



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

This thesis has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree (e.g. PhD, MPhil, DClinPsychol) at the University of Edinburgh. Please note the following terms and conditions of use:

This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, which are retained by the thesis author, unless otherwise stated.

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author.

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author.

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.

The Obedient Son:
Deuteronomy and Christology in the Gospel of Matthew

Brandon D. Crowe

Ph.D.
University of Edinburgh
2010

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this thesis; that the following thesis is entirely my own work; and that no part of this thesis has been submitted for another degree or qualification.

Brandon D. Crowe

The Obedient Son: Deuteronomy and Christology in the Gospel of Matthew

Abstract

This study argues that sonship and obedience are prominent and related themes in the Gospel of Matthew, and the Evangelist's christological articulation of obedient sonship is drawn from the calling of Israel to be Yahweh's obedient son in Deuteronomy. Thus, it is argued that a consideration of Israel's scriptural traditions is necessary to understand most fully Matthew's teaching of the sonship of Jesus.

Chapter 1 explores Matthew's use of the OT and, building on the work of Richard Hays, outlines a method for identifying subtle intertextual allusions, and suggests a composition criticism approach to Matthew that focuses on the gospel as a literary and redactional whole.

Chapter 2 seeks to establish the historical plausibility for the claim that Matthew was heavily indebted to Deuteronomy by tracing the circulation and use of Deuteronomy *in general* in ancient Jewish and Christian literature. The purpose of this chapter is to provide a foundation for the claim that Deuteronomy would likely have been an important text for Matthew.

Chapter 3 then focuses on Deuteronomy, tracing the covenantal context for the themes of sonship and obedience. It is argued that the sonship of Israel is a key motif in Deuteronomy, and this sonship was predicated on obedience. Key texts include Deut 1; 8; 14; 21; 32, and the themes of love, election, and inheritance are also considered.

Chapter 4 traces the influence of Deuteronomy under the *specific* rubric of obedient sonship through ancient Jewish and Christian literature, including texts which Matthew may have known. Here it is argued that obedient sonship, in association with Deuteronomic themes, is prominent in a wide range of texts.

Chapters 5–7 focus specifically on Matthew. It is argued in chapter 5 that the Temptation Narrative (Matt 4.1–11), the Sermon on the Mount (Matt 5–7), and the accusation that Jesus was a glutton and a drunkard (Matt 11.16–19) all demonstrate rather strong resonances with Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic call to obedient sonship. Chapter 6 proposes two significant possibilities: that the baptism of Jesus (Matt 3.13–17) and the Transfiguration (Matt 17.1–21) may also be influenced by the Deuteronomic perspective on sonship. Finally, chapter 7 suggests three additional clusters of texts that may also indicate Deuteronomy's filial influence on Matthew: Matt 1.20; 12.46–50; 21.28–22.14.

Chapter 8 offers a conclusion and synthesis, arguing that chapters 1–4 provide the foundation for the claims in chapters 5–7. It is concluded that the Deuteronomic teaching of obedient sonship was quite pervasive in the ancient world, and there is an historically plausible case to be made that Matthew was influenced by this tradition. However, it is also argued that Matthew has appropriated the Deuteronomic concept of obedient sonship in unique ways, applying it messianically to the person of Jesus as the New Israel, and consequently also to the disciples of Jesus, who are able to be a part of God's family through Jesus, the preeminently obedient son.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	xi
Abbreviations	xii
<u>Introduction</u>	1
Chapter One: Methodology and Approach	6
1.1 Matthew and the OT	6
1.1.1 Explicit OT Citations	11
1.1.2 Implicit OT Citations	12
1.1.3 OT Allusions	13
1.1.4 Richard Hays on Echoes	15
1.1.5 Developments of Hays’s Criteria	19
1.1.5.1 General NT Literature	19
1.1.5.2 Synoptic Gospels.....	20
1.2 Approach	25
1.2.1 On Citations and Allusions	25
1.2.2 Applying Hays’s Method to Matthew.....	26
1.2.3 Literary and Theological Relationships	27
1.2.4 Deuteronomy as an “Iceberg”	29
1.2.5 Applying Hays’s Criteria	30
1.2.6 Attention to Contexts	31
1.2.7 Christological Focus.....	34
1.2.8 On Subjectivity.....	34
1.3 Limitations and Focus	35
1.3.1 Scope	35
1.3.2 Matthew’s “Bible”	35
1.3.3 Synoptic Relationships.....	38

1.4 Summary	41
Chapter Two: The Circulation and Use of Deuteronomy in Ancient Judaism and Christianity	42
2.1 Text of Deuteronomy	43
2.1.1 Greek Deuteronomy	43
2.1.2 Qumran Biblical Manuscripts	48
2.1.3 Miscellaneous Manuscripts	51
2.1.4 Summary of Circulation	52
2.2 Use of Deuteronomy: Jewish Literature	53
2.2.1 Qumran Sectarian Scrolls	53
2.2.1.1 Temple Scroll	55
2.2.1.2 Damascus Document	56
2.2.1.3 Community Rule	59
2.2.1.4 Additional Texts	59
2.2.1.5 Summary: Qumran	62
2.2.2 OT Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha	62
2.2.2.1 Tobit	63
2.2.2.2 Sirach	65
2.2.2.3 Baruch	68
2.2.2.4 2 Maccabees	69
2.2.2.5 <i>Testament of Moses</i>	71
2.2.2.6 <i>Jubilees</i>	72
2.2.2.7 <i>2 Baruch</i>	73
2.2.2.8 Miscellaneous Texts	74
2.2.2.9 Summary: Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha	75
2.2.3 Synagogue	75

2.2.4 Philo	77
2.2.5 Josephus	78
2.2.6 Pseudo-Philo	80
2.2.7 Summary: Jewish Literature	81
2.3 Use of Deuteronomy: Christian Literature.....	81
2.3.1 New Testament.....	81
2.3.1.1 Pauline Epistles	81
2.3.1.2 Synoptic Gospels and Acts.....	87
2.3.1.4 Hebrews.....	90
2.3.1.5 Gospel of John and Revelation.....	91
2.3.1.5 NT Summary	92
2.3.2 Apostolic Fathers	93
2.4 Summary and Conclusions.....	95
Chapter Three: Sonship and Obedience in Deuteronomy	96
3.1 The Importance of Deuteronomy.....	96
3.1.1 Deuteronomy and Covenant.....	98
3.1.2 Covenant and Filial Obedience	104
3.1.3 Approach to Deuteronomy	106
3.2 Exegesis	107
3.2.1 Deut 1	108
3.2.2 Deut 8	111
3.2.3 Deut 14	115
3.2.4 Deut 32	116
3.2.4.1 Verses 4–6	117
3.2.4.2 Verses 15–20	119
3.2.4.3 Verse 43.....	121
3.2.4.4 Sonship and Obedience in Deut 32	122

3.2.5 Deut 21	123
3.3 Filial Themes.....	125
3.3.1 Election	125
3.3.2 Love.....	126
3.3.3 Inheritance.....	127
3.4 Summary and Conclusions.....	128
Chapter Four: Sonship and Obedience in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature	131
4.1 Sonship and Obedience: OT.....	132
4.1.1 Latter Prophets	132
4.1.2 Hosea.....	133
4.1.2.1 Hos 1–2	134
4.1.2.2 Hos 11	135
4.1.3 Jeremiah	138
4.1.3.1 Jer 3–4	139
4.1.3.2 Jer 31 (38 LXX).....	140
4.1.4 Isaiah	142
4.1.4.1 Isa 1	142
4.1.4.2 Isa 30	145
4.1.4.3 Isa 40–66	146
4.1.5 Malachi.....	147
<u>Excursus: Proverbs.....</u>	149
<u>Excursus: Royal Sonship.....</u>	150
4.1.6 Preliminary Summary	151
4.2 Sonship and Obedience: Later Jewish Literature.....	151
4.2.1 Qumran.....	152
4.2.1.1 Temple Scroll.....	152

4.2.1.2 4QDibHam ^a	153
4.2.1.3 Special Use Texts	153
4.2.1.4 Damascus Document	154
4.2.1.5 Thanksgiving Hymns	155
4.2.2 Sonship and Obedience: OT Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha	156
4.2.2.1 Wisdom	156
4.2.2.2 Tobit	157
4.2.2.3 <i>Jubilees</i>	158
4.2.2.4 <i>Psalms of Solomon</i>	159
4.2.2.5 Additional Texts	159
4.2.3 Philo	160
4.2.4 Josephus	161
4.2.5 Targumic Literature	161
4.2.6 Later Jewish Writings	164
4.3 Sonship and Obedience: Early Christian Literature	167
4.3.1 Pauline Epistles	167
4.3.2 Later Christian Literature	169
4.4 Summary and Conclusions	171
Chapter Five: Deuteronomic Sonship in Matthew. Part 1: Strong and Likely Allusions	173
5.1 Strong Allusion(s): Matt 4.1–11	174
5.1.1 First Temptation	176
5.1.2 Second Temptation	177
5.1.3 Third Temptation	180
5.1.4 Summary and Significance	180
5.2 Likely Allusions	181
5.2.1 Sermon on the Mount (Matt 5–7)	182

5.2.1.1 Deuteronomic Influence in the SM	182
5.2.1.2 Sonship and Obedience in the SM	184
5.2.1.3 Summary	192
5.2.2 Matt 11.16–19	192
5.3 Summary	197

Chapter Six: Deuteronomic Sonship in Matthew. Part 2: Significant Possibilities (Matt 3, 17)..... 199

6.1 Matt 3.15–17	199
6.1.1 Rationale	199
6.1.2 Unity of Matt 3–4.....	200
6.1.3 Fulfilling All Righteousness	201
6.1.4 The Beloved, Obedient Son	204
6.1.4.1 Jesus as New Israel in His Baptism.....	204
6.1.4.2 The Heavenly Voice: Overview.....	205
6.1.4.3 The Heavenly Voice in Matthew: A Brief <i>Forschungsbericht</i>	206
6.1.4.4 The Heavenly Voice: Sonship, Obedience, and Deut 32	214
6.1.4.5 The Heavenly Voice: Summary	220
6.1.5 Summary of Matt 3.15–17	221
6.2 Matt 17.1–21	222
6.2.1 Relationship to Matt 3–4.....	222
6.2.2 Obedient Sonship and Suffering	223
6.2.3 Obedient Sonship vs. Disobedient Sonship	226
6.2.4 Summary of Matt 17.1–21	228
6.3 Summary: Matt 3, 17	229

Chapter Seven: Deuteronomic Sonship in Matthew. Part 3:

<u>Possible Allusions</u>	230
--	------------

7.1 Matt 1.20	230
7.2 Matt 12.46–50	235
7.3 Matt 21.28–22.14	237
6.3.1 The Two Sons	237
7.3.2 The Tenants	241
7.3.3 The Wedding Banquet.....	245
7.4 Deuteronomic Sonship in Matthew: Comprehensive Summary and Conclusions	245
<u>Chapter Eight: Conclusions</u>	248
8.1 Summary and Implications: Chapters 1–4	248
8.2 Summary and Implications: Chapters 5–7	250
8.3 Suggestions for Further Study	251
8.4 Concluding Synthesis	252
<u>Bibliography</u>	254
Critical Biblical Editions	254
Primary Sources	254
Secondary Sources.....	258

Acknowledgements

Working on this thesis for the past few years has rendered it exceedingly clear to me that a project of this magnitude is not an individual effort. Completing this task has been possible because of the help, guidance, ideas, support, and challenges from numerous family members, friends, colleagues, and teachers. I hope the work that follows will be of a sufficient quality that it will reflect favorably upon those who have assisted me along the way.

First, I would like to thank our families, my parents Doug and Rhonda Crowe, my sister Cherilyn, and my in-laws, Mike and Lou Webb, for their support and encouragement.

I would also like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Paul Foster, for his guidance and challenges to my own thinking, and for his various efforts on my behalf during the final portions of this project. Thanks are also due to my secondary supervisor, Prof. Larry Hurtado, for sharing with me his time and expertise, and my examiners, Dr. Helen Bond and Dr. A. K. M. Adam, for their feedback.

I would also like to thank a number of friends who have spurred my own thinking and provided me with valuable feedback, including Bryan Buck and Josh Leim, and all my colleagues from New College. A special word of thanks to Jeff and Jennifer Brannon for helping us in our transition to Edinburgh. Our family was greatly blessed by the relationships with the many good people we met while living in Scotland, including Jonathan and Sheona DeGroot who made us feel right at home, and the congregation of St. Stephen's Comely Bank Church. I would also like to thank Vern and Diane Poythress for their gracious assistance as we have adjusted to life in Philadelphia.

I am grateful to the leadership of Westminster Theological Seminary for the opportunity to join their faculty and for the various ways they have supported my studies. Additionally, the staffs of the libraries at New College, Westminster Theological Seminary, Tyndale House, and Reformed Theological Seminary (Orlando) have been most helpful.

Our time in Edinburgh would not have been possible without the financial support of many individuals and institutions, including: our parents, New College, St. Stephen's Comely Bank Church, First Baptist Church (Fort Payne, Ala.), and Westminster Theological Seminary.

Finally, I would like to thank my wife, Cheryl, and our firstborn son, Charlie, for their love and fellowship during my doctoral studies. Experiencing the joys of fatherhood while writing this project has allowed me to reflect on a deeply personal level about the realities of the filial identity and divine Fatherhood articulated in the following pages. To my wonderful wife who has moved with me from Alabama to Florida to Scotland and now to Pennsylvania, thank you for your unwavering support and your trust, and for making our home my favorite place to be. It is with deep love and gratitude that I dedicate the following work to Cheryl and Charlie.

Abbreviations

The abbreviations in this study follow those set forth in the SBL handbook, and the following which are not listed there:

2SH	Two-Source Hypothesis
ApOTC	Apollos Old Testament Commentary
AYBRL	Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library
BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
BibSt	Biblical Studies
BLH	Biblical Languages: Hebrew
BST	Bible Speaks Today
BU	Biblische Untersuchungen
CBI	Currents in Biblical Interpretation
ConCom	Concordia Commentary
CSCD	Cambridge Studies in Christian Doctrine
CUP	Cambridge University Press
DocQ	Documenta Q
DSB	Daily Study Bible
EHS.T	Europäische Hochschulschriften: Reihe 23, Theologie
EV	English Version
FIOTL	Formation and Interpretation of Old Testament Literature
FTS	Frankfurter Theologische Studien
GBS	Guides to Biblical Studies
GCT	Gender, Culture, Theory
GD	Gorgias Dissertations
IJDMJS	Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum Münsteraner Judaistische Studien
LiBi	Lire la Bible
LJLE	Library of Jewish Law and Ethics
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
NSBT	New Studies in Biblical Theology
OG	Old Greek
OTM	Oxford Theological Monographs
OUP	Oxford University Press
PNTC	Pillar New Testament Commentary
<i>ProEcc</i>	<i>Pro Ecclesia</i>
<i>PRR</i>	<i>Presbyterian and Reformed Review</i>
PTA	Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen
SDSSRL	Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature
SEMRR	Studies in Early Modern Religious Reforms
SFSHJ	South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism
SM	Sermon on the Mount
SMRSHLL	Scripta Minora Regiae Societas Humanorium Litterarum Lundensis

SNTW	Studies of the New Testament and its World
SP	Samaritan Pentateuch
StBL	Studies in Biblical Literature
STI	Studies in Theological Interpretation
ThKNT	Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
USFISFCJ	University of South Florida International Studies in Formative Christianity and Judaism
YJS	Yale Judaica Series

Introduction

In the biblical worldview familial relationships are significant both for the covenant community and as vivid metaphors. One aspect of family life that is emphasized throughout the Old Testament (OT)¹ and New Testament (NT) is the notion that children—and sons in particular—have a responsibility to honor, respect, and obey their parents.² G. Bildstein notes that the filial responsibility to honor one's parents is deep and powerful, and is found:

in the patriarchal narratives that presuppose the graceful subordination and loyal service of children to parents; in the power and meaningfulness of God's self-description as "father" of his people Israel; in the strategic location of filial piety in the Ten Commandments where it is the first of the "social commands" and indeed the *only* positive command in the Decalogue made upon man in society.³

The emphasis on earthly relationships, as exemplified in the Fifth Commandment,⁴ must not be missed,⁵ and the importance of this Commandment is reiterated in the NT, including Matt 15.3–6 (cf. Eph 6.2–3). Particularly relevant for the present study is the concept of God as Israel's *Father*, and the fealty required within this relationship. Indeed, so significant is the horizontal father-son relationship (as will

¹ It is also common to use the term *Hebrew Bible*, but the present study will retain the term *Old Testament* since the primary focus is on the *New Testament*.

