sanctuary after the Ark of the Covenant, was the seven-branched candlestick.

³There is a legend that in the ancient East a cunieform symbol consisting of seven wedges meant "totality" or "whole." (Smith, Hastings DCAG, II, p. 249b.)

⁴W. T. Smith, "Numbers" in Hastings DCAG, II, p. 249b.

succession of six times seven generations (three times fourteen).

(2) The true Davidic descent of Jesus, is further affirmed by his birth in Bethlehem (2:1, 5-6), and by the title "Nazarene" which Matthew suggests was derived from the Hebrew word for "Branch," an eschatological term for the Scion of David.¹

(3) The fact that Jesus was the "Son of God", in a unique sense fulfilling scripture, is testified in the conception "by the Holy Spirit" (1:20) and in the Emmanuel testimonia (1:23), as well as in the abused quotation from Hosea "Out of Egypt have I called my son" (2:15).² Thus we see substantiation of Jesus' lineage, both legal and divine.

(4) The rejection of Jesus by his own people, and the recognition and subsequent adoration by the Gentiles is fore-shadowed by the search for the babe which resulted in the "Slaughter of the Innocents" (2:16-18) and the Visit of the Magi (2:1-12). Major points out, in this latter case, Matthew might well have been thinking of a messianic passage, "And nations shall come to your light, and kings to the brightness of your rising" (Isa. 60:3).³ This is the perfect contrast: not only do the Gentile kings seek "the King of

¹Major, in Mission and Message, p. 237, suggests that the title Ναζωραῖος is a pun or play on the messianically significant נֶזֶר (netzer) of Isa. 11:1. This derivation was first suggested by Jerome, and scholars are divided on it today. E.g. Allen favors it while McNeile thinks it highly improbable. If it is a true derivation, it is an obvious attempt by Matthew to link Jesus with the Davidic Messiah.

²Loisy's statement is not without merit that the comparison with Abraham and Moses may have suggested the sojourn in Egypt for Jesus, the Messiah. (Loisy, Origin of N.T., p. 115.)

³Major, Mission and Message, p. 238.

the Jews" but the Jewish leaders, acknowledging their expectation, confirm that the Messiah was to be born in Bethlehem; it is a tacit admission of validity by those who rejected Jesus.¹

Chapter 3.- This chapter follows Mark 1:1-11 rather closely, with two insertions from Q which record the eschatological nature of John's message of the imminent expectation of the one who "will baptize with the Holy Spirit and with fire." In using the Q verse (Lk. 3:17) the Redactor strikes what is to be a characteristic note of dichotomy: the depiction of the separation of the righteous from the evil persons at Judgment. It is of interest to note that only Matthew attributes to John the same message of the imminence of the Kingdom which Mark has on the lips of Jesus: "Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven (God) is at hand." Matthew also sums up the preaching of Jesus in the same words (4:17).

Verses 14 and 15 are peculiar to Matthew. Either from the narrative tradition or the M sayings-source, these verses are an apologetic for the baptism of Jesus. Indeed, the Redactor is saying here that Jesus, from his baptism, "onward, is fully conscious of His Messiahship."² The Redactor's changes in the post-baptismal experience alter the descent of the Holy Spirit (from what seems to be subjective experience in Mark) to an objective experience of the "Spirit of God" descending and the announcement, apparently to John or to onlookers, "This is my beloved Son, with whom I am well

¹Note the Messianic titles applied to Jesus in these chapters: Son of David, the Messiah (Christ), King of the Jews.

²A. Plummer, An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew (London: Eliot Stock, 1909), p. 35.

pleased" (vss. 16, 17).¹

Chapter 4.- The Markan framework (Mk. 1:12-20, 39) is expanded by additions from Q and from the special Testimonia so that the chapter moves from the Temptations (Q), through the first preaching in Capernaum, the call of the four fishermen, to the closing verses summarizing the preaching journey into Galilee. The events which Mark records as occurring in Capernaum (Mk. 1:21-38) are deleted.

The significant addition to this chapter is the quotation from Isaiah 9:1-2 (vss. 14-16). The quotation is probably from the testimonia because it is independent of both the Hebrew and LXX texts.² Major points out that the editor might well have included this proof text to justify Jesus' having begun his mission in Galilee rather than in Jerusalem.³ Matthew identifies Jesus' mission with this very famous Messianic passage (Isa. 9:2-7) by proving that when Jesus took up permanent dwelling at Capernaum he was fulfilling scripture.⁴ To Matthew the passage is a perfect explanation of the

¹Cf. Major, Mission and Message, p. 24.

²A. H. McNeile, The Gospel According to Matthew (London: The Macmillan Co. 1938), p. 44. Cf. also W. C. Allen, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907), p. 34.

³Major, Mission and Message, p. 240.

⁴It can not be known for certain if this passage was considered "Messianic" in first century Judaism, but no doubt it was looked on as the description of the Ideal King. Klausner (Idea, p. 64) concludes that without doubt these verses were written by Isaiah with reference to the accession of Hezekiah to the throne of David, but that the prophecy was intended as messianic prophecy: "I, along with most modern scholars, consider this whole prophecy Messianic." Mowinkel (He That Cometh, pp. 102ff) likewise finds this to be an ancient Messianic prophecy.

significance of Christ's mission in Galilee as he compares it with the change which Isaiah prophesied would occur when the land, despoiled by Assyria, would experience re-birth as a flood of light under the reign of a Son of David.¹

Chapter 5.—The Redactor departs from Mark's outline to present the conglomerate "Sermon on the Mount" (Chaps. 5-7), the first of the five large blocks of teaching material he has assembled.² Scholars are pretty generally agreed that the Redactor, "in accordance with his practice of 'agglomerating', i.e. of collecting into large discourses all the available material dealing with the same or related topics," has combined the Q "Sermon on the Plain" (Lk. 6:20-49) with a different version from M and some passages scattered throughout Luke in different contexts, to construct the first great "discourse."³

The theme of the sermon is righteousness; righteousness which must transcend that of the Scribes and Pharisees (5:20) in those who would inherit the Kingdom of Heaven.

Chapter 5 follows Luke 6 from verses 20-36 (omitting vss. 29-31) with additions from Q (Lk. 14:34-35; 11:33; 1a:57-59) and from M.

¹McNeile, Matthew, p. 44. Plummer, Matthew, p. 46, suggests, with some force, that the Compiler chose this passage, among other reasons, for its very mention of "Galilee of the Gentiles," for perhaps like the visit of the Magi, this "is an intimation that the salvation brought by the Messiah to the Jews does not belong to them exclusively."

²See discussion above, pp. 21f.

³Streeter, The Four Gospels, pp. 249f. Reference has already been made (see p. 29, n. 1) to the comprehensive study by A. M. Perry on "The Framework of the Sermon on the Mount" in which the author found strong support for the existence of an M-document, containing, at least, a form of this "Sermon."

Matthew lists nine beatitudes as against four in Luke. Of the nine, four are apparently from Q (5:3,4,6,11; paralleled in Luke 6:20, 21a, b, 22), four seem to be from M (5:7, 8, 9, 10) and one (5:5) might well be an interpolation by Matthew.¹

The Redactor's rendition of verse 4 provides an interesting variant from that in Luke. Luke 6:21b reads, "Blessed are you that weep now, for you shall laugh;" while Matthew's verse reads, "Blessed are those who mourn, for they shall be comforted." Undoubtedly both readings are the same in essence,² but Matthew's seems to have a definite eschatological slant. Johnson notes that one is reminded here of the phrase "the consolation of Israel" (Lk. 2:25) referring to the Messianic age, and of Isa. 61:2 which speaks of one upon whom dwells the Spirit of the Lord, who brings "comfort to all who mourn."³ The thought in this verse, remarks Allen,

is of those who mourn for the sin in Israel which checks and thwarts God's purposes for his people, and delays the coming of the kingdom."⁴

There are definite eschatological overtones in verse 5,

¹Textual variants in the Western text show vs. 4 and 5 transposed; vs. 5 is from Psa. 37:11. These two facts lead some scholars to conclude that vs. 5 is a Jewish-Christian interpolation (cf. Manson, Mission and Message, p. 444). It is of interest to note that both Bacon (Studies, p. 174) and Sherman E. Johnson, "Matthew," Interpreter's Bible, VII, p. 280) feel that Jesus may originally have given seven beatitudes, the complete number; both men would eliminate vs. 5, but Bacon feels vs. 10 and 11 were originally combined, while Johnson feels it was vs. 8 and 9. (Cf. also Knox, Sources of Synoptics, II, p.12 for still another solution.)

²A. N. Wilder, Eschatology and Ethics, Rev. Ed. (New York: Harper and Bros., 1950) points out on p. 109 that Matthew's form "is not more than a legitimate interpretation of the Q beatitudes."

³Johnson, Int. Bib. VII, p. 281.

⁴Allen, Matthew, p. 35.

"Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth." Johnson paraphrases the promise "the meek shall inherit the (promised) land or perhaps the restored earth of the messianic age."¹

The Redactor's addition² in verse 6 ("and thirst for righteousness") giving the object of the hunger (Lk. 6:21) brings up discussion of a word which is characteristic of Matthew. Δικαιοσύνη appears seven times in Matthew; he alone records it as on the lips of Jesus and in all seven instances. The only other appearance of the word in the Synoptics is in Luke 1:75, a verse from the ecstatic prophecy of Zechariah.³ Five of the seven usages appear in matter peculiar to Matthew⁴ while two are evidently additions by the Redactor.⁵ Bacon, commenting on Matthew's concept of righteousness, says that it is more than fondness for δίκαιος and such connected terms as δίκαιον and δικαιοσύνη that is to be considered. Matthew's "constant emphasis is upon a type of moral and religious teaching in which the impending messianic judgment based upon 'good works' occupies the foreground."⁶ Cremer reminds us of the Pauline

¹Johnson, Int. Bib. VII, p. 282.

²C. G. Montefiore, The Synoptic Gospels (2d. ed. London: MacMillan, 1927) II, p. 36f, discusses the reasons most scholars assume Luke's version is older.

³Sir John C. Hawkins, Horae Synopticae (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1899), p. 4.

⁴Mt. 3:15; 5:10, 20; 6:1; 21:32.

⁵Mt. 5:6 and 6:33. The word is used ninety-two times in the New Testament; this includes two uses in John, five in Luke-Acts, and fifty-five in Pauline writings. J. B. Smith, Greek-English Concordance to the New Testament (Scottsdale, Penna.: Herald Press, 1955), p. 89.

⁶Bacon, Studies, p. 133f. Bacon goes on to add that in

conception of righteousness: it "always expresses a relation to the judgment of God. . . . (and) denotes the state of the believing man called forth by the divine acquittal."¹

An examination of the verses in which Matthew has used **Δικαιοσύνη** appears in Detached Note A (p.228). The conclusion there reached is that Matthew's use of **Δικαιοσύνη** would seem to have definite eschatological implications. It defines and includes the sense of ethical imperative which is inherent in his apocalyptic hope.

In verses 7-10 we have what is probably authentic teaching from M² although some scholars claim that Matthew probably constructed these out of the original four in Q.³ The only significant eschatological note in these verses is in verse 7 which Allen feels may well refer to the day of Judgment when the merciful "shall

most cases **δικαιοσύνη** in Mt. can best be rendered as "salvation." He bases this conclusion on Mt. 6:33 where the Redactor has added **καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην (αὐτῶ)** to Q's "Seek his kingdom . . ." (Lk. 12:31), saying:

What Mt. means by this "righteousness" of God, the thing to be sought next to the kingdom as the chief end of life, is not so much the likeness of sons to the Father which is the theme of the Q discourse, but the approval of God which gives assurance of acquittal in the day of judgment.

He further notes that Mt.'s use of the word corresponds to an observation by W. Robertson Smith in his Prophets of Israel (1882), "Righteousness is to the Hebrew not so much a moral quality as a legal status" (Studies, p. 525).

¹Hermann Cremer, Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek, 3d Eng. Ed., trans. William Urwick (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1886), p. 193.

²Streeter, Four Gospels, p. 251, claims that each sermon, Q and M, had four beatitudes, those in Q (Lk. 6:20-22) being in the second person, and those in M (5:7-10) in the third person. The Redactor has simply combined them.

³E.g., Loisy, Sources of N. T., p. 120.

receive mercy."¹

Verses 5:17-20 introduce the discussion of the Law in which Jesus re-states it in terms of six antitheses. Knox notes that the saying of Jesus has been expanded by Matthew by "its eschatological conclusion, intended perhaps to answer the view of some Christians that the Law had ceased to be valid since the Messianic Age had begun."² Matthew is saying that the Torah will be valid until the end. Howard Teeple, in a discussion of the "New Law and Abrogation of the Torah," notes that Mt. 5:18--consistent with Jewish expectation of a "new" instruction or Torah in the Messianic Age--"means that no change shall be made in the Law" until all is accomplished "or until the arrival of the Age to Come."³

In verses 29-30 are recorded what seems to represent the M version of material⁴ which is preserved in Mk. 9:43-48 (paralleled in Mt. 18:8-9). Here the offending eye leading one to lustful desire suggests the sequence of thought that it is better to be rid of eye or hand than to yield to the temptation of lust. In the Markan passage the collection of sayings on offenses is clustered about the term *σκανδαλίζω*; to cause to stumble, or sin. If either hand, foot, or eye causes you to stumble or sin it is far

¹Allen, Matthew, p. 41.

²W. L. Knox, The Sources of the Synoptic Gospel, Vol. II, ed. H. Chadwick (Cambridge: University Press, 1957) II p. 19.

³H. M. Teeple, JBL Monograph, p. 25. He further notes: "This reference to the new age implies that after it comes things will be different and the Law will change or pass away. Perhaps the Law will no longer be required since God will rule in a perfect state."

⁴Manson, Mission and Message, p. 449.

better to be rid of it. The use of the word **γεένναν**, while not peculiar to Matthew, appears in the First Gospel more times than in other books of the N. T.¹ Gehenna (**גֵּהִנּוֹם** Gahinnom) - valley of Hinnom) is a ravine which bounds Jerusalem on the West-Southwest side. Traditionally it was the site of the fire-worship of Molech which had been introduced by Ahaz (II Kgs. 16) and purged by Josiah in his reforms. A great deal of mystery surrounded the place. Later it became the city dump where offal was burned. Because of the fires and the distasteful atmosphere it came to symbolize the place of future punishment for apostate Jews (I Enoch 27:2, 3; 90:26).²

There is nothing particularly distinctive in Matthew's use of the term, except the number of times he uses it, as well as the word fire, as a metaphor for the final punishment.³ On two occasions in the chapter against the Pharisees (23) the Redactor uses the word Gehenna uniquely. The Pharisees, who exert no little effort to make a proselyte, end up in making him "twice as much a **υἱος γεέννης**" as themselves (23:15). In 23:33 Mt. raises the question how the Pharisees are going to escape the judgment of hell.

¹The term is used seven times in Mt. (5:22, 29, 30; 10:28; 18:19; 23:15, 33), three times in Mk. (9:43, 45, 47), once in Lk. (12:5). James 3:6 is the only other usage in N. T. (Underlined references are peculiar to Mt.)

²McNeile, Matthew, p. 62. Charles, "Gehenna" in Hastings DOB II, p. 119f, notes the development of the concept of Gehenna from a "place of corporal and spiritual punishment of apostate Jews" to a place of spiritual punishment for all wicked persons.

³The metaphor is found frequently in Jewish apocalypses. "To be cast into the fire" is a favorite expression in Enoch. In the gospels the word is found mostly in the First Gospel. Mt. 3:10, 11, 12, (Lk. 3:9, 16, 17); 5:22; 7:19; 13:40, 42, 50; 18:8 (Mk. 9:43) 18:19 (Mk. 9:47) 25:41. (Underlined references are peculiar to Mt.) McNeile, Matthew, p. 28.

Chapter 6.-This chapter is compiled from materials from M and Q. Verses 1-21¹ deal with the further definition of righteousness as it has to do with motivation to religious practises, the giving of alms, praying, and fasting; these acts of piety (or of righteousness) should be practiced not for the acclaim of men, but for the sake of the Father who will reward, for the building up of "treasures in heaven."² (vs. 20).

In the Lord's Prayer (vss. 9-13) the first two verses are eschatological, dealing with the "Messianic future."³ The phrase "Thy Kingdom come" is common to both Lk. and Mt.,⁴ but Matthew adds the following phrase "Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven." Montefiore is right in pointing out that this addition interprets the preceding phrase for Matthew. In the Messianic Age God's will for the elimination of evil will be done on earth even as now it is in heaven.⁵

¹This section is from M, with the exception of the Lord's Prayer (vss. 9-13) which is paralleled in Lk. 11:2-4. Streeter concludes, after surveying linguistic and textual evidence, that the Lord's Prayer in Mt. is from M and that in Lk. is from L: Q did not include the prayer. (Four Gospels, p. 277).

²In Jewish literature of the period the idea of building up treasures with God was rather common. E.g. Pss. Sol. 9:9, "He that doeth righteousness treasureth up life for himself with the Lord," (P. A. Micklem, St. Matthew, (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1917), p.61.

³C. G. Montefiore, The Synoptic Gospels (2d ed. London: MacMillan, 1927) II, p. 102.

⁴Streeter discusses the major variant to this phrase. In the Western text of Luke (D) the reading is "Thy Holy Spirit come upon us and cleanse us." He concludes that "Thy Kingdom come" is the more original reading (Four Gospels, p. 277). Montefiore (Synoptic Gospels, II, p. 100) quotes Burkitt in substantial agreement.

⁵Synoptic Gospels, II, p. 101.

The remainder of the chapter contains an exhortation to singleness of purpose (soundness of eye and dedication to one master) transplanted by the Redactor from Lk. 11:34-36 and 16:13; and a discussion of the futility of anxiety, taken from Q (Lk. 12:22-31), and closes with the Redactor's conclusion (vs. 34) on anxiety for the morrow.

Chapter 7.-Following the digression from the Q-sermon in chapter 6 the Redactor again turns to material preserved in Lk. 6:37-49, with additions from Lk. 11:9-13; 13:23-24; 12:26-27. He also picks up 6:31 which had been by-passed in course in chapter 5.

The material assigned as peculiar to Mt. amounts to about nine verses. In only two passages do we find eschatological significance. Verses 13 and 14, discussing the wide gate which leads to destruction and the narrow gate which leads to life, have particular Matthean characteristics. The parallel reading in Q speaks only of the "narrow door" which many will not be able to enter, presumably because of the shortness of the time which is left and the difficulty of finding the opening. This idea is enhanced by the combination of the same metaphor ("narrow gate") with another introducing an idea more characteristically Jewish,¹ the concept of the two ways of life.² Streeter, in discussing this passage, decides that Matthew conflated the Q passage (Lk. 13:23-24) with one from

¹Montefiore, Synoptic Gospels, II, p. 121.

²The Jewish doctrine of two ways of life seems to have been grounded on Jeremiah 21:8, "Behold I set before you the way of life and the way of death."

M which contained only reference to the "two ways."¹

In Mt. 7:21-23 Bacon finds a good example of the distortion which came about as a result of the later tendency to interpret Jesus' message in terms of the developed apocalyptic Son of Man doctrine.

Luke 13:25-27

"When once the householder has risen up and shut the door, you will begin to stand outside and to knock at the door saying, 'Lord, open to us.' He will answer you, 'I do not know where you come from.' Then you will begin to say, 'we ate and drank in your presence, and you taught in our streets.' But he will say, 'I tell you, I do not know where you come from; depart from me all you workers of iniquity.'"

Mt. 7:21-23

"Not every one who says to me, 'Lord, Lord,' shall enter the kingdom of heaven, but he who does the will of my Father who is in heaven. On that day many will say to me, 'Lord, Lord, did we not prophecy in your name, and cast out demons in your name, and do many mighty works in your name?' And then will I declare to them, 'I never knew you; depart from me, you evil-doers.'"

It is to be noted, says Bacon, that the "master of the house" the "householder" is the divine representative in the Lukan passage, while Matthew substitutes "a personal claim on Jesus' part to be this divine judge."²

Four things are noteworthy here: (1) Any reference which claims Messianic power for Jesus occurs only after Caesarea Philippi in Mk. and Lk. (2) As McNeile points out, it is only in Mt. that Jesus himself explicitly claims to be the Judge in the Great Assize.³ (3) Matthew's identification of the event's occurring on "that day" introduces a common apocalyptic figure of speech. Founded on the

¹Streeter, Four Gospels, p. 283.

²Bacon, Studies, p. 431.

³McNeile, Matthew, p. 97.

concept of the "Day of Yahweh" (see supra pp. 44f) the expression "that day" became "a technical term for the Messianic age, for the world to come."¹ Matthew uses it here as a reference to the Judgment, a not uncommon usage in apocalyptic literature. (4) The change which is evident in the claims of those who knock too late, from Luke's appeal by those who claim to be disciples because they had witnessed the judge's preaching in their streets and his eating in their presence, to Matthew's identification of the appealers as prophets, exorcists and workers of miracles operating in the name of Jesus, points also to the fact that Matthew adapted teachings of Jesus to the contemporary situation in the church of his own day. The import of the passage in Matthew is against false prophets.²

Chapter 8.-Matthew picks up the narrative at Mk. 1:40, the point at which he left it in chapter 4:23 (Mk. 1:39), by recording the healing of the leper followed by the command to "say nothing to anyone" (vss. 1-4). Almost the entire eighth chapter (vss. 5-34) consists of Q material, the theme apparently being the miracle-working activity of Jesus.³

¹Johnson, Int. Bib., VII, p. 333. (E.g. cf. Zech. 14:6, "on that day there shall be neither cold nor frost.")

²Manson, Mission and Message, pp. 468f. Manson points out that the contrast is seen in the changes in the quotation from Psalms 6:9 (Lk. 13:27, Mt. 7:23). Luke says, "Depart from me all you workers of unrighteousness" (ἐργαταὶ ἀδικίας), while Mt. records it "you that are working lawlessness" (ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν). Matthew's inference is that those in the Church who do not obey the new Law, the Law of Moses as interpreted by Jesus in the Sermon, are false prophets and shall not enter the kingdom.

³It is to be noted that Matthew lists ten miracles, one

The story of the healing of the Centurion's servant (vss. 5-10) from Q (Lk. 7:1-10) is not only inserted earlier in the narrative than Luke has it, but it is interpreted by Matthew by the appending of Jesus' saying on his rejection by Israel and his prediction of acceptance by Gentiles. The metaphor of the banquet with the patriarchs is "common and Rabbinic"¹ as a symbol of the Messianic Kingdom. Thus the miracle story showing a favorable contact between Jesus and a Gentile of influence, is heightened by the Redactor's addition of Jesus' prediction that Gentiles will enter the kingdom. This latter passage is found much later in Luke, occurring during the Journey to Jerusalem (Lk. 13:28-30).

In verse 12 occur two phrases which are characteristic of Matthew. The phrase "cast into outer darkness" appears in the New Testament only in Matthew (8:12; 13:42, 50; 22:13; 24:51; 25:30). In Jewish apocalyptic literature it symbolizes Gehenna or inheritance of the sinner after death. Allen cites two Rabbinical passages in which "God names Gehinnom darkness," and "the sinners in Gehinnom will be covered with darkness."²

after the other in 8:1-9:34 (7 from Mk., 1 from Q and 2 from M). Teeple, following Hans Schoeps, lists this as one of the devices of the Redactor to portray Jesus as the Prophet like Moses:

These ten tales are grouped here in order to depict Jesus as performing ten miracles, as Moses performed ten in Egypt. Moses performed his ten before he collected his people and started them on their journey from Egypt, and somewhat similarly, in Matthew Jesus performs his ten miracles just before he calls his twelve followers to him and sends them forth on their mission. (JBL Monograph Vol. X, p. 83.)

¹Montefiore, Synoptic Gospels, II, p. 130.

²Allen, Matthew, p. 78. Manson cites a typical passage from

The second phrase "there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth" is likewise characteristic of Matthew, (appearing 8:12; 13:42, 50; 22:13; 24:51; 25:30) but it also appears in Luke (13:28) parallel to the verse under consideration. There is little reference to this exact phrase in apocalyptic literature.¹ Allen² cites Enoch 108:3, 5, as evidence of the use of the metaphor of "weeping" to describe the anguish and disappointment of those excluded from the kingdom. McNeile suggests that the phrase "gnashing of teeth" might well have come from Psalm 112:10, which says that the wicked man, seeing the steadfastness and exaltation of the righteous, "gnashes his teeth."³ Johnson states that both phrases were, in Jesus' time "a part of the usual description of Gehenna."⁴

The third miracle--the healing of Peter's mother-in-law--is from Mk. 1:29-31, an event which had been omitted previously at Mt. 4:20. The Redactor includes the next three verses from Mk. (1:32-34) which is the notation of the healing of many sick persons and the casting out of evil spirits "with a word" (vs. 16).

This first series of miracles in Mt. is closed by the Redactor with the seventh testimonia (vs. 17). Here is an explicit iden-

Enoch 103:5-8: "Woe to you, ye sinners, when ye have died. . . . Into Darkness and chains and a burning flame where there is grievous judgment shall your spirits enter." (Mission and Message, p. 518f.) Cf. also Ps. Sol. 14:6; 15:11.

¹Montefiore, Synoptic Gospels, II, p. 130, says the phrase is of "Mandaean or Persian provenance."

²Allen, Matthew, p. 78.

³McNeile, Matthew, p. 106.

⁴Johnson, Int. Bib., VII, p. 341.

tification of Jesus with the Suffering Servant (Isa. 53:4). Matthew makes here what seems to be a rather crude comparison, for the healing activity of Jesus, the removing or taking away of infirmity and disease, is compared to that of the Servant who takes the suffering upon himself, so to speak.

Mt. . . . or his source, makes no reference to the propitiatory value of the Servant's work; he quotes only v. 4, and quotes the wording of it mechanically, as in other instances, to illustrate the immediate incident, using the Greek verbs in their collateral force of 'to take away.'¹

McNeile says, with good judgment, that the incident of the "Two Aspirants for Discipleship" (vss. 18-22) comes too early in Matthew. "It belongs, as Lk. has it, to the period of the last journey to Jerusalem."² It is evident that the Redactor has rearranged the materials for purposes other than chronological development.

Several things are of note in this passage: (1) this is the first time Matthew has used the term "Son of Man" for Jesus. McNeile says of this:

¹McNeile, Matthew, p. 108. P. G. S. Hopwood, in The Religious Experience of the Primitive Church (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936), p. 78, notes that this might be more than an editorial comment, for the words "may well have occurred to the recipients of His healing power."

²McNeile, Matthew, p. 108. In light of vs. 16 which places the time of day as "evening," and vs. 18 which suggests Jesus is on the way to take a boat "to go over to the other side," the request of "another of the disciples" that Jesus should "let me first go and bury my father" is not only incongruous, but "impossible," says McNeile (p. 108). In addition, in light of Mt. 4:13 which says that Jesus took up permanent dwellings at Capernaum (κατοικέω means "to dwell permanently," Major, Mission and Message, p. 240), Jesus' statement that he "has no where to lay his head," is inconsistent.

If the words had been addressed to one of the Twelve, the title Son of Man would have been intelligible after S. Peter's confession (xvi. 16f.) but not before; but to anyone else it could have no meaning at all.¹

Matthew's use of the term "Son of Man" (30 times compared to 14 in Mk. and 27 in Lk.) is studied in Detached Note E (p. 248). The study shows that the Redactor equated Jesus with the apocalyptic Son of Man in every use of the term.

(2) Matthew uses two terms for Jesus which are not used by Luke in this parallel passage. In verse 19 the scribe addresses Jesus as "διδασκαλε" and in verse 21 "another disciple" addresses him "κυριε". A study of Matthew's uses of these two terms (see Detached Note B, p. 232) reveals that the Redactor preferred to have the disciples address Jesus as κυριε, as a title of respect, while he reserved διδασκαλε as a term of address used by Jesus' enemies. Matthew did not use ὁ κυριος "the Lord" as a title showing direct recognition of Jesus' divinity.

The Redactor continues to ignore the Markan order by relating, at this point, two incidents of the working of miracles which Mk. has at 4:35-41 and 5:1-20, the Stilling of the Tempest, and the Healing of the (two) Gadarene Demoniac(s). Matthew reproduces the stories with his usual technique of shortening or condensing, but adds little in the way of editorial comment, with the exception of the heightening of the miracle in the cemetery by making it two, instead of one demoniac, as in Mk. One significant addition comes to attention in verse 8:29. The demons have cried out in recognition

¹McNeile, Matthew, p. 109.

"What have you to do with us, O Son of God," (Mk. and Lk. have essentially the same to this point), then, "have you come here to torment us before the time?" This is an eschatological touch added to the story for it was a current belief in Palestine that "the Last Day would put an end to the power of demons over mankind."¹ It would seem that Matthew is saying, by this editorial addition, that surely the demons are not aware that the functions of the Messiah have already begun. One is reminded of this by Sherman Johnson in a recent article in Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.²

Chapter 9.-Matthew once again reverts to Mark's order, having omitted verses 35-38 of chapter 1 perhaps because the disciples express disappointment in Jesus after he left the crowds in Capernaum "at a peak of success of popularity."³

The first 17 verses of this chapter reproduce the essence of Mark 2:1-22 with no editorial changes worthy of note here. These passages mark the beginning of the opposition to Jesus. In the story of the healing of the paralytic (vss. 1-8), some of the scribes are incensed and say to themselves that Jesus is blaspheming because he speaks of forgiving sin. The second source of criticism is seen

¹McNeile, Matthew, p. 112f. Montefiore, Synoptic Gospels II, paraphrases the phrase as "before the Last Judgment and their final and permanent damnation." (p. 135).

²S. E. Johnson, "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline and the Jerusalem Church of Acts," ZAW, 66(1954), pp. 106-120. He refers to the Man. Disc. iv, 18-20 for a similar concept: "Howbeit God in His inscrutable wisdom has appointed a term for the existence of perversity, and when the time of Inquisition come, He will destroy it forever" (translation by Gaster, Dead Sea, p. 45).

³McNeile, Matthew, p. 108.

after the call of Matthew, Jesus is criticized for eating "with tax collectors and sinners" (vss. 9-13). Matthew reproduces Mk.'s third source of conflict, as well, in the question concerning fasting (vss. 14-17).

At this point the Redactor again inserts material, picking up the thread of narrative, at Mk. 5:21, which had been laid aside at Mt. 8:34. He postpones until later most of the Markan material from 2:23-4:34.

Verses 18-26 deal with the Healing of Jairus' daughter, and with the enclosed incident of the Healing of the Woman with the Hemorrhage (from Mk. 5:21-43).

The first editorial change of note occurs in verses 27-31. The story of the Healing of the Two Blind Men is a so-called doublet, that is, it is used twice in similar form by the Redactor. The incident is recorded in Mk. 10:46-52 (paralleled in Lk. 18:35-43 and in Mt. 20:29-34), but study of Mk. 10:46-52 in comparison with Mt. 9:27-31 reveals very little agreement in words used, or even in narrative setting. Aside from the common element of two blind men who cried out, on hearing that Jesus was approaching, "ἐλεησαν ἡμᾶς υἱοῦ Δαυὶδ," there is little reason to conclude that the two stories are from the same source. McNeile suggests that this incident is probably from another and later source story.¹ It is safe to assume that the Redactor has used two versions of the same incident for particular reasons. For the purposes of this

¹McNeile, Matthew, p. 128.

paper the actual source of the material is secondary.¹

The significant element in this story is the title ascribed to Jesus, and the setting in which it is used. Jesus is in Galilee so that the ascription "Son of David" at an early point in the ministry² could well signify recognition by Gentiles, or at least by the Galilean Jews in Gentile territory.³ Perhaps Matthew is trying to say at this point that within the Jewish nation blind people believed even though the leaders refused to see.

The title "Son of David" was a late-comer to the list of names for the expected Messiah. Dalman says it is not found earlier than the Psalms of Solomon (17:23), which dates it before 50 B.C.; he goes on to say that in the first century A.D. the title was frequently used.⁴

Matthew uses the title "Son of David" nine times, three of which are paralleled in Mk. and Lk:

1. and 2. Mt. 20:30-31; two blind men on Jericho road - Mk. 10:47, 48; Lk. 18:38, 39.

3. Mt. 22:42; Jesus questions Pharisees about Son of David, Mk. 12:35; Lk. 20:31.

¹Montefiore suggests, rightly I believe, that this is an "editorial miracle, drawn up to complete the number ten and to prepare for 11:5," Jesus' response to the Baptist's question. Synoptic Gospels, II, p. 140.

²The title is not used in Mk. and Lk. until Jesus is on the Jericho Road to Jerusalem.

³That there may be some credence to this theory is seen in the fact that the second telling of the story with the same ascription of title (Mt. 20:29-34) occurs in Judaea, on the road from Jericho to Jerusalem. Recognition at this point, near the heart of Judaism, signifies that some Jews also believed.

⁴Gustaf Dalman, The Words of Jesus, trans. D. M. Kay (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1909), p. 316ff.

The six additional uses of the title "Son of David" are peculiar to Matthew:

- (1) 1:1 The genealogy begins " . . . Jesus Christ, Son of David."
- (2) 9:27 Two blind men in Galilee implore "Have mercy on us, Son of David."
- (3) 12:23 Following Jesus' healing of the blind and dumb demoniac the amazed people ask "Can this be the Son of David?"
- (4) 15:22 (Before Caesarea Philippi) The Canaanite Woman in the region of Tyre and Sidon, cries, "Have mercy on me, O Lord, Son of David!"
- (5) 21:9 The crowds at Jesus' entry into Jerusalem shouted, "Hosannah to the Son of David!"
- (6) 21:15 Children in the Temple cry, "Hosannah to the Son of David!"

The redactor has taken care that Jesus shall be proven the Son of David, by birth, by his miraculous power, and by recognition by Gentiles as well as Jews. Burkitt sums up his apparent purpose very well in these words:

In a word, the special aim of Matthew is to represent our Lord as the legitimate Heir of the royal House of David. That the Messiah should be merely the son of David was not enough. There were doubtless many sons of David alive at the time; but the Evangelist wanted the legitimate Heir of the divine promises made to David.¹

After another doublet in verses 32-34 (Mt. 12:22-24 - Lk. 11:14-15) concerning the healing of the dumb demoniac, Matthew closes the chapter by combining a verse from Mk. 6:34 with one from Q (Lk. 10:2) to show Jesus' longing compassion for his people "harassed and

¹F. C. Burkitt, The Gospel History and its Transmission, (Edinburg: T. & T. Clark, 1906), p. 204.

helpless like sheep without a shepherd,"¹ the readiness of the harvest and the shortage of laborers. This introduces the Mission Charge of chapter 10.

Chapter 10.-This chapter contains the second "discourse" or block of teaching material combined as the charge to the Twelve as Jesus prepares to send them on a preaching Mission through Palestine. It is easier to discover the sources which the Redactor used and the way in which he combined them than it is to know his exact purpose. He begins by combining Mk 6:7 with Lk. 9:1 for the introductory verse; then he weaves together the Markan account of the calling of the Twelve (Mk. 3:16-19) with the records of two different Missions, the Mission of the Twelve (Mk. 6:7-11) and the Mission of the Seventy (Lk. 10:1-16). He also includes material from Mk. 13:9-13 and from Q (Lk. 12:2-9) regarding the persecution of the disciples, Q materials (Lk. 12:51-53; 14:26-27; 17:33) concerning the necessity of losing one's life for "my sake" in spite of divisions within the household, and some little material peculiar to this Gospel, perhaps from M. (vss. 5-8, 23-25, 40-42).²

¹ἔσχυλμένοι [σχύλλειν] describes the religious condition of the common people, says Allen, "harassed, importuned, bewildered by those who should have taught them; hindered from entering into the kingdom of heaven, laden with burdens which the Pharisees laid upon them." (Allen, Matt. p. 99) ἐριμμένοι denotes helpless prostration. McNeile says of this phrase, "Both participles refer to the people as sheep, mishandled, and lying helpless. They . . . describe metaphorically the grievous state of unreadiness for the Last Day into which the Jews had fallen from want of spiritual guidance" (McNeile, Matthew, p. 130).