² Marianne Meye Thompson, *The Promise of the Father: Jesus and God in the New Testament* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2000), 39; cf. Roland de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions* (trans. J. McHugh; London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1961), 19–55; Johannes Pedersen, *Israel: Its Life and Culture* (trans. A. Møller; 2 vols; London: OUP, 1926), 1:60–81; T. W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus: Studies of Its Form and Content* (Cambridge: CUP, 1931), 91.

³ Gerald Bildstein, *Honor Thy Father and Mother: Filial Responsibility in Jewish Law and Ethics* (LJLE; New York: KTAV, 1975), xi.

⁴ The Fifth Commandment is considered here to be Exod 20.12/Deut 5.16.

⁵ However, Bildstein (*Honor*, 5) further observes that the Fifth Commandment was also understood to function on both horizontal and vertical planes, since earthly parents in some sense share in God's creative activity.

be seen from Deuteronomy) that God revealed himself as a Father to Israel in order that his people might more clearly understand the nature of his love for them,⁶ and also to summon them to the proper filial response of respect, honor, and obedience. It is the earthly father-son relationship that illustrates the Creator-creature relationship.⁷

It is the presupposition of this study that if one is to appreciate most fully the NT's teaching on the sonship of Jesus, the requisite OT background must be duly considered. Part of that background comes from the OT concept of the fatherhood of God. Though this is a prevalent theme in the OT, it is even more pronounced in the NT due to the *christological* focus of God's fatherhood. In the OT divine fatherhood begins broadly, focusing first of all on Israel in general (Exod 4.22) before focusing on the king (2 Sam 7.14), yet without losing its corporate nature. In the NT the fatherhood of God is first of all focused on Jesus, the Son of God⁸ *par excellence*, and this relationship is then expanded to include all of Jesus' disciples. This correspondence between the sonship of Israel and the sonship of Jesus is one reason why in the NT Jesus is often portrayed as the *New Israel*. Hence, in a short but insightful study on the Synoptic Gospels, Joachim Bieneck argued that Jesus as Son of God fulfilled the obedience that was required of Israel, and he further showed that *filial obedience* is one of the features that reveals a primarily Jewish (rather than Greek) background for Son of God in the Synoptics.⁹ This sentiment—that Jesus' status as Son of God implies his obedience to his Father—has been echoed by many others.¹⁰

⁶ Use of the plural pronoun for Israel will be explained in §3.1.2 (n.51).

⁷ Some theologians have even posited that earthly father-son relationships are *types* of the antecedent Trinitarian Father-Son relationship, which is the *antitype*. Cf. Karl Barth, *Dogmatics in Outline* (trans. G. Thompson; London: SPCK, 1949), 43.

⁸ For sake of clarity and in accordance with general custom, in this study "Son of God" will be capitalized in reference to Jesus, but "son" will not be capitalized when speaking of Israel.

⁹ Joachim Bieneck, *Sohn Gottes als Christusbezeichnung der Synoptiker* (ATANT 21; Zürich: Zwingli, 1951); cf. B. M. F. Van Iersel, 'Der Sohn' in den synoptischen Jesusworten: *Christusbezeichnung der Gemeinde oder Selbstbezeichnung Jesu?* (NovTSup 3; Leiden: Brill, 1961), 13–14.

¹⁰ Cf. R. W. L. Moberly, *The Bible, Theology, and Faith: A Study of Abraham and Jesus* (CSCD; Cambridge: CUP, 2000), 223; Oscar Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament* (trans. S. Guthrie and C. Hall; rev. ed.; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963), 283; Richard N. Longenecker, *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity* (SBT 2/17; London: SCM Press, 1970), 98–99; *idem*, "The

Thus, Son of God implies Jesus' obedience to his Father, and although this can be seen throughout the NT, it is exceptionally clear in Matthew. For Matthew Jesus as "Son of God" is perhaps the most central christological claim,¹¹ and this sonship is marked by unswerving obedience to his Father. In this vein Ulrich Luz suggests that Matthew adds the notion of *obedience* to Mark's understanding of Son of God;¹² William Kynes that Son of God for Matthew not only indicates Jesus' origin *from* God, but also his obedience *towards* God;¹³ Birger Gerhardsson that Jesus' sonship is one of service and obedience to God in everything, including both strength and weakness;¹⁴ Jeffrey Gibbs that Jesus shows his perfect sonship in Matthew by his perfect obedience.¹⁵ These examples could be multiplied,¹⁶ but this selection indicates the extent to which it is recognized that Jesus' obedience as Son of God is centrally important for Matthew.

It is this concept of filial obedience in Matthew that provides the impetus for the present study. A few observations that provide the rationale for this study will be listed here by way of orientation, with discussions of these coming later in the study:

1) In the biblical worldview children are called to honor, respect, and obey their parents.

Foundational Conviction of New Testament Christology: The Obedience/Faithfulness/Sonship of Christ," in *Jesus of Nazareth: Essays on the Historical Jesus and New Testament Christology* (ed. J. B. Green and Max Turner; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 473–88.

¹¹ Despite a number of correctives offered to Jack Dean Kingsbury (*Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom* [London: SPCK, 1976]), his basic observation that "Son of God" is the most important title, or possibly concept, for Matthew seems to be substantially correct.

¹² Ulrich Luz, *The Theology of the Gospel of Matthew* (trans. J. Robinson; Cambridge: CUP, 1995), 4–5, 37–41.

¹³ William L. Kynes, *A Christology of Solidarity: Jesus as the Representative of His People in Matthew* (New York: University of America Press, 1991), 194–95.

¹⁴ Birger Gerhardsson, *The Mighty Acts of Jesus according to Matthew* (SMRSHLL 5; Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1979), 89.

¹⁵ Jeffrey A. Gibbs, *Matthew 1:1–11:1* (ConComm; St. Louis: Concordia, 2006), 108.

¹⁶ Cf. Donald J. Versepunt, "The Role and Meaning of the 'Son of God' Title in Matthew's Gospel," *NTS* 33 (1987): 532–66; Terence L. Donaldson, "The Vindicated Son: A Narrative Approach to Matthean Christology," in *Contours of Christology in the New Testament* (ed. R. N. Longenecker; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 100–21; Donald P. Senior, *The Passion Narrative according to Matthew: A Redactional Study* (BETL 39; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1975), 4; W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, Jr., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew* (3 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988–97), 1:263–64.

2) The importance of this concept is seen in God’s fatherhood to Israel and Israel’s call to filial obedience. These themes are foundationally developed in Deuteronomy.

3) Matthew¹⁷ speaks from a Jewish worldview, and the Jewish scriptures—not least of which is Deuteronomy—are supremely important for him.

4) Matthew presents Jesus as the obedient Son of God as the fulfillment of the nation of Israel.

Thus, the question to be addressed in this study is whether Matthew’s emphasis on Jesus’ *obedience* as Son of God may be derived from the OT in general—and *Deuteronomy* more specifically—and what the implications of this may be.

To this end, chapter 1 will explore Matthew’s use of the OT and Deuteronomy, including the role of OT allusions. Chapter 1 will also suggest a modified redactional approach to Matthew that focuses intently on the gospel as a literary whole.

Chapter 2 will seek to establish historical plausibility for the claim that Matthew was heavily indebted to Deuteronomy by tracing the circulation and use of Deuteronomy in ancient Judaism and Christianity. Chapter 2 will thus seek to determine how prevalent knowledge of Deuteronomy appears to have been and which portions may have been particularly well known. It will also be asked which sections and themes of Deuteronomy were most often appealed to in order to set Matthew within its proper interpretive milieu.

Chapter 3 will be devoted to the themes of sonship and obedience in Deuteronomy, particularly as Matthew may have known the book. Focus will therefore be on the Greek OT, but other variants will be considered.¹⁸ It will be argued that far from being a tertiary teaching of Deuteronomy, the notion of God’s

¹⁷ “Matthew” will be used in this study as shorthand for the anonymous author of the Gospel of Matthew.

¹⁸ For this study I will prefer the term “Old Greek” (OG) when referring to Greek traditions Matthew may have known (instead of the more common “Septuagint” [LXX]), since it may be anachronistic to refer to Matthew’s Greek texts as the LXX. Of course, many OG manuscripts closely reflect the later LXX, and when studying OT references in the NT the LXX is the best witness we have to the OG. For more on the state of Greek and Hebrew OT textual traditions as it relates to Matthew, see §1.3.2.

fatherhood to Israel is a core teaching of Deuteronomy, and this relationship required the obedience of Israel.

Chapter 4 will ask how similar themes of sonship and obedience may appear in other biblical and non-biblical writings, especially where these themes may betray Deuteronomic¹⁹ influence. It will be argued that the conjunction of sonship and obedience was quite common in ancient Judaism and Christianity, and that either subsequent authors took these ideas from Deuteronomy, or that Matthew may have understood these themes to have been derived from Deuteronomy.

Chapters 5–7 comprise the crux of the present study. Here it will be argued that Matthew derived his understanding of Jesus' obedient sonship largely from Deuteronomy. Several Matthean texts will be suggested in support of this view. The texts to be considered will also reveal the tendency for Matthew to equate Jesus' sonship with Israel's sonship. It will be argued, based on Matthew's use of Deuteronomy, that Matthew portrays Jesus as the obedient Son of God that Israel was called to be, yet which Israel was unable to attain. In addition, it will also be argued that obedient sonship in Matthew is not limited to Jesus, but is also seen in Jesus' call to discipleship.

¹⁹ *Deuteronomic* here refers to texts that betray similarities to Deuteronomy. It is not to be confused with *Deuteronomistic* which entails more extensive theories about a larger corpus with shared theological features.

Chapter One

Methodology and Approach

1.1 Matthew and the OT

A brief survey of recent scholarship will demonstrate that there is presently no paucity of material dealing with the appropriation of the OT in the NT.¹ This present intertextual focus is a welcome one. In addition to serving as a corrective to the overly Hellenistic tendencies of some post-Enlightenment theology,² it has yielded numerous insights into the Jewish backgrounds of NT studies, the depths of which have yet to be exhausted. One's understanding of Matthew, in particular, stands to gain much from sustained studies in the OT. That the OT is important to Matthew hardly needs any defense. It is well documented that Matthew employs a greater number and more complex Scriptural quotations than any other synoptic writer.³ According to the helpful index of quotations in the fourth edition of the United Bible Society's *Greek New Testament* (UBS4), Matthew contains 56 OT quotations,⁴ whereas Mark and Luke have 54 between them.⁵ Several of these are the uniquely Matthean *fulfillment*

¹ Note the recent *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007).

² Cf. Markus Bockmuehl, *Seeing the Word: Refocusing New Testament Study* (STI; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 193–205.

³ This is the case regardless of what one intends by *quotation*. The terminology for the present study will be explained below. Cf. W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, Jr., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew* (3 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988–97), 1:31; Graham N. Stanton, “Matthew,” in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture—Essays in Honor of Barnabas Lindars* (ed. D. A. Carson and H. Williamson; Cambridge: CUP, 1988), 205.

⁴ Pages 888–89 in UBS4. This count does not include the dual listings of Exod 20 and Deut 5 for Matt 5.21; 15.4a; 19.18–19, nor does it consider Exod 21.24 and Lev 24.20 as separate citations in Matt 5.38. R. T. France (*The Gospel of Matthew* [NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007], 10) counts an additional 262 allusions and verbal parallels listed for Matthew in UBS4.

⁵ France (*Matthew*, 10), referring to the same index, lists only 54 OT quotations for Matthew. He may be referring to the number of total *Matthean* passages listed, and not the number of *OT* texts.

quotations.⁶ These quotations are indicative of Matthew's interest in demonstrating that Jesus stood in continuity with Israel's Scriptures, and was the consummate "filling up" of their meaning.⁷ Moreover, although the notion of fulfillment can perhaps most clearly be seen in Matthew's fulfillment quotations, it is by no means limited to them, as these are only "one component in a much more comprehensive development of fulfillment in Matthew."⁸ Indeed, the fulfillment quotations are indicative of Matthew's larger concern with showing Jesus as the fulfillment of the OT at virtually every point in his gospel.⁹ Thus one could say that the OT is "woven into the warp and woof of [Matthew's] gospel."¹⁰ France aptly summarizes:

The formula-quotations are simply one expression of the total fulfillment theology which undergirds Matthew's presentation throughout, surfacing sometimes in formal quotation, sometimes in verbal echo, sometimes in the way the story is told so that any reader acquainted with the Old Testament will be set thinking about ongoing patterns in the work of God.¹¹

In other words, Matthew's use of the OT is more complex than a simplified, systematic scheme.¹² Thus, it would not be sufficient merely to state that Matthew *uses*

⁶ The number of these is not universally agreed upon, but a representative list includes 1.22–23; 2.15; 2.17–18; 2.23; 4.14–16; 8.17; 12.17–21; 13.14–15; 13.35; 21.4–5; 27.9. None of these actually come from Deuteronomy. Cf. Helmut Koester, *Introduction to the New Testament*, vol. 2: *History and Literature of Early Christianity* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1982), 175; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:211; 3:573–77; Ulrich Luz, *The Theology of the Gospel of Matthew* (trans. J. Robinson; Cambridge: CUP, 1995), 37–41.

⁷ For this view of πληρόω, see Douglas J. Moo, "The Problem of *Sensus Plenior*," in *Hermeneutics, Authority and Canon* (ed. D. A. Carson and J. Woodbridge; Leicester: InterVarsity, 1986), 191.

⁸ Richard Beaton, *Isaiah's Christ in Matthew's Gospel* (SNTSMS 123; Cambridge: CUP, 2002), 18. So John M. Court, "The Birth of Jesus Christ according to Matthew and Luke," in *New Testament Writers and the Old Testament: An Introduction* (ed. J. Court; London: SPCK, 2002), 19; Ivor Jones, "Matthew," in *Early Christian Thought in its Jewish Context* (ed. J. Barclay and J. Sweet; Cambridge: CUP, 1996), 60; G. B. Caird, *New Testament Theology* (ed. L. Hurst; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 35.

⁹ R. T. France, *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1989), 166. Cf. Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew* (2 vols.; WBC 33A–B; Dallas: Word, 1993–95), 1:lx.

¹⁰ Stanton, "Matthew," 205. Jones ("Matthew," 61) similarly notes a "mass of other references to scriptural passages, allusions which also add important detail to the 'fulfillment' framework." B. W. Bacon (*Studies in Matthew* [New York: Hentry Holt, 1930], 470) suggested "over 100 quotations and uses" of the OT in Matthew.

¹¹ France, *Evangelist*, 184.

¹² *Ibid.*, 188.

the OT. Instead, the numerous references to the OT indicate the extent to which Scripture shaped Matthew's *Weltanschauung*, and therefore provides much of the framework for Matthew's understanding of Jesus. At the same time, however, Matthew's christological reading of the OT suggests that Jesus provided a lens through which Matthew understood the OT. It is the identity of Jesus that is preeminently important for Matthew,¹³ and it is his coming and the advent of the kingdom of heaven that has provided the impetus for Matthew's gospel (e.g., Matt 4.17). The birth of Jesus as Emmanuel who will save his people from their sins (Matt 1.21–23) marks the key event in the history of God's people.¹⁴ Given the centrality of Jesus for Matthew, the OT should be understood as anticipating and preparing the way for Jesus;¹⁵ it is he who gives the OT scriptures their consummate meaning. In a word, the OT is the key to understanding Jesus in Matthew, but Jesus is also necessary to comprehend fully the OT. It is this dialectical relationship¹⁶ that permeates Matthew.

A few examples will illustrate this. The opening words of Matthew (Βίβλος γενέσεως) reveal an organic connection with the OT, relating what follows to the first Book of Moses,¹⁷ and possibly making reference to a new creation.¹⁸ Matthew continues by noting his account focuses on Jesus Christ, υἱοῦ Δαυίδ υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ—two key figures in salvation history—and then gives a short summary of Israel's history,

¹³ Hagner, *Matthew*, 1:lxii.

¹⁴ This theme of Jesus' (divine) presence with his people has often been seen as a Matthean *inclusio* (cf. Matt 28.20). Cf. David D. Kupp, *Matthew's Emmanuel: Divine Presence and God's People in the First Gospel* (SNTSMS 90; Cambridge: CUP, 1996).

¹⁵ D. A. Carson, "Matthew," in vol. 8 of *The Expositor's Bible Commentary: Matthew, Mark, Luke* (ed. F. A. Gaebelein; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984; repr., 1995), 28.

¹⁶ Credit for this terminology is due to Prof. Larry Hurtado.

¹⁷ This phrase likely has a double reference for Matthew, referring to the OG title of Genesis as well as its genealogical accounts. Although scholars disagree regarding how much of what follows is covered by these first few words, Davies and Allison have persuasively argued that these words serve as a title to the entire gospel. For discussions see Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:150–55; David L. Turner, *Matthew* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 56; Hagner, *Matthew*, 1:9.