²Albert Huck, Synopse der drei ersten Evangelien, ed. Hans Lietzmann (10th ed.; Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr, 1950).

It is apparent that this is a conscious and deliberate putting together of material from several sources for purposes which may well have been dictated by needs in the church contemporary with the Redactor. Consequently, it would seem the best way to study this chapter would be section by section, in a search for any evidence which might reveal eschatological design. When this chapter is studied from the point of view of extracting the pure teachings of Jesus from the material, one is concerned about the placement of certain verses and the validity of certain other verses, and rightly so.¹ But for the purposes of this paper the chapter can best be studied as having a unity given it by the Redactor. Several things come to mind which affect this decision: the Redactor does not mention the disciples either starting out or returning from the journey, as do both Mk. (6:12-13) and Lk. (9:6, 10:17-20). This suggests that Matthew was not really concerned to write an historical account, or to record a missionary journey, but that he was writing a formal account of the sayings of Jesus which could be applied to the post-Jerusalem period of extreme difficulty for the mission to the Jews.² Further, it would seem that Matthew has identified the Jewish-Christians as

¹Cf. Streeter, Four Gospels, p. 261ff; Manson, Mission and Message; Manson, Teachings, etc. for excellent studies of Matthew from the viewpoint of validity as source for teachings of Jesus.

²This conclusion was suggested by a line in B. Weiss, A Manual of Introduction to the New Testament, trans. A. J. K. Davidson, (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1889) Vol. II, p. 279, to the effect that since Matthew combined the passage from Mark 13 with the material of the Mission Charge he made chapter 10 refer to the later mission, "thus shaping it into a prediction of the insensibility and hostility which Jesus and His cause would meet with; for which reason also the Evangelist says nothing of a present setting out of the disciples."

carrying on the work of the Twelve.¹

Jesus called the Twelve to him and gave them authority to cast out unclean spirits, the same authority which he possessed. Matthew notes in verse 1 that the authority which Jesus gave his disciples over unclean spirits (or demons as in Lk.) was "to cast them out." All three Evangelists note that Jesus gave his disciples this "authority," but only Matthew explains the nature of the authority. The belief that evil or unclean spirits were under the dominion of Satan (cf. supra, p. 57) raised the apocalyptic expectation that the "Last Day would put an end to the power of demons over mankind."² Signs of the nearness of the Kingdom included the declining power of Satan.

Jewish-Christian missionaries are to persist, says Matthew, in going to the "lost sheep of the house of Israel" to preach the near-approach of the kingdom and to perform acts of healing. Verses 5-8 are peculiar to Mt. probably from M³ although opinion varies regarding the question of whether or not these are the words of Jesus, especially verses 5-6 having to do with the charge to go nowhere among Gentiles but only "to the lost sheep of Israel." Streeter suggests that verses 5 and 6 have such affinity to verse 23 that originally the two sections must "have stood much closer together," forming the opening and closing portions of a Judaistic version (M)

¹Cf. infra p.146 n.1. "Matthew regards the twelve as the undisputed heads of the church." Johnson, Int. Bib., VII, p. 361.

²McNeile, Matthew, p. 112. Johnson, Int. Bib VII, p. 363, points out that it is to be the task of the priestly Messiah in Test. Benj.(18:12) to cast out unclean spirits.

³Cf. Johnson, Int. Bib. VII, p. 238

of the charge to the Twelve.¹ Matthew's purpose² in including these verses, whether or not they were actual words of Jesus, was probably threefold: apologetic, interpretative, and eschatological. Apologetic in that it was one of his usual attempts to show Jesus actually fulfilling the Messianic expectations of the Jews. This would decree that Jesus could not be concerned with Gentiles, but must concentrate within his own nation. (Cf. supra on the Israel-

¹Streeter, Four Gospels, p. 255. Streeter further suggests that while the verses could represent the original words of Jesus, the exact meaning and/or context have been altered because of the controversy between Jewish Christians and Gentile-Christians in the early Church.

It is difficult not to suspect . . . the followers of James . . . of inventing saying of Christ, or misquoting sayings which, even if authentic, must originally have been spoken in view of entirely different circumstances (p. 256).

Cf. Montefiore (Synoptic Gospels, II, p. 146f) for a brief discussion of scholarly opinion on this issue. Montefiore himself thinks that vss. 5 and 6 are a genuine utterance of Jesus; they had been contained in Q but deleted by Luke because "they did not suit with the mission of the seventy" and retained by Matthew because "it did not matter that Jesus had limited this first mission to Israel. . . . The Church (already) included both Jews and Gentiles."

McNeile points out that the new age would dawn if the Jewish nation could be brought to repentance. (Matthew, p. 134.) Along this same line of thought Johnson quotes a saying from Rabbi Aha, "If the Israelites would repent for one day the Messiah, Son of David would come immediately" (Int. Bib. VII, p. 274). Perhaps this expresses the intention of Jesus in limiting the mission to Israel. The urgency of the nearness of the Kingdom could well have caused him to utter these or similar words, although the demand for repentance has been deleted from the message at this point. (Cf. 3:2; 4:17; and 10:7)

²S. G. F. Brandon in The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church (London: S.P.C.K., 1951) p. 230, in defending his daring thesis that Matthew was written from Alexandria for the Jewish-Christian refugees from the Fall of Jerusalem, and not as an attempt to compromise the extreme positions of Paul and James as Streeter holds, proposes the stimulating thought that the Redactor was deliberate in his strictures against Gentiles. Not being in favor of the admission of Gentiles, but not being able to stop it either he felt

at least it should be rigorously controlled, and Matthew was prepared to preserve in his Gospel the record of an old Dominical

centered nature of the Messianic hope.) By an interpretative purpose I refer to the obvious collateral meaning that Matthew is trying to explain to Jewish Christians the continuing necessity for their efforts to save "the lost sheep" in spite of the suffering it had caused. This can be said in light of the passage from the Little Apocalypse (Mk. 13) regarding the suffering of the disciples, (the floggings and trials, the divisions among their families, and the serious opposition are plainly out of place in the context of the "mission of the Twelve") which Matthew has inserted (vss. 17-22) apparently to show that Jesus had anticipated there would be great troubles and sufferings of all descriptions.¹ The eschatological purpose is consistent with other parts of the Redactor's work. The Kingdom is at hand because of the work of Jesus, the true Son of David, among his people. The Gentile mission is recognized in verse 18.²

prohibition of evangelizing any but Jews, so that it might clearly be known that the conversion of Gentiles was not at first sought for by the Master.

¹Brandon, Fall of Jerusalem, p. 175 suggests that Matthew was identifying himself and the band of Jewish Christians for whom he wrote as the "ideal band of chosen disciples" so that he could write words of Jesus with actual reference to the contemporary scene.

²Matthew seems to show Jesus' message having been rejected by his own people, spilling over, by default of the Jews and by the receptivity of the Gentiles, on to the Gentiles. It is an attempt, not only to prove that Jesus is the Messiah whom the Jews expected, but to justify the spread of Christianity to the Gentiles. The complex question of the mixture of pro- and anti-Gentile feelings in this gospel has not been better discussed in brief scope, than by G. D. Kilpatrick, The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946), pp. 101-123. He sees this gospel, produced in an essentially Jewish-Christian community, supplying vital impetus to the necessary transition of Christianity from a sect within Judaism to a separate existence independent of contemporary Judaism, yet containing the "true end of Judaism on which all

In addition to the proclamation of the near-approach of the Kingdom, the disciples are to perform acts of healing not merely as acts of kindness but as sure indication of the near approach of the Kingdom.¹ They are to work without receiving pay making only the barest provision for themselves,² and when they enter a town they should seek out a worthy house in which to make their headquarters;³ if no worthy house is found, or if they are rejected by house or town, they are not to stay to argue but are to hurry on to the next town, knowing that terrible judgment awaits the towns which resist.⁴

The disciple-missionaries are warned to expect more than simply rejection, but suffering as well: they will be forced to ap-

the wealth of Jewish life and teaching is focused" (quote from p. 122).

¹McNeile, Matthew, p. 136.

²Vss. 9-10, cf. Mk 6:8-9. Mk. has μηδέν αἴρωσιν (pres. subj. of αἴρω) meaning that Jesus said they should "take nothing with them, no money, no bag, etc.;" Lk. 9:3 also uses this verb. Matthew used μη κτήσηθε (1st Aor. subj. of κτάομαι which means "to gain," or "to procure for oneself.") Cf. Lk. 18:12 where it is used by the Pharisee who gives tithes of all that he gets, κτώμαι, so that vs. 9 should be translated to the effect that they were to take no pay, receive no gold for their work. Montefiore (Synoptic Gospels, II, p. 148) says this prohibition is quite in accord "with Rabbinic custom and precept." This change by Matthew agrees with his admonition in vs. 8 that they "received without pay" and thus should heal, "give without pay;" (against McNeile, p. 135). The change represents a later development.

³Vss. 11-13, cf. Mk. 6:10, Lk. 10:6.

⁴Vss. 14-15, cf. Mk. 6:11 for vs. 14 and Lk. 10:12-13 for vs. 15. It is to be noted that Matthew intensifies the terse "that day" to his more absolute "the day of judgment." Luke leaves the matter uncertain, whether the phrase refers to the day on which the disciples are rejected, or to the day of judgment. The phrase ἐν ἡμέρα κρισέως is used by Matthew at 10:15; 11:22, 24, 12:36, but it does not appear in either Mk. or Lk. (Manson, Mission and Message, p. 368.)

pear before councils, be flogged in synagogues, dragged before governors and kings "to bear testimony before them and the Gentiles." In all of this they are not to be concerned or frightened about their witnessing, for the "Spirit of (the) Father" will speak through them.¹

In the evil times (when Jews are trying to convert Jews) families will be torn asunder so that brother will testify against brother, and even children will rise up against their parents to have them put to death. The Disciple-missionaries will be hated on account of Jesus, but salvation awaits those who endure to the end.²

The end is not far off. There is an awful urgency about the

¹vss. 16-20, cf. Mk. 13:9-11 (there is a Q parallel in Lk. 10:3, for vs. 16). At this point Matthew inserts into the Charge material from Mk. 13, the "Little Apocalypse." Technically the title "Little Apocalypse" is used only of the material which is extraneous to the teachings of Jesus in Mk. 13:1-37. Most scholars identify this material as vss. 6-8, 14-20, 24-27, possibly 31. (Cf. F. C. Grant, "Mark," Int. Bib. VII, p. 854.) Thus vss. 9-13 of this chapter, used as the source by Matthew for 10:17-22, generally accepted as genuine teaching, but belonging "to a late period of the Lord's life" (McNeile, Matthew, p. 139).

The only editorial addition of note in this passage is in vs. 18. By the addition of "and the Gentiles" to the passage describing the way in which the disciples will be dragged before governors and kings to "bear testimony before them and the Gentiles," Matthew might be inserting a tacit recognition of the Gentile mission, or he might imply "mission work beyond the borders of Palestine" (McNeile, Matthew, p. 140) but still among "the lost sheep," for the insertion seems to refer "to heathen persecution as well as Jewish" (Montefiore, Synoptic Gospels, II, p. 149).

²vss. 21-22, cf. Mk. 12:12-13. The Markan passage "suggests the first great persecution of Christians under Nero in the year 64 A.D." (Johnson, Int. Bib. VII, p. 369). It would seem, however, that Matthew has adopted these verses as being "expressive of some period of intense crisis (for Jewish Christians) . . . (in) the terrible years immediately preceding and following the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70" (Brandon, Fall of Jerusalem, p. 93f.)

continuance of the mission, for before they can visit all the towns of Israel, or perhaps all the towns in which there is a community of "lost sheep," the Son of Man will come.¹

¹vs. 23. This is perhaps the most controversial verse in Matthew's Gospel, constituting a well-known exegetical difficulty. It is one of the pivotal verses in the position of "thorough-going eschatology" of Albert Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus (New York: Macmillan, 1906, 1956), p. 357ff. He combines this verse showing that Jesus truly expected the immediate coming of the Son of Man with the return of the twelve (Mk. 6:30f) to develop the idea that Jesus, being disappointed at the delay of the Parousia, became convinced that he must submit to sufferings to cause "the wheel of the world" to make its last revolution (p. 370). The weakness of Schweitzer's position lies in the fact, as Streeter pointed out, that it depends on Mt. 10 containing the exact words of Jesus (Four Gospels, p. 255, n. 1).

Scholars have been divided on the question of the authenticity of these words. Among those defending this verse as the words of Jesus, Burkitt states the classic position that Schweitzer's analysis is correct; Jesus gave these instructions in the early days when he expected the End at once. It is a "strange saying, but if it was the invention of Jewish Christians . . . it is stranger still. It seems to me to testify to their unimaginative memory rather than to their powers of invention," (quoted by Montefiore, Synoptic Gospels II, p. 147). A recent critique of Schweitzer's interpretation of this verse notes that it "means no more than that Jesus promised to join the disciples before their preaching tour was over," (Chamberlain, W. D., "Till the Son of Man Be Come" Interpretation, 7 1953 p. 12); a position which seems to be incredible, until one remembers that 23b "you will not have gone through all the towns of Israel, before the Son of Man comes" is thought by some scholars to be more primitive, more nearly the word of Jesus, than the first portion of the verse, 23a (cf. Montefiore, Synoptic Gospels, II, p. 150).

Among the scholars claiming the verse is the work of the Jewish-Christian community or of the Redactor, Streeter (Four Gospels, p. 255ff) claims it represents the period of the Gentile controversy. McNeile (Matthew, p. xxvi, 142f) while not denying a measure of authenticity to the passage, says the idea of Jesus meeting his disciples at some appointed spot could not have been "the thought in the Lord's mind at the time." He does admit that Matthew probably used the verse because he saw it as having been fulfilled in history: the Redactor recognized that the Church "born in a sudden outburst within the generation then living" fulfilled the conditions of the verse.

Johnson (Int. Bib. VII, p. 360) notes that the saying "is addressed to the whole Christian community which expects its Lord to return before it has finished its preaching mission through

The second half of the discourse (vss. 24-42) repeats, for emphasis, the injunction that the disciples should persist, that they have nothing to fear but failure to persist. They should expect to be maligned, for their master had been accused of being an evil spirit; they can expect even worse treatment.¹ They should have no fear, for everything will be revealed. Proclaim Jesus' sayings from the housetops; fear only disobeying God who has power to destroy the soul in hell. The Father is with

the cities of Palestine."

A number of scholars seek to harmonize the verse with "the rest of the Gospel by interpreting τὰς πόλεις του Ἰσραὴλ "not geographically but ethnographically as 'cities where Israelites live'." (Allen, Matthew, p. 101.) Montefiore quotes Box on the nature of a variant reading which would tend to give support to this (Synoptic Gospels II, p. 150). Kilpatrick (Origins of Matthew, p. 119) develops the idea. Strong textual evidence from both Western and Caesarean texts (D, L, Θ, it. fam. 1, fam. 13, 22, 247, 565, Syr. sin., Arm, Origin) supports the following reading (underlined portion is addition from West. & Caes. texts):

ὅταν δὲ διώκωσιν ὑμας ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ,
φεύγετε εἰς τὴν ἑτέραν κἂν ἐκ ταύτης διώκωσιν
ὑμας, φεύγετε εἰς τὴν ἑτέραν. ἀμὴν γὰρ
λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ τελέσητε τὰς πόλεις του
Ἰσραὴλ ἕως ἔλθῃ ὁ υἱὸς του ἀνθρώπου.

Kilpatrick says that the variant reminds one of the custom of Paul to go first to the Jewish synagogue in each city he visited. The addition of the phrase, "and if they persecute you in that, flee into another" heightens the feeling that the "cities of Israel" should be interpreted as meaning "cities in which Jewish communities are to be found." This, says Kilpatrick, removes "the restrictive implication of the verse."

¹vss. 24-25, an M-saying with some direct relationship to Lk. 6:40. The original Q saying is probably in Lk. 6:40 where the meaning is that even when a disciple is fully trained he is not greater than his teacher. Matthew has re-interpreted this older saying in the light of later experience to indicate that a follower of Jesus should not expect to be treated any better than their Master had been treated. Johnson, Int. Bib. VII, p. 370. (Cf. also Montefiore, Synoptic Gospels, II, p. 151.)

them constantly, so that nothing can happen to them that is not His will.¹ Again, as if to strengthen the appeal with an added warning, the Redactor adds that those who have not hesitated to acknowledge Jesus before men will be acknowledged by Him before the Father in heaven; failure will be met by lack of recognition before the Father.²

Matthew seeks to justify the great contention within the ranks of Judaism because of the rise of Christianity by including an adaptation of the Q passage that Jesus came not to bring peace, but division (a sword). This explains the reason "a man's foes" are "those of his own household."³

¹Vss. 26-31, a Q saying (cf. Lk. 12:2-7). In vss. 26-27 Matthew has changed the meaning of the Q saying. In Lk. 12:3 the implication is that anything done in secret is not really hidden from God, and all will come out into the open in the Judgment (cf. also Mk. 4:22 for a different version of the saying). But the Redactor rewords it to be an order to the disciples to proclaim aloud all that Jesus had told them privately (McNeile, Matthew, p. 144).

²Vss. 32-33, a Q saying (cf. Lk. 12:8-9). The saying in Lk. uses the term "Son of Man" in the place where Matthew has used "I".

Mt. 10:32-33
 "So everyone who acknowledges me before men, I also will acknowledge before my Father who is in heaven; but whoever denies me before men, I also will deny before my father who is in heaven."

Lk. 12:8-9
 "And I tell you every one who acknowledges me before men, the Son of Man also will acknowledge before the angels of God; but he who denies me before men will be denied before the angels of God."

While the implication of both passages may be the same, Matthew makes it more explicit. To the Redactor Jesus and the Son of Man were one.

³Vss. 34-36, a Q saying (cf. Lk. 12:51-53). Matthew has "sword" where Lk. has "division," a change which serves to intensify the meaning. Verse 35 recalls the very similar passage in Micah 7:6 concerning the day of the Lord's visitation; Matthew

The Redactor continues to add strength to the Charge by noting that if one loses his life for the sake of Jesus, he will find life eternal.¹ The Charge closes with the promise that all who receive the disciples actually are consenting to receive Jesus and through Him the Father in heaven;² a promise that any who shall receive them or even extend comfort, such as a cup of cold water, to them shall be rewarded.³

Chapter 11.-The second discourse is closed by Matthew with his characteristic transition formula "And when Jesus had finished . . . he went on from there . . . ," vs. 1 (cf. also 7:28; 19:1;

adds vs. 36 which is a paraphrase of the last portion of the Micah passage. Streeter say that this passage is the result of conflation of the Q verses with Micah 7:6 (Four Gospels, p. 494, n. 1)

Brandon points out the real significance of the change of "sword" for "division" lies in Matthew's philosophy of history. The sword means war. "The disastrous war which had ruined his people" was caused by the coming of Jesus, the reaction of the Jews to him resulting in civil strife which led ultimately to destruction by Rome (Fall of Jerusalem, p. 228).

¹Vss. 37-39. Vss. 37-38 are paralleled in Lk. 14:26-27 (Q), and vs. 39 appears in Lk. 17:33 (Q) and in Mk. 8:35, paralleled in Mt. 16:25 and Lk. 9:24. In Vss. 37-38 Matthew alters the saying from Lk's reading that whoever does not hate his family and does not carry his own cross, "cannot be my disciple," to "is not worthy of me." (McNeile, Matthew, p. 148; Montefiore, Synoptic Gospels, II, p. 153f, feels that Luke's is probably the more nearly original version.)

²Vss. 40, parallel in Lk. 10:16 (Q). This verse, of very similar wording appears twice in Mt., and twice in Lk. In Mt. 18:5, Lk. 9:48 (from Mk. 9:37) it is a child which is received; in the above verse and in Lk. 10:16 it is the disciples which are received. (Montefiore, Synoptic Gospels, II, p. 154.)

³Vss. 41-42. Vs. 41 is peculiar to Matthew; vs. 42 is from Mk. 9:41f. McNeile points out that the reference to reward in this passage is again a specific reference to the coming age. (Matthew, p. 150.)

26:1). Chapter 11 is made up almost entirely of Q material with several verses supplied by Matthew. The Redactor uses material which is paralleled in Lk. 7:18-35 and 10:13-15, 21-22.

In verse 2 we have the first editorial change: Lk. 7:19 says that John sent his disciples to "the Lord," while Matthew says that hearing about "the works of Christ" John sent his disciples to him. Montefiore says that the wording may be deliberate at this point for the question John is asking is whether or not Jesus is the Christ.¹

Verse 12 is an exceedingly obscure verse whose meaning it is now difficult to ascertain. W. L. Knox says this is one of the "short epigrammatic saying(s) preserved in the tradition after its meaning had been lost." He does, however, claim that Matthew has reproduced something nearer the original form, that it might have been a reference to the way in which the Zealots had been attracted to the movement begun by John the Baptist, so that they "plunder it by seeking to exploit it by violence to their own advantage."²

A part of the difficulty has been with the verb βιάζεται (pres./ind./med./pass. of βιάζω).³ Because the verb is clearly in the middle voice in Luke (16:16) the tendency is to try

¹Synoptic Gospels, p. 157. The Western text has a reading *Ἰησοῦ instead of Χριστοῦ (D, syr, cur.. The syr.^{sin.} reading is τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν)

²Knox, Sources of Gospels, II, p. 99.

³Meaning in Med. - "advances violently"; Pass.- "suffers violence" or "is being violated" (Abbott-Smith, Lexicon, p. 81).

to translate it as middle in Mt. But the middle voice is impossible in Mt. because ἡ βασιλεία is obviously the subject of the verb. In the passive sense it is best translated, "the kingdom of heaven suffers violence"¹ or " . . . is being violated."

This translation would tend to support Knox.

However, Rudolph Otto makes the translation of the verb as a middle, as follows " . . . the kingdom of heaven is exercising its own spiritual force, and men of spiritual force are able to lay hold of it."² The contrast which Otto is pointing up, seen in light of vs. 13, is that between the old and the new. Montefiore quotes Harnack in a similar vein,

It refers to the enthusiastic, hurried, eager, passionate way in which the Kingdom (it is here; it is present) is being populated and entered. In 11 the Kingdom is future; in 12 it is present.³

A recent paper dealing with this verse develops the thesis that is essentially in agreement with that of Otto. The powerful, persuasive preaching of John the Baptist had created an atmosphere "so electric that the . . . kingdom was suffering pressure, and those touched by his might and truth were pressing for membership."⁴

¹Allen, *Matthew*, p. 116 (cf. also R.S.V. translation). Allen says Matthew had in mind the violent treatment of the messengers of the kingdom.

²R. Otto, *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man*, trans. F. V. Filson and Bertram Lee Woolf (London: Lutterworth Press, 1943), p. 110.

³*Synoptic Gospels*, II, p. 164.

⁴C. Stratton, "Pressure for the Kingdom," *Interp.* 8 (1954) p. 417. Schweitzer interprets this verse to show the kind of kingdom Jesus expected. The "men of violence" who are engaged in "compelling the coming of the kingdom" were the "host of penitents which is wringing it (the kingdom) from God, so that it may now come at any moment" (*Quest.*, p. 357).

McNeile, in attempting to understand Matthew's purpose in including the saying, gives what seems to be the most nearly correct interpretation.

The Kingdom, since the days when the Baptist heralded its approach, is violently stormed by enthusiastic people; e.g. toll-gatherers and harlots, whom the orthodox considered excluded from it.¹

Verses 14-15 are added by the Redactor to make positive identification of John the Baptist with Elijah. The functions of Elijah in the Jewish Messianic hope were many. The concept of the return of Elijah is based on the closing verses of Malachi:

Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the great and terrible day of the Lord comes, and he will turn the hearts of the fathers to their children, and the hearts of children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the land with a curse (vss. 5-6).

It is seen here, and in Ecclesiasticus 48:10, that the early expectation was that Elijah would cleanse Israel in preparation for the Day of Yahweh. Klausner notes that "deep-rooted among the Jewish people was the belief in Elijah's return and his mission to resolve religious doubts,"² to cleanse and restore Israel or "to make ready the tribes of Israel" for the coming of the Messiah, and in the Messianic age to restore "the flask of manna, the flask of water for purification, and the flask of oil for anointing."³

¹Matthew, p. 155. He suggests, with a fine sense of balance, that Jesus' original saying might well have referred to his own temptation to consider the kingdom as an earthly prize, the Messianic kingdom on earth (cf. 4:8f). If this were so the verse no doubt belonged in a different context.

²Klausner, Idea, p. 452.

³Ibid., p. 455 (cf. also the listing of the duties of Elijah in Teeple, JBL Monograph, vol. X, pp. 4-8).

Klausner quotes from the Mishna, a tradition from Rabban Johanan ben Zakkai (a pupil of Hillel) that Elijah was to come to remove afar those (families) that were brought nigh by force and to bring nigh those (families) that were removed afar by force.¹ The nature of this expectation was such that Elijah was expected to separate the true Sons of the Kingdom, both from among those who had been forcibly brought into Judaea and those who had been forcibly removed by the various dispersing movements in the past. This could well throw light on verse 12 of this chapter, as pointed out by Allen. Allen notes that in this quotation from the Mishnah we have "the idea of membership of the Israelite community suffering violence, and violent men wrongly laying claim to it."² Matthew is saying in these verses that John the Baptist has fulfilled one of the functions of Elijah--and thus "he is Elijah who is to come"--by restoring the tribes of Israel, not in the orthodox expectation, but by throwing it open to "toll-gatherers and harlots." Those who had been dispossessed, the common people, "forced their way into the kingdom." John thus not only restored to their

rights those whose true membership was wrongly denied, but by clearing away the superstition that purity of descent in itself was essential to participation in the Messianic blessings,³

he restored the tribes to Israel.

The condemnation of the Galilaeen cities (vss. 20-24, cf.

¹Ibid., p. 453.

²Allen, Matthew, p. 118.

³Ibid.

Lk. 10:13-15) has no connection with the previous passage on the work of John the Baptist and his status in the Kingdom except a rather tenuous topical relationship to the passage on the rejection of Jesus and John (vss. 18-19). In Lk. this material appears as part of the "charge to the seventy" at which point it seems to be in more defensible context. Matthew's editorial introduction to the passage (vs. 20) casts the condemnation in the framework of the failure of the Galilean cities to repent, even after seeing the mighty works performed there. Lk.'s passage, on the other hand, deals with the anticipated poor reception of the mission of the seventy by the Galilean cities.

Chapter 12.--The Redactor once more returns to pick up the Markan thread of narrative at the point from which he had departed at 9:17. He follows Mk. rather closely, although omitting whole verses at times, from Mk. 2:23 through 3:30; this includes the tension-building incidents, Plucking Corn on the Sabbath, the Healing of the Man with the Withered Hand, the healing of many, which supplies the vehicle for a testimonia. Omitting the Call of the Twelve, because it had been reported already (10:4), he moved to the Accusation by the Pharisees, and the Beelzebub Controversy. Between Mk. 3:30 and 31 the Redactor inserts two incidents from Q, the teaching Against the Seeking of Signs, and the Parable of the Return of the Evil Spirit. The chapter closes with a return to Mk. and the incident of Christ's Real Brethren.

The Sabbath controversy with the Pharisees, over the plucking of grain by the disciples, reveals a subtle change in meaning by

the Redactor. He inserts verses 5-7 into the Markan account, saying that the priests must "profane" the Sabbath in order to carry out the Temple services, and that their important work really takes precedence over the Sabbath; Jesus is "something greater than the temple" ritual and therefore whatever he does should take precedence over the Sabbath rules.¹ This insertion is particularly meaningful in light of the omission of Mk. 2:27. Matthew's omission of "The Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath," coupled with his linking of Mk. 2:28, "For the Son of Man is lord of the Sabbath" with his verses 5-7, in which the definite claims are made concerning Jesus' role as being important enough automatically to supercede the Sabbath laws, reveals Matthew's purpose. He effectively changes Mk.'s "son of man" from its seemingly obvious reference to "Man"² into a definite linking of Jesus and the Son

¹Manson, Mission and Message, p. 479.

²Manson in Teachings, pp. 25, 214, says that this verse in Mk. belongs to those (along with 2:10) "of which it can most plausibly be said that the term 'Son of Man' in them represents a misunderstanding of an original Aramaic bar nāshā" and it is clear that "man," not "son of man" is the correct rendering in these two passages. Allen points out that vs. 28 in Mk. 2 does not logically follow from the context of the criticism of the actions of the disciples, and that most likely "Son of Man" in this context should be translated simply "man" (Matthew, p. 128).

Scholars are not in agreement with this conclusion, as for example, F. C. Grant in Int. Bib. VII, p. 679, "The trite modern interpretation, Son of man = "human being," is quite impossible, equally here as in 2:10." Vincent Taylor, The Formation of the Gospel Tradition (2d ed.; London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1953), p. 177f reminds us that form critics, following the work of Albertz, see Mk. 2:1-3:6 as an early compilation by one who wanted to show the mounting tension which preceded the break between Jesus and the religious leaders of his day. The correctness of this hypothesis solves the problem of the apparent out-of-context use of "Son of Man" in 2:28, says Taylor.

It is apparent that Matthew's use of vss. 5-7 in which

of Man. While Luke also omits Mk. 2:27, he does not include the material in Mt. 12:5-7 so that the claims are not so absolute in that Gospel.

The second Sabbath controversy concerns the healing of the man with a withered hand, vss. 9-14. The Redactor adds vss. 11-12 to the condensed story from Mk. as an illustrative analogy.

Matthew uses the Markan incident of the healing of multitudes (Mk. 3:7-12) with its subsequent demand for secrecy, as the opportunity for the introduction of another proof-text. The passage is from Isa. 42:1-4 and it seeks to explain the insistence of Jesus on the secrecy of his Messiahship. The Redactor says that it is because of his natural modesty and humility that Jesus does not want publicity; this order of silence as well as his withdrawal from controversy with the Pharisees fulfills the "Servant" passage:¹

He will not wrangle or cry aloud,

 he will not break a bruised reed
 or quench a smoldering wick (Mt. 12:19a, 20ab).

The Redactor's quotations do not "quite follow either the LXX or the Hebrew,"² and it seems to be adapted somewhat to his uses.

Verse 21 is quoted from LXX:

Jesus supercedes the Sabbath rule provides a proper setting for "The Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath," regardless of scholarly decision with regard to the original meaning of Mk. 2:28

¹Johnson, Int. Bib. VII, p. 395f; Montefiore, Synoptic Gospels, II, p. 191.

²Montefiore, Synoptic Gospels, II, p. 191.

Καὶ (ἐπι) τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιοῦσιν¹

The Hebrew translates "And for His law shall (the) isles hope," although the intent of the passage is the same. Thus, in addition to the fulfillment of Jesus' order of silence, Matthew finds in this passage a scriptural justification for the admission of Gentiles into the Church.

The healing of the blind and dumb demoniac, and its consequent Beelzebub controversy (vss. 22-32) is a conflation of Mk. 3: 22-30 with Q materials (Lk. 11:15-23).² Two sections of this passage are relevant to this study. In verse 23, after the healing of the blind and dumb demoniac, Matthew adds the question from the amazed multitude, "Can this be the Son of David?" The true Messiah or Son of David would have power to work miracles;³ the Redactor's question seems to have a mixture of incredulity or unbelief--"this man, in spite of His miraculous power, answers so little to our notions of the Messiah"⁴--and of an awakening recognition that it might be so.

In verse 28 Matthew retains the words ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ rather than change to ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν as is his custom.⁵ It is apparent that Matthew greatly prefers the lat-

¹Septuaginta, id est Vetus Testamentum Graece Iuxta LXX Interpretes, Alfred Rahlfs, ed. (Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935), Vol. II, p. 622.

²Manson Mission and Message, pp. 374-377.

³Johnson, Int. Bib., VII, p. 397.

⁴McNeile, Matthew, p. 174.

⁵The phrase ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν appears 32 times in Mt.: 20 times as the work of the Redactor (of which about 13 appear in the M source materials), and 12 times as a substitution for

ter to the former phrase, but this is one of four instances in which the phrase "kingdom of God" does appear in the gospel.¹ A number of scholars have attempted to show that Matthew had a different concept in mind in these instances. Allen says that the Redactor did not substitute "kingdom of heaven" in 12:28 because "he always uses 'the kingdom of heaven' in an eschatological sense, which would be out of place here."² McNeile takes the view that both phrases mean the same thing and that Matthew probably left it unaltered in the present case because "it formed a better parallel to ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ, and also a sharper contrast with the [kingdom of Satan] (vs. 26)."³

the phrase "kingdom of God" in Mk. or Q sources (6 in Markan and 6 in Q materials). The 20 times of the Redactor includes 3 instances in which the phrase was inserted in the materials being used (2 in Mk. at Mt. 3:2; 18:1, and 1 in Lk., at Mt. 7:21). The Redactor uses the phrase at 3:2; 5:10, 19(2), 5:20; 7:21; 13:24; 13:44, 45, 47, 52; 16:19; 18:1, 4, 23; 19:12; 20:1; 22:2; 23:13; 25:1. The substitutions in Markan materials are at: 4:17; 13:11, 31; 18:3; 19:14, 23; and those in Lukan material at: 5:3; 8:11; 10:7; 11:11, 12; 13:33. This is patterned after Allen, Matthew, pp. lxxvii-lxxxi, but this count disagrees with his listing at several points.

¹The four instances in which Matthew uses "kingdom of God" are: 12:28 (Q); 19:24 (Mk.); 21:31 (M); and 21:43 (Redactor). Allen, Matthew, p. lxxvii, lists 6:33 as containing the variant reading adding τοῦ θεοῦ but the MSS evidence for it is very weak (including only most of the Latin cursives).

²Allen, Matthew, p. 135. Plummer, Matthew, p. 177, n.1, states categorically that "Kingdom of Heaven" means to Matthew "the Kingdom which the Son of Man will come in the heavens to inaugurate, and that meaning would not be fitting here."

³McNeile, Matthew, p. 176. Manson, Teachings, p. 82f, shows that the reading ἐν δακτυλῷ θεοῦ (Lk. 11:20) is the more original, and that the Redactor has no doubt substituted ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ, perhaps to eliminate an anthropomorphism, or to use a "more Rabbinical mode of speech." This need not alter McNeile's position for Matthew could still have been seeking to preserve the "better parallel" in his use of "kingdom of God."

It is possible that this is a deliberate retention of the little-used phrase because it implies a real difference in meaning. When one examines the three additional passages in which ἡ βασιλεια του θεου appears it is apparent that two of the three unquestionably refer to something different than the coming eschatological kingdom. In 21:31 the "tax collectors and harlots" who believed in "the way of righteousness" of John the Baptist will "go into την βασιλειαν του θεου before" the leaders of the Jews; in 21:43 "ἡ βασιλεια του θεου will be taken away" from the Jews (tenants in the Lord's vineyard) and "given to the nation producing the fruits of it."¹

These references could well be to the "sovereignty of God"² or to "the Jewish theocracy conferred on the chosen people,"³ for there is no doubt that they both refer to a condition which the Jews had enjoyed or expected to enjoy, but which, because of their failure to accept John the Baptist (21:31) and their failure to produce fruits of righteousness (21:43), they would be losing.

The third use of the phrase, is in 19:24 in a context which is quite different:

Truly I say to you, it will be hard for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven. Again I tell you, it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God. (Parallel Mk. 10:24-25).

¹For a discussion of these two verses see infra, p. 196, n. 1.

²Allen, Matthew, p. 227.

³Montefiore, Synoptic Gospels, II, p. 286.

It would appear that the terms ἡ βασιλεια των ουρανων and ἡ βασιλεια του θεου are being used interchangeably in this verse. There is a reasonable doubt, however, regarding the authenticity of the passage as above. Some strong manuscripts from the Western, Caesarean and Alexandrian (Neutral) texts contain των ουρανων in place of του θεου.¹ Although no uncial manuscripts contain this variant, the stronger cursives and versions of each of the three major ancient texts are represented.²

Most scholars do not discuss the variant. One is led to conclude, however, on the basis of the Redactor's practice, that the original reading was βασιλεια των ουρανων. Matthew, twelve times (six in materials from Mk. and six in that from Q) substitutes βασιλειαν των ουρανων for βασιλεια του θεου. In addition, he inserts his favorite phrase three times in Markan or Q contexts.³ The only passage in the Gospel in which the Redactor retains the phrase βασιλεια του θεου, without textual variant, is at 12:28. The usages in 21:31 and 21:43 are in Matthean material. At 12:28 the phrase implies the immediate beginning of the Messianic Age to which the Jews looked forward and

¹Family 1; 124, (from family 13); 33, 157, 440, 1295; most of the MSS--al. it., vg.; Syr. sin., cur.; Origen.

²Alexandrian text (B) represented here by 33 ("the queen of cursives," Streeter, Four Gospels, p. 49) and 157, ("the cursive regarded by Hort as next in importance to 33," Streeter, p. 49); the Eastern text (including Caesarean and Antioch) by Family 1, family 13, 124 (strong secondary authorities for the text of Caesarea) and Syr. sin. (the primary authority, according to Streeter, for the Antioch text), cur.; the Western text by most of the Latin cursives and the Vulgate version. Origen also supports the reading.

³Supra, p. 160, n.5.

in which they had vested interests.¹ At 21:31 the use shows that sinners and the dispossessed would enjoy first privileges in the Messianic age, and in 21:43 there is implied the Messianic age will be given or will occur for a "nation producing fruits." This last is an obvious reference to the Church. Because the contexts in these three uses of Βασιλεια του Θεου are so much alike and so very unlike that in 19:24, one is forced to conjecture that the variant would be the correct reading.²

In verse 32 the Redactor reproduces the essence of Mk. 3:29 concerning speaking (blasphemy) "against the Holy Spirit" and adds "either in this age or in the age to come."³ The addition does not alter the sense of the Markan phrase "is guilty of an eternal sin," but is a deliberate use of more apocalyptic language on the part of the Redactor.

A similar use of apocalyptic language occurs in verse 34; the insertion of the words from the Baptist's speech "Ye offspring of vipers"⁴ is an indication of the intense apocalyptic character

¹See Detached Note C, p. 238, for a discussion of the Redactor's use of φθάνω in 12:28 as compared to his use of ἐγγιζω in passages dealing with the Kingdom of Heaven.

²Allen, Matthew, p. 213, concludes that: "it must remain probable that των οὐρανων is original here, and that it has been changed into του Θεου to assimilate to Mk."

³McNeile, Matthew, p. 178, notes that after the fall of Jerusalem Jewish writers "often contrast 'this age' with 'the coming age' but such expressions are foreign to pre-Christian Jewish writings, and are rare in the New Testament."

⁴John's phrase "offspring of vipers" (Mt. 3:7, Lk. 3:7) appears on Jesus' lips only in Matthew (12:34, 23:35). Manson, Mission and Message, p. 317.

of the Redactor's thinking, for John preached the immediate in-breaking of the Judgment. This feeling of apocalyptic tension is heightened when the reader comes to verses 36-37, a passage assigned to M. Those who have accused Jesus of being in league with Beelzebub are now warned, by the Redactor's use of what may be M material, that on the day of judgment they will be required to give account of every careless and evil word. This reminds one of the "book" of Daniel 12:2 in which are written the names of the saved, but Matthew speaks of a book of far more inclusive contents. Manson quoting Billerbeck (I, p. 639f) says that there is some evidence in Rabbinical writings for the belief "that the record of a man as kept in heaven included his words, even his harmless utterances, as well as his acts."¹

The refusal of Jesus to grant any sign of his Messiahship at the request of the Pharisees (vss. 38-42, cf. Lk. 11:29-32) is interpreted by Matthew, with the aid of two editorial comments (vss. 38 and 40) in a way different from the passage in Lk. In Lk. Jonah as a sign to Nineveh is compared with Jesus, Son of Man, as a sign for his generation:

For as Jonah became a sign to the men of Nineveh, so will the Son of Man be to this generation.

Matthew has added verse 40 in which Jonah's three days and nights

¹Manson, Mission and Message, p. 483. In the Qumran literature (Hymns, xvi, 10; Gaster, Dead Sea, p. 195) there is reference to such a record:

Moreover, because I know
that Thou dost keep a record
of every righteous spirit,
therefore have I chosen
to keep my hands unstained
according to Thy will.

in the belly of the whale is compared to Jesus' "three days and three nights in the heart of the earth."¹ The analogy is thus interpreted as a prediction of the resurrection of Jesus, and may well pre-suppose the Christian doctrine of Jesus' descent into Hades (cf. I Pt. 3:18-20).²

Chapter 13.-The third discourse, constructed on the Markan chronology, has as its topic the nature and growth of the Kingdom of Heaven; it consists of seven parables of the kingdom. The Redactor continues to follow Mk.'s order, including most of Mk. 4:1-34 in this chapter. The Parable of the Sower (vss. 1-9, Mk. 4:1-9) is followed, as in Mk., by the discourse on the reason for speaking in parables (vss. 10-15, Mk. 4:10-12); Matthew then inserts two verses from Q (vss. 16-17, Lk. 10:23-24) on the rare privilege which belongs to the disciples to see and hear the things for which prophets have longed, after which he returns to Mk. for the interpretation of the Parable of the Sower (vss. 18-23, Mk. 4:13-20). The Redactor omits the Markan Parable of the Seed Growing Secretly (4:26-29) and inserts the Parable of the Tares (vss. 24-30), which he follows by the Parable of the Mustard Seed (vss. 31-32, Mk. 4:30-32), and that of the Leaven (vs. 33, Lk. 13:20-21). The conclusion of the Markan collection of parables (4:33-34) is summarized in verse 34. Matthew adds a proof-text from Ps. 78:2 justifying the use of parables (vs. 35),

¹ Johnson, Int. Bib. VII, p. 403, sagely remarks that the Redactor "is like so many other Christians who, when they think of Jonah, can remember only the Whale."

² Ibid.; McNeile, Matthew, p. 182.

and follows with the interpretation of the Parable of the Tares (vss. 36-43); three Matthean parables come next, the Hidden Treasure (vs. 44), the Pearl of Great Price (vss. 45-46) and the Drag Net (47-50). Verses 41-50 contain an enigmatic saying on the understanding of the parables of the kingdom. The chapter is closed with a passage from Mk. (6:1-6) on the rejection at Nazareth.

The eschatological elements in this chapter are numerous and important for an understanding of Matthew's concepts. Matthew weakens the Q-saying of Jesus that the time for which prophets and kings longed is now present. He quotes the scripture (Isa. 6: 9-10) which is implicit in both Mk. (4:12) and Lk. (8:10) and then appends, from Q (Lk. 10:23-24) the passage on the special privilege which the disciples enjoy in seeing these things coming to pass. In Lk. these verses are in an eschatological context, occurring following the return of the seventy with the announcement that "even the demons are subject to us in your name." Matthew's editorial work seems to weaken the apocalyptic emphasis, but, in a sense, he alters it because he sees the disciples, (perhaps the Jewish-Christians) as having been granted special sight and hearing for understanding the "word of the kingdom" (vs. 19).

The Parable of the Tares is not a parable of Jesus, but an allegory of the end of time,¹ concerning the Judgment of the

¹McNeile, Matthew, p. 202, considers the Parable of the Tares to be a genuine parable of Jesus from M; so also Allen (Matthew, p. 150) sees it as being a part of what he calls "Logia" (Matthew's special source). On the other hand, Loisy, Origins of N. T., p. 130f, suggests that the parable has been "freely devel-

Church. The parable (vss. 24-30) and its interpretation (vss. 36-43) form a composite picture of the apocalyptic Judgment Day. The interpretation given by the Redactor assigns apocalyptic figures to the elements in the allegory. The Sower of good seed is the Son of Man;¹ the field is the world, the good seeds are the sons of the kingdom;² the weeds are "sons of the evil one"³ the enemy who sows the weed seeds is the "evil one" (the Devil),⁴

oped (from Mk. 4:26-29) if not composed entire . . ." Manson, (*Mission and Message*, p. 488) likewise regards both the parable and its interpretation as "the free composition of the Evangelist himself" rather than from source M. He says it refers to a Church which contains "genuine Christians and others, a Church which contains strict observers of the Jewish Law and others who are lax, a Church which knows the ascetic rigour of James the Just, and the scandal of Corinth." In *Teachings*, p. 222f, Manson discusses his conclusion at length pointing out the the parable has quite a few points "in common with the Markan parable" (Mk. 4:26-29), among which he includes six Greek words important to the contexts used in both passages.

Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, trans. S. H. Hooke (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, (1954) 1955), pp. 65-67, notes that the obvious point of the parable is Jesus' exhortation to patience, but Matthew misses the point completely. The Redactor, according to Jeremias, has produced the apocalyptic interpretation of a genuine parable.

¹ For the use of title "Son of Man" before the incident at Caesarea Philippi, cf. above chapter 9:18-22, and below 16:13. In this case it is definitely the apocalyptic Son of Man to which reference is made.

² The phrase "sons of the kingdom" appears in the N. T. only in Mt. 8:12 and 13:38. It is used in different senses, in the latter referring to those who are "good seed," presumably genuine Christians, and in the former it refers to the Israelites who will be in the "outer darkness" while "many from the east and west" are at table with the Patriarchs.

³ This is the only appearance of "sons of the evil one (Devil)" in the New Testament (Jeremias, *Parables*, p. 66).

⁴ In the synoptic gospels ὁ πονηρὸς appears only in Mt. 13:19 and 13:39.

the harvest¹ is the close of the age,² and the reapers are the angels of the Son of Man³ who will gather "all evil-doers" out of "his kingdom," i.e. "the kingdom of the Son of Man."⁴

¹The "Harvest" was used as a symbol of the end or consummation of the age in Jewish apocalyptic. Joel 4:13 is one example:

Put in the sickle, for the harvest is ripe,
Go in, tread, for the winepress is full.

The vats overflow, for their wickedness is great."

John the Baptist uses the harvest implement "winnowing fork" as a symbol of the Judgment; other N. T. references, Gal. 4:7f, Rev. 14:15 (Jeremias, Parables, p. 95)..

²The expression ἡ συντέλεια αἰῶνος appears five times in Mt., 13:39, 40, 49; 24:3; 28:20, (cf. infra 24:3) and only in Heb. 9:26 in the N. T. It is best translated "consummation, or completion" (Abbott-Smith, Lexicon, p. 433). To the Jews this did not necessarily mean the end of the material world, but it may well have meant the transformation of the world, the bringing of a period of history to fulfillment, characterized by the overthrow of the Devil (Manson, Mission and Message, p. 486). McNeile, Matthew, p. 201, would take issue with this, saying that the phrase corresponds directly with אֲחֵרֵי יָמֵי מָשִׁיחַ "in the last days" and seems to designate the end of the world.

³The concept of angels participating in the Judgment is not often mentioned in Rabbinical literature, but it does appear in the apocalypses. It might well have been based on Zech. 14:5d "God will come and all the holy ones with him."

Johnson notes a reference in Enoch 1:3-9 (Int. Bib. VII p. 418), and Manson, Mission and Message, p. 487, quotes from Enoch 53:5, "I saw all the angels of punishment abiding (there) and preparing all the instruments of Satan."

The idea of the "angels of the Son of Man" is peculiar to Matthew. It occurs nowhere else in the N. T. save in Mt. in 16:27, 13:41, and 24:31 in which Matthew writes "his angels," and in 25:31 "When the Son of Man come . . . and all the angels with him." In 13:39 and 49 the reference is to the angels separating evil from good, but does not specify whose angels. In 13:41 "his angels" are to collect and destroy all that is bad, while in 24:31 "his angels" are "to gather the elect."

⁴This is a most unusual concept, the expression appearing only in Mt. at 13:41 and 16:28. The kingdom of the Son of Man is replaced by the Kingdom of God. The designation is a reference to the Church. (Jeremias, Parables, p. 65, also Johnson, Int. Bib. VII, p. 418). It seems evident that this is the conception of the Church as the eschatological community preparing for the coming of God's Kingdom, the Kingdom of Son of Man could be the Messianic Davidic Kingdom.

Matthew combines two seemingly irreconcilable apocalyptic conceptions of eternal punishment in verse 42 of this parable. The evil ones will be cast into "the furnace of fire"¹ and there "men will weep and gnash their teeth."²

It is characteristic of apocalyptic literature to contrast the happy lot of the faithful with the tragic lot of the unfaithful. In verse 43 Matthew writes, "then the righteous shall shine like the sun in the kingdom of their Father." This can be compared with Daniel 12:2-3:

And many of those who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And those who are wise shall shine like the brightness of the firmament, and those who turn many to righteousness like the stars for ever and ever.³

Two parables follow to show the Kingdom as a thing so precious that no sacrifice can be too great for its realization to an individual (the parables of Hidden Treasure and of the Pearl, vss. 44-46).⁴

¹The "furnace of fire" is a phrase peculiar to Matthew appearing in 13:42, 50 and nowhere else in the N. T. (Jeremias, Parables, p. 67). Matthew uses "fire" as a metaphor for eternal punishment quite frequently (cf. supra on 5:29-30). The "furnace of fire" is an apocalyptic figure, found in IV Ezra 7:36, and in some descriptions of hell by the Rabbis (Manson, Mission and Message, p. 487).

²The "gnashing of teeth" is a characteristic apocalyptic metaphor used by Matthew. Cf. on 8:12, supra, p. 135.

³Manson, Mission and Message, p. 487 cites a parallel passage in Enoch 104:2, "But now ye shall shine as the lights of heaven, ye shall shine and ye shall be seen, and the portals of heaven shall be opened to you."

⁴Bacon, Studies, p. 121, sees a contrast in these parables and the teachings of Jesus. Jesus emphasized internal or inward values as against outward, motivation being more important than performance, while Matthew stressed present versus future values.

The Parable of the Drag Net (vss. 47-50) is again an apocalyptic allegory¹ showing that many kinds of people have been taken into the Kingdom or Church, but on the Judgment Day there will be a separation of the evil from the good. Here again we find Matthew grappling with the problem of those in the Church who do not have a righteousness exceeding that of the Scribes, hence they will need to be separated from the righteous ones.

This parable also contains what Bacon calls "a full set of the Redactor's "stereotyped eschatological phrases,"² including the consummation of the age, the angels participating in Judgment, the furnace of fire in which the condemned evil ones will weep and gnash their teeth. (Cf. supra on the Parable of the Tares, vss. 24-30, 36-43).

Some positive identification of Matthew's conception of the relationship of Judaism and Christianity is seen in verses 51-52. At the close of the seven parables of the Kingdom, Jesus asks if the disciples understand it all. When they reply in the

¹It would seem Rudolph Otto, The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man, trans. F. V. Filson and B. L. Woolf (Rev. ed; London: Lutterworth Press, 1943), pp. 99-102, is correct in seeing vs. 47 only as containing something of Jesus original parable stressing the all-inclusive nature of the Kingdom. The remainder is application and expansion, either by the Jewish-Christian Church or by the Redactor. Manson, Mission and Message, p. 489, thinks it is the work of the later Christian community. Bacon, Studies, p. 129, says that this parable along with that of the Hidden Treasure and the Pearl came directly from Oral Tradition into the Redactor's hands for inclusion.

It is improper to the purpose of this study to discuss the "curious missionary work which wins people only in order to reject them immediately" as does Manson, Mission and Message, p. 489. The passage is presented as a simple analogy of fishermen separating edible from inedible, which compares to the picture of the Last Judgment.

²Studies, p. 129.

affirmative, he replies

Therefore every scribe who has been trained for the kingdom of heaven is like a householder who brings out of his treasure what is new and what is old.¹

The "scribe" of the kingdom of heaven, or the leader of the Church looking forward to the kingdom of heaven, must teach of what is old--the riches of the Old Testament and Oral Tradition--and what is new--the new interpretation of the Law made by Jesus, or that which His parables had revealed which had been "hidden since the foundation of the world" (vs. 35).

Chapter 14.--The chapter has little of eschatological import in the editorial matter of Matthew. It contains material from Mk. 6: Herod's opinion of Jesus, revealing the death of the Baptist (vss. 1-12, Mk. 6:14-29), the feeding of the five thousand (vss. 13-21, Mk. 6:30-44), the incident of Jesus walking on the water (vss. 22-27, Mk. 6:45-52) with the Matthaean addition of Peter's attempt to walk to meet Him (vss. 28-33), and the landing at Gennesaret, with the subsequent healings of all who were brought to him (vss. 34-36, Mk. 6:55-56).

The incident of Peter impulsively walking out of the boat to meet Jesus on the water (vss. 28-33) is one of "the Targum-like stories with which Matthew embellishes Mark's narrative."² It is no doubt from source N. The passage to be noted here is in verse 33, after Jesus rescues Peter and they both walk

¹Bacon, Studies, p. 131, sees this passage as "an unconscious portrait" of the Redactor.

²Ibid., p. 298.

over and get into the boat, "those in the boat worshipped him, saying, 'Truly you are the Son of God'." On the surface, Bates would appear to be right when he says this is an honest recognition by the disciples that Jesus was more than human, although they were not yet sure that he was the Messiah.¹ But this is to ignore the fact that Matthew has already acknowledged Jesus to be Son of David and Son of Man.

The second Psalm is "generally reckoned the principal biblical source of the designations 'Son of God' and 'Anointed' as applied to the King of the Messianic Age."² In this Psalm the Lord's "anointed" (vs. 2) is the king whom the Lord has set "on Zion, my holy hill" (vs. 6); this king is called "God's son" in verse 7, "You are my son, today I have begotten you." This anointed one shall have universal dominion, an inheritance from God; for God says to him, "Ask of me, and I will make the nations your heritage, and the ends of the earth your possession."³ The relationship between "Messiah" ("Anointed") and "Son of God" would seem to be plain enough in this Psalm, although there is no assurance that the relationship was commonly

¹W. R. Bates, "The Relation of the Messianic Kingdom to the Kingdom of God in the Gospel of Matthew" (unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1951), p. 225. If they had recognized Jesus "Matthew probably would have used ὁ Χριστός to express this belief since that was the term Jews used for Messiah."

²Dalman, Words, p. 268.

³It is interesting to note that Dr. Pfeiffer sees this Psalm (vss. 1-10) as an acrostic composed in 103 BC to commemorate the marriage of Alexander Jannaeus to Alexandra. (Int. O.T. p. 630). While the Psalm may not have been written as a Messianic Psalm originally, it took on Messianic proportions, in early Christian circles, if not before.

thought of in Jewish circles. Mowinckel, following Dalman, says "it is most improbable that the Jews ever called the Messiah the 'Son of God'."¹

Although Matthew uses this designation very seldom, yet his uses are such that one is convinced that he equated the term with Messiah. The synoptic tradition is uniform in its testimony at several key points: the baptism and the transfiguration are climaxed by the voice from heaven claiming Jesus as Son; all three gospels testify that the demoniacs named Jesus "the Son of God" (Mt. 8:29 - Mk. 5:7 - Lk. 8:28; Mk. 3:11 - Lk. 4:41). Dalman points out that in Lk. 4:41 it is evident that Luke, at least, regards "Son of God" as simply a synonym for "The Christ."²

The Redactor, in addition to the passage under consideration, uses the title "Son of God" in 16:16 on the lips of Peter addressing Jesus, "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God" (Mk. 8:29, "You are the Christ," Lk. 9:20, "The Christ of God"); at 26:63 the High Priest asks Jesus, "Tell us if you are the Christ, the Son of God" (Mk. 14:61, "are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?", Lk. 22:67, "If you are the Christ, tell us."); and in the taunts addressed to Jesus on the cross, 27:40, "If you are the Son of God, come down," (Mk. does not contain this conditional clause, Lk. 22:34, "If he is the Christ of God, his

¹Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, p. 293. C. J. Cadoux, *The Names of Jesus* (New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc., 1953), p. 53f, takes issue with Dalman by suggesting that in the time of Christ it is possible that "Psalm 2:7 was interpreted Messianically in certain circles . . . (and) that, in reaction to Christian interpretations, the Rabbis tended to explain Psa. 2:7 otherwise."

²Dalman, *Words*, p. 275.

Chosen One"). It is apparent, in all of these examples, that for Matthew "Son of God" was the equivalent of "Christ."¹

Chapter 15.-The Redactor follows Mk. 7:1-8:10 with considerable re-writing, refining, and adding of his own material. The chapter contains the controversy with the Pharisees over ritual purity (vss. 1-20, Mk. 7:1-23), the incident of the appeal of the Canaanite Woman in the district of Tyre and Sidon (vss. 21-28, Mk. 7:24-30), a substitution of a general passage (vss. 29-31) on the healing of many persons for Mk. 7:31-37, (the healing of a deaf-mute) and the feeding of the four thousand (vss. 32-39, Mk. 8:1-10).

Matthew adds two verses to the discussion on ritual purity in which the disciples, having reported that the Pharisees had taken offense at Jesus' words, were told "Every plant which my heavenly Father has not planted will be rooted up" (vss. 12-13). The Redactor then inserts an adaptation of the Q-saying on the inability of the blind to lead the blind (Lk. 6:39) making it refer specifically to the Pharisees. One recalls here the prophetic idea of God's people as a vineyard (Isa. 5) or as a garden. Manson says the idea goes back to Isaiah 60:21, "Your people shall be righteous . . . the shoot of my planting, the work of my hands, that I might be glorified." (R.S.V.)² In

¹Montefiore, Synoptic Gospels II, p. 220, says that in Matthew "Son of God equals Messiah."

²Manson, Mission and Message, p. 491. One is reminded also of Pss. Sol. 14:2f, "The Saints of the Lord shall live therein for ever: the garden of the Lord, even the trees of life, such are his saints. The planting of them is rooted for ever; they shall not be plucked out all the days of the heaven."

Rabbinical literature the pious Israelites are pictured as God's planting. Matthew here applies this saying to the Pharisees who, he says, are weeds in the garden of God. The eschatological significance of this passage lies in the reference to the Judgment. Matthew might well be saying here that the Pharisaic and Rabbinic ordinances will be destroyed while the Law will be maintained.¹ This seems to be true especially in light of Matthew's closing sentence in the passage, "but to eat with unwashed hands does not defile a man," which, McNeile says, "is aimed not against the Mosaic law, but against the scribal tradition."²

The meeting of Jesus with the Syro-Phoenician woman (Mk. 7:24-30) is re-written by Matthew³ so that the major es-

¹Montefiore, Synoptic Gospels, II p. 224.

²McNeile, Matthew, p. 229.

³In Mk. Jesus traveled into Gentile territory and had entered a house when he was accosted by the woman. In Mt. the woman came out to Jesus who was still in Galilee (cf. vs. 22). McNeile, Matthew, p. 230. Allen says of this, "It can hardly be unintentional that Matthew omits the statement that Jesus entered a house in this heathen territory, and represents the woman as coming out of those boundaries to Jesus" (Matthew, p. 168). Manson assigns this material to the M source and notes that this change might well reflect M's attitude toward foreigners, especially in light of the Mission Charge (10:5f), (Mission and Message, p. 492). Kilpatrick, Origins, p. 115, suggests that vs. 23, in which Jesus, at first refusing to consider the woman's request for healing for her daughter until the disciples begged him to send her away, states that he was sent only to Israel, might well "represent the unwillingness of the original Jewish church to embark on the mission to the Gentiles, and then vss. 25-28 [in which Jesus, fully appreciating the woman's faith, heals her daughter] would recall that the Gentiles overcame this reluctance."

This passage has been worked over thoroughly by the Redactor. Manson notes that "the whole passage is remarkable for its small amount of agreement with Mk., except in the dialogue," vss. 26-27 with Mk. 7:27-28. He suggests that perhaps Matthew conflated his own special source with Mk., hence it is reasonable

chatological emphasis is a re-inforcement of Matthew's position that Jesus' mission was limited to the "lost sheep of the house of Israel," a claim strengthened by this Gentile woman's recognition of Jesus as Messiah.¹ (Vss. 21-28.)

Johnson suggests that the healings in verses 29-31 are a deliberate repetition, "What was done among Jews (9:1-8, 27-33) is now repeated among Gentiles who glorify the God of Israel," but in light of the above interpretation of the preceding passage this hardly seems to have been Matthew's purpose;² it rests only on the phrase, "they glorified the God of Israel." McNeile notes that the phrase does suggest that the crowd was Gentile³ but Matthew's omission of the geographic notes in Mk. 7:31, which shows Jesus making the journey along the northern route through Gentile territory from Sidon to Caesarea Philippi, seems to over-balance the implication.

Chapter 16.-Matthew has been following the Markan chronology and using Markan materials, in the main, since the closing verses of chapter 13. In this chapter he uses Mk. 8:11-9:1 in combination with M, including the Pharisees and Sadducees seeking a sign from Jesus (vss. 1-4, Mk. 8:11-13), Jesus' discussion

to assume, he says that the major parts of vss. 22-25 are from M (Mission and Message, p. 492; cf. Streeter, Four Gospels, p.260).

¹The woman is made to acknowledge, in Mt. only, that she recognizes Jesus as the Jewish Messiah, as she addresses him as "O Lord, Son of David."

²Int. Bib. VII, p. 443.

³Matthew, p. 232.

on "the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees" with his disciples (vss. 5-12, Mk. 8:14-21), the Confession at Caesarea Philippi with the first prediction of suffering (vss. 13-23, Mk. 8:27-33), and the saying on self-denial leading to reward from the Son of Man (vss. 24-28, Mk. 8:34-9:1), but omitting the healing of the blind man at Bethsaida (Mk. 8:22-26).

One of Matthew's editorial additions to the Confession at Caesarea Philippi is such that the phrasing of the question put by Jesus anticipates the answer. The Redactor replaces "I" (Mk. 8:27) with "the Son of Man,"¹ so that there is no doubt in Jesus' mind when he asks the question. Matthew gives Peter's reply as "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God" (cf. supra p. 173, on "Son of God").²

The Redactor next inserts the famous passage giving the authority for the primacy of Peter in the Church (vss. 17-19).³ Of most importance in this passage is the introduction of the

¹Some MSS put "son of Man" in apposition to "I" which is retained (C D W Θ etc.), but the evidence for deletion of "I" is very strong (NB, vg. sa. bo.).

²Howard Teeple, JBL Monograph Vol. X, p. 10, thinks that Matthew's identification of Jesus with Jeremiah (vs. 14) "may not be an invention of the author's but rather his record of an oral tradition" that in some Jewish circles Jeremiah was the expected eschatological prophet.

³Johnson, Int. Bib. VII, p. 451 raises the very plausible theory that this passage is the Petrine answer to Paul's claim of an authority received directly from Jesus. (Gal. 1:16-17, "when God was pleased to reveal his Son to me . . . I did not confer with flesh and blood.") Here in Matthew Jesus says, "For flesh and blood has not revealed this to you but my Father who is in heaven" (vs. 17). "Here, no doubt, the church of Syria answers that its apostle Peter also received his gospel and apostleship, not through flesh and blood, but by direct, divine revelation."

word ἑκκλησία, the word for "church" which does not appear in the Gospels except at this point and in Mt. 18:17. Jesus says that he will found his ἑκκλησία "on this rock." McNeile suggests what seems to be the correct interpretation. It is not on Peter that the Church is founded, but on the "bed-rock of the Lord's Messiahship," to which testimony has just been given by Peter (vs. 16). There is an obvious play on words, Πέτρος (stone, boulder)--the nickname for Simon¹--suggesting πέτρα (rock, as ledge). The interpretation that Jesus implied he was founding the Church upon Peter makes the Greek construction a bit strange: the very personal σου εἰς Πέτρος is followed by the very indirect καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ.² The construction could be explained satisfactorily if Jesus turned from addressing Peter directly to speak to the others about Peter. Allen's postulation is convincing to the writer: it is based on the idea that "the πέτρα is equivalent to the object of ἀπεκαλύψε of vs. 17." That is, "upon this rock" refers back in the preceding sentence to the object of "revealed" in the phrase "flesh and blood has not revealed this to you." Thus, "flesh and blood" did not reveal "the Messiahship and divine Sonship of Christ."

The play upon πέτρα and Πέτρος means, "You have given expression to a revealed truth, and your name Πέτρος suggests a metaphorical name for it. It shall be the πέτρα or

¹The Apostle's name was probably Simon bar Jonah (Mt. 16:17), but he was affectionately called "the rock." כֶּפֶז or Cephus is the Hebrew-Aramaic equivalent for Πέτρος. Apparently the word was little used as a proper name--F. H. Chase, Hastings DOB III, p. 756, finds little evidence that either the Hebrew or Greek words were so-used in any other case. Matthew's first mention of the Apostle is "Simon, who is called Peter" (4:18). These facts combine to justify the conclusion that "Peter" was a nickname for Simon.

²McNeile, Matthew, p. 241.

rock upon which the Church shall stand.¹

This is not the usual or popular interpretation of this verse, it generally being assumed that Matthew, in strengthening the position of Peter in the church, as discussed above, p.178,n.3, recorded this passage from a tradition which proved that Jesus had given Peter primary authority,² but it is given further support by the discussion which follows.

The Church, founded upon the Messiahship of Jesus, is the "People of God" (cf. Detached Note D, p. 241). Peter is given the "keys of the kingdom" with power "to bind" and "to loose" on earth. These are technical Rabbinical terms for "forbidden" and "permitted." A teacher of the law could, "on the strength of his expert knowledge of the oral tradition, declare some action or thing 'bound' i.e. forbidden, or 'loosed,' i.e. permitted."

The apostle would, in the coming Kingdom, be like a great scribe or Rabbi, who would deliver decisions on the basis, not of the Jewish law, but of the teaching of Jesus, which 'fulfilled' it. His decisions on earth would be endorsed 'in heaven,' i.e. by God.³

¹Allen, Matthew, p. 241.

²Cf. Johnson, Int. Bib. VII, p. 452; Montefiore, Synoptic Gospels II, p. 234; Micklem, Matthew, p. 166. Johnson (also Micklem) quotes a passage from Rabbinical writings in support of the claim that the Church was founded "upon a man of Peter's character." Johnson paraphrases the passage as follows:

A certain king (i.e. God) desired to erect a building, but as he dug down he found only morasses: at last he found a rock (i.e. Abraham), and on this he was able to lay his foundations."

The passage seems rather to support the position of McNeile that it was upon the "Messiahship of Jesus" that it was founded, for Matthew relates Jesus to both Moses and Abraham, and the parallel seems obvious that, as Israel was founded on Abraham, so the Church or New Israel was founded upon Jesus, the Christ.

³McNeile, Matthew, p. 243.

Matthew is thus relating the Church as the entrance to the Kingdom of Heaven. Bultmann is not far wrong when he suggests that the Church was first the "eschatological congregation."

By designating itself Congregation --more exactly Congregation of God . . . --the earliest Church declared that it itself was the fulfillment of the hopes of the apocalyptists.¹

Matthew (vs. 20) re-writes Mk. 8:30 so that Jesus charged his disciples "to tell no one that he was the Christ."

Verse 27 presents an interesting insight into the Redactor's eschatology. Jesus has spoken of the absolute necessity of self-denial even to the point of giving up life for his sake. Matthew alters Mk. 8:38 as follows:

Mk. 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.

Mt. 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 man for what he has done.

Matthew emphasizes Jesus, the Son of Man's divine authority by adding the pronoun "his" so that He is to come with his angels.

The underlined portion of the verse (27) perhaps is better translated "and then he will repay (or recompense--ἀποδώσει) each one according to his deeds" (πραξιν).² It refers to the Judgment.³

¹R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, trans. Kendrick Grobel, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1954), I, p. 37.

²The verb ἀποδίδομι can be translated "both in good and bad senses" (Abbott-Smith, Lexicon, p. 49).

³One is reminded of passages in Enoch (Parables), e.g. this verse: "On that day Mine Elect One will sit on the throne of glory and make choice amongst their deeds" (45:3).

Matthew makes a subtle editorial change in verse 28

to lend a definitely apocalyptic interpretation.

Mt. 16:28

Truly I say to you, there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.

Mk. 9:1

Truly I say to you, there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see the kingdom of God come with power.

Lk. 9:27

But I tell you truly, there are some standing here who will not taste of death before they see the kingdom of God.

Chapter 17.-Mk. 9:2-29 furnishes material for this chapter containing the Transfiguration (vss. 1-8, Mk. 9:2-8), the sayings on the coming of Elijah (vss. 9-13, Mk. 9:9-13), and the healing of the epileptic child at the foot of the "mount of transfiguration" (vss. 14-23, Mk. 9:14-29). The chapter is closed by the narrative on the payment of the temple tax, assigned to N.

Although there is much of eschatological import in this chapter there is very little due to the editorial activity of Matthew; he is using Markan material with few eschatologically significant changes. He does make more definite the vague statement in Mk. 9:13 that "Elijah has come," by the addition of verse 13, "Then the disciples understood that he was speaking to them of John the Baptist."

There are two places in this chapter in which Matthew exhibits what seems to have been a characteristic editorial change: in the references to the resurrection of Jesus he always changes the active voice of the verb to the passive, so that "he will rise" becomes "he will be raised" (cf. 16:21; 17:9, 23; 20:19). Johnson notes that "the earliest Christian doctrine

was that Jesus was raised up by God (cf. Acts 2:24), not that he arose."¹

The Matthaean narrative of the temple tax reflects a condition and time in which the Jewish-Christians were perhaps beginning to question the necessity of conforming to Jewish law, the temple tax being a case in point. It has no eschatological significance.

Chapter 18.—The fourth discourse is "On the Nature of the Christian Fellowship."² The first nine verses are dependent pretty largely on Mk: the question of who is greatest "in the kingdom of heaven" (vss. 1-5, Mk. 9:33-37), and the teaching on resisting temptation (vss. 5-9, Mk. 9:42-48). Manson says that the remaining portion, verses 10-35, is a "solid block of M-material,"³ containing the Parable of the Lost Sheep (vss. 10-14), the sayings on excommunication or breach of fellowship (vss. 13-20), the question of continued forgiveness for multiple wrongdoings (vss. 21-22), and the Parable of the Unmerciful steward (vss. 23-35).