¹⁸ So Davies and Allison, 1:150; France, *Matthew*, 28.

indicating Jesus' significant role in it.¹⁹ It is thus suggested here, and reinforced throughout the narrative, that for Matthew Jesus is the climax of Israel's history.²⁰

Another example that illustrates both the importance of the OT for comprehending Jesus in Matthew's gospel, as well as the primacy of Jesus in Matthew's reading of the OT, is Matthew's portrayal of Jesus as the *New Israel*.²¹ Just as the OT recounts the history of the nation of Israel and their relationship with God,²² so Matthew utilizes passages and patterns from the OT to communicate the history and theology surrounding Jesus of Nazareth.²³ Matthew applies OT passages that refer to the nation of Israel to Jesus, perhaps most notably in chapters 1–4.²⁴ Discussions of relevant passages will come later, but a few words will be said here by way of orientation. The first *explicit* reference to this Jesus-as-Israel typology is Matt 2.15. Here Hos 11.1,

¹⁹ Cf. France, *Matthew*, 28–29; John Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Bletchley: Paternoster, 2005), 70; Turner, *Matthew*, 56. For the genealogy as the genre “Summary of Israel’s Story,” see the forthcoming dissertation by Jason Hood (University of Aberdeen).

²⁰ So N. T. Wright, *Christian Origins and the Question of God*, vol. 1: *The New Testament and the People of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 390. Similarly, Nolland (*Matthew*, 36) notes that one of the purposes for Matthew’s use of the OT is “to retell the OT story as context for the coming of Jesus.”

²¹ A few works here will be representative of this widespread view: Dale C. Allison, Jr., “The Son of God as Israel: A Note on Matthean Christology,” *IBS* 9 (1987): 74–81; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:263–64; Nolland, *Matthew*, 123; J. A. E. van Dodewaard, “La Force Évocatrice de la Citation mise en lumière en prenant pour base l’Évangile de S. Matthieu,” *Bib* 36 (1955): 482–91, especially 488; Raymond E. Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke* (rev. ed.; ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1993), 215; France, *Matthew*, 77–78; *idem*, *Evangelist*, 207–10; Carson, “Matthew,” 91–93; Terence L. Donaldson, “The Vindicated Son: A Narrative Approach to Matthean Christology,” in *Contours of Christology in the New Testament* (ed. R. Longenecker; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 114–17; Jeffrey A. Gibbs, “Israel Standing with Israel: The Baptism of Jesus in Matthew’s Gospel (Matt 3:13–17),” *CBQ* 64 (2002): 511–26. Gibbs (522n.45) asks whether Jesus is portrayed as the “new” Israel or “true” Israel. Perhaps it is best not to make a sharp distinction between these two options.

²² This, of course, is a generalization and therefore risks oversimplification. The point here is simply that this is one acceptable summary of the OT.

²³ For a recent discussion of how Matthew may have connected history with salvation, see Mervyn Eloff, “‘Από . . . ἔως and Salvation History in Matthew’s Gospel,” in *Built Upon the Rock: Studies in the Gospel of Matthew* (ed. D. Gurtner and J. Nolland; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 85–107. For other surveys of Matthean *Heilsgeschichte* see David B. Howell, *Matthew’s Inclusive Story: A Study in the Narrative Rhetoric of the First Gospel* (JSNTSup 42; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990), 55–92; Donald Senior, “Directions in Matthean Studies,” in *The Gospel of Matthew in Current Study: Studies in Memory of William S. Thompson* (ed. D. Aune; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 13–14.

²⁴ It will be argued in later chapters that one reason the New Israel theme is so prominent in these chapters is because it is here that Matthew first establishes who Jesus is. As Luz has noted (*Theology*, 30–37), these chapters are key to understanding Matthean Christology.

which refers to the nation of Israel as the son of God, is applied to Jesus, thereby suggesting that Jesus (the Son of God *par excellence*) is representative of the nation.²⁵ Likewise, in his wilderness temptation (Matt 4.1–11) Jesus recapitulates the experiences of Israel.²⁶ Here Jesus quotes, among other passages, Deut 8.3, which is found in a passage that also likens Yahweh's actions toward Israel to a father's discipline of his son (Deut 8.5). Again, one of the points of this pericope is Jesus' role as the New Israel, with particular focus on his filial obedience in the midst of hardship.

The parallels with Israel are not only evident in the citations attributed to Jesus, but also in other details of the passage(s). For example, the temptation setting recalls Israel's testing in the wilderness. Moreover, Jesus' testing comes immediately after his baptism in Matthew's narrative, and many have noted similarities to the Exodus in Jesus' baptism.²⁷ This further reflects the account of Israel's temptation, which came after their deliverance through water. The point is simply that Matthew's ability to communicate Jesus' relation to Israel is not limited to explicit citations, but is also expressed by narrational descriptions, structure, and various other means.

In light of these considerations, an approach that fails to recognize Matthew's scriptural saturation at virtually every point (i.e., even where no citation is present) will inevitably lead to "an impoverished view of Matthew's use of the OT,"²⁸ and therefore to an impoverished view of Matthew's gospel in general. Heeding this warning, the current study will not only take into consideration Matthew's OT citations, but will also consider Matthew's more subtle references to the OT. This chapter will outline a method for identifying the more oblique ways in which Matthew's gospel is dependent on OT texts, devoting particular attention to Deuteronomy. I will begin with a definition of terminology, which will be followed by a brief survey of recent perspectives on the

²⁵ Allison ("Son of God," 77) correctly observes that *Son of God* is the title Jesus shares with Israel. One of the present aims of this study will be to trace the significance of this connection.

²⁶ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:402; Birger Gerhardsson, *The Testing of God's Son (Matt 4.1–11 & Par): An Analysis of Early Christian Midrash* (trans. J. Toy; ConBNT 2; Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1966); France, *Matthew*, 128.

²⁷ So, e.g., Hagner, *Matthew*, 1:61–62; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:344–45.

²⁸ Beaton, *Isaiah's Christ*, 19. Cf. Dale C. Allison, Jr., *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993).

NT usage of the OT. Lastly, I will indicate the approach and limitations of the present study.

1.1.1 Explicit OT Citations

The most readily demonstrable category of OT usage in Matthew is *explicit citation*. These are citations in which Matthew gives his readers a clue—namely an introductory formula—that he is citing from the OT, and often indicates the source of the quote. These include, but are not limited to, Matthew’s fulfillment quotations (*Reflexionszitate/Erfüllungszitate*). Although there are debates about Matthew’s *Vorlage(n)* and textual traditions, there is no question that these are indeed OT quotations.²⁹ Matthew 3.3 is an example of such a citation. This verse includes an introductory formula (οὕτως γὰρ ἔστιν ὁ ῥηθεὶς δια Ἰησοῦ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος) that prefaces the quotation, followed by extensive verbal correspondence with the Septuagintal reading of Isaiah 40.3.³⁰

Isa 40.3 (LXX) ³¹	Matt 3.3
φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ	φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ
ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου	ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου
εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν	εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ

By these criteria, 24 of Matthew’s 56 OT citations can be considered explicit.³² It should be noted that, despite the relative clarity of explicit citations, they do not always

²⁹ This includes Matt 2.23, which may derive from נצַר and messianic expectations (Craig S. Keener, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999], 114). In this study *citation* and *quotation* will be used interchangeably.

³⁰ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:293.

³¹ The Göttingen text of the LXX will be used in this study.

³² 1.23a–b; 2.6, 15, 18; 3.3; 4.4, 6, 7, 10, 15–16; 8.17; 11.10; 12.18–21; 13.14–15, 35; 15.4a–b; 15.8–9; 21.5a–b; 21.42; 22.44; 26.31; 27.9–10. Matthew 2.23 also contains a citation formula.

exhibit precise verbal correspondence with a known text form.³³ Nevertheless, explicit citations can be identified on the basis of Matthew’s introductory formulas. For citations, I will consider the indices of quotations in NA27/UBS4 to be mostly accurate,³⁴ though they do not make the distinction between *explicit* and *implicit* citations.

1.1.2 Implicit OT Citations

A second category of OT usage in Matthew is *implicit citation*, which refers to those texts in which Matthew seems to quote an OT text, but gives the reader little or no indication that he is citing a source. Thus, there is either no introductory formula, or an introduction that is sufficiently vague that one could not rightly call it a formula.³⁵ Nevertheless, one may rightly refer to these as *citations* because rather extensive verbal parallels are evident.

Matthew 18.16 is an example of an implicit citation. Here one encounters extensive verbal correspondence with Deut 19.15,³⁶ though no introduction is given:

Deut 19.5b (MT)	Deut 19.15b (LXX)	Matt 18.16b
עַל־פִּי שְׁנֵי עֵדִים אִו עַל־פִּי שְׁלֹשָׁה־עֵדִים יָקוּם דְּבָר	ἐπὶ στόματος δύο μαρτύρων καὶ ἐπὶ στόματος τριῶν μαρτύρων σταθήσεται πᾶν ῥῆμα	ἐπὶ στόματος δύο μαρτυρῶν ἢ τριῶν σταθῆ πᾶν ῥῆμα

³³ More will be said on this phenomenon below.

³⁴ It will be apparent that these lists are not carbon copies. The present study will default to the list in NA27, but will also refer to the indices in UBS4.

³⁵ 10.35–36 is an example of the former, and 18.16 an example of the latter.

³⁶ For the difficulty in establishing the text type of this citation, see Robert H. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew’s Gospel with Special Reference to the Messianic Hope* (NovTSup 18; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967), 139; Maarten J. J. Menken, *Matthew’s Bible: The Old Testament Text of the Evangelist* (BETL 173; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2004), 271–73.

The remaining 31 citations in Matthew fall into this category.³⁷ Both implicit and explicit citations are important for the present study since they provide extensive verbal parallels that indicate Matthew's familiarity with and re-appropriation of Deuteronomy.

The differences between explicit and implicit citations may be minimal, and one may even be able to make an argument for labeling some explicit citations as implicit, and vice versa. The importance of these two categories is not in what decision is made regarding individual passages, but in acknowledging that Matthew employs both explicit, formulaic citations of Scripture, as well as more implicit citations, the source of which he does not clearly identify.³⁸ At the very least this indicates that Matthew is deeply concerned with the OT, and that his utilization of Scripture is multifaceted. Indeed, his numerous and variegated citations of Scripture suggest that one has reason to expect a positive response when asking whether Matthew often engages the OT in passages where no citation is present.

1.1.3 OT Allusions

The third and most debated category is *allusions*. That allusions exist in some form in Matthew can hardly be doubted.³⁹ It is universally accepted that Matthew in some way makes reference to OT texts without citing passages, but determining what these passages are, what criteria should be employed to identify them, and the level of significance that should be attached to them are thornier matters. For this study *allusion* will be considered *a broad category referring to any passage in which Matthew in his gospel draws upon language, images, themes, and/or structure from the OT, suggesting his indebtedness—whether consciously or unconsciously—to a biblical text.*⁴⁰ Thus, the present understanding of allusions will be broad enough to include more widely

³⁷ These are 5.21, 27, 31; 5.33a–b; 5.38a–b; 5.43; 9.13; 10.35–36; 12.7, 40; 18.16; 19.4a–b; 19.5, 7, 18, 19; 21.9, 13, 15; 22.24, 32, 37, 39; 23.39; 24.30; 26.64–b; 27.46.

³⁸ This distinction is also recognized by, e.g., Krister Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew and its Use of the Old Testament* (2d ed.; ASNU 20; Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1968), 45; Menken, *Matthew's Bible*, 1; Douglas J. Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives* (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1983), 19–20; J. Samuel Subramanian, *The Synoptic Gospels and the Psalms as Prophecy* (LNTS 351; London: T&T Clark, 2007), 13.

³⁹ Cf. Menken, *Matthew's Bible*, 10; Moo, *Passion Narratives*, 20; France, *Matthew*, 11.

⁴⁰ These criteria will be outlined below.

recognized references to the OT, as well as those passages that might be said to *echo* OT passages. It should also be noted that an allusion might be *intentional* or *unintentional*. This distinction will be discussed in more detail below (§1.2.3).

The term *allusion* has been chosen for this category for a couple of reasons. First, it is language that is commonly employed and accepted as a legitimate category for biblical authors, even if the criteria for what constitutes allusions often vary from one exegete to another. Second, though other terms are frequently used to refer to subtler allusions,⁴¹ it appears to be more prudent to include all types of allusions under the same heading since it is not possible to demonstrate with precision the differences between an allusion and an echo. Since all categories are artificial, they are best kept to a minimum.

At times there is very little distinction between explicit and implicit citations, and between implicit citations and allusions. Therefore, it is best to view these three categories as points on a continuum, since it is more difficult to determine how to define OT usage the vaguer it becomes. For sake of clarity, any reference to the OT in Matthew, apart from the 56 explicit/implicit citations listed above, will be considered an allusion.⁴² The indices of allusions listed in NA27/UBS4 will be referenced, but it will not be assumed that all the passages listed there have strong support, nor will the discussion of possible OT allusions be limited to these passages. Instead, the method for identifying allusions will be outlined, and this method will be applied to particular passages in Matthew. Before this, however, more needs to be said about the warrant for seeking allusions, and the work of those scholars whose contributions have been formative for the method adopted in this study will be acknowledged.

⁴¹ Most notable is the term *echo* in NT studies, especially since the influential work of Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989).

⁴² This accords with Stanley Porter's suggestion that it would be advantageous to have a streamlined definition of allusion that includes anything not found in a quotation. Cf. Porter, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals* (ed. C. Evans and J. Sanders; JSNTSup 148/SSEJC 5; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 95.

1.1.4 Richard Hays on Echoes

Foundational for the present study is the approach of Richard Hays, whose methodology for identifying allusions is outlined in *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. Here Hays argues not only for the existence of subtle OT references in Paul's letters, but also that these allusive references are highly significant for understanding Paul's thought. The basis of Hays's view, which draws heavily on the work of literary critic John Hollander,⁴³ can be summarized:

Allusive echo can often function as a diachronic trope to which Hollander applies the name of *transumption*, or *metalepsis*. When a literary echo links the text in which it occurs to an earlier text, the figurative effect of the echo can lie in the unstated or suppressed (transumed) points of resonance between the two texts.⁴⁴

For Hays, Paul's references to the OT reveal theological connections that are important for the NT epistle in which it is recalled. In Hays's estimation, "scriptural echoes lend resonant overtones to Paul's prose."⁴⁵ In other words, where Paul allusively echoes an OT passage he does not do so incidentally, but these echoes often provide an integral key for understanding Paul's argument. Although these references are not always easily identified, they are not therefore less important. Elsewhere, discussing the way in which allusions and echoes function as tropes,⁴⁶ Hays has noted that the effectiveness of these devices actually "depends partly upon their initial obscurity."⁴⁷ However, once the

⁴³ John Hollander, *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981).

⁴⁴ Hays, *Echoes*, 20. Elsewhere Hays defines *metalepsis* more fully: "In brief, 'metalepsis' is a rhetorical figure that creates a correspondence between two texts such that text B should be understood in light of a broad interplay with the precursor text A, encompassing aspects of A beyond those explicitly cited." Cf. *idem*, *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 43n.38.

⁴⁵ Hays, *Echoes*, 21.

⁴⁶ For Hays, *allusions* are obvious intertextual references, and *echoes* are subtler ones. He also recognizes, however, that quotation, allusion, and echo are all points on a spectrum and he implies that we cannot easily distinguish between them (*Echoes*, 29).

⁴⁷ Hays, "'Who Has Believed Our Message?' Paul's Reading of Isaiah," *SBL Seminar Papers, 1998* (2 vols.; SBLSP 37; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 1:205–25.

connections are made, the effect for Hays might be compared to a dawning of light that reveals a storehouse of treasures.

A significant aspect of Hays's perspective is the need to consider appropriately the OT context from which an OT echo is taken. Hays, agreeing with one of the main points of C. H. Dodd's *According to the Scriptures*,⁴⁸ states that Paul's OT references are not merely proof-texts, but "usually must be understood as allusive recollections of the wider narrative setting from which they are taken."⁴⁹ Hays even suggests that Paul read the OT Scriptures as a literary and/or theological unity.⁵⁰ Hays cites the example of Isa 52.5 in Rom 2.24, maintaining that Paul understood Isa 52 in light of the entirety of canonical Isaiah that depicts Israel's exile and redemption. Thus, the broader context of Isaiah from which Paul's reference comes must be considered to grasp most fully the effect of Paul's rhetoric.⁵¹

Another helpful discussion advanced by Hays states that explicit citations in Paul are merely the *tip of the iceberg* that "point to a larger mass just under the surface." Hays continues, "It would, therefore, be highly artificial to suppose that Scripture plays an important role in Paul's thought only in those cases where he quotes a text explicitly." For Hays, the implication is simple. "That means our efforts to interpret his writings must deal also with allusions and echoes of Scripture in his writings."⁵²

Hays gives seven criteria to assist in finding and evaluating the significance of scriptural echoes in Paul. By these he does not intend to set forth a step-by-step process that always leads to a firm conclusion. Instead, these should underlie any exegetical decisions made regarding echoes. Below is a brief recounting of these principles;⁵³ later in this chapter I will indicate how these may be applied to Matthew's usage of Deuteronomy.

⁴⁸ C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures: The Substructure of New Testament Theology* (London: Nisbet, 1952). So Hays, *Echoes*, 222. Dodd does not confine his study to Pauline literature.

⁴⁹ Hays, *Echoes*, 157–58.

⁵⁰ Hays, "Who Has Believed?," 205.

⁵¹ Hays, *Echoes*, 24, 158.

⁵² Hays, "Who Has Believed?," 206–8.

⁵³ Cf. *Echoes*, 29–32.

1) *Availability*. Was the proposed text that is being echoed available to the author and/or the original audience?

2) *Volume* deals with the prominence, either in wording or significance of the OT passage in question, in the possible NT allusion.

3) *Recurrence* refers to the frequency with which Paul alludes to or quotes the same OT passage. The more often a passage is cited, the more probable it is that an allusion will be valid.

4) *Thematic coherence* has to do with the OT context from which an echo comes. Here Hays asks whether the meaning, images, and ideas in the possible OT echo help to clarify Paul's reasoning. In addition, this criterion asks whether the OT passage is consistent with other occurrences in the Pauline corpus.

5) *Historical plausibility* asks whether the modern-day exegete's thoughts about a proposed echo would have been feasible to a first-century audience. Put differently, exegetes must be sure that present-day readings and/or theological reconstructions are not anachronistic, but would have fit with what is known of the theological milieu of Paul's day.

6) *History of interpretation* asks whether other exegetes throughout history have seen the same or similar connections. This provides a buffer against fantastic, shortsighted, or erratic interpretations.⁵⁴

7) *Satisfaction*. This is a way for exegetes to ask themselves whether a proposed reading produces a satisfying account of the surrounding discourse. Although this criterion is arguably the most subjective of the seven, it remains imperative that the exegete has confidence in his/her exegetical conclusions. Presumably, however, achieving this step (in conjunction with the other six) will concomitantly result in interpretations that other exegetes will also find to be superior.

⁵⁴ Although Hays lists this criterion as important, he also discounts it, suggesting that history may have "dampened our drowned out" some echoes due to hermeneutical revisions stemming from different historical contexts. Thus, Hays insists we must not limit our insights into those discovered in the past.

Despite criticisms that have been offered against these seven criteria,⁵⁵ many still recognize their legitimacy.⁵⁶ Indeed, Hays's conclusions are corroborated when one considers the biblical assumptions of Paul and other NT authors. Their widespread appeal—most obviously by way of citation—to OT texts indicates that they saw the OT as sacred Scripture. In addition, many NT texts point to the provisional character of the OT, serving to prepare God's people for the time of the Christ.⁵⁷ Thus, the NT authors' frequent application of OT texts for their (Christian) audiences suggests they viewed the OT as directly relevant for the eschatological community of the last days.⁵⁸ If this is true, it would not be surprising if Paul and other biblical authors read the OT widely, even after the coming of Christ, and did not simply scour it for isolated proof-texts. Old Testament citations certainly reveal the OT's abiding relevance for NT authors, but their appropriation of the OT is not limited to citations. Instead, citations are merely the most notable way in which the OT is organically incorporated throughout the NT. Awareness of this biblical feature will be especially significant for the present study of Matthew—a book that is saturated with Scriptural citations. It will be argued that OT citations in Matthew—from Deuteronomy in particular—are merely the *tip of the iceberg* that allows the exegete to look for the larger mass of influence that may lie just below a surface reading.

The following survey will demonstrate the widespread view that various NT writings—particularly Matthew—are replete with allusory scriptural references, and it therefore behoves the exegete to weigh these carefully. Since Hays's method remains the best approach for identifying and assessing OT allusions, it will be followed in this study. Before these are applied, however, I will briefly survey other scholars who have advanced Hays's arguments on the nature and significance of OT allusions in the NT.

⁵⁵ See, e.g., the critique by Stanley Porter ("Use of the Old Testament," 83) who suggests that of the seven criteria only three are viable, and even these are problematic.

⁵⁶ E.g., N. T. Wright, *Paul: In Fresh Perspective* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 61–62.

⁵⁷ So Carson, "Matthew," 28. Cf. Matt 11.13; Luke 24.44; Gal 3.22–4.5; Col 2.16–17; Heb 10.1; al.

⁵⁸ On the OT's relationship to NT eschatology see E. Earle Ellis, *The Old Testament in Early Christianity: Canon and Interpretation in the Light of Modern Research* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991), 101–5.

1.1.5 Developments of Hays's Criteria

Since the publication of *Echoes*, numerous NT scholars have demonstrated an affinity with Hays's thesis and subsequent elaborations. What follows is a survey of a few of these scholars and their contributions to an understanding of *allusions*. First, some studies focusing on Pauline and non-Pauline literature will be recounted.⁵⁹ Next, more space will be devoted to discussions of the Gospels in general, and Matthew in particular.

1.1.5.1 General NT Literature

Many scholars writing on Paul have demonstrated continuity with Hays's approach, while adding insights of their own. One such scholar is N. T. Wright. In *The Climax of the Covenant*, Wright affirms that he finds Hays's arguments "basically convincing." However, Wright goes beyond Hays and suggests that Paul read Israel's Scriptures as a specific *story* that was moving towards a climax.⁶⁰

A couple of other scholars note Paul's interest in the Pentateuch. Carol Stockhausen has shown in her work on 2 Corinthians that Paul is superlatively interested in the stories of the Pentateuch "as narratives."⁶¹ Additionally, Francis Watson helpfully demonstrates that Paul was an interpretive reader of Scripture, and as such was attuned to the theological message of the passages he referenced. He further states that explicit citations to OT passages "are simply the visible manifestations of an intertextuality that is ubiquitous and fundamental to the Pauline discourse," thus agreeing with Hays's *iceberg* metaphor.⁶² It is especially instructive that these scholars recognize in Paul a keen interest in the Pentateuch.

⁵⁹ See §1.2.2 below on the relevance of Pauline intertextual studies for studying intertextuality in Matthew.

⁶⁰ N. T. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 264.

⁶¹ Carol K. Stockhausen, "2 Corinthians 3 and the Principles of Pauline Exegesis," in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel* (ed. C. Evans and J. Sanders; JSNTSup 83/SSEJC 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 144–46 (emphasis original).

⁶² Francis Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith* (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 1–6, 17.

It is also appropriate to note a couple of scholars who have applied similar insights to other portions of the NT. First, Steve Moyise acknowledges the existence of *intertextual echoes*, and argues that such subtle allusions can sometimes be more influential than explicit citations, especially if they are “frequent and pervasive.” Later Moyise proposes that such allusions can accompany the reading of a NT passage as a “shading voice”⁶³ that add texture and depth to a text, even when the OT text is not expressly cited.

Second, G. K. Beale’s work will inform the present perspective. Beale recognizes the importance of the OT background for the NT, and believes that the nature of the OT context of an allusion must be taken into consideration. In addition to literary and thematic contexts, Beale maintains the exegete must also reflect on *historical* contexts within literary units. Thus, one must consider the Exodus events when interpreting Hos 11.⁶⁴ Put differently, although the historical context for the writing of Hosea was not the Exodus, the literary composition of Hosea assumes and draws upon the historical context of the Exodus to communicate its message.

1.1.5.2 Synoptic Gospels

It is significant that Hays himself does not restrict his application of OT echoes to Pauline literature, but has also applied his insights to the Gospels. First, in an article on Mark, he considers how important the OT contexts were for the citations of Isa 56; Jer 7 in Mark 11. Hays shows that the full force of Jesus’ rebuke of discrimination against the Gentiles and the ultimate deception of trusting in national identity based on Temple presence in Mark is lost without a knowledge of the contexts of these two OT passages. Second, Hays notes that the allusion to Job 9 in Mark 6:48 is a key that helps unlock the meaning of the passage and makes sense of the curious phrase *καὶ ἤθελεν παρελθεῖν αὐτοῦς*. He concludes that Mark intends this pericope to be a theophanic vision of Jesus based on connections between the language of Job 9 LXX and Mark 6.

⁶³ Steve Moyise, “Intertextuality and the Study of the Old Testament in the New Testament,” in *The Old Testament in the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. L. North* (ed. S. Moyise; JSNTSup 189; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 17, 24.

⁶⁴ G. K. Beale, *John’s Use of the Old Testament in Revelation* (JSNTSup 166; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 20, 62–63, 74.

Hays also suggests that *παρελθεῖν* alludes to God's passing by Moses in Exod 33–34, which adds to the theophanic imagery.⁶⁵ Additionally, in an even more germane article that surveys the use of the OT in Matthew, Hays presses the need to heed more subtle allusions in addition to fulfillment citations. He further suggests that Matthew read the OT as a narrative, and this is evident the way Matthew himself emphasizes key elements of the OT story (election, kingship, sin, exile, messianic salvation). In Hays's estimation, Matthew exhibits "a diverse and complex use of Scripture."⁶⁶

An earlier perspective on many of these same themes comes from Douglas Moo, who noted in 1983 that those steeped in the OT, such as the four Evangelists, and writing on religious topics would almost certainly employ scriptural language, even if not intending to evoke a particular passage. He maintains it is not necessary to discuss whether an author *intended* an allusion, but whether such allusions are present in the text. For Moo, allusions are not only present, but frequent. Moo also provides three guiding principles to identify allusions: the appropriateness of the purported OT text in the new context, the citation of the OT text elsewhere, and the author's characteristic style.⁶⁷ These are indeed important criteria to remember when attempting to locate allusions in Matthew.

Of particular interest is the work of those who have focused on the importance of OT allusions specifically in Matthew. J. van Dodewaard suggested in 1955 that too little attention had been given to NT passages that draw from the OT "un seul mot ou une seule phrase, non seulement à cause de la signification restreinte de cette phrase ou de ce mot, mais pour évoquer du même coup tout le contexte, toute l'histoire, l'événement même, durant lequel ce mot a été prononcé." In other words, many OT allusions are not limited to the words included by the author, but evoke the entire contextual world from

⁶⁵ Richard B. Hays, "Can the Gospels Teach Us How to Read the Old Testament?," *ProEcc* 11 (2002): 402–18. Hays is presently working on an extended project focusing on the OT in the Gospels.

⁶⁶ *Idem*, "The Gospel of Matthew: Reconfigured Torah," *HvTSt* 61 (2005): 165–90.

⁶⁷ Moo, *Passion Narratives*, 17. So Donald Juel, *Messianic Exegesis: Christological Interpretation of the Old Testament in Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 21, 96–98.

which they are derived. Tellingly, van Dodewaard's article focuses on how this is typical in Matthew.⁶⁸

Similarly, in 1972 L. Hartman, writing on Matthew, recognized that a quotation or allusion gains much of its communicative effect from a set of its associations and/or context, and warned that one may at times miss the force of a text if an allusion is not recognized. In the course of his study Hartman also suggests that, when identifying allusions, one should try to discern what the author intended.⁶⁹

A 1979 monograph by Brian Nolan focusing on Matt 1–2 offers a definition for allusions, which he contends are prominent in these two chapters. Nolan suggests that an allusion is “a conscious evocation of an Old Testament personage, event, institution, passage, or literary technique, made by the writer in order to communicate through the medium of received religious tradition.” He adds two criteria to validate such allusions: 1) a series of verbal similarities; 2) a theological motive giving them coherence and direction.⁷⁰ The arguments set forth later in this study will basically concur with these two criteria, but with the realization that a “series of verbal similarities” can be difficult to establish for allusive references.

R. T. France, who has done substantial work on both Matthew and the use of the OT in the NT, notes that less formal allusions often reveal the OT basis upon which an author formed his thinking.⁷¹ As such, allusions may offer important insights into the theological influences of a given author, especially one such as Matthew whose gospel teems over with OT language and imagery. France acknowledges that allusions will not be manifestly evident to everyone, and suggests that Matthew may have been catering to “differing levels of sophistication and readership” in the allusions he includes, and may

⁶⁸ Van Dodewaard, “La Force,” 484–85.

⁶⁹ L. Hartman, “Scriptural Exegesis in the Gospel of St. Matthew and the Problem of Interpretation,” in *L'évangile selon Matthieu: Rédaction et théologie* (ed. M. Didier; Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1972), 131–52. Hartman does not distinguish sharply between quotations and allusions, but seems to identify an *allusion* based on verbal parallels.

⁷⁰ Brian M. Nolan, *The Royal Son of God: The Christology of Matthew 1–2 in the setting of the Gospel* (OBO 23; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), 23.

⁷¹ France, *Jesus and the Old Testament* (London: Tyndale Press, 1971), 15. France adds that allusions can be quite difficult to locate.

have included “bonus meanings” in his text for those with a sharp eye.⁷² This being the case, one should not be surprised to find some rather noticeable allusions, and some that are discovered only after extended reflection, perhaps by those very familiar with the OT. Thus, when studying Matthew, it would be counterproductive to restrict one’s investigation to citations, but one must also consider Matthew’s more subtle OT references.⁷³

Another contribution to Matthean studies can be found in Wright’s *New Testament and the People of God*. Here Wright notes the widespread view that Matthew’s gospel has a “thoroughly Jewish flavour.” Consistent with the observations of this chapter thus far, Wright observes that Matthew’s fulfillment quotations are only “the tip of a very large iceberg.” He also suggests that Matthew’s narrative relies heavily on the story of Israel, most notably as encapsulated in the latter portions of Deuteronomy. Matthew, according to Wright, is in part a narrative that is looking for the fulfillment of Israel’s story. Wright further recognizes the importance of the Pentateuch for Matthew, arguing that the Pentateuch (and Deuteronomy in particular) *as covenant* lies at the back of Matthew’s structure.⁷⁴

This study will also gain methodological insight from Dale Allison who has argued in detail for a pervasive Mosaic typology throughout Matthew, which further supports the view that OT—especially Pentateuchal—imagery is prominent in Matthew.⁷⁵ Allison’s criteria for identifying OT allusions are rather straightforward. His approach is to look for a combination of similar circumstances, key words/phrases,

⁷² France, *Evangelist*, 114. Cf. *idem*, “The Formula-Quotations of Matthew 2 and the Problem of Communication,” *NTS* 27 (1981/82): 233–51; *idem*, *Matthew*, 45.

⁷³ So France, *Evangelist*, 184–5; 190–91.

⁷⁴ Wright, *New Testament*, 384–89. Deuteronomy 27–30 is especially important for Wright, as he believes the covenant, as Matthew understood it, is summarized in these chapters.

⁷⁵ Allison, *New Moses*. Michael Fishbane comments on typology in his important work *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985), 350ff. Fishbane explains how connections were made in the Hebrew Bible by typology: “[S]uch nexuses are the product of a specific mode of theological-historical speculation—one which seeks to adapt, interpret, or otherwise illumine a present experience (or hope, or expectation) *by means of an older datum*” (352, emphasis original). Although Fishbane’s work is focused on the inner-biblical exegesis of the OT, Matthew’s practice seems to follow this basic pattern.

narrative structure, and verbal or syllabic resonances.⁷⁶ Although *The New Moses* deals mainly with typology,⁷⁷ it assumes the importance of intertextuality. This latter theme is expounded in more detail in Allison's more recent work dealing with Q in the Synoptics.⁷⁸ Here Allison expands his criteria for identifying allusions. In addition to the principles listed in *The New Moses*, he also mentions shared themes, imagery, and circumstances as elements when, taken together, most likely indicate an allusion. Allison further believes that the history of interpretation is an imperative safeguard in the process of finding allusions. Positively, Allison states that the probability of an intertext is heightened if the author utilizes the source text in other portions of his writing. This criterion will be especially important for the present inquiry into Deuteronomy in Matthew. Finally, Allison concedes that subjectivity is unavoidable in the quest to uncover allusions.⁷⁹ For Allison, there is no simple way to identify oblique references, but a mature judgment is needed to "feel" whether a supposed reference is solid or inconsequential.⁸⁰ Thus Allison, no less than Hays, does not deny that searching for subtle allusions requires a degree of exegetical judgment. Both agree, however, that the subjective dangers involved in identifying allusions do not thereby undermine the value of such allusions, nor should this deter the exegete from attempting to locate them.⁸¹

Michael Knowles's work on Jeremiah also acknowledges the importance of allusions in Matthew. Knowles's study adds at least two things to the present survey. First, he notes the inherent difficulty in evaluating purported allusions only on the basis of verbal correspondence, since the version Matthew is citing or drawing his references from may not be an extant text form. Second, Knowles explicitly applies Hays's method

⁷⁶ Allison, *New Moses*, 20–21.