¹Int. Bib. VII, p. 461.

²Manson, Mission and Message, p. 498.

³Ibid. Scholars disagree with this conclusion at some specific points, e.g., Johnson, Int. Bib. VII, p. 471, feels that verses 10-14, "The Lost Sheep" can be "accounted for by Matthew's usual editorial methods." Kilpatrick, Origins, pp. 28^f, likewise thinks the parable is a free adaptation of the Q parable. But aside from some similarities in themes in the "Lost Sheep" parable, and in the passage on forgiveness for multiple wrongdoing (vss. 21-22), to materials in Q, Manson's conclusion is held to be valid.

The entire chapter seems to be written on the one topic of the "Nature of the Fellowship" in kingdom or church, a theme which is enlarged by discussion of the necessity for humility, of the danger of leading others into temptation and the equal danger of yielding to it and of being consigned thereby to eternal fire, of the fact that the Father desires that not one should be lost, or separated from the fellowship. However, there are situations in which reconciliation with an erring brother is impossible because of his refusal; in these cases the church can decide on excommunication. So necessary is the need for reconciliation of every "little one" that forgiveness and patience are to be unlimited, in fact forgiveness from the heart is needed to satisfy the demands of the Father. The unity of the theme leads to the obvious conclusion that Matthew has here made membership in the Church a pre-requisite to membership in the Kingdom of Heaven. Those in the Church will enter the Kingdom.¹

In verse 1 he lists the question of the disciples as "Who is greatest in the kingdom of heaven?" whereas Mk. and Lk. report that they had been discussing who among them was greatest.²

The phrase "into life" (vss. 8,9) replaces "into the Kingdom" of Mk. 9:47 so that one is led to believe that to Matthew

¹Bultmann's phrase is significant here, the "ecclesia is the vestibule, so to say, of God's Reign that is shortly to appear." (Theology N. T., I, p. 37).

²Montefiore, Synoptic Gospels II, p. 247, notes that the use of the present tense in the question "must be supposed to refer to the future. The Kingdom is future." This would be correct, technically in view of verse 3, "unless you turn and become like children you will never enter the kingdom of heaven."

"life," "eternal life" (cf. 19:16, 29) and "kingdom of heaven" represent the same thing.¹

Matthew's emphasis that the church and the disciples have the disciplinary power to excommunicate sinful and unrepentant members (vss. 15-20) has eschatological significance for the action shall be valid even in heaven. Brownlee points out the significant similarity between verse 16 of this passage, stipulating that one must "take one or two others along . . . that every word may be confirmed by the evidence of two or three witnesses,"² and the regulation for dealing with offending brothers (cf. Man. Disc. v, 26-vi, 1) which provides that a man must reprove his brother before witnesses before bringing an accusation in the presence of "the Many."³ This would again seem to bear out the suggestion that the Church is considered as the "eschatological community," in this case because of the parallel with the Qumran eschatological community.

Chapter 19.-Matthew closes Book IV and with the characteristic formula (19:1, cf. 7:28, 11:1), which makes the transition to the last major section of the narrative and discourse. In this chapter again Matthew follows the Markan order, supplementing the teaching on marriage and divorce (vss. 3-9, Mk. 10:1-4) with the M passage on celibacy, following along with the

¹McNeile, Matthew, p. 262.

²Montefiore reminds us that this stipulation is according to the rule of Deut. 19:15 (Synoptic Gospels II, p. 251).

³W. H. Brownlee, "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline," (BASOR, S. S., 1951), p. 23, n. 3.

saying concerning children and the kingdom (vss. 10-15, Mk. 13-16), and closing the chapter with the story of the wealthy young man who came seeking knowledge of the way to inherit eternal life, with its accompanying sayings on the question "who then can be saved?" (vss. 16-30, Mk. 10:17-31).

One major point will be brought up for discussion in this chapter. Verse 28 presents a number of very interesting and significant problems. Peter, questioning Jesus concerning the kingdom, notes that the disciples have given up everything to follow Jesus and asks, "What then shall we have?"

Mt. 19:28

Truly I say to you, in the new world, when the Son of Man shall sit on his glorious throne, you who have followed me will also sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

Lk. 22:28-30

You are those who have continued with me in my trials; as my Father appointed a kingdom for me, so do I appoint for you that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

The context is not the same in Lk., for this passage comes in the table discourse at the Last Supper.¹ Bacon feels that both setting and content of the Lukan passage are more nearly representative of Jesus' intent. The prophetic eschatology included the judgment of the twelve tribes; and the Pass-over rejoicings, in the mind of Jesus, would include looking forward to this as the fulfillment of the prophetic ideal.

¹Streeter notes that neither of these passages are found in the Q context, and that apart from the sitting on the thrones and the judging of the twelve tribes, there are no points of contact between the two passages. "We naturally," he concludes, "assign the two versions to M and L" (Four Gospels, p. 288). Cf. also Manson, Mission and Message, p. 508.

This phase precedes the apocalyptic end¹ and is named the "pre-parousia era" by Wilder.²

The Greek phrase ἐν τη παλιγγενεσία does not appear elsewhere in any of the gospels.³ It is a technical term in Stoic philosophy for the beginning of a new cycle or era in the cosmic process. Dalman says that the term "is distinctly Greek and cannot be literally translated either into Hebrew or Aramaic."⁴ Josephus used the phrase to refer to the restoration of Judah after the return from Babylonia⁵ and Philo employed it of the rebirth of the earth following the flood and of its restoration after destruction by fire.⁶ It is best translated as "renewal, regeneration, rebirth,"⁷ and has definite relationship to the idea of "a new heaven and a new earth" of apocalyptic eschatology.⁸

¹Bacon, Studies, p. 421.

²A. N. Wilder, Eschatology and Ethics in the Teachings of Jesus (rev. ed.; New York: Harper & Brothers, 1939, 1950), p. 108.

³The only other use of this word in the New Testament is in Titus 3:5 where it refers to spiritual regeneration (Abbott-Smith, Lexicon, p. 335).

⁴Words, p. 177.

⁵McNeile, Matthew, p. 281.

⁶Montefiore, Synoptic Gospels, II, p. 270; Allen, Matthew, p. 212.

⁷Abbott-Smith, Lexicon, p. 335. ("New world" of R.S.V. seems an adequate representation of the meaning.)

⁸A parallel thought with reference to "the new world" appears in Man. Disc. iv,25.

Thus far, the spirits of truth and perversity have been struggling in the heart of man For God has apportioned them in equal measure until the final age, until 'He makes all things new.' (Gaster, Dead Sea, p. 46.)

The "throne of glory," according to Jewish belief, is one of those things which were in existence before the creation of the world;¹ it is the throne of God. The only writing in all Jewish literature in which someone other than God is seen occupying God's throne of glory or "the glorious throne" is the Parables of Enoch. The "Elect One" sits on the throne, placed there by God Himself (cf. Enoch 51:3, 55:4, 61:8). Enoch 45:3 is quoted by Manson: "On that day Mine Elect One shall sit on the throne of glory and shall try their works."² Matthew uses the phrase again in 25:31, the Judgment Scene.

One aspect of the palingenesis is the restoration of the Twelve Tribes of Israel to the ideal state. The "judgment" of the tribes by those who sit on the twelve thrones may express the concept of "governing" or "ruling."³ McNeile points out that in the Old Testament $\kappa\rho\iota\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$ often means "to govern," for besides being used for שָׁפַט (to judge or administer justice) it is often used for שָׁרַף (to rule, govern or punish) in the LXX.⁴ This could well refer, then, to the Messianic Kingdom on earth, the restoration of Israel, except for the fact that the Redactor has used a term to preface the judgment which is obviously apocalyptic and refers to the "new world." Manson points out that in some Rabbinical literature righteous Israelites are seen assist-

¹Manson, Mission and Message, p. 542.

²Ibid., p. 509.

³Montefiore, Synoptic Gospels, II, p. 270.

⁴Matthew, p. 282.

ing in the Last Judgment.¹

An editorial change in verse 29b would tend to support the idea that the reference is to the Last Judgment. Matthew changes Mk.'s phrase "and in the age to come eternal life" to "and inherit eternal life." Obviously this change is necessary because verse 28 already has mentioned the Judgment at the end of the age, and the beginning of the new age.

Chapter 20.--The first sixteen verses of this chapter continue the discussion of the question of "who then shall be saved?" The parable of the Workers in the Vineyard from M is enclosed in the Redactor's comment that "the first shall be last and the last first" (19:30, 20:16). Matthew then follows along in the Markan material with the third prediction of suffering by Jesus (vss. 17-19, Mk. 10:32-34), the request for special privilege by the (mother of the) Sons of Zebedee (vss. 20-28, Mk. 10:35-45), and the healing of two blind men on the Jericho Road (vss. 29-34, M., 10:46-52--the Healing of Bartimaeus).

The most significant portion of this chapter for the purposes of this paper is the parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard (vss. 1-16). It is apparent the parable, if originally the words of Jesus, meant something different than the meaning implied in its prelude and postlude, "The last will be first and the first last." The principle of the parable is that the unmerited grace of God is the only basis of admission

¹Mission and Message, p. 509.

to life eternal.¹ It is pretty generally agreed that M is the source for this material² but that Matthew re-interpreted or mis-interpreted it for his own purposes. Bacon points out that the principle of grace was not a principle of Matthew:

Of the many paradoxes of Jesus' teaching none, perhaps, was more unacceptable to post-apostolic neo-legalism than the doctrine of unmerited grace.³

Manson makes the suggestion that Matthew might very well have seen in this parable the review of the whole history of Israel's relation to God's plan for His people: the first workers could be the Fathers, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob; next the Jews, and then those at the eleventh hour could represent John the Baptist, Jesus, and the Christians. The end of the day is the end of the age; labor is ended, reward is come.⁴

To Matthew the parable means that early or late, those who are in the Christian community will receive the same reward, eternal life; all believers will be treated alike. There is, in one sense, a parallel between the moment of reward in this parable, and the judgment scene in chapter 25. In 25:31 the

¹Bacon, Studies, p. 128; Montefiore, Synoptic Gospels, II, p. 273; Manson, Mission and Message, p. 510. Jeremias, Parables, p. 27, claims that this parable comes from Jesus who told it to vindicate the gospel of love before its critics. The Pharisees, who opposed the good news, are thus shown that Jesus is justified in associating with the despised and the outcast persons because God is good, full of compassion for the poor. This seems a bit far-fetched to me, though conceivably it might reproduce the original historical context.

²Manson, Mission and Message, p. 511; Kilpatrick, Origins, p. 35; but Johnson disagrees saying that it does not seem to contain "M" characteristics (Int. Bib. VII, p. 239).

³Studies, p. 128.

⁴Manson, Mission and Message, p. 511.

verdicts are given, not by God but by the Son of Man; in this parable, the owner commissioned his steward to render the wages to the workers.¹

Chapter 21.—The Markan report of the entry into Jerusalem and the subsequent beginning of the discussions and controversies with the authorities, is followed closely in this chapter, but the hand of the Redactor rests heavily on the material in spots. The chapter contains the entry into Jerusalem (vss. 1-9, Mk. 11:1-10), the cleansing of the Temple to which Matthew adds incidents of healing and the acclaim of children (vss. 10-17, Mk. 11:11-19), the cursing of the fig tree (vss. 18-22, compressing the before-and-after incidents of Mk. 11:12-14, 20-25 into one), the questioning of the source of the authority of Jesus (vss. 23-27, Mk. 11:27-33), and, before the Markan Parable of the Wicked Tenants (vss. 33-46, Mk. 12:1-12), the Redactor inserts the Parable of the Two Sons (vss. 28-32, from M).

Matthew alone records the proof text which explains messianically the symbolic action of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem. McNeile speculates that by placing the quotation from Zech. 9:9 at the point in the story in which Jesus is instructing his disciples concerning the bringing of an ass (and colt) rather than at a later point in connection with the ride itself, the Redactor seems "to suggest that the Lord Himself had the words in mind."²

¹Manson, Mission and Message, p. 511.

²McNeile, Matthew, p. 294.

That this passage (Zech. 9:9) could have had messianic significance in the time of Jesus is testified by Klausner who says of it, "As early as the Tannaitic period¹ not only Zech. 9 but also Gen. 49 were interpreted as referring to King Messiah."² It is significant in Matthew's record of the "Entry" that "most of the crowd" spread garments and branches on the road and that "the crowds" hailed Jesus as Messiah, "the Son of David;" in Mk. it is left a bit uncertain just who spread garments and branches on the road, and who sang "Blessed be the kingdom of our father David that is coming" (Mk. 11:10), whether the retinue of Jesus or an accumulated crowd of onlookers. By this clarification the Redactor says that the people recognized immediately that Jesus, in this action, was fulfilling messianic prophecy.

Montefiore says of verses 10-11, which are peculiar to Matthew, that the record of the excited crowds' making answer to queries, by saying "This is the prophet Jesus from Nazareth of Galilee" has made some scholars deduce that "this is no Messianic entry," that Jesus made no claim to be Messiah. But he concludes that probably Matthew "chose the wording which appeared to him most in conformity with probability and with the Galilean antecedents of the preaching of the Gospel."³ It would seem rather that the Redactor is claiming that Jesus fulfilled not

¹The period of the Tannaim (teachers); namely, the period beginning with Hillel and Shammai (30 B.C.-10 A.D.) and ending with the final redaction of the Mishnah (ca. 200 A.D.)." Klausner, Idea, 388.

²Klausner, Idea, 439.

³Synoptic Gospels, II, p. 280.

only the expectation of the coming Messiah, Son of David, but of the coming of the "Mosaic eschatological prophet" as well.¹

The crowds follow Jesus into the city and their enthusiasm seems unabated as Jesus enters the Temple. This change makes the cleansing of the Temple understandable as it occurs at the height of the public enthusiasm for Jesus. Immediately after the Temple is cleared Jesus healed blind and lame persons. These "wonderful things," and the fact that children surrounding Jesus were crying "Hosanna² to the Son of David," brought forth an indignant protest from the "chief priests and scribes," providing the setting for the use of another proof text, a quote from Ps. 8:3 (LXX). Psalm 8 is one, says McNeile, which the Christians very early learned to interpret messianically.³

Matthew next has assembled three parables dealing with the theme that the leaders of Judaism will be replaced, because of their unbelief and their unworthiness in leadership, by the lowly, the dispossessed, the sinners (21:28-22:10). This rejection of the official teachers and leaders of Israel is occasioned by the controversy over the source and nature of Jesus' authority (vss. 23-28).⁴

¹Cf. Teeple, JBL Monograph, Vol. X, for a description of this aspect of the messianic hope.

²The term "Hosanna" means "Save now!" Matthew uses it as if it means "hail" or "welcome," a cry of acclamation and praise perhaps because it lends itself to the quote from Psalm 8 about "perfect praise" from the mouth of babes.

³Matthew, p. 301.

⁴Ibid., p. 306, also Montefiore, Synoptic Gospels, II, p. 283.

The first of these, the Parable of the Two Sons, is from M, perhaps included at this point following the reference to John the Baptist in verses 23-27, by reason of its application to the Baptist (vs. 32), and also because of its direct implication that those who were questioning Jesus in unbelief would not enter the kingdom.

The hand of the Redactor is seen at work in the Parable of the Wicked Tenants (vss. 33-46). Jeremias sees the process of allegorization at work in the three records of this parable in the Synoptics. The original meaning might well have been the attempt of Jesus to justify the offering of the gospel to the poor and dispossessed. The tenants in God's vineyard, or the leaders of Israel, have opposed God's plan, have not returned produce or fruits, therefore the vineyard will be given to others. In Lk. (20:9-19) the parable "retains the features of a simple story." Three servants are sent, one at a time: the first is beaten, the second is beaten and insulted, and the third is wounded. There does not seem to be an allegorical meaning suggested or apparent. Mk. likewise shows three servants being sent singly: first is beaten, second is wounded in head and insulted, and the third is killed. But, says Jeremias, Mark adds a note of allegorization in verse 5b with reference to "many others" being sent some of whom were beaten and some killed. This verse is an expansion.¹

Thus we see that the process of allegorization from its

¹Jeremias, Parables, p. 56f.

original simplicity, begun in the pre-Markan sources,¹ considered the servants as symbolizing the prophets, and the son as Christ. Jeremias continues by showing that Matthew completely allegorizes the parable. In the sending of the servants (vss. 34-35), first a number of servants are sent, some of whom are stoned, some killed, others ill-treated; second a larger group is sent and these receive similar treatment. Matthew sees, in these two missions, "the earlier and later prophets." Further than this, Matthew's version of the Parable is "an exact outline of the story of redemption, from the covenant at Sinai (. . .), embracing the founding of the Gentile Church, and passing on to the Last Judgment."²

Jeremias is incorrect on the question of "the founding of the Gentile Church." In verse 43, ἔθνε: does not refer to the Gentiles, but to a "people," τὸ ἔθνος in the singular being translated as a "nation" or "people" not "the Gentiles."³ Johnson notes the rabbis had taught "that in previous ages the kingdom had been taken away from Israel because of its unfaithfulness."⁴ Matthew is here justifying his claim that the Christian Church has replaced Judaism in the favor of God. The Kingdom of

¹Jeremias, Parables, p. 60. The author does not explain how Luke was able to produce the simpler, more primitive version of the story.

²Ibid. Sherman Johnson, Int. Bib. VII, p. 511, supports Jeremias view of the nature of the allegory.

³Abbot-Smith, p. 129. "The ἔθνος is the Israel of the future" (McNeile, Matthew, p. 312).

⁴Int. Bib. VII, p. 514.

God¹ will be given to a people producing fruit of righteousness.

Chapter 22.--The third parable in the trilogy concerning the dispossession of the Jews is the Parable of the Marriage Feast (vss. 1-14). This is followed by the short parable of the "Wedding Garment" (vss. 11-14) after which Matthew uses most of the remainder of Mk. 12, including the controversial questions by which the Jewish leaders sought to ensnare Jesus: the question of paying tribute to Caesar (vss. 15-22, Mk. 12:13-17), that concerning the Resurrection (vss. 23-33, Mk. 12:18-27), and the query about which is "the Great Commandment." Matthew closes the chapter with Jesus' question "What do you think of Christ, whose son is he?" (vss. 41-46, Mk. 12:35-37a).

In the Parable of the Marriage Feast one sees the strong hand of the Redactor. Manson points out that in verses 1-10 there are four significant points of contact with the similar "Parable of the Great Banquet" in Lk. 14:16-24:

1. A man orders a feast and sends out invitations.
2. His invited guests refuse to honor the invitations,

¹Allen, Matthew, p. 227, 232, notes that in 21:31 by the deliberate use of Kingdom of God (cf. supra, p. 162) the Redactor does not refer to the eschatological kingdom, but rather to "the condition of preparedness" for its coming. By the second usage, 21:43, Allen says Matthew means the sovereignty of God. The Jews had been occupying the vineyard of God's favor, under the sovereignty of God, but now they would be dispossessed. Matthew uses kingdom of heaven as the term for "the eschatological kingdom which Christ announced, and which was to be inaugurated when the Son of Man comes . . . (that) kingdom had never been the possession of the Jewish rulers and could not be taken from them." These are neat distinctions with a high degree of probability. Montefiore, Synoptic Gospels, II, p. 286 supports the special meaning of Kingdom of God in 21:43. "It means the Jewish theocracy with the privileges conferred on the chosen people by its possession."

for various reasons.

3. The man then sends his servants into the streets to invite a sufficient number of guests.

4. The feast takes place.

Although the verbal agreement between these two parables is practically nil, the four point outline shared in common does make it highly probable that both are versions and interpretations of an original parable of Jesus.¹

The banquet as it is presented in Lk. is properly the "Messianic Banquet" of Jewish expectation, and the refusal of the Jews to recognize and attend it, whether or not that was the import of the story as told by Jesus. The elements which were apparently added by Matthew are eschatological in nature changing not the idea that this is the "Messianic Banquet" but heightening its meaning by the addition of contemporary references. Matthew added the following elements to the skeleton of the story above:

1. The feast is a wedding feast.
2. The host is a king whose son is to be honored.
3. Twice the king sends servants to call those who were invited.
4. Following the refusal by the invited guests to honor their invitations, "the rest" mistreat the king's servants, kill them.
5. The enraged king sends his army and burns the city,

¹Manson, Mission and Message, p. 516. Cf. also Johnson, Int. Bib., VII, pp. 514f.

wreaking vengeance, after which the feast proceeds with new guests garnered from the streets and thoroughfares.¹

McNeile comments on the first addition above that the wedding feast is a Christian symbol of the joy of the union of Christ and His Church . . . but it is doubtful if Jewish writers ever thought of the Messianic banquet as a wedding feast.²

The concept of the Messiah as the bridegroom is seen here.

On the second addition it is to be noted that the two-fold invitation represents the prophets and the apostles, two missions from God to His people, invitations to come and honor His Son.³

The servants who were killed, in the second deputation, could well symbolize Stephen, James Zebedee, James the Just, and other Jewish-Christian martyrs.⁴ The addition of the note of the destruction of the city and its inhabitants is the Fall of Jerusalem.⁵ The central theme of the parable, as Matthew tells

¹Manson, Teachings, p. 84, Mission and Message, p. 517. Manson, Teachings, p. 85, following Harnack, sees the Matthaean additions to the Q parable as evidence for the existence of another parable. They state that Matthew conflated a parable akin to that of the Wicked Tenants (Mk. 12:1-12, Mt. 21:33-43) with that of the Great Feast. Streeter feels that the two parables of the Great Banquet and the Wedding Feast differ so radically that he assigns them to L and M respectively, (Four Gospels, pp. 243f).

²Matthew, p. 314.

³Montefiore, Synoptic Gospels, II, p. 288, also Jeremias, Parables, p. 54.

⁴Johnson, Int. Bib., VII, p. 516.

⁵Jeremias, Parables, p. 54, Johnson, Int. Bib., VII, p. 516, Montefiore, Synoptic Gospels, II, p. 288.

it, is that the Jews' rejection of Jesus, the Son of God, was the cause of the Fall of Jerusalem and was also the cause of their ultimate rejection from the Messianic Banquet. Again the Redactor has given a sketch of the history of salvation from the prophets through the Fall of Jerusalem to the Last Judgment.¹

The verses which seem to form the ending of the Wedding Feast are, in reality, a portion of a different parable which has been named the Parable of the Wedding Garment,² (vss. 11-14). The primitive church, or Matthew, added this conclusion from another parable as a corrective to the misunderstanding of the free, unmerited grace of God. The "indiscriminate invitation" of the Parable of the Wedding Feast might give the impression that conduct or preparation was of no significance.³

Matthew is saying that not all who are in the Church, or who participate in the Messianic Banquet, will enter the Kingdom but only those who are clothed in righteousness,⁴ the righteous-

¹F. W. Beare, "The Parable of the Guests at the Banquet: A Sketch of the History of Its Interpretation," in *The Joy of Study* (S. E. Johnson, ed.; New York: Macmillan & Co., 1951), p. 6.

²Streeter, *Four Gospels*, p. 243, n.2, suggests that something similar to vs. 2 could well have prefaced vss. 11-14 making a twin parable with vss. 1-10. "Without such emendation the second half is pointless. How could a man, just swept in from the highways, be expected to have on a wedding garment?" E. H. Merriman, "Matthew 22:1-14" *Exp. Tim.* 66(1954), p. 61, points out that servants in vss. 1-10 = *δοῦλοῖ*; while servant in vss. 11-14 = *οἱ ἄλλοι*, supporting the idea of the separate origins of these two sections.

³Jeremias, *Parables*, p. 38.

⁴Manson, *Mission and Message*, p. 518, is troubled by the fact that both good and evil wedding guests had been brought in, yet only one is singled out for ejection. "One is tempted to surmise that the one man of the parable is meant for some one person

ness defined by Jesus in Mt. 5-7. One sees here the repetition of the warnings of chapter 13. The Redactor's theme is the justification of Jewish-Christianity.

Verse 13 of this chapter is a typical apocalyptic passage. In Enoch 10:4 the angel Raphael is commanded by God to bind Azazel, the rebellious angel, "hand and foot and cast him into the darkness."¹ Outer darkness symbolizes hell, as does the phrase "weep and gnash their teeth."

Chapter. 23.- Mk. 12:38-40, which is a brief condemnation of scribes following the discussion on the Christ as Son of David, no doubt suggested the placement of this chapter in which the polemic against the scribes and Pharisees reaches its bitterest heights. The source of almost the entire chapter is M, with a number of parallels to Q passages, especially to the material in Lk. 11. There is such a wide divergence in language in those passages which are held in common with Lk. and also so great a discrepancy in the order of the sayings that Manson is led to conclude that, in the main, chapter 23 "is derived from M." In certain verses - notably vss. 23, 25f, 29-31, 34-46 - "the M material may well have been conflated with Q but . . . the backbone of the chapter is M."²

- a Judas, or (if party feeling ran high enough) a Paul?"

¹Johnson, Int. Bib., VII, p. 517.

²Mission and Message, p. 388. Johnson, Int. Bib., VII, p. 528, says that the "bulk of the material was drawn from Q; Vss. 4, 13, 23, 25-27, 29-36 are paralleled in Lk. 11:46, 52, 39-42, 44, 47-51, and vss. 37-29 in Lk. 13:34-35. From his special source M Matthew draws vss. 2-3, 5, 8-10, 15-22, 24." K11-

Chapter 23, 24, and 25 make up the fifth and last discourse in Mt. closing with the characteristic formula at 26:1. Johnson adequately accounts for the differences of subject matter in this discourse by noting that chapter 23 serves well as a transition between the controversies of chapter 22 and the apocalyptic discussions of 24-25. In 23 Jesus pronounces judgment on the religious leaders of Israel.¹

The condemnation of the religious leaders is bitter, but there is little of eschatological note in the chapter. In verse 10 Jesus, in speaking to his disciples, is caused by the Redactor to say, "you have one master, the Christ." The seven woes against the Pharisees climax in verse 33, "You serpents, you brood of vipers, how are you to escape being sentenced to hell?" The Greek actually reads *ἀπο της κρισεως της γεεννης*;-- "from the judgment of hell."

Montefiore, following Allen, suggests that verses 38-39 might originally have read something like this, "Your house shall be left unto you desolate until ye shall say 'Blessed be he who comes in the name of the Lord.'" But the passage as it now stands is obviously vaticinium ex eventu. Jerusalem had been made desolate, the Messiah had not come. Jewish-Christians must have felt that Jesus had predicted that interval between the de-

patrick agrees with Johnson's delineation of M, Origins, p. 35. Streeter says the chapter "reads like an early Jewish Christian polemical pamphlet against their oppressors, the Pharisees." He concludes that Matthew conflated materials from M and Q to produce a chapter which was finally not like either. (Four Gospels, pp. 253-254.)

¹Johnson, Int. Bib. VII, p. 528.

destruction of Jerusalem and the coming of the Messiah.¹ The destruction of the city was evidence that the presence of God had deserted Israel and no longer could she be guaranteed salvation in the coming Judgment.² The Jewish leaders had resented the greeting of the crowds at Jesus' entry into the city. That greeting, "Blessed be he who comes in the name of the Lord," is now turned against them and "they must prepare to welcome Jesus with the same greeting or see no Messiah."³ Matthew's addition of the word ἐρημος attested in all four major texts⁴ seems to make direct reference to the desolation of Judah by God in Jeremiah 22:5; LXX has the word "this house shall be εἰς ἐρημωσιν."

Chapter 24.—In re-working the material of Mk. 13 Matthew was under the necessity of explaining why the Christ had not come, as expected, at the Fall of Jerusalem. One does not get the complete picture of the Redactor's work from such a statement as the following:

The eschatological matter peculiar to Matthew consists of (1) two brief insertions in Marcan contexts (Mt. 24:10-12 and 24:30a), and (2) a long appendix to the Marcan eschato-

¹Montefiore, Synoptic Gospels, II, p. 306f; cf. also Allen, Matthew, p. 251.

²McNeile, Matthew, p. 342; cf. Allen, Matthew, p. 252, "Your city and Temple are abandoned by God, and given up to desolation." This statement has apocalyptic overtones; cf. Enoch 89:50, 51.

³Micklem, Matthew, p. 226.

⁴With good MSS support: \aleph , D, Θ , Koine, lat, MSS omitting the word: B, L, ff², Syr.sin. R.S.V. includes the word as "desolate."

logical chapter (13), containing the parable of the Ten Virgins (25:1-13), the parable of the Talents (25:14-30) and the picture of the Last Judgment (25:31-46).¹

Although this is true it is not the whole truth when one is seeking to discover the eschatology of the Redactor. As in the rest of the Gospel, his choice and arrangement of materials often are as important as the peculiar materials he uses.

Bacon feels that Matthew was constantly engaged in re-writing Markan eschatology so as to "enhance its predictions of a second coming but shortly delayed."

Matthew aims to rekindle the hope of the Parousia and makes his constantly repeated warnings of coming judgment one of the main incentives of his Gospel to the "good works" which in it are to be the ground of justification.²

Jesus predicts the destruction of the Temple, and his disciples ask "When?" (vss. 1-3, Mk. 13:1-4). A comparison of the rendering of their questions in the three Gospels is important. Mk. reads:

Tell us when will this be, and what will be the sign when these things all $\sigma\upsilon\nu\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$;

Lk. reads:

When will this be, and what will be the sign when these things $\gamma\iota\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$;

Mt. reads:

Tell us, when will this be, and what will be the sign της σης παρουσιας και συντελειας του αιωνος;

Matthew has added the word parousia, a technical term for the coming of the Christ, used in the gospels only in this

¹Manson, Mission and Message, p. 532.

²Bacon, Studies, p. 67.

chapter (24:3, 27, 37-41).¹

The Redactor has also changed the meaning of the Markan phrase, from the question of the time of the fulfillment of the prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem--apparent in Mark's use of the present, passive infinitive "to be accomplished" or "fulfilled," and transparent in Luke's use of γίνομαι --by the use of a "technical apocalyptic expression"² συντελείας του αἰῶνος.

Jesus responds to the question with the discussion of signs of the end (vss. 4-8, Mk. 13:5-8) including false messiahs, wars and rumors of wars, nations rising against nations, famines and earthquakes. This is the "beginning of the sufferings."³ The Redactor makes very little change in the Markan material with the exception of the clarification of the vague "Many will come in my name saying 'I am he,'" of Mk. 13:6, by the addition of "the Christ" in place of "he."⁴

¹See Detached Note F. p. 254.

²Allen, Matthew, p. 254. This expression is found only in Mt. 13:39, 40; 24:3, and in Heb. 9:26. (Montefiore, Synoptic Gospels, II, p. 310). A. Feuillet takes the opposite view in "Le sens Du Mot Parousie Dans L' Evangile De Matthieu" in The Backgrounds of the New Testament and Its Eschatology, W. D. Davies and D. Daube, editors (Cambridge: University Press, 1956), pp. 261-280. He says that in all three cases the reference is to the end of the old world which coincides with the ruin of the temple.

³Both Mk. and Mt. have this phrase, "the beginning of the sufferings" which refers to the apocalyptic period known as the "birth pangs" of the Messianic Age, or "the pangs of the Messiah" (McNeile, Matthew, p. 346.) Cf. also Johnson, Int. Bib. VII, p.544.

⁴"No such definite claim to Messiahship is known till that of Bar Cochba," (c. 130) but other claims were made which deceived many. (Cf. Acts 5:36f; 8:9; 21:38) McNeile, Matthew p. 345.

Matthew inserts a major revision of Mk. 13:9-13 (vss. 9-14; most of this Markan passage having already been used in 10:17-21) adding the note of apostasy, betrayal and strife within the Church, the appearance of false teachers, and the increase of wickedness, all of which will result in love growing cold.¹ This is no doubt a reference to controversy in the Church of Matthew's day, perhaps occasioned by the catastrophe of the destruction of Jerusalem.² Where Mk. 13:10 has "And the gospel must first be preached to all nations," the Redactor has written "And this gospel of the kingdom will be preached throughout the whole world as a testimony to all nations; and then the end will come." This change is subtle; from the prediction of the Gentile Mission the Redactor has created a saying to the effect that it will be necessary to preach throughout the whole world, not to the nations, but as a testimony to the nations before the end will come. It is the mission to Jews (cf. supra on 10:23) witnessing to the nations that the end is at hand. Johnson compares this verse with Rom. 10:12-15 combined with 11:25-26, in which Paul's idea is that "all Israel will be saved" when the gospel has been preached everywhere so that "the full number of

¹There is only one other use (Lk. 11:42) of this term ἡ ἀγάπη in the Synoptics. Montefiore, Synoptic Gospels, II, p. 311.

²Brandon, Fall of Jerusalem, p. 173f suggests that the bitter internal strife and apostasy of many reflects the strain which the fall of the Holy City placed on the Jewish-Christian Church. Apostasy of the righteous and the increase of wickedness are sure signs of the end. Cf. Allen, Matthew, p. 255; McNeile, Matthew, p. 347; Montefiore, Synoptic Gospels, II, p. 311.

the Gentiles come in" to the Church,¹ but the comparison is strained and does not hold in view of the anti-Gentile sentiments in the Gospel.

The "Abomination of Desolation" (vss. 15-22, Mk. 13: 14-20) appears in Mt. little changed from its Markan form. The first thing to be discovered is the change in the introductory or conjunctive particle at the beginning of the passage: Mk. 13: 14 (also Lk. 21:20) has ὅταν δέ . . . --"But when . . .", so that a new stage of events is in fact introduced. Matthew's change is to ὅταν οὖν . . . --"When therefore . . ." or "So . . ." (R.S.V.), a change which definitely links the verses which follow with that which preceded, in this case, with τὸ τέλος of verse 14.²

Matthew locates the "scriptural" source of the phrase by adding that it was "spoken by the prophet Daniel" (vs. 15).

The meaning of ἑστὸς ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ (apparently translated incorrectly by R.S.V. as "standing in the holy place" since the text omits the article) is of some relevance. By the omission of the definite article does the Redactor refer to a profanation to occur or one that has already occurred on any other holy place than the Temple, which has already been destroyed?

¹Int. Bib. VII, p. 546.

²McNeile, Matthew, p. 347, suggests this possibility. Johnson, Int. Bib. VII, p. 546 says that the "So" indicates that vss. 15-22 "are a further explanation of what is meant by the foregoing. . . . The events predicted in these verses do not come after those which are mentioned in vss. 9-14, but before them." Bacon, Studies, p. 68, "The tribulation here described (vss. 9-14) is the same set forth in greater details in vss. 15-28."

How could the Redactor repeat a prediction so manifestly contradicted by fact, especially when it compounded in the same perspective the fall of Jerusalem and the end of the world? Would Matthew have left unexplained the failure of the Jewish Wars and the Destruction of Jerusalem to produce the Messiah? "With every year after A.D. 75 the nonfulfillment of these prophecies became a more grievous difficulty to the early Church."¹ Two explanations of Matthew's purpose are forthcoming from this portion of verse 15. One by Dr. Streeter is based on a reading in one MSS, Syr.^{sin}. ("an especially good authority for the Antiochene Gospel of Matthew"), which omits "standing in a holy place." Streeter, guided by the last chapter of the Didache, which infers that the "Abomination of Desolation" is the "personal Anti-Christ," decides that "standing in a holy place" must have originated as a marginal gloss. If this be true then Matthew has solved the problem of the non-appearance of the Messiah after the Fall of Jerusalem by detaching the Anti-Christ expectation completely from any local connection with Jerusalem. Thus, says Dr. Streeter, Matthew is able to interpret the "Abomination prophecy in the light of the Nero-redivivus myth."²

The other possibility is that Matthew might not have been

¹Streeter, Four Gospels, p. 518.

²Four Gospels, pp. 519f. Brandon, in Fall of Jerusalem, pp. 245f. takes issue sharply with Streeter on the basis that the use of the article by Matthew would have made the reference too explicitly the Temple, when it is highly probable that the reference is to Roman standards erected, not in the Temple proper, but in one of the Temple courts near the East Gate.

referring to the Temple at all,¹ but by the omission of the definite article was leaving the interpretation open either looking back to the profane act which precipitated the Jewish War (the desecration of a synagogue in Caesarea), or looking forward to still another desecration which will occur at "a holy place."²

The Redactor uses the Markan material almost unchanged for the short passage on the warning against being led astray by false messiahs and false prophets (vss. 23-25, Mk. 13:21-23).

Matthew now inserts a passage paralleled in Lk. 17:23-24, 37, enriching the discourse on warnings. The Redactor enlarges the passage but the meaning is the same: do not believe anyone who says the Messiah is in the desert preparing³, or in a secret room waiting the proper time, for the parousia of the Son of Man will be as lightning, unexpectedly sudden, immediately and universally visible (vss. 26-28).⁴

¹Allen, Matthew, p. 256, points out that Acts 6:13 and 21:28 contain similar references to the Temple, but that both also contain the definite article. He concludes, however, that Matthew probably was referring to the Temple anyway.

²Johnson, Int. Bib. VII, p. 547. The author qualifies this suggestion by noting that at a later date "a pagan shrine was . . . erected on the site of the temple." Montefiore, Synoptic Gospels II, p. 311, feels that Matthew might refer to some unnamed profanation yet to occur on the sacred site of the Temple.

³One is led to ask of Matthew's addition "Lo, he is in the wilderness," if it is a reference to the Qumran community which claimed to be preparing the way for the Messiah? It could well be a reference to the rejection of the Qumran eschatological community by the Jewish-Christian eschatological community.

⁴Johnson, Int. Bib. VII, p. 548, suggests this may well be a reference to and refutation of the idea that was somewhat in vogue that the Messiah was hidden until the proper moment of revelation. (Cf. also Montefiore, Synoptic Gospels, II, p. 312.)

Picking up the Markan order again, Matthew re-works in some detail the passage on the Parousia of the Son of Man (vss. 29-31, Mk. 13:24-27). The first word in the passage is an addition by the Redactor. He says that "immediately after the tribulation of those days the sun will be darkened . . ." To say, with Montefiore, that since this word contradicts history because the Temple had been destroyed and the Messiah had not come, and therefore the word could not have been added by the Redactor but was merely copied from an old apocalyptic source he was using,¹ is to accuse Matthew of clumsiness and even worse, of purposelessness in his composition. It is not so obvious that the Redactor was referring to the Fall of Jerusalem as the "tribulation of those days" (cf. supra on vss. 15-22). In fact, if the Redactor is to be granted any kind of coherence of purpose it must be that the tribulation is yet to come.² McNeile notes that "this is a true sequel to verses 19-22 . . . the (tribulation) is that of verse 21, the climax of the 'pangs' being followed immediately by the End."³

The cosmic disasters, darkened sun and moon, stars falling from the heavens, repeated from Mk. were common and standing

¹Synoptic Gospels II, p. 313.

²Although Feuillet, in Backgrounds of N. T., p. 270, argues with cogency that Matthew feels the Resurrection of Jesus ushered in the future age, I cannot agree with the thesis this helps to "prove"--that the Parousia of the Son of Man is a judgment of Israel before His coming on the clouds of heaven. He would relate "immediately" to some unmentioned tribulation(s) of vss. 26-28 --because of Matthew's use of the word parousia there --rather than to the tribulations of vs. 21 as above.

³Matthew, p. 351.

features of Jewish eschatology. Matthew then adds a reference which is without precedent: "Then will appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven" (vs. 30a). McNeile concludes that "it may have been an eschatological feature known to Matthew's Jewish readers but not to us."¹ A second apocalyptic detail added by the Redactor in this verse is the reference to the mourning of the tribes of the earth. This is probably based on Zech. 12: 10-12 which refers to the repentance of the Jews for past misdeeds. Manson says that in giving it wider application, "all the tribes of earth" Matthew is revealing his sympathy with Jewish apocalyptic, "with its prophecies of woe for the Gentile nations."² Two other minor changes are of interest in this passage. With reference to the gathering of the elect Matthew makes the angels the personal possession of the Son of Man ("his angels"); and he inserts the "loud trumpet call," a thoroughly familiar eschatological reference (vs. 31), with connotations of the calling home of the dispersed of Israel.³

The Parable of the Fig Tree with its lesson of the immediacy of the Parousia, and the re-iteration that no one save only the Father knows the day and hour, follow from Mk. 13: 28-

¹Matthew, p. 352.

²Mission and Message, p. 533f.

³The sound of the trumpet was "the traditional summons home of the dispersed of Israel" (Micklem, Matthew, p. 235). Johnson, Int. Bib. VII, p. 550, quotes from the Eighteen Benedictions of the synagogue service this petition concerning the hope of the gathering of the "dispersion:" "Sound the great horn for our freedom; lift up the banner to gather our exiles, and gather us from the four corners of the earth."

32 (vss. 32-36). Taking the cue from Mk's ending on the need for watchfulness (13:33-37) which he omits, the Redactor constructs a more elaborate and detailed passage on the same theme (vss. 37-51, Lk. 17:26-27, 34; 12:39-40, 42-46) by the inclusion of Q material. The suddenness and unexpectedness of the parousia of the Son of Man is re-iterated (vss. 37-41). This is the passage in which the word parousia appears twice (vss. 37, 39; vs. 37 is paralleled by Lk. 17:26 as "the days of the Son of man" while vs. 39 is peculiar to Matthew). It is evident that the Redactor is seeking to re-interpret the delay of the parousia, a term by now familiar if only because of the work of Paul.

Verse 42 is re-written by Matthew from Mk. 13:35, the conclusion of the Parable of the Doorkeeper:

Mark 13:35

Watch, therefore, for you do not know when the master of the house will come, in the evening, or at midnight, or at cockcrow, or in the morning.

Mt. 24:42

Watch, therefore, for you do not know on what day your Lord is coming.

Jeremias points out that the change of "master of house" to "your Lord" and the "nightwatch" to the "day" give the passage an obvious Christological, eschatological interpretation.¹

The chapter closes with the exhortation that the faithful and wise servant is always ready for his master's arrival and that when the master does arrive, the unprepared, unfaithful servant will be punished by confinement with the hypocrites, where "men will weep and gnash their teeth"(vss. 45-51).

¹Parables, p. 44.

Chapter 25.-The "Three Parables of Judgment" ¹ are contained in this eschatological chapter. The Parable of the Ten Maidens as it now appears is more of an allegory than a parable. Jeremias sees an original core parable which came from Jesus in which the need for preparedness in view of the imminence of the End is stressed; he calls it a kind of "crisis parable." Matthew, in re-writing the parable put stress on what must have originally been an unstressed phrase, "but the bridegroom was delayed" (vs. 5) changing the parable to an allegory symbolizing the delay of the Parousia.²

If Matthew saw in this parable as he has written it an allegory of the coming of Christ,³ in light of its delay, then the following elements are discernible:

¹Streeter, Four Gospels, p. 167.

²Parables, p. 43; cf. also McNeile, Matthew, p. 361. Bacon, Studies, p. 249, notes the parallel ideas which are contained in the Q parables on Watchfulness (Lk. 12:35-38) and on the Closing Door (Lk. 13:23-27) and characteristically claims that Mt. 25:1-13 is an expansion of Lk. 12:35f and 13:32. Manson, Mission and Message, p. 534, also points out the parallel between vss. 1-7 and Lk. 12:35-38, and the affinity of ideas but not of language between vss. 10-12 and Lk. 13:25f; he concludes that "the parable is a curiously involved mixture of ideas drawn from various sources." The fact that the bride is not mentioned in the parable argues, says Jeremias, in favor of the essential authenticity of the core of the parable. "For although the comparison of the redeemed community to the bride is a commonplace of early Christian literature (II cor. 11:2; Eph. 5:31f) yet it is entirely absent from the teachings of Jesus. Jesus prefers to compare the saved community with the wedding guests (Mk. 2:19a; Mt. 22:1, 11f)." Parables, p. 42, n. 83.

³The use of εἰς ὑπάντησιν suggests, says J. H. Moulton, Prolegomena, p. 14, n. 4, the idea of "the official welcome of a newly arrived dignitary . . . (corresponding) to his inauguration." McNeile, Matthew, p. 360, feels this usage was deliberate by Matthew to "correspond with the thought of the Parousia."

1. Christ is the heavenly bridegroom.¹
2. The ten maidens are the expectant Christian community.²
3. The delay of the bridegroom's coming is the postponement of the coming of Christ.
4. The suddenness of the bridegroom's coming, perhaps symbolized by the sleeping maidens, is representative of the unexpected suddenness of the Parousia.

5. The rejection of the unprepared is Final Judgment.³

To this list by Jeremias I would add the sixth:

6. The marriage feast is the Messianic Banquet (cf. 22: 1-10). The distinction is to be noted by comparison with Lk. 12: 35-38: Luke has the servants awaiting the return of their master from a Marriage feast and the reward for those found in readiness is to sit down to a dinner served by the master; Matthew, on the other hand, shows a banquet in which the prepared ones will participate with the bridegroom.

It is obvious that this is not a true allegory because the bride is not mentioned, and one is left asking what is meant

¹The concept of the marriage of Christ to the Church, or the Church as the bride of Christ, is the "New Testament equivalent," says Manson, "of the Old Testament idea of God as the bridegroom of Israel (cf. Hosea 2:16; Isa. 54:6; and II Cor. 11: 2; Eph. 5:25, 32; Rev. 19:7)." Mission and Message, p. 534. One is reminded of 9:15 (cf. Mk. 2:19) in which Jesus uses the analogy of the bridegroom, "Can the wedding guests mourn as long as the bridegroom is with them?"

²Manson says, as it now stands, it is apparent that the ten maidens represent the church, with both good and bad members (Mission and Message, p. 535). McNeile, Matthew, p. 360, also has this interpretation with the added allegorical explanation for the sleep as death.

³Jeremias, Parables, p. 44.

by the lamps and oil. If the ten maidens are "the expectant Christian community" as Jeremias says then one must conclude that the bride is unimportant to the allegory. There is, however, a variant reading in the Western and Caesarean texts with strong manuscript evidence for the inclusion of "and the bride" in verse 1.¹ In view of the incompleteness of the allegory it would seem that Matthew must have written it originally as "the bridegroom and the bride." Manson discusses this problem at length, bringing in F. C. Burkitt's defense of the variant reading. Burkitt offers two explanations² regarding the meaning of the ten maidens neither of which seem to be satisfactory: if they represent the church then the Bride is unexplained, and if they represent the Disciples, then there seems to be a real redundancy for both Bride and maidens, in effect, represent the Church, and what of the five who were rejected? Professor Manson rather hesitantly advances what seems to me

¹Western text, variant supported by C. vg. Syr. sin. pe.; Caesarean text, Θ , fam. 1. The omission of "and the bride" is supported mainly by Neutral (Alexandrian) MSS. - Δ , B, C, W, ϕ , Sa. Bo. McNeile, Matthew, p. 361, supports the variant reading as does Johnson, Int. Bib. VII, p. 556, the latter adding "The high point of the wedding came when the bridegroom took the bride from her father's house to her new home, usually in a litter, and his attendants and guests escorted her there. The words 'and the bride' are missing in some MSS probably because the bridegroom was understood as an allegorical reference to Christ, and the copyists could see no way of fitting the bride into the allegory."

²Burkitt's earlier solution was that the maidens were maidservants left in the bridegroom's house to await his return with the bride; they thus represent the church. His second and later view was that the maidens represent fellow-townsmen of the bridegroom who plan to light the way in hopes of being invited to participate in the marriage feast; in this case they are the disciples (Manson, Mission and Message, p. 536).

to be the best explanation of the meaning of this allegory. Following is a summary of his suggestion: The Church, as the continuation of the true Israel, bride of God, is the bride of the Messiah; the maidens then become the Gentile converts, five of whom are foolish enough to reject the Jewish-Christian "standard of conformity to the Law," and five of whom are wisely prepared by conformity to the Law.¹ This latter element is given support by noting that the lamps and the oil could symbolize the Law, both being frequently used as such symbols. Manson quotes passages in support of both figures.²

The Parable of the Talents (vss. 14-30) also shows signs of having been re-worked by Matthew into a Parousia-parable. It is difficult to find any but an affinity of ideas between the Matthean and Lukan parables (cf. Lk. 19:12-27).³ Manson points out that the central and essential point of the parable in both versions is the Jewish Law which decrees that the slave, along

¹I would add that the Law to Matthew is the new law of righteousness, a re-interpretation of the Mosaic Law.

²Mission and Message, p. 536. Ps. 119:105 "Thy word is a lamp to my feet;" Prov. 6:23, "For the commandment is a lamp and the teaching a light" (also Apoc. Baruch 59:2; 4 Ezra 14:20f); a Rabbinical passage "As oil is light for the world, so also are the words of the Law light for the world."

³Jeremias feels Jesus originally addressed a similar parable to the scribes. They had been trusted with much and would soon be faced with the necessity of rendering account of their faithfulness (Parables, p. 50). A. B. Bruce, The Expositor's Greek Testament, (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1897), Vol. I, p. 301, suggests the parable was not originally a "Parousia parable" but concerned the inculcation of "skill and fidelity in the use of earthly goods." Manson says that the M and L parallel versions were based on a tradition which "was already fixed in its original form before the M and L traditions took shape" (Mission and Message, p. 537).

with all that he produces, belongs to his master. This has a religious meaning to the effect that God has an absolute claim upon man, all that he has and is. Man lives to serve God and his reward for faithful service is the increased opportunity for larger service.¹ But at several points the parable in Matthew has a definitely eschatological meaning. Jeremias says "In Matthew the merchant has become an allegory for Christ, his journey has become his ascension, his subsequent return μετὰ πολὺν χρόνον (vs. 19) has become the Parousia."²

Two verses are worthy of note in this connection. (1) Verse 21 (also 24) "enter into the joy of your Lord" can also be translated "enter into the feast of your Lord." Dalman points out that χαρὰ, usually translated "joy" can also be translated "feast." One example is in Esther 9:17 where the Hebrew פִּתּוּיָהּ ("with feasting") is rendered by the Greek μετὰ χαρᾶς.³ Even if this translation be false--evidence notwithstanding--Manson

¹Mission and Message, p. 537.

²Parables, p. 51.

³Dalman, Words, p. 117f. He cites Aramaic equivalents as well. Jeremias, Parables, p. 49, strongly favors this translation; Montefiore, Synoptic Gospels II, p. 320, notes it "may even refer to the Messianic meal; it stands for feast in Esther 9:17." McNeile discusses this suggestion but discards it as being too sudden an introduction of the thought of the Messianic banquet in this context. But one must ask if this is true, especially in light of the nature of the preceding parable.

Walter Bauer, Wörterbuch, p. 1590, mentions the translation, "banquet" as the third meaning of the word (following Dalman and Strack-Billerbeck). Likewise, Arndt and Gingrich, Lexicon, p. 884, translating Bauer's work, include the definition and add Bauer's qualification as well, "would this have been intelligible to Greeks?" Perhaps not, but it would have been intelligible to the Jewish-Christians for whom the work apparently was written.

notes that this phrase "enter into the joy of your Lord" gives a "definitely eschatological cast to the scene."¹

(2) Verse 30 is an apocalyptic ending, containing the two Matthean stereotyped phrases "cast into outer darkness" and "there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth." In both verses the householder is the divine master, Christ of the Parousia; he is the judge, assigning men either to a share in the new age or to eternal damnation, depending on the faithfulness of their service.

The critical verse in the "Royal Judgment Scene"² (vss. 31-46) for determining the Redactor's purpose in recording the allegory is verse 40 (also 45), especially the phrase "unto one of the least of these, my brethern." Whether or not the allegory represents the authentic words of Jesus, or a homily constructed on an authentic core of Jesus' teachings,³ the fact of

¹Mission and Message, p. 539; also Johnson, Int. Bib. VII, p. 560. F. C. Grant, The Gospel of Matthew, (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1955) Vol. II, p. 45, notes that το μαθημα παρα "probably signifies salvation and eternal peace."

²The title is assigned by C. A. Briggs, The Messiah of the Gospels (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1894), p. 226.

³Wm. Manson, Jesus the Messiah (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1946), p. 97, says the passage rests on "authentic oracles of Jesus." T. W. Manson, Teachings, p. 223, says it is "the M account of the last judgment." Other scholars which assign this to M are: F. C. Grant, Matthew II, p. 46; McNeile, Matthew, p. 368; Johnson, Int. Bib. VII, p. 562; Jeremias, Parables, p. 144; all of these would agree with Manson, Mission and Message, p. 541, "Whether or not it belongs as a whole and in all its details to the authentic teaching of Jesus, it certainly contains features of such startling originality that it is difficult to credit them to anyone but the Master Himself." Bacon, Studies, p. 249, is a bit more cautious, "this free depiction of Mt.'s own conception of the last assize does not wholly lack an authentic nucleus;"

the Redactor's purpose remains of primary importance for this study. What is meant by "τούτων των ἀδελφῶν μου των ἐλαχίστων" ("one of these my brethern [even, of] the least")? Most scholars fail to discuss the "brethern" as a separate group. McNeile says the reference is to "the classes of sufferers just mentioned, not . . . to a group standing by the Son of Man."¹ Jeremias notes that "the brethern are . . . all the afflicted and needy."² One can readily imagine a setting in which Jesus would utter similar words: pointing to the crowds of suffering, shepherdless poor, he very well might have identified himself and his mission with these by saying in effect that to love one's neighbor, to do the will of the Father, to enter the Kingdom of God, one must exercise love for "even these, the least of my brethern." But the setting is missing in this allegory. The scene as Matthew has painted it so magnificently reveals the Son

Kilpatrick, *Origins*, p. 32, notes it "has features which suggest it is of later date;" and Montefiore, *Synoptic Gospels II*, p. 323, flatly states that in its present form the passage is "a product of Christian thought, and cannot be regarded as authentic."

¹Matthew, p. 371. Manson recognizes that the "King is not alone in the judgment, but is the representative and spokesman of a body of persons ('my brethern') distinct from the other parties present." (*Mission and Message*, p. 541.) He solves the problem by means of his conception of the "corporate Servant," "the only possible conclusion would seem to be that they are included in the concept 'Son of Man' . . . the Danielic Kingdom of the Saints" (*Teachings*, p. 265). Thus he identifies the "Son of Man" as a corporate term embracing the King (Jesus) and "my brethern" (disciples).

²*Parables*, p. 143. A. B. Bruce, *Exp. Gk. Test. I*, p. 306, gives what seems to me to be the classic expositional or spiritual application, "The brethern are the Christian poor and needy and suffering, in the first place, but ultimately and inferentially any suffering people anywhere."

of Man, King-Messiah, seated on the throne of glory, separating the righteous "sheep" from the evil "goats" on the basis of the way in which each had ministered unto Him by having succored or ignored "one of these, the least of my brethern." Spiritually or religiously the meaning is transparent. Jesus identifies himself with the dispossessed and suffering. But in the actual setting of the allegory, who are "my brethern"?

It is the thesis of this discussion that the Redactor was writing for the persecuted Jewish-Christians, and that "the least of these my brethern" refers to them. In 10:42, at the conclusion of the Mission charge, Matthew having encouraged the missionaries to give their lives unafraid for the sake of Jesus, closes with an aside, a parenthetical remark taken out of context from Mk. 9:41, "And whoever gives to one of these little ones even a cup of cold water because he is a disciple, truly I say to you, he shall not lose his reward." In Mark the saying is cast in the setting of Jesus--having forbidden the disciples to stop one who was exercising in His name because "He that is not against us is for us"--telling them "For truly I say to you, whoever gives you a cup of water to drink because you bear the name of Christ will by no means lose his reward."

If the discussion of chapter 10 above has any coherence it is clear that Matthew's purpose was to strengthen the Jewish-Christians for the mission to the "lost sheep of Israel" and the parenthetical statement refers directly to these "disciples" (cf also supra on 24:14).

It remains to show that ἕνα των μικρων τουτων ¹ of 10:42 is the equivalent of ἐνὶ τοῦτων των ἀδελφων μου των ἐλαχίστων of 25:40. Jeremias notes, in a discussion of 18:14, that μικροί (which he translates "these very least") is the same as the ἐλαχίστοι of 25:40.² It is very possible that the same word might have been used in both verses, from the strength of the variant reading, or at least that the same meaning is attached to both words. Is it not possible that the beleaguered Jewish-Christians of Matthew's day are the "least ones, my brethern?"

The allegorical meaning of τὰ ἔθνη of verse 32 is critical for the above interpretation, for what would Gentiles be doing on the scene if only Jewish-Christians were concerned? Montefiore says that the "nations" are ignored in the allegory because the "good" and "bad" are both Christians. "Or," he asks, "did the writer suppose that all the nations were converted before the Judgment."³ This last is exactly the clue. In light of 24:14 in which the Redactor says that the Parousia with its attendant Judgment will not arrive until the Gospel is preached "throughout the whole world as a testimony to all nations." The Gospel must be preached as a testimony to all nations: this need not be inconsistent with 10:5, for the preaching throughout the world could still be among the Diaspora as a witness to the na-

¹The Western text, notably Bezae (D), 59, and the complete Latin tradition (latt.) has ἐλαχίστων in place of μικρων.

²Parables, p. 143.

³Synoptic Gospels, II, p. 324.

tions (but see on 28:19-20). It is necessary to remember that both the apocalyptic and the prophetic eschatologies in Judaism contained direct references to the judgment of the nation on the basis of their treatment of Jews and acceptance of Judaism.

Manson has very neatly characterized this allegory by noting that the picture of the Last Judgment is set in a frame of "conventional Jewish apocalyptic expectation."¹ The apocalyptic elements not yet mentioned in the allegory include: the angels of the Son of Man assisting in the Judgment;² The Son of Man sitting "on his glorious throne";³ the kingdom of eternal life prepared, from the beginning of time (vs. 34) for the righteous, and the eternal fire already prepared for the "devil and his angels" to receive the unrighteous;⁴ and the alternate name for the Son of Man sitting in Judgment as "King."⁵

¹Mission and Message, p. 541.

²Cf. on 13:41, supra p.169 n.3, also 16:27.

³Cf. on 19:28, supra p. 188.

⁴Both are apocalyptic metaphors for "eternal punishment and eternal life" (vs. 46). Cf. Micklem, Matthew, p. 242. Cf. Daniel 12:2 for the conventional apocalyptic view.

⁵At first glance the change from "Son of Man" to "King" in vs. 34 presents a problem. Montefiore says that "the Messiah or Son of Man is not elsewhere called King" (Synoptic Gospels II, p. 324), but this is hardly correct in view of the interpretation of the Parousia Parables. Matthew uses the word "King" in 2:2 of Jesus "born king of the Jews"; in 21:5 in the quotation from Zechariah on the Entry into Jerusalem (paralleled in Lk. 19:38); and five times in three parousia parables, 22:7; 22:11, 13; 25:34, 40. It is evident that the word King is associated with Judgment in Matthew's mind. It is not necessary to assume, with Allen, Matthew, p. 265, that the change indicates that the original parable concerning a king was adapted to the coming of the Son of Man.

Cadoux, Names of Jesus, pp. 75f, has a fine discussion

Chapters 26, 27 and 28.—Matthew follows closely the Markan story of the Passion, embracing the Passover, the betrayal, the trial, the crucifixion, and the Resurrection. The major additions to the narrative are considered to be from the Narrative (N) source and are of little value to this study.¹ They include: the death of Judas, with an appropriate scriptural proof-text (27:3-10), the dream of Pilate's wife (27:19), Pilate washing his hands (27:24-25), the placing of the guard at the tomb (27:62-66), the earthquake and the stone rolled back by the angel of the Lord (28:2-4), and the bribing of the soldiers (28:11-15). One of these additions, that on the resurrection of the saints (27:52-53), will be considered in this discussion along with other editorial changes and additions of relevance to the study.

In Jesus' "words of institution of the Eucharist" Matthew adds the phrase "for the forgiveness of sins" so that the death of Christ is seen as having propitiatory or atoning qualities. It is noted that in the description of the message of

on this subject in which he points out that the title "King" appears in Mk. only six times, each time in chapter 15 (paralleled in Mt. 27:11, 29, 37, 42), and each time in derision or contempt for Jesus. He goes on to point out that "there was an increased interest in the kingship of Jesus" at Ephesus at the end of the century (John uses the title seven times in addition to six parallels from the Synoptics; cf. also Rev. 1:15; 17:14; 19:16), but that the name was not freely used because it was naturally politically dangerous.

¹Taylor, Formation, p. 54, notes that these additions serve only to amplify the Markan narrative and to answer the questions it raised. They mark the beginnings of Christian legend, serving to deepen, enhance, and enrich the elements of the Passion.

John the Baptist the Redactor omitted Mk.'s words which had ascribed to John's work the power of forgiving sins (cf. Mk.1:4, Mt. 3:4). The association of Jesus with the Servant in 8:17, "He took our infirmities and bore our diseases," hints at the same concept in the mind of the Redactor. Although he copied Mk.'s words exactly in 20:28 (Mk. 10:45), "to give his life as a ransom for many," Matthew, by the above-noted changes, more completely rounds out the doctrine of the atoning work of the death of Christ than is done in Mk.¹ Montefiore notes that Matthew interprets Jesus' death as "a sin offering" in the same way that the blood of the Covenant was considered to have had an atoning efficacy (cf. Ex. 24:8).² The Redactor's method of reasoning was based on the Jewish concept of the necessity for the shedding of blood for forgiveness of sins: if the premise underlying the blood covenant in Exodus be correct, then it must also be true for "the covenant poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins" (26:29).

In Matthew's addition to the scene of the capture in the Garden, two items of interest appear. The word "legion"--"twelve legions of angels" at the command of Jesus (vs. 52)--is not based on an Aramaic or Hebrew word, but came into Greek directly from the Latin. The occupation of the land by the powerful Roman legions influenced the Semitic tongue too, for in late Rabbinic writings an Aramaic equivalent is used with several attendant meanings: it connotes a large number, and it implies, as well, attendance upon

¹Cf. Micklem, Matthew, p. 244, and Montefiore, Synoptic Gospels, II, pp. 331f.

²Synoptic Gospels, II, p. 331.

a king.¹ The Redactor no doubt is adding strength to his affirmation of Jesus' Messiahship, if these thoughts truly underlie his use of the term. The statement that the scriptures must be fulfilled (vs. 54) is further defined by the insertion of the qualification "of the prophets" (vs. 56) into Mk.'s statement that "the scriptures be fulfilled," making what seems to be a more explicit reference to the "suffering Servant" passages.

In answer to the high Priest's question "Are you the Christ, the Son of God?"² the Redactor alters Mk.'s report of Jesus' direct reply, "I am,"³ to "You have said so" (vs. 64). It is of interest at this point that the phrase $\acute{\alpha}\pi' \acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\acute{\iota}$ is peculiar to Matthew, being used in the gospels only at 26:29, an insertion in the Marcan saying of Jesus that they will not again share the wine until the kingdom has come, and at 23:39 an insertion in the Q lament over Jerusalem as well as at 26:64 under consideration. In each of these instances the Redactor has used the phrase in conjunction with "a prophetic declaration as to the coming Parousia and the kingdom."⁴ This, it seems to me, serves to heighten the apocalyptic elements in the

¹W. Emory Barnes, "Legion," Hastings DOB, III, p. 94.

²Cf. supra on 14:33 for discussion of the Redactor's use of "Son of God."

³Streeter, Four Gospels, p. 321f, points out that it is most likely that the Caesarean text bears the correct reading for Mk. 14:62, "you said that I am." This would make Matthew's rendition more reasonable; he leaves out the last three words and inserts an interpretation of the reply as "You have said it in scorn, but very soon, I tell you, you shall see with your eyes."

⁴Micklem, Matthew, p. 260.

prediction of the coming of the Son of Man "on the clouds of heaven" (vs. 64). Feuillet, following V. Taylor, advances the theory that in Matthew also the prediction of the sight of the Son of Man, "seated at the right hand of Power" is that of a vision, fulfilled by the progressive victory of the cause of Christ through the Church.¹ It is doubtless true that Mk.'s report of Jesus' words can be interpreted as a prediction of the fulfillment of the glorious destiny prophesied for the Messiah in the growth of the church, but in light of the above discussion on ὁπ' ἄπτῃ, and especially of n. 3, it hardly seems likely in Matthew.

In the light of Matthew's claim that the Church founded on the Messiahship of Jesus has replaced Judaism,² his inclusion of the words of terrible historic significance, "His blood be on us and on our children" in the incident of Pilate's washing his hands of the responsibility (27:24-25), is significant as an explanation for the destruction of Jerusalem. Not only the leaders, but "all the people" shall suffer for the rejection of the Messiah.

The rending of the veil of the temple occurring at the death of Jesus in Mk. is reported by Matthew to have been caused by an earthquake which also split rocks and opened tombs so that "the saints who had fallen asleep were raised" (vss. 52-53).³

¹Backgrounds of N. T., p. 266.

²Cf. supra the discussions on 13:51-52; 16:17-19; 21:43.

³The location of this legend causes a little difficulty because the saints are raised at the moment of Jesus' death but

The inclusion of this haggadic expansion of the effects of the Crucifixion was made by Matthew either to make a "more impressive explanation of the comment" of the centurion (vs. 54),¹ or to show that the atoning death of Christ marked the beginning of the Messianic kingdom² even though some correction had to be made to allow Jesus to be "the first fruits of them that are asleep" (I Cor. 15:20).

The closing passage of the gospel (vss. 16-20) includes the final appearance to the Eleven and the command to go into all the world. The command

Go, therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you; and lo I am with you always, to the close of the age (vss. 19-20),

is generally recognized by scholars as the final proof of Matthew's universality of outlook, of his liberal attitude toward Gentiles in the Church, and that he was writing mainly to rec-

do not appear in Jerusalem until after his resurrection. McNeile, Matthew, p. 424, and Kilpatrick, Origins, p. 47 feel it probably originated as a sequel to the earthquake Matthew reports at the resurrection of Jesus (28:2).

¹Kilpatrick, Origins, p. 47.

²The resurrection of the saints, especially the patriarchs and martyrs, was a part of first century popular eschatology, "a recognized feature of the Day of the Lord" (Micklem, Matthew, p. 275). Feuillet, Backgrounds of N. T., says "This is truly the future age, that of the resurrection, which makes here its debut." Thus the end of the age is begun by the death of Jesus. O Cullman, Christ and Time, trans. F. V. Filson (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1950), pp. 236f, notes that the New Testament places us in the Messianic time but that even the resurrection of the saints in this verse is not thought of in the same sense as the "first fruits"; "the 'bodies of the saints' are not thought of as spiritual bodies."

oncile Gentile and Jewish-Christians.¹ It would seem to make impossible one of the underlying theses of this study, that Matthew was writing for Jewish-Christians. Brandon, however, suggests that the clause "teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you" effectively qualifies the passage so that there is no contradiction with such passages as 10:5 and 15:24.² When we raise the question of the content of "all that I have commanded you," we recognize that Matthew has presented the teachings of Jesus as a re-interpretation or fulfillment of Mosaic Law, so that the Redactor may well be making here a final justification for the continuation of the Jewish-Christian Church as the true Israel, the eschatological community.³ The "close of the age" is the characteristic Matthaean phrase.

¹E.g., Streeter, Four Gospels, p. 514; McNeille, Matthew, p. 435; Micklem, Matthew, p. 285.

²Fall of Jerusalem, p. 219. Bacon, The Founding of the Church (Boston: The Pilgrim Press, 1909), p. 3, n. 1, commenting on the fact that it was not until after Jesus' resurrection that his disciples extended their view to include all humanity, notes "The Gospel of Matthew still remains nationalistic. Matt. 7:6; 10:5, 6, 23; 15:24. Its universalism (28:19, 20) must be understood in consonance with these earlier passages."

³Johnson, ZAW 66 (1954) p. 166, notes that Matthew's charge "teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you," recalls the Man. Disc., which holds that the "keeping of a special tradition of commandments is essential." Man. Disc. viii, 9, "speaks frankly of enacting laws which are to be in force until the coming of the future age."

DETACHED NOTE A

Matthew's uses of Δικαιοσύνη

A brief examination of Matthew's uses of the term will help to discover the eschatological imperative.

(1) 3:15. Jesus answers John's demurring words at the baptism by the statement that his baptism would fulfill Πασαν Δικαιοσύνη. To Matthew the baptism of Jesus may mean not only the great example but may also represent "the moment of Messiah's epiphany."¹ His use of the word at this point may well have a more profoundly eschatological meaning than is easily apparent. The fulfillment of Δικαιοσύνη comes through the Messiah.

(2) 5:6. In this verse the Redactor adds the object of the hunger (cf. Supra) καὶ διψῶντες τὴν δικαιοσύνην to the Q beatitude (Lk. 6:21a). Here Bacon's translation as "salvation" would work quite well.

(3) 5:10. "Blessed are those who are persecuted ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." Again "salvation" would work as well. But a fuller definition (as in 5:20) would be that it is behavior, moral and ethical living, characterized as Δικαιοσύνη which is required for entrance into the Kingdom.²

¹Loisy, Origins of N. T., p. 117.

²C. T. Wood, in his article "Righteousness," Hastings, DCAG, p. 529b, notes that Matthew uses the word "to denote the character which He requires in citizens of the Kingdom of Heaven." Montefiore, Synoptic Gospels, II, p. 39 says that righteousness in this verse means the disciples' "fidelity to (their) master," whom they believed to be the Messiah.

(4) 5:20. "For I tell you, unless ὑμῶν ἡ δικαιοσύνη exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees, you will never enter the kingdom of heaven." Here Matthew uses the term as an inclusive term for the standard of religious observance. But Jesus gives it fuller content. In the verses which follow Jesus defines righteousness declaring that not only murder but anger toward a brother, not only adultery but lustful desiring as well as divorce, not only swearing falsely but any act of swearing, shall be considered unrighteous behavior making one unfit for the kingdom of heaven; that rather than living according to lex talionis a citizen of the kingdom must not resist evil done him but must turn the cheek, go the extra mile, give the cloak; that one must not only love neighbors, but one's enemies as well. All this, says Matthew, in effect, defines the righteousness which is demanded, a perfection like unto that of the heavenly father (5:21-48).

(5) 6:1. "Beware of practicing your piety (τὴν δικαιοσύνην ὑμῶν) before men in order to be seen . . ." At first glance this seems to be a mistake.¹ But it is apparent from the context of verses 1-21, that Matthew is here using δικαιοσύνη, not as "an inclusive term for the active duties of the religious life,"² but as

¹This would seem to have been the reaction of some copyists for there is a textual variant, some MSS (Koine, Θ, it., Syr. sin.) reading ἐλεημοσύνην in place of δικαιοσύνην . This MSS evidence is weak as compared to the full support for δικαιοσύνη by both Alexandrian and Western tests. Allen explains the variant as an attempt at clarification, since the Hebrew and Aramaic [פְּרָטָה, אֲדָרָסָה] equivalents of δικαιοσύνη "had acquired the sense of 'alms'" and that in this context it might well have been thought that "alms-giving" was the more correct interpretation of the essence, especially in light of vs. 2 (Allen, Matthew, p. 57.)