⁷⁷ It is helpful to consider typology under the rubric of *allusion* since most typology is not based on overt scriptural citations, but on parallels between two or more texts (as Allison ably shows in *New Moses*). Therefore, typology is best described as a particular species of allusion. This accords with Bruce Waltke's observation that "[a]llusions often merge with typology." Cf. Bruce K. Waltke with Charles Yu, *An Old Testament Theology: An Exegetical, Canonical, and Thematic Approach* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2007), 133.

⁷⁸ *The Intertextual Jesus: Scripture in Q* (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press, 2000).

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 10–12.

⁸⁰ Allison, *New Moses*, 21.

⁸¹ Ulrich Luz ("Intertexts in the Gospel of Matthew," *HTR* 97 [2004]: 119–37, especially 130–31) follows Hays and Allison in laying out four criteria for allusions.

to Matthew, even noting that Hays's arguments for allusions based on Paul's familiarity with the OT have "even greater force" when applied to Matthew.⁸² Similarly, Richard Beaton suggests the need to give greater weight to allusory OT references in Matthew, alongside other explicit references. Attention to this will, according to Beaton, provide the foundation upon which one can truly understand the role of the more prominent formula quotations.⁸³

A final contribution to consider comes from Anne O'Leary, who argues that Matthew is preeminently a rewritten, "Judaized" text of a Markan source. O'Leary acknowledges her debt to Hays and Allison, and inquires how Matthew used Mark as a source. Two aspects of her findings warrant mention here. First, O'Leary believes Matthew exhibits a "Torahized frame." This simply means that Matthew has added elements of the Torah to the beginning and ending of his narrative. Second, O'Leary contends that certain elements of Matthew's gospel have been "Deuteronomized," having been styled in such a way that they echo portions of Deuteronomy.⁸⁴ The most relevant portions of O'Leary's research for the present study is the consistency of her methodology with the authors already mentioned, as well as her arguments highlighting Deuteronomy's role in Matthew.

1.2 Approach

1.2.1 On Citations and Allusions

In this study, following a method that is indebted to the scholars above, I will endeavor to identify and assess allusions to Deuteronomy in Matthew based in large part on the prevalence of citations. This study will be particularly focused on Deuteronomy as it relates to the sonship and obedience of Jesus. Given the debated nature of

⁸² Michael Knowles, *Jeremiah in Matthew's Gospel: The Rejected-Prophet Motif in Matthean Redaction*. (JSNTSup 68; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 162–64.

⁸³ Beaton, *Isaiah's Christ*, 19–20.

⁸⁴ Anne M. O'Leary, *Matthew's Judaization of Mark: Examined in the Context of the Use of Sources in Graeco-Roman Antiquity* (LNTS 323; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2006), 19, 118, 139, 164–69. The two passages she explicitly mentions are Matt. 17.22–27; 18.15–35. In these passages she follows Thomas Brodie.

allusions, it has been necessary to substantiate their importance.⁸⁵ It should be recognized that allusions are not always more important than citations. Indeed, apart from the *citations* of Deuteronomy in Matthew, arguments for *allusions* would carry little weight.⁸⁶ Yet it remains that one must give due attention to allusions, or risk insufficient readings of texts. Indeed, it would be highly artificial to conclude that Deuteronomy plays a significant role in Matthew's thought only where Deuteronomy is cited explicitly.⁸⁷

The aim of this study will be not be simply to identify possible allusions, but specifically to evaluate how Deuteronomic thought may have shaped Matthew's Christology. This study will not consider an OT citation or allusion in Matthew to be bare repetition, but will assume these involve some sort of development.⁸⁸ Matthew understands the coming of Jesus to mark *the* major event in salvation history; thus the narrative climax of the OT for Matthew is seen in the person of Jesus. The upshot of this is that although we should search for verbal, thematic, and other similarities in Matthew's Deuteronomic allusions, we should also expect that Matthew's utilization of his OT sources might be creatively appropriated. That is, Matthew may take themes, commandments, or other aspects of Deuteronomy and apply them in new ways to people, events, or realities in Matthew that demonstrates the climactic filling up of all Israel's hope in the person and work of Christ.

1.2.2 Applying Hays's Method to Matthew

Hays's methodology on allusions was first articulated in reference to Paul. Nevertheless, it is the contention of this study that his methodology can rightly be applied to Matthew. Indeed, Hays himself studies Matthew in accordance with his own

⁸⁵ Cf. Gundry, *Use*, 3, citing C. Taylor (*The Gospel in the Law* [Cambridge, 1869], xxi): "the least direct allusion testifies to the firmest grasp and appreciation of a subject."

⁸⁶ Cf. Guy Waters, *The End of Deuteronomy in the Epistles of Paul* (WUNT II/221; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 23–24.

⁸⁷ Cf. Porter, "Use of the Old Testament," 96. This approach differs from that of Maarten J. J. Menken, "Deuteronomy in Matthew's Gospel," in *Deuteronomy in the New Testament* (ed. S. Moyise and M. Menken; LNTS 358; London: T&T Clark, 2007), 42–62.

⁸⁸ Wright, *New Testament*, 385; France, *Evangelist*, 190; Allison, *New Moses*.

principles, and it has become common practice in NT scholarship to apply Hays's criteria to a gamut of texts. Matthew is particularly well suited for such an endeavor.⁸⁹

Moreover, the observations of Paul as a reader of Scripture have many parallels to the author of Matthew. Matthew, no less than Paul, is "clearly Jewish, in dialogue with contemporary Jewish thought, and skilled in traditional Jewish interpretation of the OT."⁹⁰ Among other factors, Luz points to the author's understanding of the law and his appeal to the OT as evidence for a Jewish Christian author well versed in the literature of Judaism.⁹¹ Similarly, much of Hays's approach is built on the foundation that Paul was not only familiar with Israel's Scriptures and interpretive traditions, but also consciously invoked them in his letters.⁹² Whatever differences may exist between their writings, Matthew and Paul were both first-century Jewish Christians⁹³ who had a thorough knowledge of OT texts and traditions, and who used their Scriptural heritage to elucidate and bolster their arguments. Thus, it would not be surprising if Matthew's approach to the scriptures, though distinct from Paul's, exhibits numerous similarities with the former Pharisee.⁹⁴ In light of all these considerations, it is appropriate and well founded to apply Hays's approach to Matthew with minimal modification.

1.2.3 Literary and Theological Relationships

Another driving assumption for the present approach is the persuasion that a literary relationship between Deuteronomy and Matthew also reveals a theological

⁸⁹ So Knowles, *Jeremiah*, 164

⁹⁰ Keener, *Matthew*, 40. For Paul as a Jewish Christian in conversation with Israel's Scriptures, see Hays, *Echoes*, ix-xii; Watson, *Hermeneutics*, 1-6.

⁹¹ Luz, *Matthew*, 1:80-81. In addition, many believe that Matt 13:52 gives the reader a biographical glimpse of the author: he may have been a scribe who was made a disciple for the kingdom of heaven (γραμματεὺς μαθητευθεὶς τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν). Cf. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:445-46; David E. Orton, *The Understanding Scribe: Matthew and the Apocalyptic Ideal* (JSNTSup 25; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 168.

⁹² Hays, *Echoes*, xii, 4-6.

⁹³ For dating Matthew before 100 C.E. see Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:128-38; Luz, *Theology*, 15; W. G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament* (14th ed.; trans. A. Mattill; London: SCM Press, 1966), 84.

⁹⁴ Phil 3.4-6.

relationship.⁹⁵ Matthew was not primarily drawing from the OT simply because he preferred the language, but to demonstrate continuity with and fulfillment of the OT in Jesus.⁹⁶ Even a preliminary reading of Matthew will demonstrate that the author viewed the OT as authoritative for his purposes. Although this is most readily evident in the fulfillment quotations, the influence of the OT can also be seen in any of the ways Matthew employs these authoritative texts. In other words, one must heed OT allusions in Matthew because they, no less than the fulfillment citations, provide insight into how Matthew's perspective is shaped by the OT.

This assumes that one can, to *some* degree, and in general ways, speak positively of the intention of the author. In this study allusions to Deuteronomy in Matthew will be most likely if they can plausibly be attributed to authorial intention.⁹⁷ However, positively identifying authorial intent is a slippery enterprise,⁹⁸ and one may come across oblique references that Matthew may not have intended, but simply reflect his familiarity with the OT. Although it is not possible to assess with confidence which allusions Matthew intended and which ones may be merely due to his keen familiarity with scriptural texts, it will be argued that Matthew's use of Deuteronomic sonship texts exhibits a consistent pattern, which may reveal Matthew's intent. In other words, one can learn something of authorial intent by asking where allusions occur, and how they are employed in the overall context of Matthew's gospel. What is their function in the narrative? Do they comport with Matthew's citations? Are they consistent with recognized Matthean themes? Questions such as these, along with the criteria listed below, will help assess authorial intent. However, it should also be recognized that some scriptural allusions may not be *intentional*, but may still be present in the text. Nevertheless, even in these instances Scripture informs the author's thought in some way, and we should therefore not dismiss them as insignificant. The key question will be

⁹⁵ This assumption is challenged by William S. Green in "Doing the Text's Work for It: Richard Hays on Paul's Use of Scripture," in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel* (ed. C. Evans and J. Sanders; JSNTSup 83/SSEJC 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 58–63.

⁹⁶ Cf. France, *Evangelist*, 166–205.

⁹⁷ So Hays, *Echoes*, 28.

⁹⁸ Hays, "Who Has Believed?," 208.

whether there is ample reason to believe that Matthew's gospel is influenced by Deuteronomic sonship themes. It will be argued that there is.

The present approach that seeks to acknowledge Matthew's literary patterns differs from those who believe an audience-centered approach is the most reliable way to identify purported allusions.⁹⁹ Although one may not be able wholly to reconstruct the intentions of an author, it remains that focusing on an extant text provides a firmer foundation for an author's view of the OT than theoretical reconstructions of an author's supposed audience¹⁰⁰—even if one were to have a well-developed hypothesis regarding Matthew's audience that can be adhered to with confidence.¹⁰¹ As France has argued, Matthew may have even (intentionally) included allusions that were not readily recognizable by all his readers/auditors.¹⁰² It is highly unlikely that Matthew's audience was a homogenous group in which each member had an equally developed knowledge of the Scriptures. Instead, it is more feasible that some allusions in Matthew went unnoticed by an average reader/auditor, and were only picked up on by those with more extensive training and familiarity. This does not mean, however, that the more obscure (or perhaps unintentional) allusions did not exist, only that they were more difficult to distinguish.¹⁰³

1.2.4 Deuteronomy as an "Iceberg"

Based on the frequent of citations to Deuteronomy in Matthew, this study will consider Deuteronomy to be an *iceberg* in Matthew. That is, in light of the recurrence of

⁹⁹ So Christopher Tuckett, "Paul, Scripture and Ethics," in *New Testament Writers and the Old Testament: An Introduction* (ed. J. Court; London: SPCK, 2002), 71–97. Cf. Christopher D. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature* (SNTSMS 69; Cambridge: CUP, 1992), 34.

¹⁰⁰ So Porter, "Use of the Old Testament," 95.

¹⁰¹ For discussions of Matthew's community see Paul Foster, *Community, Law and Mission in Matthew's Gospel* (WUNT II/177; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), especially 22–79, 253–60; Luz, *Matthew*, 1:45–55; David C. Sim, *The Gospel of Matthew and Christian Judaism: The History and Social Setting of the Matthean Community* (SNTW; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998); Graham N. Stanton, *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992), 45–51. For those hesitant to attach too significant a role to specific gospel audiences, see Richard Bauckham, ed., *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).

¹⁰² France, "Formula Quotations," 233ff.

¹⁰³ For Matthew as a text that was designed for multiple readings, see Luz, *Matthew*, 1:6–8.

Deuteronomic citations, it is warranted to look for additional (and likely more numerous) references that reveal Deuteronomic influence and lie just below the surface. Index 4 in NA27 lists 9–10 citations to Deuteronomy in Matthew, the second most of any OT book.¹⁰⁴ If the iceberg analogy is pressed, it can be inferred that one should expect many more than 10 allusions to Deuteronomy,¹⁰⁵ and these allusions will reveal foundational Matthean convictions. Put differently, there exists a rather prominent *tip* of the iceberg, and this study will seek to discover the more inconspicuous references that demonstrate continuity with these citations. In addition, the more prevalent an OT passage is in Matthew (whether citation or allusion), the more likely it is that one will find additional references to the same passage elsewhere. In a word, the proliferation of citations to Deuteronomy gives ample warrant to search for subtler references that may lurk beneath a cursory reading of the text.

1.2.5 Applying Hays's Criteria

It will now be shown how Hays's seven criteria relate to Deuteronomy in Matthew.

1) *Availability*. Matthew's citations of Deuteronomy indicate that Matthew clearly knew Deuteronomy in some form.

2) *Volume* will be addressed for each passage in turn. Admittedly, some passages will be "louder" than others. The passages in Matthew will be treated under the headings *Strong Allusions*, *Likely Allusions*, and *Possible Allusions*.

3) *Recurrence*. It will be argued that some Deuteronomic texts are alluded to in more than one instance in Matthew (e.g., Deut 32). Moreover, some references to Deuteronomic sonship may be more general, with Matthew echoing thematic parallels.

¹⁰⁴ This number may depend on how one understands the citation in Matt 4.10 (most likely from Deut 6.13, but possibly from 10.20; 32.43). The citations from the Decalogue may also come from Exod 20. Even if these were subtracted from the tally, however, Deuteronomy would still be cited more often than any other book of the Torah (cf. Menken, "Deuteronomy in Matthew's Gospel," 43; Menken posits 15 Deuteronomic citations in Matthew). The most frequent book, according to Index 4 in NA27, is Isaiah with 15. Interestingly, the index of OT quotations in UBS4 lists 13 references to Deuteronomy, and only 10 to Isaiah.

¹⁰⁵ Index 4 in NA27 lists over four times more allusions than citations to Deuteronomy in Matthew (10 citations, 43 allusions).

Nevertheless, it will be suggested that this practice also exhibits a pattern of recurrence. Recurrence will be a key criterion for this study.

4) *Thematic Coherence*. This criterion will also be especially important, as allusions will not be limited only to those passages with extensive verbal parallels, but will also include strong thematic links relating to sonship, obedience, and Deuteronomy.

5) *Historical Plausibility*. This is also a significant criterion for the present study, as chapters 2, 4 will argue for widespread Deuteronomistic influence, particularly in relation to obedience and sonship, ancient Judaism and Christianity.

6) *History of Interpretation*. This application of this criterion differs slightly from Hays. Chapters 2–4 will be focused on the reception and interpretation of Deuteronomy through the years predating and contemporaneous with Matthew, with particular focus in chapter 4 on how the theme of sonship in various literature may be influenced by Deuteronomy. Chapters 5–7 will then, building on this history, pose new questions regarding how Deuteronomistic texts and themes may be operative in Matthew. Thus, much of the history of interpretation in this study will focus on the history *before* Matthew was written (though some Jewish sources will likely postdate Matthew). But chapters 5–7 will also interact with more recent scholarly literature that in many ways supports the present thesis, even though some of the specific questions addressed by the thesis may be new.

7) *Satisfaction*. This is perhaps the most difficult of all Hays's criteria to demonstrate, but will be retained nonetheless. Thus I will state clearly which passages are more and which are less likely.

1.2.6 Attention to Contexts

Another factor that will be important for this study is attention to the OT contexts of Matthean citations and allusions. *Context* here refers both to the basic message of the OT text employed by the evangelist, as well as to the portions of the OT text that are found in close proximity to the text referenced. It will be assumed that both the basic sense of the OT passage, as well as an awareness for the wider landscape from which a reference is taken, are consistently in view when Matthew alludes to Deuteronomy. Thus, a focus on context will heed not only the wider literary setting of Deuteronomy,

but also the historical, thematic, and theological backgrounds of selected texts.¹⁰⁶ Finally, attention to contexts will also be expressed by focusing on the narrative context of Matthew. That is, I will seek to understand how Matthew's utilization of biblical sources fits with the gospel's literary and theological characteristics (see below).

In light of this approach, it is appropriate to note the longstanding debates about OT contexts in the NT. Dodd famously argued that certain OT passages were particularly well-known in the early church, and when these passages are cited in the NT the entire context is in view.¹⁰⁷ Many today have especially picked up on Dodd's concept that a narrative substructure is often invoked when a NT writer references an OT text.¹⁰⁸ A noteworthy modification of Dodd is found in Barnabas Lindars's *New Testament Apologetic*.¹⁰⁹ Lindars acknowledged Dodd's point that certain key passages (and their contexts) were particularly well-known in the early church, but then suggests that these texts were the *starting points* for Christian theology and the understanding of them developed over time. Thus, passages were used in different ways in various strata of NT texts, which indicates that the original OT contexts may not have been determinative for how they were used in the NT. Lindars's view has been followed largely by D. Juel, who argued that early Christian writers were primarily engaged in *messianic* exegesis.¹¹⁰ Thus NT writers were most concerned with explaining how an OT passage might be applied to Jesus than to its original use.