²G. Abbott-Smith, A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament (3d ed.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1937), p. 116.

that attitude or motivation in the practice of religious duties which centers in the Father, and which accumulates "treasures in heaven" (vs. 20).

(6) 6:33. This is the crucial verse in Bacon's definition of $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\upsilon\nu\eta$ Matthew is saying, "Seek first his Kingdom and that kind of thinking and acting which are demanded of seekers after the Kingdom, or of citizens of the Kingdom."

(7) 21:32. This verse contains a usage of the word seemingly different, but perhaps deliberately used by the Redactor. "For John came to you $\acute{\epsilon}\nu \acute{\omicron}\delta\omega \delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\upsilon\nu\eta$ and you did not believe him . . ." but those who did believe him, "the tax collectors and harlots" will go into the kingdom of God. The way of righteousness of John the Baptist is eschatological in its import; it is behaviour which admits one into the Kingdom. McNeile points out that $\acute{\omicron}\delta\omega\nu$ "describes a manner of life," a way of life, and cites Mt. 22:16 in which $\tilde{\eta}\nu \acute{\omicron}\delta\omega\nu \tau\omicron\upsilon \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ is "the manner of life required by God."¹ Whether we translate $\acute{\epsilon}\nu \acute{\omicron}\delta\omega \delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\upsilon\nu\eta$ as "with the way of righteousness" with McNeile and Allen,² or "in the way of righteousness" with the R.S.V., the implications are the same: $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\upsilon\nu\eta$ is the manner of life, the motivation for those who are aware of living under eschatological tension.

Cremer defines $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\upsilon\nu\eta$ "in its more special and particular manifestation" as "a state of a subject who stands up to

¹McNeile, Matthew, pp. 308, 318.

²Ibid., p. 308; Allen, Matthew, p. 229. Bacon freely translates the passage "for John came to you teaching a way of salvation" (Studies, p. 314).

God's judgment, who, having fulfilled all obligations, has no guilt to hide."¹ He lists Mt. 5:6 and 5:20 as containing the word used in this sense.

It would appear that Matthew has used the term in two ways with one end result in mind: a Pauline-like conception of justification or divine acquittal at the Judgment made possible by the Messiah (3:15), and by the work of John the Baptist (21:32), and realized by those who hunger for it (5:6), are willing to suffer for it (5:10), and who seek it above all else (6:33); the moral and ethical demands of such salvation are stressed in the redefinition of the meaning of obedience to the law in terms of the attitude and willingness to go beyond legalism (5:20), and the motivation underlying religious observances (6:1). In summary, Matthew's use of **δικαιοσύνη** would seem to have definite eschatological implications, for it defines and includes the ethical imperative inherent in his apocalyptic hope.

¹Cremer, Lexicon, 3d. Eng. Ed., p. 192.

DETACHED NOTE B

The Uses of the Terms διδάσκαλος and Κύριος Compared

TABLE I

THE REDACTOR'S USE OF THE TERM ΔΙΔΑΣΚΑΛΟΣ

Uses of Terms	Matthew		Mark	Luke
	Pecul- iar to	Paral- lel		
1. Term used by those who opposed Jesus (scribes, Pharisees, lawyers) as direct address to Jesus or to disciples about Jesus (9:11; <u>12:38</u> ; <u>17:24</u> ; 22:16, <u>24</u> , <u>36</u>).*	3	3	2	5
2. Term used by disciples in direct address to Jesus.	0	0	4	2
3. Term used by others to or about Jesus (<u>8:19</u> ; 19:16).	1	1	5	6
4. Term used by Jesus of himself (10:24, <u>25</u> ; <u>23:8</u> ; 26:18).	2	2	1	3
*Underlined vss. are peculiar to Mt.	6	6	12	16

It is seen by Table I that Matthew used the term διδάσκαλος twelve times, with reference to Jesus, as against twelve in Mk. and sixteen in Lk. In group one it is discovered that the Redactor added three references in which the opponents of Jesus designate him as διδάσκαλος, and it is worthy of note that the resulting six verses run the gamut of a list of Jesus' recognized enemies: scribes, and Pharisees speak to disciples about him (9:11), scribes and Pharisees speak directly to him (12:38), the tax collector accosts Peter (17:24), the Pharisees and Herodians raise the question of paying

tribute to Caesar (22:16), the Sadducees put the question of the resurrection to the teacher and finally a lawyer asks him concerning the "Great Commandment" (22:36).

TABLE II
THE REDACTOR'S USE OF KYPIOΣ

Uses of Terms	Matthew's Uses		Total
	Peculiar to	Paralel	
1. With reference to God (1:20, <u>22</u> , <u>24</u> ; 2: <u>13</u> , <u>15</u> , <u>19</u> ; 3:3; 4:7, <u>10</u> ; <u>5:33</u> ; 9:38; 11:25; 21:9; 22:37; 23:39; <u>27:10</u> ; <u>28:2</u>)*	9	8	17
2. Used in parables of Jesus (sometimes translated "Master" by R.S.V.) (18: <u>25</u> , <u>26</u> , <u>27</u> , <u>31</u> , <u>32</u> , <u>34</u> ; 24:45, 46, 48, 50; 25: <u>11</u> , twice).	8	4	12
3. Jesus' discussion on the Messiah as the Son of David (Mk. 12:35-37) (Mt. 22: <u>43</u> , 44, 45).	1	2	3
4. Used by Jesus with reference to the Son of Man (7:21 twice, <u>22</u> ; 24: <u>42</u> ; 25: <u>37</u> , <u>44</u>).	4	2	6
5. Used in direct address to Jesus:			
a) By his disciples (8: <u>25</u> ; 14: <u>28</u> , <u>30</u> ; 16: <u>22</u> ; 17: <u>4</u> ; 18: <u>21</u> ; 26: <u>22</u>).	7	0	7
b) By others (Jews) (8:2, 21; 9: <u>28</u> ; 17: <u>15</u> ; 20: <u>31</u> , 33).	3	3	6
c) By others (Gentiles) (8: <u>6</u> , 8; 15: <u>22</u> , 27).	2	2	4
6. Used by Jesus of himself (12:8; 21:3).	0	2	2
*Underlined vss. are peculiar to Mt.	34	23	57

The term "κύριος" appears fifty-seven times in Mt., as against eleven times in Mk. and eighty-one in Lk. As we examine Table II we discover that only uses numbered 4, 5, and 6 are of any significance. The Redactor in usage #4 has related the title to the Son of Man in four places: in 7:22 he adds the additional κύριε as emphasis, an editorial addition (cf. supra, p.132, discussion of the passage 7:21-23); in chapter 24, the context is the coming of the Son of Man to which Matthew adds an adaptation of Mk. 13:32, with the addition of ὁ κύριος ὑμῶν, "Watch, therefore, for you do not know on what day your Lord is coming." The two references in the great Last Judgment scene (25:37, 44) which contain κύριε reveal that the word is used as a formal title of address to the King-Judge, the Son of Man.

The group of uses numbered 5 contains some interesting detail. Matthew has added the title at twelve points out of the total of seventeen such uses. All of the references in sub-group a), in which the disciples use κύριε in direct address to Jesus, are the work of the Redactor: in two cases he substitutes κύριε, in 8:25 for διδάσκαλε in Mk. 4:38 and ἐπιστάτα in Lk. 8:24, and in 17:4 for ῥαββεΐ in Mk. 9:5 and ἐπιστάτα in Lk. 9:33; source N supplies the context for usage of κύριε in 14:28, 30; as Peter, in fear of sinking, cries "κύριε, σωσον μέ," and the remaining three (16:22, 18:21, and 26:22) seem to be editorial additions showing the respect of disciple for master.

Sub-groups 5b and 5c contain five additions by Matthew out of ten usages. Two of the three additions under b) represent substitutions of the term for another in the source: κύριε is substi-

tuted in 17:15 for the term διδάσκαλος used by both Mk. 9:17 and Lk. 9:38; in the incident of the healing of the two blind men the Redactor adds κύριε (20:31) to the title υἱε Δαβίδ used by both Mk. and Lk., and two verses later at 20:33 substitutes κύριε (along with Lk. 18:41) for ῥαββουνί in Mk. 10:51.

Group 6, in which the title is used by Jesus of himself, contains no additions by Matthew. The two instances in which he followed the sources are 12:8, "The Son of Man is Lord . . . of the Sabbath" and 21:3 in which Jesus, sending disciples to get the ass for the entry into Jerusalem uses the term as if they are accustomed to calling him ὁ κύριος, "The Lord has need of it (them)."

Κύριε is often used in Mt. as a term of address or of respect, but the verse just discussed (21:3) is the only instance in which Matthew makes the direct application of the title ὁ κύριος to Jesus. This passage ὁ κύριος αὐτῶν κρείαν ἔχει, is solidly imbedded in Markan context (11:3) as the self-designation of Jesus. Cremer notes that following the Resurrection the Redactor does use ὁ κύριος of Jesus, in 28:6 ὅπου ἔκειτο ὁ κύριος.¹ But he does not note, or perhaps did not know, that there is a textual variation at this point so that there is serious doubt as to its authenticity.²

¹H. Cremer, Biblico Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek, trans. D. W. Simon and W. Urwick (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1872), p. 391.

²MSS omitting ὁ κύριος- κ, B, θ, Syr.^{sin.}, Sa.Bo.

MSS including ὁ κύριος-A, C, D, W, fam. 1, it. vg. Nestle, 20th ed. omits the words from the text.

The Redactor actually avoids using ὁ κύριος a number of times in his adaptation of the source materials: e.g. Mk. contains a total of eleven uses of κύριος in various forms, four referring to God, two to the discussion of Messiah as Son of David (see group 3 supra) three times in which κύριε is used of Jesus (2:28; 7:28; 11:30) and already discussed as parallels in Mt. This leaves one which was omitted by the Redactor. In the story of the Gadarene demoniac(s) Matthew deletes the command of Jesus, in Mk. 5:19, that the demoniac should go home and tell his friends "how much ὁ κύριος has done for you." Likewise, in his use of the Q materials the Redactor either omits or Lk. has added, the title ὁ κύριος for Jesus at several points: (Lk. 11:39, 17:5, 6 are examples of Q material containing the title deleted or not used by Matthew).¹

In summary, several facts of interest emerge: (1) Matthew preferred that the disciples address Jesus as κύριε rather than διδάσκαλε . He does not have the latter term on the lips of the disciples at any time, in fact he substitutes κύριε for it on four different occasions. In addition, the seven instances in which Jesus is addressed as κύριε by his disciples are all the work of the Redactor.

(2) The Redactor, if anything is true of his use of διδάσκαλος , preferred that the term be used on the lips of the opponents or adversaries of Jesus. Although not enough evidence

¹Lk. also contains a number of references in L material, (7:13; 10:1; 19:8; 22:49, 61; 24:34) which might well raise the question whether this is characteristically a Hellenistic usage which Luke has used rather freely in his Gospel.

is available for absolute decision, yet from the study of the table, it would seem that Matthew identified the usage of the term διδασκαλος with Jesus' opponents.¹

(3) Matthew did not use ὁ κύριος to designate Jesus in the way in which Luke used the title so freely. Dalman points out that the Hellenistic-Christian use of ὁ κύριος or κύριος could mean God or Jesus, but among Jewish-Christians (of the "Hebraist" section) there would be no ambiguity; the Aramaic-speaking Jews did not designate God as "Lord," hence the use of κύριος would be of Jesus, not of Jesus as God.²

¹Kilpatrick, *Origins*, p. 80, points out that Matthew reproduces only seven out of Mk's seventeen uses of διδασκειν, and that on a number of occasions Mt. does not contain this verb while it does occur in the corresponding Q passages. These facts, coupled with the above conclusion, lead me to agree with Kilpatrick that while "we cannot conclude from these statistics that the evangelist was not interested in teaching, . . . taken by themselves they do not yield evidence that he was."

²Words, p. 329.

DETACHED NOTE C

Matthew's use of ἔγγιζω

The word ἔγγιζω appears forty-three times in the New Testament of which twenty-nine are in the gospels, as follows: eight in Mt., three in Mk., eighteen in Lk., and none in Jn. The King James' translation is "draw nigh," "draw near," or "be at hand."¹ Most Lexicographers agree that the word is translated as "to come near, to approach," "to be at hand."²

Of the eight uses reported in Mt. by Smith (see n.1), five are in the perfect tense, two are in the aorist, while one has been eliminated in recent texts.³ The two uses in the aorist tense are:

- (1) 21:1, Καὶ ὅτε ἤγγισαν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα καὶ ἦλθον βηθαφαγι -- "and when they drew near Jerusalem, and came (to) Bethphage" -- meaning that the party had arrived near to, but not in, Jerusalem;
- (2) 21:34, ὅτε δε ἤγγισεν ὁ καιροσ των καρπων -- "and when the time of harvest drew near," which could mean "the time of the harvest had come" or "the time of the harvest approached," it being uncertain as to the exact meaning,⁴ although the use of

¹J. B. Smith, Greek-English Concordance to the New Testament (Scottsdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1955), p. 97.

²W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 212; Abbott-Smith, Lexicon, p. 127; Liddel & Scott, Lexicon, p. 189.

³Mt. 15:8 in Texus Receptus contained the word, but all major texts omit the reference. See Bruce, Exp. Grk. Test., I, p. 213, n. 4.

⁴Kümmel, Promise and Fulfillment, p. 23.

the acrist would seem to favor the latter.

The five uses in the perfect tense include three which make reference to the expectation of the Kingdom of Heaven: 3:2, the proclamation of John the Baptist is the same in Mt. as the proclamation of Jesus at 4:17 and 10:7 ἤγγικεν γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν. The final two uses are most instructive: (1) 26:45 ἴδου ἤγγικεν ἡ ὥρα --"behold the hour has drawn near"-- in which Jesus notes the approach of the hour of his betrayal; and (2) 26:46 ἴδου ἤγγικεν ὁ παραδιδούς με --"behold he who betrays me has come near"-- which notes the approach of the one who was to betray; he had not arrived as yet, but was within sight.¹

From the uses in Mt., with the possible exception of 21:34, it seems that the best translation would be "is at hand," or "approaches at this instant," or "is coming near." C. H. Dodd, arguing from the Hebrew and Aramaic derivatives, concludes that ἔγγιζω means "has come,"² but W. G. Kümmel, in a recent study argues quite conclusively that "is coming near" is the most proper

¹Two of the seven appear in matter added by the Redactor (3:2, and 21:34); four are paralleled in Mk. and/or Lk. by the same word sometimes in different construction, (4:17, 10:7, 21:1, and 26:46); while one has been substituted by the Redactor for ἦλθεν (26:45, cf. Mk. 14:41).

²Charles H. Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom (3d ed.; London: Nisbet & Co., Ltd., 1936), pp. 44f. W. R. Bates, Dissertation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary (1951) quotes A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research (5th ed.; New York: Richard R. Smith, 1931) p. 893 to the effect that the usage in these passages is in the "extensive perfect" which expresses "continuance of completed action," but a check of Robertson reveals that this very thorough study does not include the verb ἔγγιζω as occurring in this rather rare use of the perfect tense.

translation.¹ It would appear that Dodd's weakest argument is with relation to 12:28 for he equates φθάνω with ἐγγιζω because, he says, they had both been used to translate the same Hebrew words--which meant "to arrive" or "to come"--in the LXX. He strengthens his argument by noting that in Lk. 10:9 which reads ἤγγικεν ἐφ' ὑμας ἡ βασιλεια του θεου, ἤγγικεν means exactly the same as ἐφθασεν in the passage ἀρα ἐφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμας ἡ βασιλεια του θεου, recorded alike by both Mt. (12:28) and Lk. (11:20). It is highly probable, in view of the use of ἡ βασιλεια του θεου in 12:28, that Matthew has deliberately retained φθάνω to express a concept different from that implied by ἐγγιζω in his other uses. Dalman translates φθάνω as "to come upon anyone so that he cannot escape."² Liddell and Scott point out that the earlier uses of the word signified "to come before" or to arrive sooner,³ and Abbott-Smith notes that in late writers it meant "to come, arrive."⁴

The best conclusion seems to be that Matthew envisioned the Kingdom of Heaven as near at hand, expected momentarily, but that he had a different conception of the Kingdom of God; the uses of the latter term indicate that he considered the Kingdom of God--equated with the Church--to have begun with the ministry of Jesus.⁵

¹Kümmel, Promise and Fulfillment, pp. 19-25.

²Dalman, Words, p. 107.

³Liddell and Scott, Lexicon, p. 755.

⁴Abbott-Smith, Lexicon, p. 468.

⁵See discussion of Kingdom of God, supra, pp. 160ff.

DETACHED NOTE D

'ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑ

The word **ἐκκλησία**, in the Greek world was a term for a convened assembly. It was derived from common usage, for as Schmidt points out, the "**ἐκκλητῶι**" (the "called out")-- "those who have been summoned by the herald"--was the name of "the assembled citizens."¹ Schmidt goes on to state that "it is questionable whether **ἐκκλησία** ever meant a religious society in ordinary Greek," but rather was used of any assembly of persons called to meet for a special purpose.²

One can learn little more than this, for our purposes, from the study of the Greek derivation and common usages, for it was really the Septuagint which gave the word to the New Testament. The LXX was the Bible of the early Church and the fact that **ἐκκλησία** appears there more than one hundred times would tend to make it a hallowed word. A Hebrew expression and concept lies behind the LXX, therefore, a study of the Semetic equivalents is necessary. Interestingly enough, the Hebrew word **קָהָל** comes from a root meaning "voice," very similar in meaning to the Greek root of **ἐκκλησία**, i.e. "to call."

In the Hebrew **קָהָל** is used of an assembly convened for a definite purpose, sometimes a gathering on a festal occasion,

¹Schmidt, Karl Ludwig, The Church from Gerhard Kittel's Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, trans. J. R. Coates, as Bible Key Words (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951), p. 30.

²Ibid, p. 24.

but "far more frequently it has in view the community of Israel collectively regarded as a congregation."¹ The significant uses of קָהָל include the gathering of the people of Israel at Sinai; that gathering on the day of the Covenant is so designated, and the day on which the event took place was "the day of the קָהָל "; the worshipping community at the dedication of Solomon's Temple (I Kgs. 1:14ff); and the gathering of men, women and children for the reading of the Law by Ezra.² Thus this particular word usually referred to religious gatherings of Israelites, the congregation gathered before Yahweh, or to the whole people of Israel, as in the assembly at Sinai. In these senses it meant "God's people."

Another Hebrew noun עֵדוּת , meaning "congregation," must be considered also. Cremer notes that both קָהָל and עֵדוּת served to express something more than a collective unity due to any natural causes;

they implied that the Israelitish community . . . was based on a special idea, that it was established in a special way and for a special end. . . . it is self-evident that the underlying thought is the function of the people in the plan of salvation--a religious function which is confirmed, especially in the case of קָהָל , by its application to festive and Sabbath assemblies.³

The translators of the LXX seem to translate the two words interchangeably as ἐκκλησία and συναγωγή . Selbie points out that קָהָל is translated by ἐκκλησία and עֵדוּת by συναγωγή in

¹J. A. Selbie, "Congregation," Hastings DOB, I, p. 467.

²Schmidt, Church, pp. 55f, n. 1.

³Cremer, Lexicon, 3d. ed., p. 334.

Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah and most of Deuteronomy; but that the reverse of these translations occurs in Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and one passage in Deuteronomy.¹ The former of the two sets of translations is the customary combination, however. The absence of a consistent usage or pattern in translation into the Greek leads Schmidt to conclude that neither of the terms was a technical term, as such. "It [$\zeta\eta\rho$ or $\pi\tau\upsilon$] only becomes one when it is coupled with Yahweh, or with Israel as the people of Yahweh, whether in the text or to be understood."²

The two lines of tradition focussed in the use of $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\alpha$ by the early Christians help to determine the meaning it had for them, but, finally, the meaning must be interpreted in light of the new situation in which the Apostles found themselves. The original meaning of $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\alpha$ as "the convened

¹Selbie, Hastings, DOB, I, p. 467. R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1954) trans. Kendrick Grobel, I, p. 38, attempts to support the claim that $\zeta\eta\rho$ meant exclusively "People of God" and that it is usually rendered by $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\alpha$ "but, significantly, not where it would mean a heathen people." He goes on to add that the word $\pi\tau\upsilon$ is never "rendered by $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\alpha$, but in most cases by $\sigma\upsilon\nu\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\eta$. "

That the concepts were not consistent is shown by the Qumran documents. In the Scrolls, $\pi\tau\upsilon$, "the congregation," is equated by Gaster (Dead Sea, p. 327, n.1) with "the Israel of God." In addition, in the Dam. Doc. (according to Schmidt, Church, p. 49) both $\zeta\eta\rho$ and $\pi\tau\upsilon$ are used interchangeably, the latter at least three times, and the former four times, as a self-designation of that particular "eschatological community." We must conclude that $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\alpha$, as used in the LXX, regardless of the Hebrew word it translated, is "the term for the community of Israel, whether assembled, or no." (Moulton and Milligan, Vocabulary, p. 195.)

²Schmidt, Church, p. 55.

assembly"--which Deissmann says is the best translation possible¹--and the Hebrew concepts, filtered through the interpretations of the translators of LXX, point the way for understanding. But we must conjecture the reasons the early Christians chose to use this particular word for the local congregation as well as for the universal church.

By the first century the term συναγωγή was used by the Hellenistic Jews as the name for the local religious groups, the Jewish synagogue. (Acts 9:2, Lk. 12:11). There is some evidence that the earliest Jewish-Christians, thinking of themselves as faithful Jews who also believed in Jesus as the Christ--and therefore as a sect within Judaism--were known as a synagogue (James 2:2). The oldest New Testament writings containing ἐκκλησία are the letters of Paul, although there is good reason for the belief that the appearances in the early chapters of Acts reflect a more primitive usage.² It is likely that the use of the term arose among Greek-speaking Jewish-Christians and their Gentile adherents "who formed congregations resembling the Hellenistic synagogues before Paul's time,"³ but who wished to make a distinction between the Christian and the Jewish groups.

One of the important passages in Acts is 7:38 which contains the reference to the ἐκκλησία in the wilderness at Mount Sinai. The verse echoes Deut. 9:10 which, in the Hebrew, identi-

¹Deissmann, Light From Ancient East, p. 112.

²Schmidt, Church, p. 12, n. 2.

³Ibid., p. 30.

fies this assembly as the $\zeta\pi\rho$, translated in the LXX as $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\alpha$. Other uses in these chapters of Acts refer to the Christians in particular: in 5:11 a "great fear came upon $\acute{\omicron}\lambda\alpha\nu\ \tau\eta\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\alpha\nu$ and upon all who heard of these things"--making a distinction between the band of Christians and "others"; in 8:1, 3 the $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\alpha$ is the group of Christians in Jerusalem; and 9:31 refers to the $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\alpha$ --with some slight MSS evidence for the plural here--"throughout all Judaea and Galilee and Samaria."

The development of the idea in the direction of the New Testament $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\alpha$ is bound up with the fact that the word was used for those who shared in the covenant of Sinai and also for those who renewed their devotion to the Law under Ezra. Thus $\zeta\pi\rho$ is seen to connote those to whom belong the covenant and the promises. A second important point is that at least from the time of Ezra, women and children were included. Thus, in its LXX form $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\alpha$ commends itself to Christians whose community welcomes women and children, in preference to $\sigma\upsilon\nu\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\eta$, whose responsibilities were confined to men.¹

It would appear that the early Christians deliberately chose $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\alpha$ as the word which most effectively linked them with the ancient Hebrew tradition, and yet which would distinguish them from the contemporary Jews. The choice, in effect, constituted a claim by the Greek-speaking Christians that "that community was no mere sect of Israel but the true messianic people of God."² The strong ties with the LXX would indicate that the term is not a Hellenistic innovation, but is deeply rooted in Hebrew religion.

Several different uses of the word appear in the New Testa-

¹Ibid., pp. 55f, n.1.

²G. B. Caird, The Apostolic Age, (London: Gerald Duckworth and Co., Ltd., 1955), p. 46.

ment.¹

1. "Assembly, as a regularly summoned political body," as used in Acts 19:39--"it shall be settled in the regular ἐκκλησία (also Acts 19:32, 41).

2. "The congregation of the Israelites, especially when gathered for religious purposes," as used for example, in Acts 7:38, "This is he who was in the ἐκκλησία in the wilderness."

3. Several different applications are made to the Christian Church: (a) "a church meeting"--e.g., I Cor. 11:18, III John 6; (b) "the church or congregation as the totality of Christians living in one place"--e.g., Mt. 18:17, Acts 5:11, 8:3; (c) of "house-churches"--e.g., Rom. 16:5; (d) "the church universal"--e.g., Mt. 16:18, Act. 9:31; (e) local and universal church called specifically, ἐκκλησία του θεου (in I Cor. 1:2; 10:32; 11:6), ἐκκλησία του χριστου (Rom. 16:16), and both of these together in I Thes. 1:1.

It would seem that Matthew has used the term in two different ways: from the above definitions 16:18 refers to "church universal" while 18:17 is a reference to a local congregation.

Cremer is helpful at this point for he notes that the particular verb used by Matthew in 16:19 helps define the meaning:

When Christ says οἰκοδομησω μου την ἐκκλησιαν we are scarcely reminded that ἐκκλησία denoted in profane Greek the place of assembly as well as the assembly, but rather that the Old Testament community was the house of Israel.²

¹Arndt and Gingrich, Lexicon, p. 240. Cf. also W. Barclay, A New Testament Wordbook (London: SCM Press, 1955), pp. 34ff.

²Cremer, Lexicon, 3d. ed., p. 334.

This suggests--ignoring Cremer's allusion that the words are the words of Jesus--that Matthew considers the Church as the congregation of Israel. Montefiore notes that in the context--the brother who rejects reconciliation shall be considered as a Gentile--the use in 18:17 "clearly means the little community of Jewish Christians."¹ The Redactor has, it would appear, deliberately chosen the word--already in use--which links the followers of Jesus with the Hebrew tradition, a tradition which he saw not as repudiated by, but as fulfilled in the Christ.

¹Synoptic Gospels, II, p. 252.

DETACHED NOTE E

The Son of Man

The title "Son of Man," had evolved, by the first century, so that in certain contexts it was an apocalyptic term for the supernatural agent of God in the Final Judgment. Its development is of interest. The term "son of man" is used twenty times in Ezekiel, mostly in the personal sense, as a dramatic term for "I". It next appears in the Psalms, (cf. 8:4 and 80:17) where it is possible for it to be translated as "Man" in the generic sense. The vision of Daniel (7:13-14) employs the term when "one like a son of man" appears before the Ancient of Days. The use in Daniel is simply as "human being"¹ as distinguished from the metaphorical beasts which had previously appeared. The meaning of the term "son of man" in Daniel is seen in the context to be "the Saints of the Most High" or Israel (vs. 7:18). That is, as the beasts each represent a Gentile kingdom, even so does the human figure represent Israel.

The figure next emerges in The Similitudes of Enoch (chapters 37-71) as a super-human, supernatural agent of God, the judge of men, the Messiah.²

Studies are constantly being made of the Son of Man sayings in the New Testament to determine whether or not Jesus used

¹Klausner, Idea, p. 230.

²Cf. supra, Chapter III, pp. 70f., on this concept.

the term of himself.¹ T. W. Manson's hypotheses that Jesus used the title in the Danielic sense, the corporate Son of Man, and that he had hoped to "create the Son of Man, the Kingdom of the saints of the Most High"² with his disciples as the nucleus, has gained a most favorable reception. There seem to be three different uses of the title in the authentic sayings of Jesus: those with the distinctly personal, first person reference, which could be translated as "I"; those which seem to point to the future and refer to the apocalyptic, or the coming Son of Man; and those which speak of the passion, suffering and resurrection of Jesus.³ The latter two are of most importance. Manson concludes that in the passion sayings Jesus is combining the Danielic Son of Man with the Suffering Servant concept, suffering being seen as the instrument of redemption. The references to the apocalyptic Son of Man are in the third person and there is no assurance that they were ever connected in Jesus' mind with the concept of the "corporate Son of Man." John Knox points out that there is "least evidence of Jesus' self-identification in the apocalyptic elements."⁴ He goes on to suggest that, since Jesus sometimes referred to himself as bar Nasha, the early Church did the

¹T. W. Manson, Teachings, pp. 211-236, presents a thorough-going study of the problem. Cf. also R. Otto, Kingdom and Son, pp. 159-221; J. W. Bowman, Intention, pp. 119-153; G. S. Duncan, Jesus, Son of Man (New York: Macmillan, 1940); V. Taylor, Names of Jesus, pp. 25-35; H. B. Sharman, Son of Man and Kingdom of God (New York: Harper & Bros., 1943), pp. 9-83.

²Manson, Teachings, p. 228.

³Ibid., pp. 211-228; Taylor, Names of Jesus, p. 32.

⁴J. Knox, Christ the Lord (New York: Willett, Clark and Company, 1945), p. 38.

rest.¹

Matthew uses the title Son of Man thirty times, nine of which are in passages peculiar to Mt. A study of his uses of the title and the parallels in the other documents is helpful. From Mark, with no apparent change in meaning, Matthew includes eleven uses:

- 9:6 Son of Man has authority to forgive sins (Mk. 2:10).
 17:9 "until the Son of Man is raised from the dead" (Mk. 9:9).
 17:12 "Son of Man will suffer many things" (Mk. 9:12).
 17:22 Son of Man is to be delivered into the hands of men (Mk. 9:31).
 20:18 . . . will be delivered to the chief priests (Mk. 10:33).
 20:28 . . . came not to be served (Mk. 10:45).
 24:30 "they will see the Son of Man coming on the clouds (Mk. 13:26).
 26:24 "The Son of Man goes as it is written of him, but woe to that man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed" (Mk. 14:21).
 26:45 "The Son of Man is betrayed into the hands of sinners (Mk. 14:41).
 26:64 "You will see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power and coming on the clouds" (Mk. 14:62).

From Mk. with some change in meaning:

- 16:27 The Son of Man is to "come with his (the) angels" (Mk. 8:38).

This represents a change only in intensity, not in meaning.

- 12:8 "The Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath" (Mk. 2:28).²

The change in this verse is effected by the arrangement of the

¹Knox, Christ the Lord, p. 41.

²Cf. supra, p.158, n. 2.

materials preceding it, and makes a definite linking of Jesus, "something greater than the Temple," with the Son of Man.

16:13 "Who do men say that the Son of Man is?" The Redactor omits the term from 16:21 (Mk. 8:31) but had added it previously at 16:13. The change of position is significant because it shows Jesus anticipating the answer to his question.

Matthew takes seven Son of Man sayings from Q, four of which stand with no apparent change:

- 8:20 Son of Man has nowhere to lay his head (Lk. 9:58).
- 11:19 "The Son of Man came eating and drinking" (Lk. 7:34).
- 12:32 "Whoever speaks against the Son of Man will be forgiven" (Lk. 12:10).
- 24:44 Son of Man is coming at an hour you least expect (Lk. 12:40).

The three from Q which were altered:

- 24:27 Matthew has "the Parousia of the Son of Man", and Lk. has "the days of the Son of Man." (Lk. 17:24).
- 24:37 same change as 24:27 (Lk. 17:26).
- 12:40 Son of Man will be three days and nights in the heart of the earth¹ (Lk. 11:30).

Matthew twice omits the title Son of Man from Lukan contexts by substituting "my" (5:11) and "I" (10:32), both instances, however, being such as to serve to make a definite claim for Jesus as Son of Man.²

In addition to the above uses the Redactor includes also ten peculiar uses of the titles as follows:

¹Cf. supra, p. 165 on this verse

²Cf. supra, p.151, n. 2.

10:23 "You will not have gone through all the towns of Israel before the Son of Man comes."¹

Two are from the Interpretation of the Parable of the Tares:

13:37 "He who sows the good seed is the Son of Man."²

13:41 "The Son of Man will send his angels and they will gather out of his kingdom . . ."³

16:13 "Who do men say that the Son of Man is?"⁴

16:28 "Some will not taste death before they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom."⁵

19:28 In the new world when the Son of Man shall sit on his glorious throne."⁶

24:30 "Then will appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven . . . all the tribes of the earth will mourn."⁷

24:39 "So will be the parousia of the Son of Man."⁸

25:31 "When the Son of Man comes in his glory and all the angels with him."

26:2 "You know that after two days the Passover is coming and the Son of Man will be delivered up to be crucified."

Of the total uses of the title, the fifteen which are paralleled in Mk. and Lk. and appear in Mt. without change reveal little except that Matthew accepts the Synoptic evidence that Jesus identified himself as Son of Man--Suffering Servant. The fifteen, including two from Mk. and three from Q which have been altered, and the nine uses peculiar to Matthew, all--with the

¹Cf. supra, pp.149f, n. 1. ²Cf. supra, p.168, n. 1.

³Cf. supra, p.169, n. 3 and 4.

⁴The Redactor substitutes "Son of Man" for "I". This is counted as a usage peculiar to Mt. rather than as an alteration to a Markan verse. Cf. above in the listing of usages from Mk.

⁵Cf. supra, p. 182.

⁶Cf. supra, pp. 186-89.

⁷Cf. supra, p. 210.

⁸Cf. supra, p. 211.

possible exception of the last one (26:2)--serve to reveal the Redactor's purpose to relate Jesus to the supernatural, coming Son of Man by heightening the meaning or by making definite references to such a one. It is apparent he has no conception of a communal or corporate Son of Man, although one could see a reference to this idea(13:41 and 16:28)in the phrase "his kingdom."

DETACHED NOTE F

The Parousia

The Greek word παρουσία "has become naturalized in English as a technical term for the Second Coming of Christ."¹ In classical Greek the word means "presence" or "being present"² and was so used by Paul many times, (e.g. "God comforted us by the parousia of Titus," II Cor. 7:6 and "as you have always obeyed me, so now, not only as in my parousia but much more in my absence . . .," Phil. 2:12). In the papyri, beginning with the third century B.C., the word has the "sense of a solemn visit, a joyful entrance of a prince or reigning king."³ Preparations were made for such a coming: special taxes were levied as a gift to the king, all things must be made ready. The visit of the king was often the time when wrongs could be set right by the presentation and hearing of petitions. It was a common practice also "to strike new coins to commemorate the visit of the king." Barclay points out two other uses of the word: sometimes it is used of "the invasion of a province by a general" as in the case of Mithradates' invasion of Asia; and parousia is used of "the visitation of a god," e.g. of the healing visit of Aesculapius, god of

¹Barclay, N. T. Wordbook, p. 90.

²Abbott-Smith, Lexicon, p. 347.

³A. Feuillet, "Le Sens Du Mot Parousie Dans L' Evangile De Matthieu" in W. D. Davies and D. Daube, editors, The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology (Cambridge: University Press, 1956) pp. 261-280.

healing, to a sufferer in his temple. "The word describes a healing and corrective visitation."¹

The application of the term parousia to the coming of Jesus Christ "is not easy to explain" says Cremer.² Deissmann, in his study of the papyri, concludes that it was a natural transition made by Paul from the understanding the Christians of Thessalonica would have had of the parousia of the Roman emperors ("the cities of Corinth and Patras struck advent-coins"³ in commemoration of a visit of Nero), to the expected coming of Jesus Christ.