Christology was certainly a (the?) dominant issue for the early church, and this is reflected in the NT writers' appeals to the OT. This does not necessarily mean, however, that NT writers appropriated OT texts atomistically, or that there is a development in the understanding of OT texts that may progressively deviate from the original contexts. Indeed, although a number of Jewish interpretative methods were

¹⁰⁶ For these categories I am especially indebted to Beale, *John's Use*, 74; Watson, *Hermeneutics*.

¹⁰⁷ Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Richard B. Hays, *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1–4:11* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001).

¹⁰⁹ Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations* (London: SCM Press, 1961).

¹¹⁰ Juel, *Messianic Exegesis*.

used at the turn of the era,¹¹¹ it is also clear that many Jewish exegetes in Matthew's day were highly sensitive to biblical contexts. This has been argued by David Instone-Brewer, who notes especially that Jewish scribes before 70 C.E. respected scriptural contexts in their exegesis.¹¹² There is therefore a *prima facie* likelihood that Matthew, who himself was quite likely a Jewish scribe around this time (Matt 13.52), was a contextually sensitive interpreter.¹¹³ It will be argued in this study that Matthew's appeals to Deuteronomy to explicate Jesus' sonship appear not to have been proof-texting or atomistic exegesis, especially since he does not always draw attention to his allusions. Instead, it will be argued that Matthew weaves Israel's call to obedient sonship from Deuteronomy into the fabric of his text in such a way that Deuteronomy appears to have served as a significant part of the "narrative substructure" for Jesus' sonship in Matthew. It is clear from Matthew's citations of Deuteronomy that he knew and regarded the book as authoritative, but his appeal to Deuteronomistic sonship texts is often more subtle, revealing the foundations of his thought. And it is highly likely that Matthew was aware not only of the immediate contexts of the passages he alludes to, but the wider story of Israel's history (perhaps even as set forth in Deut 32). In sum, Matthew does seem to be aware of the contexts of the passages he invokes from Deuteronomy, particularly as these passages relate to the sonship of Israel.

In conclusion, the present focus on OT contexts will benefit the present study in two ways. First, when the OT context of a supposed reference meshes well with Matthew's context, this may help to determine the validity of a supposed allusion. Second, an examination of the context of an OT reference may serve to illuminate the significance of an OT reference in Matthew.

¹¹¹ Cf. Richard N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975).

¹¹² David Instone-Brewer, *Techniques and Assumptions of Jewish Exegesis before 70 CE* (TSAJ 30; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), especially 167–69.

¹¹³ Cf. Keener, *Matthew*, 40–41; Richard Beaton, "Isaiah in Matthew's Gospel," in *Isaiah in the New Testament* (ed. S. Moyise and M. Menken; London: T&T Clark, 2005), 63–78.

1.2.7 Christological Focus

Matthew's appropriation of the OT is primarily christological in nature.¹¹⁴ That is, Matthew's concern is to demonstrate that Jesus is the fulfillment of the Scriptures.¹¹⁵ Therefore, it is fitting that the present study asks how Matthew's engagement with the OT may reveal the contours of Matthew's understanding of Jesus.

1.2.8 On Subjectivity

Finally, the danger in Hays's approach should be acknowledged. Identifying and interpreting OT allusions are not a precise science, but require exegetical judgment.¹¹⁶ Thus, one should expect differences of opinion. Nevertheless, the insights to be gained from valid observations outweigh the dangers. As argued above, if one does not grapple with Matthean allusions the exegete risks not fully grasping the christological foundations of Matthew.¹¹⁷ Although the possibility of subjectivity negatively tainting an exegete's findings should be recognized, the present approach will advance a cumulative case that will stand even if an occasional error of judgment is made. Identifying allusions may be more subjective than some other exegetical enterprises, but it should be recognized that pure objectivity is a figment of the imagination.¹¹⁸ This does not mean, however, that every supposed allusion is equally valid.¹¹⁹ By looking for patterns of Matthean employment of the OT, this study will seek allusions that can reasonably be attributed to authorial intent. Thus it will be argued that Matthew consciously invoked a Deuteronomic concept of sonship.

¹¹⁴ Hays himself recognizes this christological characteristic of Matthew's gospel, even though he considers Paul to have read the Scriptures ecclesiocentrically (*Echoes*, 85).

¹¹⁵ See the discussion above regarding the centrality of Jesus for understanding the OT.

¹¹⁶ This fact is articulated well by Hays, "Who Has Believed?," 209; Allison, *New Moses*, 21.

¹¹⁷ So Porter, "Use of the Old Testament," 95.

¹¹⁸ So Wright, *New Testament*, 82–92.

¹¹⁹ For a discussion of Hays's response at this point, see Waters, *End of Deuteronomy*, 23–24.

1.3 Limitations and Focus

1.3.1 Scope

The focus of this study will primarily be on Deuteronomy and Matthew, and the significance of the former for the latter. Thus, it will not endeavor to deal with other streams of OT influence. Although numerous questions exist concerning the origin, date, author, and redaction(s) of Deuteronomy, this study will not, for the most part, engage such questions. Focus will instead be given to the text of Deuteronomy as it may have been known to Matthew.¹²⁰ In conjunction with this, attention will also be given to OT passages that share Deuteronomistic themes, as well as to some texts roughly synchronic with Matthew. This combination of diachronic and synchronic perspectives will hopefully help avoid one of the critiques offered in response to Hays's methodology.¹²¹

1.3.2 Matthew's "Bible"

The Bible Matthew used is notoriously difficult to define with precision¹²² since Matthew's "usage of the OT is distinct and creative, defying easy categorization."¹²³ Stendahl has suggested that Matthew basically adheres to a LXX text form, but his fulfillment quotations stand closer to the Masoretic Text (MT).¹²⁴ Similarly, Davies and Allison observe that Matthew often agrees with the MT over the LXX in most of his formula quotations, and many of his unique allusions.¹²⁵ Stendahl also concludes that Matthew may have employed a targumizing procedure, whereby he created his own renderings of the texts.¹²⁶ Gundry agrees that formal quotations in Matthew diverge

¹²⁰ The nature of the OT text for Matthew will be discussed in the next section.

¹²¹ See James A. Sanders, "Paul and Theological History," in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel* (ed. C. Evans and J. Sanders; JSNTSup 83/SSEJC 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 52–57.

¹²² Note, among others, the important studies by Stendahl, *School of St. Matthew*; Gundry, *Use*; Menken, *Matthew's Bible*. Cf. David S. New, *Old Testament Quotations in the Synoptic Gospels, and the Two-Document Hypothesis* (SBLSCS 37; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993).

¹²³ Beaton, *Isaiah's Christ*, 119. So Knowles, *Jeremiah*, 162.

¹²⁴ Stendahl, *School of St. Matthew*, 143–51.

¹²⁵ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:45. To anticipate the discussion below, we must remember that Matthew would not have known the LXX or MT as we know them today. Nevertheless, we can detect similarities to versions extant today in many of his OT references.

¹²⁶ Stendahl, *School of St. Matthew*, 127.

from Mark and the LXX, and suggests that implicit citations present the reader with “all possible permutations of text forms, and those within a single quotation.”¹²⁷ Although Gundry criticizes Stendahl’s lack of attention to non-Septuagintal quotations apart from formula quotations, he also posits Matthew’s role as a targumist, drawing from a knowledge of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek textual traditions.¹²⁸

Some, however, are not convinced that the targumizing theory is precise enough to be fully convincing, given the state of the text prior to 100 C.E.¹²⁹ That is, recent research regarding the nature of the biblical texts around the turn of the era indicates the apparent fluidity and diversity of the biblical texts at that time. Frank Moore Cross has noted that the diversity of textual traditions among the biblical manuscripts found at Qumran is their “most striking feature.”¹³⁰ Similarly, Shemaryahu Talmon observes the “kaleidoscope of textual traditions” exhibited in the Qumran scrolls, and suggests that the biblical manuscripts from Qumran “in their totality present, in a nutshell as it were, the intricate and variegated problems of the OT Hebrew text and Versions.”¹³¹ Emanuel Tov is in basic agreement with these perspectives, but posits more text types than Cross. In addition to the three textual types representing the MT, LXX, and Samaritan Pentateuch (SP), Tov suggests textual classification should include two additional categories: 1) texts written in the Qumran practice of orthography, morphology, and scribal practice; 2) non-aligned texts.¹³² This latter category is especially noteworthy, since non-aligned texts (i.e., texts that agree with the MT, LXX, or SP traditions, but

¹²⁷ Gundry, *Use*, 9, 28.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, 172. So also Luz, *Theology*, 38; France, *Evangelist*, 175–76.

¹²⁹ So Beaton, *Isaiah’s Christ*, 29.

¹³⁰ Frank Moore Cross, “The Contribution of the Qumrân Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text,” *IEJ* 16 (1966): 81–95; repr. in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (ed. F. M. Cross and S. Talmon; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975). It is noteworthy, however, that Cross does believe the texts adhere to a “clear, simple pattern” of textual families limited in number (84). Cross understands there to be three main textual types that developed in three main locations: 1) Palestine; 2) Egypt; 3) Babylon. These correspond to what the Samaritan Pentateuch, LXX, MT.

¹³¹ Shemaryahu Talmon, “Aspects of the Textual Transmission of the Bible in the Light of Qumran Manuscripts,” *Text* 4 (1964): 95–132; repr. in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (ed. F. M. Cross and S. Talmon; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975).

¹³² Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 114–16.

also disagree with that same textual tradition to a comparable extent) illustrate well the textual plurality and variety in the pre-Christian era.¹³³

Christopher Stanley concurs with these observations, noting that the diversity of the biblical manuscripts at Qumran suggests a milieu of textual diversity, which does not allow the exegete to know in advance the OT textual tradition a NT writer may have utilized.¹³⁴ Timothy Lim corroborates Stanley's position, noting that the Qumran pesharim and the Pauline letters both date to a period when the textual situation is fluid, and therefore positing only three text types (MT, LXX, SP) is not sufficient to explain the data.¹³⁵ Instead, it should be recognized that the OT in Paul's day was characterized by textual variety and pluriformity.¹³⁶

Although the Matthew-as-targumist hypothesis may be difficult to prove, Gundry's suggestion that Matthew may have been capable in Greek, Hebrew, and Aramaic finds more support in recent research.¹³⁷ For example, Lim has suggested that Paul would have been polylingual, and most likely could have read the OT in Hebrew, Greek, or an Aramaic targum. Therefore, it would have been possible for Paul to make his own translations.¹³⁸ A similar conclusion regarding Matthew's capabilities has been reached by Davies and Allison, who suggest Matthew was capable of reading the OT in both Greek and Hebrew.¹³⁹ Since Aramaic was the spoken language of the day,¹⁴⁰ Matthew would probably, like Paul, have been able to consult Aramaic sources as well.

¹³³ Ibid., 116–17. These pages also contain examples of texts that Tov considers to be non-aligned. For others who note the textual fluidity of this time see Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (SDSSRL; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 9, 12; James C. VanderKam, "Questions of Canon Viewed through the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Canon Debate* (ed. L. M. McDonald and J. A. Sanders; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002), 91–109. For the view that this diversity may actually support the proto-MT tradition, see Peter J. Gentry, "The Text of the Old Testament," *JETS* 52 (2009): 19–45.

¹³⁴ Stanley, *Language of Scripture*, 39–42, 48.

¹³⁵ Timothy H. Lim, *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 20. See also *idem*, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Very Short Introduction* (VSI 143; Oxford: OUP, 2005), 47. Lim adds that questions regarding textual diversity should be considered separately from what books were considered canonical (56). Cf. Ulrich, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 38.

¹³⁶ Lim, *Scripture*, 160

¹³⁷ Gundry, *Use*, 172; so Stendahl, *School of St. Matthew*, 127.

¹³⁸ Lim, *Scripture*, 26–27, 148.

¹³⁹ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:33, 45.

The combination of these factors—the textual diversity of the OT in the first century, as well as the likelihood of Matthew’s biblical proficiency in several languages—can make determining what text Matthew’s allusive wording might reflect quite difficult. It also illustrates the difficulty in simply asking whether Matthew’s references come from the MT or LXX, since both of these, insofar as they are known today, would not have been known in exactly the same way by Matthew. These observations should discourage one from disallowing an OT allusion strictly on the basis of the lack of precise verbal parallels; it is eminently possible that Matthew was familiar with different textual traditions. Moreover, if pinpointing a text form from which citations are drawn is problematic, it is even more arduous when searching for allusions.¹⁴¹ Nevertheless, attempts to determine Matthew’s *Vorlage* for particular passages will be important for this study in order to establish if there is a basis for textual dependency. To this end, the present study will take into consideration a number of textual traditions of Deuteronomy, although the primary focus will be the LXX since this is the best representation we have of the Greek textual traditions Matthew and his audience may have known.

These factors also serve to reinforce the approach of not relying wholly on extensive verbal parallels to identify Matthean allusions. If Matthew was polylingual and lived in a time when various text forms of the OT were known, he may have relied on variant readings or adapted his allusive references for his own purposes. Thus, it is prudent to focus on such issues as thematic and theological parallels, in addition to verbal parallels, when attempting to discern relevant Deuteronomic allusions.

1.3.3 Synoptic Relationships

The present study will assume the Two-Source Hypothesis (2SH) to describe the relationship between the Synoptic Gospels. Some of the Matthean passages to be dealt with in chapters 5–7 are also found in Mark and/or Luke, which means the

¹⁴⁰ So Lim, *Scripture*, 163.

¹⁴¹ So France, *Evangelist*, 175; Stanley, *Language of Scripture*, 48. Illustrative of this is Menken, who in his thorough study of Matthean text forms does not even deal with allusive references because they are, in his view, “too free and elusive” to help determine Matthew’s *Vorlagen* (cf. *Matthew’s Bible*, 10).

material has likely first appeared in Mark or Q. Although the 2SH appears to make the most sense of the data and is presently the majority scholarly position regarding Synoptic relationships, it is far from a consensus. Some continue to object to the 2SH, and even more suggest that a straightforward literary dependence on Mark and Q is an oversimplification.¹⁴²

Thus, the present study will adopt the 2SH, but adopt it cautiously.¹⁴³ Given that Q remains a hypothesis—albeit a likely one—this study will not place too much weight on the supposed theology of Q, but will consider primarily how probable Q material is used by Matthew. Put differently, this study will not look *first* to Mark or Q to explain a Matthean passage, but *first* to Matthew itself. This approach is a slightly nuanced incarnation of redaction criticism that has been called *composition criticism*. Composition criticism can be defined as “a holistic variation of redaction criticism in which the work itself...viewed rigorously and persistently in its entirety, becomes the primary context for interpreting any part of it.”¹⁴⁴ Thus composition criticism displays affinities with both redaction criticism and narrative criticism, but differs from the latter in that:

Whereas narrative criticism is preoccupied with the Evangelists’ “story,” composition criticism is interested in the author’s theology...Thus, in its preoccupation with the author’s theological—or better Christological—perspective, compositional criticism remains firmly within the sphere of redaction criticism.¹⁴⁵

Taking this approach, the primary focus will be on the text of Matthew itself. Matthew may well have taken much of his material from earlier sources, but if he did he has

¹⁴² So France, *Matthew*, 20–22.

¹⁴³ See, e.g., Mark Goodacre (*The Case Against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem* [Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2002]), who rejuvenates the Farrer Hypothesis: questioning Q while affirming Markan priority.

¹⁴⁴ Stephen D. Moore, *Literary Criticism and the Gospels: The Theoretical Challenge* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 4.

¹⁴⁵ Joel Willitts, *Matthew’s Messianic Shepherd-King: In Search of the Lost Sheep of the House of Israel* (BZNW 147; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007), 38; cf. the similar approach in Kenyn M. Cureton, “Jesus as Son and Servant: An Investigation of the Baptism and Testing Narratives and their Significance for Cohesion, Plot, and Christology in Matthew,” (Ph.D. diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1993), 21.

included these in his gospel in a way that communicates the story of Jesus to his audience in a distinct way. Thus, “even when Matthew duplicates exactly what one of his sources says, this passage has to be viewed as expressing *Matthew's* convictions and views.”¹⁴⁶ Matthew’s audience almost certainly did not encounter Matthew’s gospel in conjunction with Mark and Luke.¹⁴⁷ Any material Matthew includes in his gospel is material he has appropriated for his own purposes. It is therefore important not to miss Matthew’s (redactional) aims as an Evangelist. As Raymond Brown warns: “It may be academically useful to detect the sources [Matthew] employed, but to concentrate on the compositional background and miss the final product is to miss the beauty of the forest while counting the trees.”¹⁴⁸ Moreover, although Matthew almost certainly used sources, it is highly unlikely, given Matthew’s scriptural saturation and obvious esteem for the OT scriptures, that his knowledge of Deuteronomy was *limited* to his sources. This will be argued in greater detail in later chapters. Nevertheless, as a form of *redaction* criticism a composition criticism approach still recognizes the need to look at gospel parallels to understand best Matthew’s unique emphases.

It should also be recognized that Matthew may have utilized both written and oral sources.¹⁴⁹ Thus, positing straightforward literary dependence on a monolithic Q document, apart from oral tradition, risks oversimplification.¹⁵⁰ Nevertheless, it is quite

¹⁴⁶ Daniel Patte, *The Gospel according to Matthew: A Structural Commentary on Matthew’s Faith* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 12. Emphasis original.

¹⁴⁷ It is likely that the majority of Matthew’s audience would have *heard* the gospel. Harry Gamble (*Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995]) observes: “It may seem paradoxical to say both that Christianity placed a high value on texts and that most Christians were unable to read, but in the ancient world this was no contradiction” (8). He adds that “although the oral and the written remained different modes, they were far closer and interactive in antiquity than today, and a too sharp theoretical differentiation misconceives the situation” (30). However, this does not mean that Matthew did not intentionally weave in elements of the OT into his gospel, nor that the audience would not have been able to discern them.

¹⁴⁸ Raymond E. Brown, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1997), 208.

¹⁴⁹ Richard Beaton, “How Matthew Writes,” in *The Written Gospel* (ed. M. Bockmuehl and D. Hagner; Cambridge: CUP, 2005), 116–34; cf. James D. G. Dunn, *Christianity in the Making*, vol. 1: *Jesus Remembered* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 210–54.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 237. It is generally agreed among Q hypothesizers that Q was a written document, but as John Kloppenborg [Verbin] (*Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000], 59–60) comments: “To conclude that Q was written rather than oral should not . . . encourage the conclusion that its transmission and character are explicable solely in literary terms, as if once committed to writings, prior oral traditions simply died out.”

likely that Matthew knew a written source of the Pentateuch, even if some or most of his knowledge of Jesus traditions was transmitted (at least in part) orally. Although the documentary evidence for Deuteronomy is widespread (see chapter 2), Matthew may have been so steeped in the OT that he invokes the OT from memory and not in consultation with a written source.¹⁵¹ The interplay between written and oral sources, and the possible flexibility in language this implies, is to be remembered when searching for the influence of Deuteronomy in Matthew.

1.4 Summary

In this chapter an approach to the OT in Matthew has been suggested that takes into consideration both citations and allusions. It has been proposed that rightly interpreting OT allusions is essential for understanding Matthew's Christology, and that searching for numerous allusions to Deuteronomy in Matthew is appropriate given the pervasiveness of Deuteronomic citations in Matthew. Due to the textual multiformity of Matthew's era, a focus on possible OT references must not be limited only to precise verbal parallels with the LXX/MT, but must be aware of other possible text forms and allusive references. The approach rehearsed in this chapter will be implicit in the exegesis in chapters 5–7, but will also be helpful for the discussions in chapters 2–4.

¹⁵¹ Charles E. Hill (*The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church* [Oxford: OUP, 2004], 67–70), focusing on later Christian writers, challenges the notion that writers in antiquity always operated with a source open in front of them, and further asks “who is to say that the use of [citation] formulas always denotes a higher respect for a text than does the incorporation of words and phrases from that text into one's thought?” (70n.40). These observations are also relevant for Matthew's use of his sources.

Chapter Two

The Circulation and Use of Deuteronomy in Ancient Judaism and Christianity

Before studying specific texts in Deuteronomy, it will be helpful to consider how Deuteronomy was known and interpreted in the years leading up to, and approximately concurrent with, the writing of Matthew. The purpose of this chapter is to establish the plausibility of the claim that Matthew and his audience would have been familiar with Deuteronomy. The greater the circulation and influence of Deuteronomy in the years approaching Matthew's gospel, the greater will be the probability that Matthew may have known and utilized Deuteronomy in similar (and perhaps distinct) ways. To this end, the present chapter will be focused on the text and interpretation of Deuteronomy in general; the following chapter will consider specific texts that relate to the sonship of Israel.

Several questions will be addressed in the present chapter. The first category of questions will deal with the extant evidence of Deuteronomy's *circulation*. For example, what can be said about the textual state of Deuteronomy in the first century C.E.? Did it enjoy widespread circulation? Were certain portions known more than others? Does the evidence generally suggest that knowledge of Deuteronomy was limited to a few texts, or do we have evidence that Deuteronomy was viewed as a literary unity?

The second class of questions relates to how Deuteronomy was *interpreted* in various texts. That is, in addition to investigating the nature of Deuteronomy's manuscript tradition, it will also be important to consider how ancient writers (Jewish and Christian) understood Deuteronomy and how they may have gleaned from it for their own purposes. Thus, it will be asked how prominent the engagement of Deuteronomic texts was in ancient documents. Are there any patterns to how it was utilized? Are specific portions used more than others? Was it interpreted messianically?

Questions such as these will be addressed in order that Matthew's employment of Deuteronomy may be viewed in its interpretive context. The conclusions reached at the end of this chapter should shed light on two areas. The first is the physical form in which Matthew may have encountered the text of Deuteronomy (i.e., did Matthew know only excerpts from the book, or is it likely that he knew the entire book?). The second is whether there was a pattern(s) of interpretation from which Matthew may have drawn or deviated. Answering the questions set forth in this chapter will be important to establish the probability of the extent of Matthew's knowledge of Deuteronomy, as well as whether it is likely that Deuteronomy would have served as an important biblical precedent for the writing of his gospel. Anticipating the results of this chapter, one caveat is necessary. Given the extensive usage of Deuteronomy in the Second Temple Jewish period¹ an exhaustive study of these questions will not be possible here. Instead, the aim of this portion of the thesis is to sketch a picture that will be sufficiently thorough and representative of the interpretive *Zeitgeist* of Deuteronomy in Matthew's day.

2.1 Text of Deuteronomy

2.1.1 Greek Deuteronomy

One of the most important witnesses of the ancient text and interpretation of Deuteronomy is its Septuagintal form.² According to tradition 70/72 Jewish elders translated the Pentateuch from Hebrew into Greek in the third century B.C.E.³—a date that seems plausible to Emanuel Tov.⁴ However, this original translation, also known as the “Old Greek,” is not a single, monolithic composition that exists *in toto*, but must be reconstructed from the surviving manuscript evidence. Nevertheless,

¹ Sidnie White Crawford, “Reading Deuteronomy in the Second Temple Period,” in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretations* (ed. K. de Troyer and A. Lange; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 127–40.

² For a discussion of what *Vorlage(n)* Matthew may have used, see the previous chapter.

³ For 72 translators, see *Let. Aris.* 39, 49–50; Josephus, *Ant.* 12.39, 46, 56; for 70 translators see Josephus, *Ant.* 12.57, 86; Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 7.32.16. Cf. Albert C. Sundberg, Jr., “The Septuagint: The Bible of Hellenistic Judaism,” in *The Canon Debate* (ed. L. McDonald and J. Sanders; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002), 68–90.

⁴ Emanuel Tov, “The Septuagint,” in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. M. Mulder; CRINT II/1; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 161–88. Tov specifically notes the existence of some early papyri of the Pentateuch from the middle or end of second century B.C.E.

LXX Deuteronomy is singularly important as an ancient witness to the supposed Hebrew *Vorlage* from which it was translated, and as the earliest written translation of what is now commonly known as the OT.⁵ As a translation it is also an interpretation, and thus may tell us a great deal about how those of the Second Temple period read and regarded Deuteronomy. Another reason to begin with LXX Deuteronomy is due to the immense influence the OG had on NT authors in terms of language, theology, and as a source for citations.⁶

Tov further recognizes that it is best not to make sweeping generalizations regarding the LXX as a whole, but each book must be considered a distinct translational unit.⁷ Cécile Dogniez and Marguerite Harl, in agreement with John William Wevers, reflect the widely held view that the translator of LXX Deuteronomy produced a conservative translation, which is quite literal in relation to its exemplar.⁸ They particularly observe that the translator followed the syntax and style of his model fairly rigorously, and when LXX Deuteronomy does diverge from the supposed parent text, the differences are normally *quantitative* rather than *qualitative*.⁹ This conclusion is based in part on the premise that LXX Deuteronomy's parent text was close to the consonantal text of the MT.¹⁰ Wevers further suggests that the Hebrew text used by the translators of LXX Deuteronomy could not have been drastically different from that which is presently represented in the MT, given Deuteronomy's revered status as a canonical text.¹¹ To be sure, a certain amount of textual diversity is apparent around this time, as the evidence from Qumran suggests.¹² Nevertheless, by the time of the translation of the LXX,

⁵ So Tov, "Septuagint," 164; *idem*, "Some Reflections on the Hebrew Texts from which the Septuagint was Translated," *JNSL* 19 (1993): 107–22.

⁶ *Idem*, "Septuagint," 163. To reiterate an earlier point, in this study I will use the term LXX for text-critical purposes, but OG when referring to the Greek OT the NT writers may have used (which we do not have direct access to).

⁷ *Idem*, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (2d ed.; Jerusalem: Simor, 1997), 15.

⁸ Cécile Dogniez and Marguerite Harl, *La Bible d'Alexandrie 5: Le Deutéronome* (Paris: Cerf, 1992), 29; so Timothy H. Lim, "Deuteronomy in the Second Temple Period," in *Deuteronomy in the New Testament* (ed. S. Moyise and M. Menken; LNTS 358; London: T&T Clark, 2007), 6–26.

⁹ Dogniez and Harl, *Deutéronome*, 29, 33.

¹⁰ John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy* (SBLSCS 39; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), xi; so Tov, *Text-Critical Use*, 188.

¹¹ Wevers, *Notes*, xii.

¹² See, e.g., Eugene Ulrich, "Septuagint Manuscripts from Qumran: A Reappraisal of their Value," in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on*

Deuteronomy was clearly considered to be an authoritative book. The translation of Deuteronomy thus reveals two important factors: 1) that Deuteronomy was translated along with the other four books of the Pentateuch indicates its scriptural status; 2) the translation of Deuteronomy into Greek is a rather literal rendering of its posited Hebrew parent text.

The oldest surviving manuscripts of LXX Deuteronomy may also be instructive. The Rylands Greek Papyrus (P.Ryl. 458=Rahlfs 957), which seems to have been used as cartonnage for an Egyptian mummy,¹³ dates from the middle of the second century B.C.E. and contains portions of Deut 23–26, 28, though it is quite fragmentary.¹⁴ In 1936 Colin Roberts could claim that this papyrus was 300 years older than any other known biblical manuscript.¹⁵ Although such a claim cannot be maintained today, it remains that P.Ryl. 458 is one of the oldest (if not *the* oldest) existing biblical manuscripts.¹⁶

One ancient fragment from LXX Deuteronomy discovered at Qumran is 4QLXXDeut (=Rahlfs 819), which contains Deut 11.4 and dates from the early or middle second century B.C.E.¹⁷ In addition to being another piece of evidence for the widespread circulation of Deuteronomy, this fragment suggests that some members of the Qumran community knew Greek in addition to Hebrew or Aramaic.¹⁸

Two fragments from the Fouad papyrus also warrant discussion. The Fouad papyrus (P.Fouad 266), which Wevers recognizes as one of the most significant

the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings (Manchester 1990) (ed. G. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars; SBLSCS 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 49–80.

¹³ C. H. Roberts, ed., *Two Biblical Papyri in the John Rylands Library Manchester* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1936), 11–14. Interestingly, the portions of Deuteronomy were intertwined with portions of Homer's *Iliad*.

¹⁴ Ernst Würthwein, *The Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Biblia Hebraica* (trans. Erroll Rhodes; 2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 188; Roberts, *Two Biblical Papyri*, 11. Cf. the helpful chart in Larry W. Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 210–27, especially 211–12.

¹⁵ Roberts, *Two Biblical Papyri*, 11.

¹⁶ So Würthwein, *Text*, 71.

¹⁷ Patrick W. Skehan, Eugene Ulrich, and Judith E. Sanderson, eds., *Qumran Cave 4.IV: Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts* (DJD 9; Oxford: Clarendon, 1992), 195.

¹⁸ So Martin Abegg Jr., Peter Flint, and Eugene Ulrich, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible* (New York: Harper Collins, 2004), 145.

discoveries of LXX texts in the 20th century,¹⁹ consists of three fragments, labelled A–C. P.Fouad 266A (=Rahlfs 942) contains portions of Genesis, whereas P.Fouad 266B (=Rahlfs 848) and P.Fouad 266C (=Rahlfs 847) contain portions of Deuteronomy.²⁰ P.Fouad 266B has been dated to the middle of the first century B.C.E., and P.Fouad 266C to the second half of the first century B.C.E.²¹ Of these P.Fouad 266B is more extensive,²² and is exceedingly important as an ancient witness to the text of Deuteronomy.²³ Indeed, among witnesses to the LXX, only P.Ryl. 458 is older than P.Fouad 266B,²⁴ which appears to have been copied only about 150 years after it was first translated.²⁵ Aly and Koenen note the textual value of P.Fouad 266:

P.Fouad 266, indeed, shows that already in the middle of the first century B.C. the text of the Greek Genesis and Deuteronomy was basically steady, though the results of continuous attempts to bring the Greek text into closer accord with the Hebrew are clearly recognizable.²⁶

A manuscript of Greek Deuteronomy from approximately the second century C.E., which Hurtado includes among Christian documents, is P.Baden 4.56 (=Rahlfs 970).²⁷ However, it is very fragmentary, containing only a few verses from Deut 29.²⁸ Of more value is Chester Beatty Papyrus VI (=Rahlfs 803 [963]), a codex that

¹⁹ John William Wevers, *Text History of the Greek Deuteronomy* (MSU 13; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), 64.

²⁰ For plates of these fragments, along with commentary, see Zaki Aly and Ludwig Koenen, *Three Rolls of the Early Septuagint: Genesis and Deuteronomy* (PTA 27; Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1980). P.Fouad 266B contains parts of Deut 17.14–33.27; P.Fouad 266C contains parts of Deut 10.3–11.16; 31.26–33.27.

²¹ Aly and Koenen, *Three Rolls*, 4, 6; cf. Wevers, *Text History*, 64.

²² Aly and Koenen, *Three Rolls*, 5. P.Fouad 266B contains portions of Deut 17.14–32.39 and P.Fouad 266C portions of Deut 10.17–33.27.

²³ Wevers, *Text History*, 72.

²⁴ Aly and Koenen, 1.

²⁵ Wevers, *Text History*, 64.

²⁶ Aly and Koenen, *Three Rolls*, 1.

²⁷ Hurtado, *Earliest Christian Artifacts*, 166–67, 212.

²⁸ John William Wevers, ed., *Deuteronomium* (VTG III/2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977), 15.

originally contained all of Numbers and Deuteronomy.²⁹ P.Chest.Beatty VI is most noteworthy for its antiquity, dating from the second or third century C.E.³⁰ Although it is difficult to be certain, Kenyon suggested that it is the oldest of all the Chester Beatty papyri.³¹ Thus, P.Chest.Beatty VI is “extremely important” for establishing the critical text of LXX Deuteronomy because it contains substantial portions of Deuteronomy that are some two centuries earlier than Vaticanus (B).³² As a codex, P.Chest.Beatty VI was most likely a Christian document that demonstrates that early Egyptian Christians were able to use professional scribes for the copying of their sacred books.³³ It is also revealing that the *nomen sacrum* was used for the name Joshua, which, of course, is also the name of Jesus in Greek (Ἰησοῦς).³⁴ This practice indicates a Christian provenance and, as Hurtado notes, suggests that Christians had begun to venerate the name of Jesus.³⁵ Thus, this may also be early evidence of Christians reading Deuteronomy christologically.

In sum, it is significant that there exists a number of very early copies of LXX Deuteronomy, suggesting that it enjoyed widespread circulation. Moreover, the oldest known fragments of LXX Deuteronomy attest a wide sample of passages, including what are commonly known as both narrative (1–11, 27–34) and legal sections (12–26). This suggests that both the narrative and legal materials in Deuteronomy were esteemed. Manuscripts from LXX Deuteronomy, however, are only one piece of a larger puzzle revealing Deuteronomy’s pervasive influence in the ancient world.

²⁹ Frederic G. Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible*, fasc. 5: *Numbers and Deuteronomy* (London: Walker, 1935), v.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, ix; Hurtado, *Earliest Christian Artifacts*, 212.

³¹ Kenyon, *Chester Beatty*, ix.

³² Wevers, *Notes*, 52, 54.

³³ Kenyon, *Chester Beatty*, ix–x.

³⁴ Cf., e.g., Deut 3.21 (Fol. 62 *recto*, Col. 1). Several supposed occurrences of this use of the *nomina sacra* are not extant, but have been reconstructed (e.g., Deut 1.38; 31.3, 7, 14, 23). The *nomina sacra* does not appear to be used in Deut 3.28 (cf. Fol. 63 *recto*, Col. 1), although the papyrus is difficult to read at this point. The copy of Numbers in P.Chest.Beatty VI also uses the *nomina sacra* in this way.