How graphically it must have appealed to the Christians of Thessalonica, with their living conception of the parousiae of the rulers of this world, when they read in St. Paul's second letter of the Satanic "parousia" of Antichrist, who was to be destroyed by "the manifestation of the parousia" of the Lord Jesus.⁴

Deissmann quotes another characteristic example of the use of the word; it was in a petition found in the wrappings of the mummy of a sacred crocodile. In expectation of the visit of King Ptolemy II who called himself Soter ("savior"), the officials of a village say, concerning the delivery of corn to defray the cost:

. . . and applying ourselves diligently both night and day, unto the fulfilling of that which was set before us and the

¹Barclay, N. T. Wordbook, p. 91.

²Cremer, Lexicon, p. 221.

³The Latin advent is the equivalent of parousia.

⁴A. Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, trans. Lionel R. M. Strachan (rev. ed.; New York: Harper & Brothers, n. d.), p. 371.

provision of 80 artabae which was imposed for the parousia of the king.¹

In the New Testament the term parousia came to be used for the coming of Christ, with all the apocalyptic signs of the end, the accompanying Judgment, the final victory of the Kingdom of God over all forces of evil. The uses of the word itself are summarized by Barclay:

- (1) It is used as the basis of a demand to preserve life blameless against the coming of the king. . . .
- (2) It is used as a reason for patience. . . .
- (3) It is spoken of as something to desire and to pray for.²

Bultmann proposes the idea that the concept of the parousia in the earliest period of Christianity denoted, not return, but arrival or advent of the Son of Man. Predictions of the parousia are older than those of passion and resurrection, because the sayings predicting the suffering, death, and resurrection are "all vaticinia ex eventu," while the oldest Son of Man sayings on the lips of Jesus speak of the coming of the Son of Man in the third person and do not necessarily identify Jesus with him.

Clearly, the predictions of the parousia originally had nothing to do with the prediction of death and resurrection; i.e. in the sayings that speak of the coming of the Son of Man there is no idea that this Son of Man is already here in person and must be removed by death before he can return from heaven. . . . it is not to be doubted that the predictions of the parousia are older than those of the passion and resurrection; Q knows only the former.³

Manson's study of the Son of Man sayings does not support

¹Barclay, N. T. Wordbook, p. 91.

²Ibid., p. 92.

³Bultmann, Theology N. T., pp. 29-30.

this conclusion. He does say that

In Q and M . . . there is no case where it can be maintained with any confidence that the idea of the Passion is connected with the Son of Man. . . .

but that in Mark and L the opposite is true:

In Mark the sufferings and death and resurrection of the Son of Man are a prominent and integral feature of the story in the second part of the ministry. The evidence is equally clear, though not so overwhelming, . . . in Proto-Luke.¹

The actual use of parousia to refer to a second coming of Jesus technically is not settled until the second century although this is surely what Paul had in mind. Ignatius of Antioch speaks of the parousia as the first coming (arrival, appearance) of Christ, a prelude to his passion and resurrection (Phila. 9:2). Bultmann points out that Justin Martyr was the first to speak of the πρώτη and the δευτέρα παρουσία (Dial. 14:8, 40:4) and of παλιν παρουσία (Dial. 118:2).²

T. Francis Glasson, in a recent study of the origin of the New Testament doctrine of the Second Coming of Christ, shows rather conclusively that neither in the teachings of Jesus nor in the immediate post-Resurrection Church do we see the idea of the Second Advent. The Messiah's Parousia was not a current Jewish doctrine, according to this scholar, nor did Jesus teach it of himself. The references to the Son of Man in the sayings of Jesus are references to his exaltation--of his ascent to God in the

¹Manson, Teachings, pp. 226f.

²Bultmann, Theology N. T., p. 29. Johnson, Int. Bib., VII p. 543, apparently takes the opposite view by saying, with reference to Matthew's use of parousia, "Coming is by now a technical term for the Second Advent.

true Danielic sense of the term.

The twenty years between the resurrection of Jesus and the writing of the Thessalonian Epistles saw the development and emergence of the doctrine.¹

There are no parallels in Enoch to the descent of the Messiah, Son of Man nor to other apocalyptic elements seen in the Synoptic Gospels. But there are remarkable similarities in the "Day of the Lord" passages in Isaiah 26-27. This apocalypse speaks of the Coming of the Lord, the Judgment, the Resurrection, the sounding of the Trumpet, and the Gathering of the Elect, all of which are elements in the parousia passages in I and II Thessalonians. This leads Glasson to conclude:

To find the true origin of the Parousia teaching of I and II Thessalonians we are not to go to the teaching of Jesus and then to Enoch and then to Persian eschatology. Rather, as the language suggests, we are to go straight from these passages of I and II Thessalonians, as representing the early Church teaching, to the O. T. The connecting link was the conviction that Jesus was Lord.²

In other words, the very early association of the Lord, of the Old Testament, and the Lord Jesus led to the use of the Old Testament passages in the development of the parousia doctrine.

In a sense, the doctrine of the Parousia was not new; all the essential details are found in the O. T. description of the coming theophany. Broadly speaking, the Christians took over the O. T. doctrine of the Advent of the Lord, making the single adjustment that the Lord was the Lord Jesus.³

The use of the term parousia does not occur in the Gos-

¹T. F. Glasson, The Second Advent (2d ed. rev.; London: The Epworth Press, 1947), p. 156.

²Ibid., p. 171.

³Ibid., p. 176.

pels outside of Mt. 24:3, 27, 37-41. It is quite clear that Matthew has in mind the apocalyptic coming of Jesus as the Son of Man at the Final Judgment.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

INTRODUCTION

This final chapter will be concerned with three aspects of the study: (1) a summary of the findings in chapter four "The Eschatological Implications in the Work of the Redactor"; (2) conclusions to be drawn from these findings; and (3) some implications for further study which these conclusions suggest.

SUMMARY

The work of Matthew can be seen as consciously moving from prophetic to apocalyptic eschatology in a synthesis which is consistent in terms of the setting of the Church in his own day.

Prophetic Elements Concern the Work of Jesus

A number of elements in Matthew's eschatology stem from the older prophetic or nationalistic hope of the Jews in the restoration of the Davidic kingdom. He is under the necessity of showing that Jesus of Nazareth fulfilled the several facets of the Messianic hope, although in ways different from the expectations.

Son of David.-The Redactor has deliberately taken steps to show that Jesus of Nazareth shall be proved to be the Messianic Son of David, true heir to the throne, "by birth, by his miraculous power, and by recognition by Gentiles as well as by Jews."¹

The Eschatological Prophet.-Matthew, in 21:10-11, seems to combine the expectation of the Son of David with that of the coming of a "Mosaic eschatological prophet," claiming that Jesus fulfilled both.² This would seem to be supported by the attempts to identify Jesus with Moses, e.g. the ten miracles of 8:1-9:34,³ the arrangement of material in five discourses, the new Torah.

The Christ.-Messiah, the common designation of the expected One,⁴ is used by Matthew in different contexts to show that Jesus the Christ is the Son of David,⁵ the Son of Man,⁶ the Master to be emulated by those in the Church,⁷ the Son of God,⁸

¹Supra, p. 140 on 9:27-31, a summary of the uses of this title by Matthew. Cf. also on chapters 1 and 2, pp. 119-122.

²Supra, on 21:10-11, p.189. That the early Church was not unaware of this expectation is attested in a recent article by Dr. Matthew Black, "Servant of the Lord, and Son of Man," in SJTh, VII (1953), pp. 1-11; the speeches of Stephen and Peter in Acts linking the expectation of the Prophet with the idea of the Suffering Servant, show us "one of the most primitive forms of New Testament Christology."

³Cf. supra, p.133, n.3.

⁴See the discussion on the meaning of "Messiah" in chapter III, p. 50f. The Redactor uses the term "Christ" 16 times, of which 3 refer generally to the expected Messiah and 13 directly to Jesus; of the 13, 2 are paralleled in Mk. and Lk. while 11 are in the Redactor's materials.

⁵1:1

⁶16:13-16

⁷23:10

⁸16:16

the expected Messiah of the Jews.¹ Even the unexpected beginning of the Messianic work in Galilee rather than in Jerusalem is justified by Scripture.²

Suffering Servant.-Joseph Klausner has contended recently that the Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah was a part of the Messianic hope of the Jews,³ and the Qumran material has added a measure of proof to his contention,⁴ despite the claims of some Christian scholars that in Jesus the concept first attained Messianic significance. It would appear that the concept was a part of the total eschatological hope of first century Judaism. The Christians very early, following Jesus' teachings,⁵ made the identification absolute (cf. e.g., the preaching of Philip in Acts 8:26-39). The Redactor, in conformity with his practice of identifying Jesus with every expectation in

¹1:16, 17, 18; 2:4; 11:2; 16:20; 26:68; 27:17, 22.

²Supra, pp. 123f, on 4:14-16.

³Klausner, Idea, pp. 24f. Dr. Klausner notes that both Deutero-Isaiah and Daniel had made a significant change in the conception of the Messiah:

The Messiah is not one man from the house of David or any other royal line, but the whole people of Israel. But, while Israel is portrayed in Deutero-Isaiah as a 'light of the Gentiles' and the 'servant of the Lord,' that is, as a spiritual and a suffering Messiah, this people is portrayed in Daniel as a 'son of man coming with the clouds of heaven,' to whom rulership of the Gentiles is handed over forever and ever, that is, as a politically and materially successful Messiah.

⁴Cf. discussion on "Corporate Servant" supra in chapter III, pp. 109-115.

⁵Cf. e.g., Otto, Kingdom and Son, pp. 249-61; V. Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1948), pp. 21-32; and the fine article by R. B. Y. Scott, "Isaiah," Int. Bib. V, pp. 412-413.

existence, likewise makes this identification of Jesus with the Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah.¹ There is a subtle hint that Matthew saw the sufferings of Jesus as being necessary for fulfillment of the conditions which would make the Parousia possible.² The hints of the atoning or propitiatory quality of Jesus passion would support this.³

The Redactor's Chain of Eschatological Events

Introductory Note.--Dr. Klausner lists the links in what he calls the "complete Messianic chain" as the signs of the Messiah, the birth pangs of Messiah, the coming of Elijah, the trumpet of Messiah, the ingathering of the exiles, the reception of proselytes, the war with Gog and Magog, the Days of the Messiah, the renovation of the world, the Day of Judgment, the resurrection of the dead, the World to Come. He points out that not every apocalypse contains all of these "links," and that this particular order is not always observed, but "in general, you find these links and in the order mentioned."⁴

The study of Matthew's eschatology reveals that most of the above elements are included, but that the order of events is somewhat different. The following will be a discussion of the links in the Redactor's eschatological chain in what seems to be

¹Supra, p. 159, on 12:18-21, and pp. 135f on 8:17.

²Supra, p. 224, on 26:52-54, 56. Micklem, Matthew, p. 244, says that Matthew had "sought to show that the Jews ought to have been prepared for a Messiah, poor, lowly, suffering, rejected of men and killed, and only so entering his glory."

³Supra, p. 222f.

⁴Klausner, Idea, p. 385. See also Detached Note F. p.254.

his chronological arrangement. The links include: the coming of Elijah, the signs of the Messiah, the Days of the Messiah, the birth pangs of the new age, the consummation of the age, including the ensign and trumpet of the Son of Man, and the ingathering of the "elect," the Parousia of the Son of Man, the Last Judgment, and the World to Come or Kingdom of Heaven.

The Coming of Elijah.-One can catch glimpses in Jewish writings of the belief in the coming of a prophet to interpret properly the will of God. Prophecy had ceased with Ezra, and the people, through their leaders, were under the necessity of making human decisions based on the interpretation of Torah, but there was an expectation that in the beginning of the new age God would send a prophet to reveal His will and to make the Tribes of Israel ready for the coming of the Messiah.¹

It is apparent that there existed in Judaism various concepts of a prophet or the Prophet who would come at the beginning of the eschatological period, though there was not agreement about the identity of the Prophet.²

The Redactor recognized this expectation and saw its fulfillment, as marking the beginning of the signs of the Messiah, in the work of John the Baptist. Two passages, making definite the identification of John the Baptist with Elijah, are added to Markan and Q contexts.³ The restoration of the tribes to Israel, seen as a part of this hope, was fulfilled in a way different from common expectation. The separation of the "true sons of the

¹Supra, p. 155.

²Teepie, JBL Monograph, Vol. X, p. 11.

³See discussion supra on 11:14-15, p. 155; 17:13, p. 182.

Kingdom" is seen as having been accomplished in the opening of the Kingdom by the Baptist, not to "Sons of Abraham" but to those who repent of their sins. The entrance of the dispossessed, common people into the Kingdom or Church effects, in the Redactor's scheme, the "restoration of the tribes to Israel."¹

The Signs of the Messiah.-The life and works of Jesus of Nazareth serve as the sign of the Messiah. His work not only fulfilled the prophetic expectations of Son of David, Son of God, Christ, Suffering Servant, but his suffering and death fulfilled scripture and made possible His exaltation to "the right hand of Power" and set the stage for his coming as Son of Man at the consummation of the age; and, in addition, the manifestations of his power and other signs which accompanied his work, were taken as portents of the Messianic age to follow. Such signs are seen in 8:29, when the demons inquire if Jesus has come to destroy them "before the time";² in 10:1, 8, the casting out of demons and the healing of all manner of infirmity and disease which accompanied the proclamation of the near approach of the Kingdom;³ the question of the amazed multitude in 12:23, "Can this be the Son of David?";⁴ the statement of Jesus that "casting out demons by the spirit of God" indicates that "the kingdom of God has come upon you" (12:28);⁵ and the resurrection of the saints in

¹Cf. discussion supra, p.156, also Detached Note A, p. 228, on 21:32.

²Cf. supra, pp. 137f.

³Cf. supra, pp. 144, 147.

⁴Cf. supra, p. 160.

⁵Cf. supra, pp. 160f.

27:52-54.¹

The Days of the Messiah.—Because of the work of Jesus of Nazareth, Son of David, the Christ, the Days of the Messiah, or the Messianic Era, began with his resurrection and exaltation. The Church, founded on the bedrock of the Messiahship of Jesus,² is the restored Israel, the Messianic Kingdom which replaces Judaism. Some passages which support this are: the Parable of the Two Sons (21:28-32) which shows that the leaders, having failed to do the will of God, will be preceded in the Kingdom of God by those who, by their original actions had rejected His offer, but who through belief in the "way of righteousness" of the Baptist, gained entrance;³ the Parable of the Wicked Tenants (21:33-46) in which the Redactor recounts the story of redemption to show that the Kingdom of God has been taken away from the Jews and given to "the nation producing fruits";⁴ the Parable of the Marriage Feast (22:1-10) as reworked by Matthew showing that the rejection of Jesus caused not only the rejection of the leaders of Judaism but also the Fall of Jerusalem;⁵ all of chapter 23 in which Jesus pronounces judgment on Israel's leaders;⁶ and especially 23:38-39, the re-writing of the Lament over Jerusalem to show that the Presence of God had gone from Israel.⁷

The Church combines the "old" of Judaism with the "new"

¹Cf. supra, pp. 225f. ²Cf. supra, pp. 178ff, on 16:17-19.

³Cf. supra, p. 194. ⁴Cf. supra, pp. 194-96

⁵Cf. supra, pp. 196-199.

⁶Cf. supra, p. 200. ⁷Cf. supra, pp. 201f.

of the teachings of the Messiah.¹ The Messiah had given a new statement of the Torah for the Messianic Age, on his own authority.² It is important to note, in this connection, that Matthew did not choose to call Jesus "Teacher,"³ his attitude being that the Christ was not to be thought of as an interpreter but as a giver of the Law for the Messianic Age.

The Church, or the restored Israel of the Messianic Age, was called "Kingdom of God" by the Redactor. In 12:28 the Redactor, by use of a re-statement of a Q passage, notes that the Kingdom of God "has come upon you" because the Christ drives out demons by the spirit of God.⁴ This does not make proper sense standing alone, but in the other two uses of the term the meaning becomes clear. In 21:31, in the Parable of the Two Sons, it is stated that the leaders of Judaism will be preceded by tax collectors and harlots in entering the Kingdom of God;⁵ and in 21:43 Matthew notes that the leaders of Judaism, keepers of the vineyard of the Lord, will be replaced by "the nation producing fruit."⁶ The disciples, presumably Jewish-Christian leaders, have been given special sight and hearing for the "word of the kingdom" in order that they might better prepare the Church for the coming Judgment.⁷

The role of the Church is seen as that of the Eschato-

¹Supra, p. 171, on 13:51-52. ²Supra, p.128, on 5:17-20.

³Supra, p. 137. Detached Note B, p. 232.

⁴Supra, pp. 160ff.

⁵Supra, p. 194.

⁶Supra, p. 195.

⁷Supra, p. 167, on 13:19.

logical Community, the Kingdom of the Son of Man (13:41, 16:28),¹ "the nucleus of a new, and reformed Israel" whose task is "to prepare Israel for the coming of the Son of Man; and that coming cannot be long delayed."² The proper role of ethics is seen in the fact that entrance into the Kingdom of Heaven, the ultimate eschatological destiny, is gained only by obedience to the Father's will as interpreted by the restatement of the Law, so that the Church is to be seen as the congregation of those who are living in "righteousness" in preparation for the Final Judgment.³ However, not all who are in the Church will enter the Kingdom of Heaven, for the Final Judgment will separate out those who have not done the will of the Father (7:21-23), or who have not been clothed in "righteousness" (22:11-14).⁴

Although Gentiles will be in the Church⁵ because of their faith in Jesus the Christ, as in the case of the centurion (8:5-13),⁶ and because of the unmerited grace of God illustrated by the late workers in the vineyard,⁷ they will be separated at Judgment on the basis of their obedience to the Law⁸ as well as on the basis of their treatment of the Jewish-Christian mission-

¹Supra, p. 169, n. 4.

²Manson, Mission and Message, pp. 470, 476.

³Supra, p. 131 on 7:13-14, and p. 132 on 7:21-23.

⁴Supra, pp. 199f.

⁵10:18, recognition of the Gentile Mission.

⁶Supra, p. 134. ⁷Supra, pp. 189ff on 20:1-16.

⁸Supra, pp. 213-215.

aries.¹ The primary function of the Church was the continuing Mission to the Jews; the mission to the Lost Sheep of Israel² which is of such urgency³ because the common people, the "lost sheep" are in a grievous state of unpreparedness--by reason of the defection of the leaders--for the coming Kingdom of Heaven⁴. The Mission will be confined to the House of Israel⁵ but it must be preached to Jews throughout the world as a testimony to the nations before the end will come.⁶

Peter, symbolic of the Jewish-Christian leaders of the Church, holds the keys to the kingdom and the power to excommunicate offending members. It is the will of the Father that not one should be lost but if all attempts at reconciliation, including unlimited forgiveness and deliberate actions to restore the strayed one, should fail then that one can be thereafter considered to be as "a Gentile."⁷

The Birth Pangs of the New Age.--The Redactor relates the occurrence of "birth pangs" of the Messiah to the imminent coming of the Son of Man in Final Judgment, rather than to the coming of the Messianic Age. He accepts those traditional apocalyptic signs of the end as given by Mk., including "false messiahs, wars and rumors of wars, nations rising against nations,

¹Supra, pp. 217-221.

²Supra, p. 144, on 10:5-7.

³Supra, p. 149.

⁴Supra, p. 142.

⁵Supra, on 15:21-28 (The Cannanite Woman), pp. 176f.

⁶Supra, on 24:14, pp. 205f.

⁷Supra, p. 185 on 18:10-20.

famines, and earthquakes" as the "beginning of the sufferings."¹ To these Matthew adds several contemporary items from the Church life of the days following the Fall of Jerusalem: "the note of apostasy, betrayal and strife within the church, the appearance of false teachers, and the increase of wickedness, all of which will result in love growing cold."² In two other places he also adds to the list: the sufferings of the Jewish-Christian missionaries,³ and the explanation of the mission of Jesus to bring "a sword" into the ranks of Judaism, and contention within the Church.⁴

The "Abomination of Desolation," rather than referring to the Fall of Jerusalem already accomplished, is shown by Matthew to refer to some as yet unexperienced suffering or desecration soon to be perpetrated.⁵ The end can be expected when the Gospel has been preached throughout the world as a testimony to the nations.⁶

The Consummation of the Age.—The Matthaean expression *συντελεία του αἰῶνος*, best translated as "the consummation of the age,"⁷ refers to the anticipated end (*τὸ τέλος*) of the Messianic Age brought about by the will of the Father who will send the Son of Man with his angels. The expression is used of the harvest in 13:39, 40,⁸ when the angels of the Son of Man

¹Supra, p. 204, 24:4-8. ²Supra, p. 205, 24:9-14

³Supra, p. 148, 10:16-22. ⁴Supra, p. 151, 10:34-36.

⁵Supra, p. 206-208, 24:15-22. ⁶Supra, p. 205, 24:14.

⁷Supra, p. 169, n. 2. ⁸Supra, p. 169, n. 2, 3.

will separate out of the Church the evil doers and the causes of evil; it is used in the metaphor of the fishermen separating edible from inedible fish (13:49) as the illustration of the action of the angels;¹ it is used in the question of the disciples concerning the "parousia" of Jesus, in the introductory passage to the eschatological discourse (24:3);² and it is used in the last verse (28:20) of the Gospel in which Jesus, having commanded his disciples to go and teach the things he had commanded them, assures them that he will be with them until the consummation of the age.³ The consummation of the age will lead directly into the Final Judgment.

The consummation of the Messianic Age will occur in the very near future; before the mission to the Jews can be completed⁴, even before the death of some of the disciples.⁵ The signs point to the imminence of the consummation⁶, but it will come at a time known only to the Father⁷ with a suddenness and an unexpectedness, engulfing the whole world in an instant.⁸

At the proper moment it will be announced by the appearance of the ensign of the Son of Man in the sky,⁹ and the blowing

¹Supra, p. 171.

²Supra, p. 203.

³Supra, pp. 226f.

⁴Supra, pp. 148f.

⁵Supra, p. 182, 16:28

⁶Supra, pp. 210-211.

⁷24:36

⁸Supra, p. 208.

⁹Glasson, Second Advent, p. 190f., has shown that τὸ σημεῖον of the Son of Man, while it does not appear in apocalyptic literature as such, does in Isaiah in connection with the great trumpet, as well as in Jeremiah. The Hebrew ׀ is often translated in LXX by σημεῖον. The usages suggest the ensign which is associated with the gathering of the dispersed (24:30).

of the trumpet.¹ When the ensign of the Son of Man appears in the sky, "all the tribes of the earth will mourn," a feature which implies the Gentiles' recognition of coming disaster,² then the great trumpet will be blown and the angels of the Son of Man will gather his elect from "one end of heaven to the other";³ this will be the nature of the ingathering of the exiles of Jewish apocalyptic.⁴ All of this will herald the parousia of the Son of Man.

The Parousia.--Matthew has been under the necessity of accounting for the delay in the Parousia, especially in light of the failure of the Fall of Jerusalem to produce it.⁵ He counsels patience and a constant state of ethical preparedness and integrity in the fulfillment of duties.⁶ While recognizing that only the Father knows the day and hour, he yet ventures to explain that the mission to the Jews throughout the whole world must be completed, and new depths of suffering and desecration experienced by the Church before the Son of Man will come.⁷

The Final Judgment.--Jesus, as the Son of Man⁸ coming in

¹The only occurrence of the "great trumpet" in the O. T. is in Isa. 27:13, used to summon home the dispersed Israelites (Glasson, Second Advent, p. 190), cf. supra, p. 210, n.3, 23:31.

²Supra, p. 210, 24:30. ³Supra, p. 210, 24:31

⁴Klausner, Idea, pp.470f. ⁵Supra, pp. 205-208.

⁶The Parable of Ten Maidens, supra, pp. 212-215, and the Parable of the Talents, supra, pp. 215-217.

⁷Supra, p. 149, 10:23, and pp. 206-208 , 24:15-22.

⁸Supra, p. 132, 7:21-23 in which Jesus is the Judge, p. 151, n. 2, p. 168, n. 1. Cf. also Detached Note E, p. 248.

the glory of his Father¹ will sit on his glorious throne² as King and Judge of "all the nations."³ His angels will participate as assistants in the Judgment.⁴ The Judgment will be on an individual basis, each person being required to give account of every word and deed;⁵ the "Son of Man will repay every man for what he has done."⁶

The Redactor speaks of the Judgment as ἐν ἡμέρα χριστέωσ,⁷ or as "that day,"⁸ and as "the day."⁹ He foresees a dual judgment combining the Jewish concepts of the judgment of Israel¹⁰ and the Final Judgment of the Gentiles. All the nations will be judged, as well as the Church, as the true Israel.

There is only one specific reference to the Judgment of

¹Supra, p. 181, 16:27.

²Supra, pp. 186-188, 19:28, and 25:31.

³For the reference to "King", supra, p. 221, n. 5. That Jesus represents God is clear from 10:32 and 18:35 which show him appearing before the Father.

⁴Supra, p. 169, n. 3.

⁵Supra, p. 165, 12:36-37, which speaks of a record of deeds being kept in Heaven.

⁶Supra, p. 181, 16:27.

⁷This phrase does not appear in Mk. or Lk., supra, p. 147, n. 4.

⁸7:22

⁹24:42

¹⁰The Judgment of Israel is mentioned in Lk. in a context which implies that it refers to the judgment of the twelve tribes as a part of the prophetic eschatological hope, a judgment which begins the Messianic era, and precedes the apocalyptic end (Lk. 22:28-30). Matthew, in incorporating this element, uses the rare Greek word παλιγγενεσία and the apocalyptic element of Son of Man sitting on "his glorious throne" so that the scene is transformed to the apocalyptic Final Judgment (supra, pp. 186-89, 19:28).

the Nations, that is in 25:32, in the Great Judgment Scene. In this scene the nations are judged or separated on the basis of their treatment of Jewish-Christians, these "little ones."¹ One other passage refers, by implication, to such a Judgment: 19:28 tells of the Son of Man, on his glorious throne, with the Twelve on thrones judging the tribes, the implication being that the Son of Man judges the world while the Twelve judge Israel.²

The Judgment of the Church, or the true Israel, is mentioned many more times. The Church has taken in all kinds of people, both early and late, from the beginning of God's redemptive process,³ and there must needs be some separation at the final assize. The implication is very strong throughout the Gospel that judgment will be on the basis of conformity to the re-statement of the Law by the Messiah: in 7:21-23, at the conclusion of the most important passage on the new Law (chapters 5-7), the warning is given that false prophets (verse 15) will be denied admittance into the Kingdom, and only those doing the will of the Father--living in accordance with the previous statement of the Law--will be received;⁴ the interpretation of the Parable of the Ten Maidens given in this study is that the Gentile Christians will be judged on the basis of conformity to the

¹Supra, pp. 219ff; also pp. 127f, "the merciful shall receive mercy".

²Supra, pp. 188f.

³Supra, p. 190, the Parable of the Workers in the Vineyard, 20:1-16.

⁴Supra, pp. 132f.

Law as re-stated by Christ;¹ the Parable of the Wedding Garment, following the Parable of the Marriage Feast, is indication that because the Church received all kinds of persons, identification with it will not guarantee a place at the Messianic banquet, but individuals will be judged on the basis of their having come prepared with proper clothing, the garments of righteousness.² The Parable of the Talents (25:14-30) points out that judgment will be based also on the faithful performance of assignments during the Messianic Age.³

The rewards and punishments meted out by the Son of Man at the Judgment contrast eternal life with eternal punishment. The Redactor uses "life" and "eternal life" interchangeably for the rewards the faithful ones will receive. In 19:29b Matthew's alteration to the Markan passage is such that the rewards for those who have suffered for the name of Jesus will be to "inherit eternal life," a decree of the Last Judgment.⁴ In 13:43 the interesting apocalyptic passage shows the righteous shining "like the sun" in the Kingdom of the Father.⁵ Other references to "life" include the passages which contrast it with eternal fire,⁶ and the presentation of the "two ways" leading to "life" or to

¹Supra, pp. 212-15, 25:1-13.

²Supra, pp. 199f, 22:11-14. Two other parables, the Drag Net (13:47-50) and the Tares (13:24-30, 36-43) develop this same theme. In the Kingdom of the Son of Man are both evil and good people; these will be separated by his angels (supra, pp. 167-71).

³Supra, pp. 215-17.

⁴Supra, p. 189.

⁵Supra, p. 170.

⁶18:8, 9.

"destruction."¹

True to the nature of apocalyptic eschatology, the lot of the wicked is more fully defined. Matthew uses traditional apocalyptic imagery to describe their punishment: they are consigned to the furnace of fire,² fire being used as a metaphor for punishment;³ Gehenna,⁴ is variously described as Gehenna of fire,⁵ the "outer darkness,"⁶ and the place in which men will "weep and gnash their teeth."⁷ The latter two descriptions are peculiar to Mt., while the references to fire and Gehenna are much more frequent in Mt. than in other gospels.

Resurrection.—It is strange that in the apocalyptic scheme of Matthew there is no explicit reference made to the Resurrection, so much a part of apocalyptic eschatology. There is an implicit reference in the Parables of the Workers in the Vineyard if one grants that this parable is recounting the history of the redemptive process of God from the choosing of the nation Israel to the Last Judgment. All workers, whether they entered the vineyard early (as the Jews) or late (as the Gentiles) would receive the same reward; this would imply a resurrection of the "workers" for the reward, a scene which is compared to the "Great Judgment" scene of 25:31-46.⁸

¹Supra, pp. 131f, 7:13-14

²Supra, p. 170, n. 1.

³Supra, p. 129, n. 3.

⁴Supra, p. 129, n. 1.

⁵5:22

⁶Supra, p. 134.

⁷Supra, p. 135.

⁸Supra, p. 190.

The World to Come.-The Redactor's term for the renovated, regenerated world is "Kingdom of Heaven."¹ The scene of this Kingdom of Heaven is not named, but there is some evidence for considering it as being expected on the restored earth. The petition Matthew adds to the Lord's Prayer, following "thy kingdom come" with "thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven,"² points in this direction. In 19:28 the Redactor speaks of the new world³ in which the Son of Man will be sitting on his glorious throne and the Disciples on twelve thrones judging Israel, and this is followed in 19:29 by the promise of a hundredfold return for those who have sacrificed houses, lands or families for Jesus' name. The reward has connotations of the material. The meek are promised the inheritance of the restored earth,⁴ and the bliss of the new age will bring comfort to those who mourned.⁵ Most references are neutral on the question of description. It is most likely that a spiritual interpretation is to be understood. The Kingdom of Heaven is the highest goal of men's striving,⁶ some men even making themselves eunuchs for its cause;⁷ admittance is granted to those who seek after righteousness,⁸ who do the will of the Father,⁹ and who have a forgiving spirit.¹⁰

¹For the Redactor's use of this term, supra, p. 160, n.5.

²Supra, p. 130, 6:13.

³Supra, pp. 186-89.

⁴Supra, pp. 125f, 5:5.

⁵Supra, p. 125, 5:4.

⁶13:44, 45.

⁷19:12

⁸5:10, 20.

⁹7:21; 20:1f.

¹⁰18:23.

The persons who are considered "greatest" in the Kingdom are the humble¹ and those who kept and taught the Law in the Messianic Age,² while those who relaxed the Law are considered as "least."³ The Kingdom of Heaven is the Kingdom of the Father⁴ which was prepared as a reward for his faithful ones "from the foundation of the world."⁵

The Messianic Banquet is one element of the new age which is often mentioned. Participation in this banquet is the reward for some Gentiles who believed in Jesus, the Christ,⁶ to those who kept the Law given by the Messiah,⁷ and to those who have faithfully performed their assigned tasks of propogating the Gospel (bringing the Master a return);⁸ although many had been invited into the Marriage Feast by reason of membership in the Church, only those who were properly attired were permitted to join the feast.⁹

CONCLUSIONS

It was no "scissors-and-paste" editor who gave us the First Gospel. On the contrary, Matthew was an author,¹⁰ a creative genius, who worked carefully--by the methods of consistent

118:4.	25:19.	35:19.
413:43.	525:34.	68:5-13.
725:1-13.	825:21, 23.	
922:1-10, 11-14, pp. 196-200.		

¹⁰The writer is led to agree with Morton Enslin that "the designation editor is a most unhappy one; in every sense of the word he deserves the title author." (Beginnings, p. 389.)

emendation of Mk. and Q, and by deliberate selection from among his source materials, guided by a keen sense of the relevance of the Gospel of Jesus Christ to the contemporary scene--to produce a Gospel replete with eschatological drama and a doctrine which provided consistent answers to the problems faced by the Church of his day. The question of authorship need not bog down over the decision whether Matthew, or a "School," or simply oral tradition was responsible for the re-working of some of the parables;¹ the fact that the author has employed such re-worked materials is evidence enough that he believed or agreed with their contents and implications, whether or not he actually created them. Matthew might well be seen as underlining rather than creating the revised sayings. The burden of proof lies with those who deny that such changes have been made, or with those who would claim that creative interpretation lies in the work of oral tradition rather than in the genius of a dedicated Christian-Jew.

The Compiler of this Gospel must be viewed with imagination. He was a Christian-Jew, perhaps more after the order of James than of Paul, although a characterization somewhere between the two would be more accurate. Like James, Matthew insisted on obedience to the Law, but it was a new Law or a re-statement of the Law to

¹The Compiler, on two occasions, traces the history of the relationship of the Jews to God's plan of redemption from Abraham, through the prophets, to the Christian Church and finally to the Last Judgment; cf. The Parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard (20:1-16), pp. 189f, and the Parable of the Wicked Tenants (21:33-46), pp. 194ff. Cf. also the Parable of the Tares (13:24-30), pp. 167ff, for another example of a re-worked parable or allegory.

which citizens of the Kingdom must conform. Like Paul, Matthew saw the Church as the true Israel but he was unable to go so far as to see the Gentiles in the Church as having been grafted to the true shrub (Romans 11); rather he clung to the belief that the Jewish-Christian Church--with those Gentiles who conformed to the new Law included as well--was the true, restored Israel of the Messianic Age.

The effects of the Fall of Jerusalem, with the destruction of the temple and the scattering of the Jews, can hardly be underestimated. To a Jew, raised in the atmosphere in which chosen people placed implicit trust in the promises of their God through their prophets, and schooled in the apocalyptic hope that Israel's vindication will be the world's ruin, the failure of the repetition of the "abomination of desolation" to eventuate in the Messianic Age was incomprehensible as well as intolerable. To a Christian-Jew it must have been even more intolerable, because of the development of the idea that Jesus Christ would come to usher in the Messianic Age, following a period of great suffering in which evil apparently was triumphant. The delay of the Parousia in the face of such a catastrophe was a major cause for concern.

As Matthew surveyed this scene--the destruction of the Holy City, God's abandonment of the Jews, the division and strife among his people because of the work of Jesus Christ, the growth of the Church--he faced a dilemma. Either he must admit that God's promises had been in vain and the eschatological hope had been false, or admit that the Christian Church was outside of God's purposes and, in time, the Jews would be restored according

to God's promises. He was unwilling to settle for such an unsatisfactory compromise as had Paul (the grafting of the Gentiles to the true shrub, with the ultimate divine purpose of the re-grafting of the Jews). Being unable to surrender either the traditions and eschatological hopes of his people, or his strong faith in the Christ and in the new and vigorous Church, Matthew, with dedicated genius, combined the two in a synthesis which gave divine reason to the historical process, and preserved the roots of Judaism in the new growth of the Church.

He was an apocalypticist in an era when Judaism, fighting for its very existence, was on the point of repudiating the methods of apocalypticism and of recouping its losses by the return to the Torah and its interpretation in school and synagogue. To Matthew the Jewish apocalyptic hopes could not be abandoned, they must be fulfilled. The plan he evolved saw Jesus, in his life, death and resurrection, ushering in the Messianic Age in which the Church, ruled over by a true Son of David and living according to the New Torah of the Messianic Age, was seen as the restored Israel. The catastrophe of the Fall of Jerusalem was but the proof that, because they had refused to accept the Messiah, the Jewish leaders and all who repudiated the Son were brought to ruin and were replaced by the Church in the vineyard of God.¹ Along with the strife and division within the body of the Church, he saw the sufferings and destruction of Jerusalem as signs of

¹Matthew's philosophy of history is encapsulated in the statement in 27:25, "His blood be on us and on our children" (supra, p. 225).

the fast-approaching eschaton, the end of the world.

In God's good time, but not before the gospel had been preached as a testimony to all nations, Jesus, the Son of Man, would come to sit in judgment over the world, and over the Church. The world (all those outside the Church) would be judged, as in all Jewish apocalypses, on the basis of its treatment of the restored Israel, the Jewish-Christian Church. The Church would experience a purging, persons being accepted for reward on the basis of conformity to the re-statement of the Torah, and nonconformists being assigned to everlasting torment.

Matthew gathered into five groups the sayings of Jesus, not primarily for didactic purposes, although that motive would be strong, but for the purpose of presenting the restatement of the Torah for the Messianic Age. He was more concerned about combatting the "false prophets," those who claimed the Torah had been superceded--the "workers of lawlessness"--than he was about ethical teachings, as such.¹ The Jewish-Christian Church was under constraint to live in obedience to the new Torah as one of conditions of the Parousia. In this sense, Schweitzer's conclusion that we are dealing with "interim ethics" would be true, although it is Matthew's re-interpretation of the teachings, and not necessarily the teachings of Jesus, which are so involved.

That Matthew was a creative genius there is little doubt. His skill in working out the answers to the problems facing the Jewish-Christian Church of his day was such that, although he

¹See on 7:21-23, supra, p. 133, n. 2, and also Detached Note B, supra, pp. 232ff.

wrote for that branch of the Church, his Gospel became known as the gospel of reconciliation, the ecclesiastical and teaching gospel. His attempt to make sense out of the confusion of his times, making the future consistent both with the past and with the present state of things, was eminently successful. The spiritual or religious interpretation can still be universal, even though one recognizes that the author's purposes were originally more restricted.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

The Redactor's Purpose.-This study has served at least partially to expose the purpose of the Redactor in composing this Gospel. Seeking to fit the Christian Church, with its Gentile components, into the Jewish eschatological scheme in the light of the Fall of Jerusalem and the subsequent decline in the evangelization of the Jews, Matthew evolved a consistent eschatological philosophy of history which saw God's purpose for Israel being fulfilled in the Church. This calls in question the generally accepted conception of the First Gospel as the gospel which reconciled Jewish- and Gentile-Christians. Was it so accepted in the beginning? Is there not more strength in Brandon's theory of the Gospel's having been written for Jewish-Christians in Alexandria? This whole problem far from being solved, is only now becoming properly exposed.

Parallels with the Qumran Literature.-Although the parallels noted in this study between the literature of the Qumran

eschatological community and that of the Jewish-Christian Church as represented by Matthew's compilation are only hints,¹ enough similarities are seen to justify additional study, especially on the idea of the eschatological community as the corporate suffering servant. The whole idea of the Church as an eschatological community, living in the Messianic Age, and working toward the consummation of the age, is promising and bears deeper investigation.

¹Supra, p. 128 on the new Torah, p. 165 on 12:36-37, p. 185 on 18:15-20, the regulation for dealing with an offending brother; the question of celibacy in 19:10-12; the concept of palingenesis, 19:28, pp. 187ff; the hint on rumors of a Messiah in the wilderness, 24:26-28, p. 208, n. 3; and the parallel noted in 28:19, p. 227, n. 3, on the keeping of a special tradition of laws until the future age.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCE MATERIALS

HUCK, ALBERT. (ed.). Synopse der Drei Ersten Evangelien. Zehnte Auflage. Von Hans Lietzmann völlig neu bearbeiteten Auflage Neun. Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1950.

NESTLE, D. ERWIN. (ed.). Novum Testamentum Graece. 20 Auflage. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1950.

Gospel Parallels, A Synopsis of the First Three Gospels. Arrangement follows the Huck-Lietzmann Synopsis, Ninth edition, 1936. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1949.

GRAMMARS, LEXICA, AND CONCORDANCES

ABBOTT-SMITH, G. A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament. 3d. ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1937.

The Analytical Greek Lexicon. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, Limited, n.d.

ARNDT, WILLIAM F. and GINGRICH, F. WILBUR. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. (A translation and adaptation of Walter Bauer's Wörterbuch. 4th ed. rev., 1952). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

BAUER, WALTER, Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur. Vierte, völlig neu bearbeitete Auflage. Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1952.

BURTON, ERNEST DEWITT. Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek. 2d. ed. revised and enlarged. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1893.

CREMER, HERMANN. Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek. Translated by D. W. Simon and William Urwick. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1872.

.Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek. 3d. English Edition. Translated by William Urwick. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1886.

- DAVIDSON, B., (ed.). The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, Limited, 1956.
- HUDSON, CHARLES F. A Critical Greek and English Concordance of the New Testament. Boston: H. L. Hastings, 1882.
- LEGG, S. C. E. Nouum Testamentum Graece secundum textum Westcotto-Hortianum. Evangelium secundum Mattheum. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940.
- Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon. Abridged and revised by James M. Whiton. New York: American Book Company, n.d.
- MACHEN, J. GRESHAM. New Testament Greek for Beginners. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949.
- MOULTON, JAMES HOPE. An Introduction to the Study of New Testament Greek. 4th. ed. rev. London: The Epworth Press, 1930.
- _____. A Grammar of New Testament Greek. Vol. I: Prolegomena. 3d. ed. rev. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1908.
- _____, and MILLIGAN, GEORGE. The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1950.
- RAHLFS, ALFRED, (ed.). Septuaginta, id est Vetus Testamentum Graece Iuxta LXX Interpretes. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935.
- SMITH, J. B. Greek-English Concordance to the New Testament. Scottdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1955.
- WEINGREEN, J. A Practical Grammar for Classical Hebrew. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1939.
- WEYMOUTH, RICHARD FRANCIS, On the Rendering Into English of the Greek Aorist and Perfect. 4th ed. London: James Clarke & Co., n.d.
- WIGRAM, GEORGE V. The Englishman's Greek Concordance of the New Testament. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1848.

BOOKS AND ENCYCLOPEDIAS

- AIGER, WILLIAM R. A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life. Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1880.
- ALLEGRO, JOHN M. The Dead Sea Scrolls. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, Ltd., 1956.

- ALLEN, WILLOUGHBY C. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew. (The International Critical Commentary). New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913.
- BAAB, OTTO J. The Theology of the Old Testament. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1949.
- BACON, BENJAMIN WISNER. The Founding of the Church. Boston: The Pilgrim Press, 1909.
- _____. Studies in Matthew. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1930.
- BARCLAY, WILLIAM. A New Testament Wordbook. London: S. C. M. Press, Ltd., 1955.
- BARNETT, ALBERT EDWARD. The New Testament Its Making and Meaning. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1946.
- BEASLEY-MURRAY, G. R. Jesus and the Future. (An Examination of the Criticism of the Eschatological Discourse Mark 13). London: The Macmillan Company, 1954.
- BECK, DWIGHT MARION. Through the Gospels to Jesus. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954.
- BLACK, MATTHEW. An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts. London: Oxford University Press, 1953.
- BOWEN, CLAYTON R. Studies in the New Testament. (The Collected Papers of Clayton R. Bowen, edited by Robert J. Hutcheon). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936.
- BOWMAN, JOHN WICK. The Intention of Jesus. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1943.
- _____. The Religion of Maturity. New York: Abingdon Press, 1948.
- BRANDON, S. G. F. The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church. London: S. P. C. K., 1951.
- BRANSCOMB, HARVIE. The Teachings of Jesus. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1931.
- BRIGGS, CHARLES AUGUSTUS. The Messiah of the Gospels. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1894.
- BRIGHT, JOHN. The Kingdom of God. (The Biblical Concept and Its Meaning for the Church). New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1953.

- BRUCE, ALEXANDER BAIMAIN. The Expositor's Greek Testament. Vol. I: The Synoptic Gospels. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1897.
- BUBER, MARTIN. Two Types of Faith. Translated by Norman P. Goldbowl. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1951.
- BULTMANN, RUDOLPH. Primitive Christianity in Its Contemporary Setting. Translated by R. H. Fuller. New York: Meridian Books, 1956.
- _____. Theology of the New Testament. Vol. I. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1954.
- BUNDY, WALTER E. The Religion of Jesus. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1928.
- BURNET, ADAM W. The Lord Reigneth. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1947.
- BURKITT, FRANCIS CRAWFORD. The Gospel History and Its Transmission. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1906.
- _____. Jewish and Christian Apocalypses. (The Schweich Lectures) London: Oxford University Press, 1914.
- BURROWS, MILLAR. The Dead Sea Scrolls. New York: The Viking Press, 1956.
- BUTLER, B. C. The Originality of St. Matthew. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1951.
- BUTTRICK, GEORGE ARTHUR, (Commentary Editor) and HARMON, NOLAN B, (Editor). The Interpreter's Bible. 12 Vols. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951-57.
- CADOUX, CECIL JOHN. The Early Church and the World. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1925 (Reprinted 1955).
- _____. The Historic Mission of Jesus. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1943.
- CAIRD, G. B. The Apostolic Age. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., Ltd., 1955.
- CARRINGTON, PHILIP. The Early Christian Church. Vol. I: The First Christian Century. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1957.
- _____. The Primitive Christian Calendar. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1952.

- CASE, SHIRLEY JACKSON, (ed.). Studies in Early Christianity. New York: The Century Co., 1928.
- CHARLES, ROBERT H. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. 2 vols. London: Oxford University Press, 1913.
- _____. The Book of Enoch ("Translated from Professor Dillman's Ethiopic Text"). Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1893.
- _____. A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life In Israel, In Judaism, and In Christianity. ("Hebrew, Jewish and Christian Eschatology from pre-Prophetic Times Till the Close of the New Testament Canon"). London: Adam and Charles Black, 1913.
- _____. Religious Development Between the Old and New Testaments. New York: Henry Holt & Company, n.d.
- CULIMAN, OSCAR. Christ and Time. Translated by Floyd V. Filson. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1950.
- _____. The Early Church. Edited by A. J. B. Higgins. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1956.
- DAIMAN, GUSTAF. The Words of Jesus. Translated by D. M. Kay. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909.
- DAVIDSON, SAMUEL. The Doctrine of Last Things Contained in the New Testament. London: Kegan, Trench & Co., 1882.
- DAVIES, A. POWELL. The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls. New York: The New American Library, 1956.
- DAVIES, W. D. and D. DAUBE, (editors). The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology. Cambridge: The University Press, 1956.
- DAVIES, W. D. A Normative Pattern of Church Life in the New Testament: Fact or Fancy? London: James Clarke & Co., n.d.
- _____. Torah in the Messianic Age and/or the Age to Come. Vol. VII of JBL Monograph Series. Philadelphia: The Society of Biblical Literature, 1952.
- DEISSMAN, ADOLPH. Light From the Ancient East. (Rev. ed.). Translated by Lionel R. M. Strachan. New York: Harper & Brothers, n.d.
- DIBELIUS, MARTIN. A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and Early Christian Literature. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936.

- DIX, DOM GREGORY. Jew and Greek (A Study in the Primitive Church). London: Dacre Press, 1953.
- DODD, CHARLES H. The Apostolic Preaching and Its Development. New York: Willett, Clark & Co., 1937.
- _____. New Testament Studies. Manchester: University Press, 1953.
- _____. The Parables of the Kingdom. 3d. ed. rev. London: Nisbet & Co., Ltd., 1936.
- DUNCAN, GEORGE S. Jesus, Son of Man. London: The Macmillan Company, 1947.
- DUNKERLEY, R. The Hope of Jesus. (A Study in Moral Eschatology). London: Longmans Green, 1953.
- ELLIOTT-BINNS, L. E. The Beginnings of Western Christendom. London: Lutterworth Press, 1948.
- _____. Galilean Christianity. Chicago: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1956.
- ENSLIN, MORTON SCOTT. Christian Beginnings. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1938.
- FERM, VERGILIUS, (ed.). An Encyclopedia of Religion. New York: The Philosophical Library, 1945.
- FINKELSTEIN, LOUIS, (ed.). The Jews: Their History, Culture and Religion. 2 vols. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1949.
- FRITSCH, CHARLES T. The Qumran Community (Its History and Scrolls). New York: The Macmillan Company, 1956.
- GASTER, THEODOR H. The Dead Sea Scriptures in English Translation. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1957.
- GLASSON, T. FRANCIS. The Second Advent. London: The Epworth Press, 1945.
- GOGUEL, MAURICE. The Birth of Christianity. Translated by H. C. Snape. London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1953.
- _____. The Life of Jesus. Translated by Olive Wyon. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1933.
- GOODSPEED, EDGAR J. An Introduction to the New Testament. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937.

- GRANT, FREDERICK CLIFTON. The Earliest Gospel. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1948.
- _____. The Growth of the Gospels. New York: Abingdon Press, 1933.
- _____. The Gospel of the Kingdom. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1940.
- _____. The Gospels: Their Origin and Their Growth. Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1957.
- _____. The Gospel of Matthew 2 vols. Introduction and Critical Notes. Harper's Annotated Bible Series. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1955.
- _____. An Introduction to New Testament Thought. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950.
- GUIGNEBERT, CHARLES. Jesus. Translated by S. H. Hooke. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1935.
- _____. The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus. Translated by S. H. Hooke. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1939.
- GUY, H. A. The New Testament Doctrine of the Last Things. London: Oxford University Press, 1948.
- HASTINGS, JAMES, (ed.). A Dictionary of the Bible. 5 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1898.
- _____. A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1906.
- HATCH, H. G. The Messianic Consciousness of Jesus. London: S. P. C. K., 1939.
- HAWKINS SIR JOHN C. Horae Synopticae. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1899.
- HEARD, RICHARD. An Introduction to the New Testament. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950.
- HEBERT, A. G. The Throne of David. (A Study of the Fulfillment of the Old Testament in Jesus Christ and His Church). New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co., Inc., n.d.
- HORT, FENTON JOHN ANTHONY. Judaistic Christianity. London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd., 1898.
- HOWLETT, DUNCAN. The Essenes and Christianity (An Interpretation of the Dead Sea Scrolls). New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957.

- HUNTER, ARCHIBALD M. Interpreting the New Testament. London: S. C. M. Press, Ltd., 1951.
- _____. The Work and Words of Jesus. London: S. C. M. Press, Ltd., 1951.
- JEREMIAS, JOACHIM. The Parables of Jesus. Translated by S. H. Hooke. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955.
- JOHNSON, SHERMAN E. The Joy of Study (Studies in Honor of Frederick Clifton Grant). New York: The Macmillan Company, 1951.
- KILPATRICK, GEORGE DUNBAR. The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1946.
- KLAUSNER, JOSEPH. Jesus of Nazareth, His Life, Times and Teaching. Translated by Herbert Danby. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1926.
- _____. The Messianic Idea in Israel. (From Its Beginning to the Completion of the Mishnah). Translated from the Third Hebrew Edition by W. F. Stinespring. London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1956.
- KNOX, JOHN. Christ the Lord. New York: Willett, Clark and Company, 1945.
- KNOX, WILFRED L. The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels. Vol. II: St. Luke and St. Matthew. Edited by H. Chadwick. Cambridge: The University Press, 1957.
- "
KUMMEL, WERNER GEORG. Promise and Fulfillment. (The Eschatological Message of Jesus). Translated by Dorothea M. Barton. Naperville, Illinois: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1956.
- LIETZMANN, HANS. The Beginnings of the Christian Church, 3d. ed. rev. Translated by Bertram Lee Woolf. London: Lutterworth Press, 1953.
- LOISY, ALFRED. The Origins of the New Testament. Translated by L. P. Jacks. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1950.
- MAJOR, H. D. A., MANSON, THOMAS W., and WRIGHT, C. J. The Mission and Message of Jesus. New York: E. P. Dutton & Company, Inc., 1938.
- MANSON, THOMAS W. The Servant-Messiah. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1953.
- _____. The Teachings of Jesus. 2d. ed. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1951.

- MARSH, JOHN. The Fullness of Time. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952.
- MATTHEWS, I. G. The Religious Pilgrimage of Israel. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1947.
- MATTHEWS, SHAILER. The Messianic Hope in the New Testament. (The Decennial Publications, Second Series, Vol. XII). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1905.
- MCCOWN, CHESTER CHARLTON. The Promise of His Coming. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1921.
- _____. The Search for the Real Jesus. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1940.
- MCGIFFERT, ARTHUR CUSHMAN. A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897.
- MCNEILE, ALAN HUGH. The Gospel According to Matthew. London: The Macmillan Company, 1938.
- _____. An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament. 2d. Edition Revised by C. S. C. Williams. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1953.
- MICKLEM, PHILIP A. St. Matthew (with Introduction and Notes). Westminster Commentaries, edited by Walter Lock. London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1917.
- MOFFATT, JAMES. An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament. 2d. ed. rev. The International Theological Library, edited by C. A. Briggs and S. D. F. Salmond. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912.
- MONTEFIORE, CLAUDE G. The Synoptic Gospels. 2 vols. 2d. ed. London: The Macmillan Company, 1927.
- MOORE, GEORGE FOOT. Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era. 3 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927.
- MOWINCKEL, SIGMUND. He That Cometh. Translated by G. W. Anderson. New York: Abingdon Press, 1954.
- OESTERLEY, W. O. E. The Doctrine of the Last Things. London: John Murray, 1909.
- _____. and ROBINSON, THEODORE H. A History of Israel. 2 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1932.
- OTTO, RUDOLPH. The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man. Rev. ed. translated by Floyd V. Filson and Bertram Lee Woolf. London: Lutterworth Press, 1943.

- PETRY, RAY C. Christian Eschatology and Social Thought. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956.
- PFEIFFER, ROBERT HENRY. History of New Testament Times with an Introduction to the Apocrypha. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1949.
- _____. Introduction to the Apocrypha. New York: Harper & Brothers, n.d.
- _____. Introduction to the Old Testament. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1948.
- PLUMMER, ALFRED. An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew. London: Elliot Stock, 1909.
- REDLICH, E. BASIL. The Student's Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels. London: Longmans, Green and Co. n.d.
- RIDDLE, DONALD W., and HUTSON, HAROLD H. New Testament Life and Literature. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1946.
- RINGGREN, HELMER. The Messiah in the Old Testament. Chicago: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1956.
- ROBINSON, H. WHEELER. Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1946.
- ROBINSON, THEODORE H. The Gospel of Matthew. (Moffatt New Testament Commentary Series). London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1928.
- ROWLEY, H. H. The Re-Discovery of the Old Testament. London: James Clarke & Co., Ltd., 1945.
- _____. The Relevance of Apocalyptic. London: Lutterworth Press, 1944.
- _____. The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1952.
- ROWLINGSON, DONALD TAGGERT. Introduction to New Testament Study. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1956.
- SANDAY, WILLIAM. Studies in the Synoptic Problem. (By Members of the University of Oxford). Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1911.
- SCHONFIELD, HUGH J. Secrets of the Dead Sea Scrolls. London: Valentine, Mitchell, 1956.

- SCHWEITZER, ALBERT. The Quest of the Historical Jesus. Translated by W. Montgomery from the First German Edition. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1956.
- SCOTT, ERNEST FINDLAY. The Literature of the New Testament. New York: Columbia University Press, 1936.
- SCOTT, R. B. Y. The Relevance of the Prophets. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1944.
- SCHMIDT, KARL LUDWIG. The Church, in Bible Key Words from Gerhard Kittel's Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Translated by J. R. Coates. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.
- SHARMAN, HENRY BURTON. Son of Man and Kingdom of God. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1943.
- STENDAHL, KRISTER. The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament. Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1954.
- STRACK, H. L. and BILLERBECK, PAUL. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. Vol. I: Das Evangelium nach Matthäus. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1922-28.
- STREETTER, BURNETT HILLMAN. The Four Gospels. London: The Macmillan Company, Ltd., 1951.
- _____. The Primitive Church. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929.
- TAYLOR, VINCENT. Behind the Third Gospel. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1926.
- _____. The Formation of the Gospel Tradition. London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd., 1953.
- _____. Jesus and His Sacrifice. London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd., 1937.
- _____. The Names of Jesus. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1953.
- TEEPLE, HOWARD M. The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet. Vol. X of JBL Monograph Series. Philadelphia: The Society of Biblical Literature, 1957.
- TORREY, CHARLES CUTLER. The Apocryphal Literature. (A Brief Introduction). New Haven: Yale University Press, 1945.
- VOLZ, PAUL. Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter. Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1934.

- WEISS, BERNHARD. A Manual of Introduction to the New Testament. 2 vols. Translated by A. J. K. Davidson. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1886.
- WEISS, JOHANNES. The History of Primitive Christianity. 2 vols. (Completed after author's death by Rudolph Kumpf). Translated by F. C. Grant, and others. New York: Wilson-Erickson, Inc., 1937.
- WILDER, AMOS N. Eschatology and Ethics in the Teaching of Jesus. Revised Edition. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950.
- WILLIAMS, C. S. C. Alterations to the Text of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1951.
- WILLOUGHBY, HAROLD, (ed.). The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1947.
- WILSON, EDMUND. The Scrolls from the Dead Sea. New York: Oxford University Press, 1955.
- ZIMMERLI, W. and J. JEREMIAS. The Servant of God. (First published in G. Kittel's Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, Stuttgart, 1952). Naperville, Illinois: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1957.

ARTICLES AND PERIODICALS

- ALBRIGHT, WILLIAM FOXWELL. "The Biblical Period," in The Jews, Their History, Culture, and Religion. (Louis Finkelstein, editor). I, 3-69.
- ARNOLD, WILLIAM R. "The Relation of Primitive Christianity to Jewish Thought and Teaching," Harvard Theological Review, XXIII (1930), 161-180.
- AGUS, JACOB. "Toynbee and Judaism," Judaism, IV (1955), 319-332.
- ALLEGRO, JOHN M. "Further Light on the History of the Qumran Sect," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXV (1956), 89-95.
- _____. "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXV (1956), 174-187.
- BEARE, FRANCIS W. "The Parable of the Guests at the Banquet: A Sketch of the History of Its Interpretation," in The Joy of Study, (Sherman E. Johnson, editor).
- BLACK, MATTHEW. "The Servant of the Lord and Son of Man," Scottish Journal of Theology, VI (1953), 1-11.

- BOWMAN, JOHN WICK. "From Schweitzer to Bultmann," Theology Today, XI (1954), 160-178.
- BROWN, W. ADAMS. "Parousia," in Hastings DOB, III, 674-680.
- BROWNLEE, WILLIAM HUGH. "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline," Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research, Special Supplement, (1951).
- _____. "John the Baptist in the New Light of Ancient Scrolls," Interpretation, IX (1955), 71-90.
- _____. "The Servant of the Lord in the Qumran Scrolls," Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research, 132 (December, 1953), 8-15; 135 (October, 1954), 27ff.
- BRUCE, F. F. "Qumran and Early Christianity," New Testament Studies, II (1955s), 176-90.
- BULTMANN, RUDOLPH. "History and Eschatology in the New Testament," New Testament Studies, I (1954), 5-16.
- BURROWS, MILLAR. "The Discipline Manual of the Judaeen Covenanters," in Oudtestamentische Studien (P. A. H. DeBoer, ed. [Leide: E. J. Brill, 1950]) III, 156-192.
- _____. "Thy Kingdom Come," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIV (1955), 1-8.
- _____. "The Messiahs of Aaron and Israel," Anglican Theological Review, XXXIV (1952), 202-206.
- CRAIG, CLARENCE TUCKER. "The Proclamation of the Kingdom," Interpreter's Bible, VII, 145-154.
- CADBURY, HENRY J. "Acts and Eschatology," in The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology, (W. D. Davies and D. Daube, editors), pp. 300-321.
- CHAMBERLAIN, J. V. "The Function of God as Messianic Titles in the Complete Qumran Isaiah Scroll," Vetus Testamentum, V (1955), 366-72.
- _____. "Further Elucidation of a Messianic Thanksgiving Psalm from Qumran," Journal of Near Eastern Studies, XIV (1955), 181.
- CHAMBERLAIN, WILLIAM D. "Till the Son of Man Be Come," Interpretation, VII (1953), 3-13.
- CHARLES, ROBERT H. "Eschatology of the Apocryphal and Apocalyptic Literature," Hastings DOB, I, 741-49.

- CROSS, FRANK M., JR. "The Scrolls from the Judaean Wilderness," The Christian Century, August 3, 1955, pp. 889ff.
- _____. "The Scrolls and the Old Testament," The Christian Century, August 10, 1955, pp. 920ff.
- _____. "The Essenes and Their Master," The Christian Century, August 17, 1955, pp. 944ff.
- _____. "The Scrolls and the New Testament," The Christian Century, August 24, 1955, pp. 968ff.
- CULLMAN, OSCAR. "The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIV (1955), 213-26.
- DAVIDSON, A. B. "Eschatology," Hastings DOB, I, 734-41.
- DAVIES, W. D. "Knowledge in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Matthew 11:25-30," Harvard Theological Review, XLVI (1953), 113-39.
- FEUILLET, A. "Le Sens Du Mot Parousie Dans L 'Evangile De Matthieu," in The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology (W. D. Davies and D. Daube, editors), pp. 261-80.
- FRITSCH, CHARLES T. "Herod the Great and the Qumran Community," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIV (1955), 173-81.
- GÄRTNER, BERTIL. "The Habakkuk Commentary (DSH) and the Gospel of Matthew," Studia Theologica, VIII (1955), 1-24.
- GRANT, FREDERICK C. "Mark" (Introduction and Exegesis), Interpreter's Bible, VII, 629-917.
- GRIEG, J. C. G. "The Teacher of Righteousness and the Qumran Community," New Testament Studies, II (1955), 119-126.
- HYATT, J. PHILIP. "The Dead Sea Discoveries: Retrospect and Challenge," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXVI (1957), 1-12.
- JOHNSON, SHERMAN E. "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline and the Jerusalem Church of Acts," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, LXVI (1954), 106-120.
- _____. "Matthew" (Introduction and Exegesis), Interpreter's Bible, VII, pp. 231-625.
- KÖNIG, ED. "Numbers," in Hastings DOB, III, 560-67.
- KÜMMEL, WERNER GEORG, "Theologie und Geschichte des Judentums," Studia Theologica, III (1949), 188-94.

- KUHN, KARL GEORGE. "Die beiden Messias Aarons und Israels," New Testament Studies, I (1954s), 168-79
- LEIVESTAD, R. "An Interpretation of Matthew 11:19," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXI (1952), 179-81.
- LIEBERMAN, S. "The Discipline in the So-Called Dead Sea Manual of Discipline," Journal of Biblical Literature LXXI (1952), 199-206.
- MANSON, WILLIAM. "Eschatology in the New Testament," in Eschatology (Four Papers Read to the Society for the Study of Theology). Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers, No. 2 (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, Ltd., 1952).
- MERRIMAN, E. H. "Matthew 22:1-14," The Expository Times, LXVI (1954), 61.
- MINEAR, PAUL S. "The Coming of the Son of Man" (An Exposition of Mt. 25:31-46). Theology Today, IX, 2 (January, 1953), 489-93.
- MULLENBERG, JAMES. "The History of the Religion of Israel," Interpreter's Bible, I, 292-348.
- MUIRHEAD, LEWIS A. "Eschatology," in Hastings DCAG, I, 525-36.
- PERRY, ALFRED M. "The Framework of the Sermon on the Mount," Journal of Biblical Literature, LTV (1935), 103-115.
- _____. "The Growth of the Gospels," Interpreter's Bible, VII, 60-74.
- PFEIFFER, ROBERT HENRY. "The Literature and Religion of the Apocrypha," Interpreter's Bible, I, 391-420.
- _____. "The Literature and Religion of the Pseudepigrapha," Interpreter's Bible, I, 421-38.
- RABINOWITZ, ISAAC. "A Reconsideration of 'Damascus' and '390 Years' in the 'Damascus' ('Zadokite') Fragments," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIII (1954), 11-35.
- ROWLEY, H. H. "4Qp Nahum and the Teacher of Righteousness," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXV (1956), 188-93.
- _____. "The Suffering Servant and the Davidic Messiah," Oudtestamentische Studien, (P. A. H. DeBoer, ed. [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1950]) III, 100-36.
- SCHOEPS, H. J. "Ebionite Christianity," Journal of Theological Studies, IV (1953), 219-24

- SCOTT, ERNEST FINDLAY. "The Beginnings of the Church," Interpreter's Bible, VII, 176-86.
- SCOTT, R. B. Y. "Isaiah, Chapters 1-39" Interpreter's Bible, V, 151-380.
- SELBIE, J. A., "Congregation," Hastings DOB, I, 466
- SHEPHERD, MASSEY J. "The Epistle of James and the Gospel of Matthew," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXV (1956), 40-51.
- SILBERMAN, L. H. "The Messiahs of the Manual of Discipline," Vetus Testamentum, V (1955), 77-82.
- SMITH, W. TAYLOR. "Numbers," in Hastings DCAG, II, 247-53.
- STRATTON, CHARLES. "Pressure for the Kingdom: An Exposition," Interpretation, VIII (1954), 414-21.
- WILLIAMS, WALTER G. "Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls," The New Christian Advocate, (August, 1957), pp. 18-22.

UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

- BATES, WILLIAM RICHARD. "The Relation of the Messianic Kingdom to the Kingdom of God in the Gospel of Matthew." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1951.
- HALS, RONALD MYRON. "The Apocalyptic Faith from I Enoch to IV Ezra: An Analysis of the Basic Theological Perspectives of the Non-Biblical Apocalypses of 200 B.C. to 100 A.D." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, The Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, 1953.
- RAND, JAMES FREEMAN. "The Eschatology of the Olivet Discourses." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation (Ph.D.), Dallas Theological Seminary, 1954.
- ROWLINGSON, DONALD TAGGERT. "Research in the Synoptic Gospels Since 1918." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Boston University Graduate School, 1938.
- STICKFORD, WRAY WILSON. "The Eschatology of the Fourth Gospel and the Revelation." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Boston University Graduate School, 1953.

THE ESCHATOLOGY OF THE COMPILER OF
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO SAINT MATTHEW

(Publication No.)

Robert Luther Treese

Boston University Graduate School, 1958.

Major Professor: Dr. Edwin P. Booth

ABSTRACT

Purpose.-What eschatological doctrine is discernible among the presuppositions of the Compiler of the Gospel According to Matthew? The enigma of this Gospel, seen in the emergence of strongly universal overtones from the most Jewish, the most anti-Gentile, and the most apocalyptic of the gospels, leads to the primary question of this dissertation. The dissertation is a study of the editorial methods--additions, deletions, emendations, and arrangements of materials--employed by the Compiler, as well as of the materials which are peculiar to this Gospel. The purpose of the study is to determine if the Compiler's work was conditioned by a particular eschatological perspective.

Methods.-The material peculiar to Matthew was extracted from the Gospel by a comparative study of the Greek synopsis. This Matthaean matter (comprising about 429 verses) was further divided into four types on the basis of predicated sources: (1) materials from a teachings source or sources (M); (2) materials

from a testimonia source; (3) materials from the Petrine and Jerusalem-centered narrative sources; and (4) materials which remain and are considered to be the work of the Compiler. This latter material, comprising about 166 verses, plus all of the minute but important editorial changes and additions, was the primary source material for the study. Use was made, however, of certain passages in the other three categories of materials when these seemed to reflect an effort by the Compiler to follow an eschatological design.

Organization.--Statements of the problem of the dissertation and its relevance to the contemporary scene, a survey of the major developments in the study of eschatology, and an analysis of the present status of critical study of the First Gospel are presented in Chapters I and II. The development of Jewish eschatology is shown in Chapter III in a chronological survey revealing the prophetic and apocalyptic roots, and including a topical study of the eschatological beliefs of the Qumran Covenanters. The purpose of this latter chapter is to portray and highlight the eschatological milieu within which the Compiler's task is set. Chapter IV, "The Eschatological Implications in the Work of the Compiler," is a verse-by-verse search for eschatological doctrines and implications as revealed in the structure of the Gospel and in the particular matter contributed by the Compiler. The summary, conclusions and implications for further study comprise Chapter V.

Conclusions.--The Compiler of the Gospel did have a consistent apocalyptic eschatology undergirding his work. Writing in the

aftermath of the Fall of Jerusalem, and being concerned with the delay of the Parousia, he produced a consistently eschatological interpretation of the relevance of Jesus to the history of his day. The Jews, rightful heirs of Israel, by their rejection of the Messiah sent by God, had caused the Fall of Jerusalem, and its desolation (i.e., removal of the Presence of God). The Jewish-Christian Church, by reason of the work of the Christ, represents the restored Israel--the Messianic Age. It is an eschatological community, under constraint to live in obedience to the Torah as re-stated on the authority of the Messiah, and to proclaim the Gospel of Christ throughout the world, as a testimony to all nations, teaching the observance of all things commanded by the Messiah. The Parousia is expected even before the mission to the Dispersion can be completed. Jesus, as the apocalyptic Son of Man, will then sit in Judgment: over the world, judging all persons outside the Church on the basis of their acceptance and treatment of the Jewish-Christian Church; and over the Church, judging all persons in the Church on the basis of conformity to the new Torah.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY

Robert Luther Treese, the first of three sons of David and Margaret (Formwalt) Treese, was born in Altoona, Pennsylvania on March 23, 1919.

He was educated in the Public Schools and became a member of The Methodist Church of Williamsburg, Pennsylvania. In 1937 he



graduated from Williamsburg High School. He worked in industry as an experimental machinist and a field representative for an engineering firm, until 1947. He attended Lycoming College, Williamsport, Pennsylvania, where he majored in English and was graduated in 1950 with a B.A. degree (magna cum laude). He attended Boston University School of

Theology, graduating in 1953 with the S.T.B. degree (cum laude), and enrolled immediately in Boston University Graduate School, studying as The Reverend Edmund M. Beebe Fellow (1953-54).

During graduate studies Mr. Treese served as graduate assistant in the Departments of Historical Theology (1953-54) and of New Testament Literature (1954-55).

Mr. Treese is an ordained Methodist minister, a member of the New England Annual Conference of The Methodist Church. He has served as pastor of the Allston Methodist Church, Allston, Massachusetts, and of the St. Paul Methodist Church, Quincy, Massachusetts. In 1955 he joined the faculty of Boston University School of Theology as Associate Director of Supervised Field Work and Instructor in Practical Theology.

In 1939 he was united in marriage with Phyllis Marie Shultz, of Williamsburg, Pennsylvania. They have two daughters: Jacqueline Marie, born July 1, 1940, and Mary Margaret, born March 19, 1944.