³⁵ Hurtado, *Earliest Christian Artifacts*, 117.

2.1.2 Qumran Biblical Manuscripts

Deuteronomy was a very important book for the Qumran community. This is evident both from the number of manuscripts preserved, and the extent to which Deuteronomistic thought pervades the sectarian scrolls.³⁶ Deuteronomy is the second most attested biblical book in the Qumran library, rivaled only by the Book of Psalms in the number of copies found.³⁷ Lim notes that fragments of 34 original scrolls of Deuteronomy have been discovered to date, and 31 of these were found in caves of Qumran.³⁸ Although none of these scrolls is complete, it is noteworthy that at least part of every chapter of Deuteronomy is represented between them.³⁹ As Crawford notes: “[The] exceptionally high number of preserved manuscripts witnesses to the importance of Deuteronomy in the life and thought of the Qumran community.”⁴⁰ Strikingly, the other four books of the Pentateuch are represented in significantly lower numbers.⁴¹ Therefore it may be that Deuteronomy was considered to be the most important book of the Torah at Qumran.⁴²

A few specific manuscripts merit mention. Duncan notes the oldest fragmentary *witness* to Deuteronomy, 4QpaleoDeut^s, dates from the second half of the third century B.C.E. and contains parts of Deut 26. The oldest surviving *manuscript* of Deuteronomy is 5QDeut, which was written in square script in the first quarter of the second century B.C.E. and contains portions of Deut 7–9.⁴³

Most of the Qumran copies of Deuteronomy were found in Cave 4,⁴⁴ and the most extensive Deuteronomistic manuscript from Cave 4 is 4QDeut^c.⁴⁵ Dating from

³⁶ This section will be devoted to Qumran biblical manuscripts; an evaluation of the sectarian scrolls will be covered in §2.2.

³⁷ Julie A. Duncan, “Deuteronomy, Book of,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam; 2 vols; Oxford: OUP, 2000), 1:198–202.

³⁸ Lim, “Deuteronomy,” 9.

³⁹ Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 145.

⁴⁰ Crawford, “Reading Deuteronomy,” 127; so Duncan, “Deuteronomy,” 198; Lim, “Deuteronomy,” 9.

⁴¹ Duncan, “Deuteronomy,” 199. She lists the following number of scrolls for the other books: Genesis–19; Exodus–17; Leviticus–12; Numbers–6.

⁴² Possible explanations for this preference for Deuteronomy will be considered in conjunction with the *use* of Deuteronomy below.

⁴³ Duncan, “Deuteronomy,” 199. For Duncan, a *manuscript* is more extensive than a *witness*.

⁴⁴ F. Garcia Martínez, “Les Manuscrits du Désert de Juda et le Deutéronome.” in *Studies in Deuteronomy in Honour of C. J. Labuschagne on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (ed. F. G. Martínez et al.; VTSup 53; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 63–82.

150–100 B.C.E., it consists of 55 identifiable fragments and contains the greatest amount of text from the most number of chapters.⁴⁶ These include Deut 3–4, 7–13, 15–18, 26–29, 31–32. Thus 4QDeut^c seems originally to have included most or all of Deuteronomy. Other fragments also attest a variety of Deuteronomistic passages. One example is 4QDeut^e, which dates from 50–25 B.C.E. and contains portions of Deut 3, 7–8, 10–11, 15–16.⁴⁷ Another fragment, 4QDeut^l, contains portions of Deut 10, 14–15, 28–29, 31, 33–34.⁴⁸ Similarly, 4QpaleoDeut^f, which has been dated to the first half or first three quarters of the first century B.C.E., comprises portions of Deut 7, 10–15, 19, 22–23, 28, 31–33, and may contain parts of chapters 1, 17, 21, 29–30.⁴⁹ An important copy of Deuteronomy from Qumran Cave 1 is 1QDeut^b, which contains portions of Deut 1, 9, 15, 21, 24–25, 29–33.⁵⁰ This sample of biblical manuscripts reveals that a wide array of Deuteronomistic material was in circulation among the members of the Qumran community; their knowledge of Deuteronomy was not limited to a few texts.

At the same time, several passages from Deuteronomy were utilized in *special use* texts. These excerpted texts were presumably employed in liturgical or devotional practices. By Duncan's count 33 phylacteries and nine mezuzot found in the Judean desert attest portions of Deuteronomy.⁵¹ The prominence of Deuteronomy among these manuscripts indicates that certain passages from Deuteronomy had become standardized for worship and study in Judaism.⁵² Deuteronomistic texts used in this way include the Decalogue and *Shema* (Deut 5.1–6.9), Deut 10.12–11.21, and the Song of Moses (Deut 32).⁵³ Interestingly, Exod 12.43–13.16 is also found among special use texts, but Deuteronomy's preeminence may be seen in the way that the sections from Exodus frequently follow the sections

⁴⁵ Eugene Ulrich, et al., eds., *Qumran Cave 4.IX: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings* (DJD 14; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 15.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 39.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 109.

⁴⁹ Skehan, Ulrich, and Sanderson, *Qumran Cave 4.IV*, 132.

⁵⁰ D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik, eds., *Qumran Cave 1* (DJD 1; Oxford: Clarendon, 1955), 57–62.

⁵¹ Duncan, "Deuteronomy," 200.

⁵² Crawford, "Reading Deuteronomy," 130.

⁵³ Duncan, "Deuteronomy," 200; J. T. Milik, ed., *Qumrân Grotte 4.II.2: Tefillin, Mezuzot et Targums* (DJD 6; Oxford: Clarendon, 1977), 38.

from Deuteronomy.⁵⁴ Illustrative of this is 4QPhylG which contains the Decalogue from both Deuteronomy and Exodus, but the portions from Deuteronomy seem to take priority over the portions from Exodus.⁵⁵

It is significant for the present focus on sonship in Deuteronomy that two key passages likening Israel to Yahweh's son are also attested in special use texts: Deut 8, 32. These passages will be investigated in detail in chapter 3, but their presence in special use texts indicates their prominence. Deuteronomy 8.5–10 is found in two biblical manuscripts from Qumran: 4QDeut^{j,n}. The second of these, 4QDeutⁿ, dates from 30–31 B.C.E. and contains almost all of Deut 8.5–10, followed by 5.1–6.1.⁵⁶ White [Crawford] has argued convincingly that this document was actually a selection of excerpted texts rather than an entire manuscript of Deuteronomy.⁵⁷ 4QDeutⁱ is also a collection of special use texts (from Deuteronomy and Exodus) that has an entire column devoted to Deut 8.5–10.⁵⁸ Moshe Weinfeld agrees that these manuscripts were special use texts, and elaborates on the specific function of Deut 8.5–10 at Qumran: he suggests that this passage was used liturgically for the blessing after meals in Qumran. This practice was closely linked with the recitation of the Decalogue and *Shema*, which explains the combination of texts from Deut 5–6, 8 in these special use manuscripts.⁵⁹

Deuteronomy 32 is also of interest for the present thesis. This passage is attested in at least four special use texts. The first to note is 4QPhylN, which is a phylactery containing portions of Deut 32.14–20, 32–33.⁶⁰ When it was published in the sixth volume of the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert series in 1977 the editor could claim that it was “le seul exemple du cantique de Moïse utilisé comme

⁵⁴ Ibid., 38.

⁵⁵ Crawford, “Reading Deuteronomy,” 130.

⁵⁶ Sidnie Anne White [Crawford], “4QDtⁿ: Biblical Manuscript or Excerpted Text?,” in *Of Scribes and Scrolls: Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins* (ed. H. W. Attridge, J. J. Collins, and T. H. Tobin; Resources in Religion 5; Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1990), 13–20; Ulrich et al., *Qumran Cave 4.IX*, 117.

⁵⁷ White [Crawford], “4QDtⁿ,” 14–17.

⁵⁸ Ulrich et al., *Qumran Cave 4.IX*, 76–77. Crawford dates this manuscript to c. 50 C.E.

⁵⁹ Moshe Weinfeld, “Grace after Meals in Qumran,” *JBL* 111 (1992): 427–40. In Weinfeld's assessment the focus is not on the sonship of the Israelites, but on the bounty of the land. Nevertheless, the prominence of this text increases the likelihood that Deut 8.5 would have been widely known and read in the first century.

⁶⁰ Cf. Milik, *Qumrân Grotte 4.II.2*, 73.

tefillin.”⁶¹ Since then, however, other examples have been identified. 4QDeut^q from the second half of the first century B.C.E. preserves Deut 32.37–43 (possibly vv. 9–10) and appears to have contained only the Song of Moses, further corroborating the view that Deut 32 was treated as a special text.⁶² The Song of Moses also seems to have been treated as a special use text in 4QDeutⁱ, a manuscript that also contains Deut 8.5–10. Here portions of Deut 32.7–8 are preserved, and it is estimated that it originally contained 32.1–9.⁶³ Finally, Deut 32.17–18 is found on 4QDeut^{k1}, a manuscript that has also been categorized as a special use text, since it contains only passages from Deut 5, 11, 32.⁶⁴

A word about the textual tradition of these discoveries is also necessary. It can be difficult to make generalizations about the Hebrew scrolls from Qumran,⁶⁵ especially since a large percentage of Qumran manuscripts of Deuteronomy are not extensive enough to place confidently within a textual tradition.⁶⁶ Nevertheless, it is recognized that for Deuteronomy the proto-MT tradition is usually confirmed or supported, although a number of important variants have been identified.⁶⁷ This can be illustrated by skimming David Washburn’s *Catalog of Biblical Passages in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, which overwhelmingly notes the tendency of readings to agree with the MT in Deuteronomy.⁶⁸ Duncan adds that no biblical manuscript of Deuteronomy from Qumran demonstrates an affinity with the SP.⁶⁹ More evidence for these conclusions will be adduced in the section on the sectarian scrolls below.

2.1.3 Miscellaneous Manuscripts

In addition to findings at Qumran, manuscripts of Deuteronomy have also been discovered in the Judean desert at Masada, Nahal Hever, and Wadi

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² Duncan, “Deuteronomy,” 201; Ulrich et al., *Qumran Cave 4.IX*, 137–38.

⁶³ Ibid., 79.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 93–95.

⁶⁵ Tov, *Text-Critical Use*, 188.

⁶⁶ Crawford, “Reading Deuteronomy,” 128.

⁶⁷ Lim, “Deuteronomy,” 25; Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 146.

⁶⁸ David L. Washburn, *A Catalog of Biblical Passages in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (SBLTCS 2; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002), 56–75.

⁶⁹ Duncan, “Deuteronomy,” 199.

Murabbaʿat.⁷⁰ The findings from Masada (Mas1c=MasDeut) comprise four fragments containing Deut 33.17–24; 34.2–6. The fragments from Nahal Hever (HevDeut=XHev/Se3) include portions of Deut 9.4–6, 21–23, and the discoveries at Wadi Murabbaʿat (MurDeut=Mur2) include portions of Deut 10.1–3; 11.2–3; 12.25–26; 15.2.⁷¹ This suggests that Deuteronomy was widely used in communities other than Qumran. The diversity of passages discovered is also noteworthy.

Before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS), the Nash Papyrus was the oldest known witness to the Hebrew Scriptures.⁷² Variouslly dated from the second century B.C.E. to the second century C.E.,⁷³ the Nash Papyrus contains portions of the Decalogue from Exod 20.2–17, with some influence of Deut 5.6–21, followed by the *Shema* from Deut 6.⁷⁴ This papyrus appears to have been a special use text,⁷⁵ indicating Deuteronomy’s prominent role in liturgical and devotional practices. When viewed in light of the similar evidence from Qumran, it can be concluded that special use texts were common for Deuteronomy.

. The evidence from Qumran below will indicate that Deuteronomy was indeed commonly used in this way.

2.1.4 Summary of Circulation

The manuscript evidence surveyed above illustrates Deuteronomy’s significance at the dawn of the NT era. Numerous excerpts of Deuteronomy, many dating from before the turn of the era, have been discovered, and these attest every chapter of Deuteronomy.⁷⁶ This suggests that the book was likely known in its entirety. In addition, the prominence of Deuteronomy in liturgical and apotropaic texts points to its high level of influence in cultic and devotional practices.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 198.

⁷¹ Martínez, “Manuscripts,” 75–81.

⁷² Würthwein, *Text*, 34.

⁷³ Ibid., 34; W. F. Albright, “A Biblical Fragment from the Maccabean Period: The Nash Papyrus,” *JBL* 56 (1937): 145–76.

⁷⁴ Würthwein, *Text*, 34.

⁷⁵ So Albright, “Nash Papyrus,” 175.

⁷⁶ The listings given above do not include Deut 2, 20, 30, but these are also attested in Qumran manuscripts. Cf. Washburn, *Catalog*, 57–73.

2.2 Use of Deuteronomy: Jewish Literature

An even fuller picture of the prevalence of Deuteronomy can be seen when an investigation is made of its *use* in Jewish and Christian literature. Indeed, as Lim notes: “On virtually every page and column of Second Temple Jewish Literature, one is able to detect a verbatim citation, *oratio obliqua* or allusion to a deuteronomic source.”⁷⁷ Two aspects of this quote need to be highlighted. First, given the number of literary engagements with Deuteronomy, it will be impossible to note every occurrence. Nevertheless, it is possible to draw out a sufficient number of references from the wide array of Deuteronomic intertextualities to convey accurately the extent of Deuteronomy’s influence in Second Temple Jewish literature.⁷⁸ Second, an exclusive focus on explicit citations to Deuteronomy would not be sufficient to understand best the various and sometimes creative ways Deuteronomy was utilized in these documents.⁷⁹ Therefore, the following survey will take into consideration all kinds of engagement with Deuteronomy. Thus a cumulative argument will be mounted that it was commonplace for ancient Jewish authors to draw significantly from Deuteronomy.

2.2.1 Qumran Sectarian Scrolls

Having surveyed the biblical manuscripts and special use texts from Qumran, attention will now be given to the *use* of Deuteronomy in various sectarian documents. By way of introduction, it should be noted that the authority of biblical books, including Deuteronomy, in these scrolls is apparent from the various citations and citation formulae they employed.⁸⁰ Fishbane observes three types of exegetical authority at Qumran:

1. the writing down of new rules together with their... Scriptural justification *alongside the Tora of Moses*, as is common in the *Damascus Document*; 2.

⁷⁷ Lim, “Deuteronomy,” 20.

⁷⁸ “Deuteronomic intertextualities” is used here as a generic phrase referring to any sort of textual or thematic engagement with Deuteronomy.

⁷⁹ So Lim, “Deuteronomy,” 6. Moreover, determining what constitutes a citation is a daunting task in itself.

⁸⁰ Michael Fishbane, “Use, Authority and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran,” in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. M. Mulder; CRINT II/1; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 339–77. Fishbane notes legal, nonlegal, and prophetic forms of citation (348).

the writing down of new rules together with their Scriptural justification *within a new Tora of Moses*—as is characteristic of the *Temple Scroll*; and 3. the preservation in oral form only of new rules...*alongside the Tora of Moses*.⁸¹

Fishbane's emphasis underscores the prominence of the Mosaic Torah for the Qumran community. Indeed, knowledge of the Mosaic Torah was understood to be the prerequisite for faithful living. Thus it should not be surprising that the Qumran community highly esteemed the figure of Moses, whom they considered to be the prophet *par excellence*.⁸² He is the figure most often referred to throughout the scrolls, and his significance is almost always associated with Torah.⁸³ Thus, the importance of Deuteronomy for the Qumran community is inextricably linked with the pride of place given to Moses. Notably, Deuteronomy appears to have been the most cited and influential of the Mosaic books at Qumran.⁸⁴

Before considering specific scrolls, it is important to note some of the ways DSS employed Scripture. Jonathan Campbell suggests two main categories. The first includes those texts whose starting point is a portion of Scripture, the purpose of which is to harmonize, elucidate, modernize, or comment on biblical material. This description includes implicit editorial exegesis (e.g., *Temple Scroll*), exegesis of individual books (e.g., *peshet*), and thematic exegesis (e.g., 4QFlor). The second category describes texts that deal with a topic and uses Scripture secondarily to bolster their arguments (e.g., *Damascus Document*).⁸⁵ Excepting *peshet*, all these types of exegesis are utilized in connection with Deuteronomy.

⁸¹ Fishbane, "Use," 363 (emphasis original).

⁸² *Ibid.*, 340–44.

⁸³ James E. Bowley, "Moses in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Living in the Shadow of God's Anointed," in *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation* (ed. Peter Flint; SDSSRL; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 159–81.

⁸⁴ So Duncan, "Deuteronomy," 201. According to the listings of Washburn (*Catalog*, 11–79), Deuteronomy is referenced 261x in the DSS. This number is greater than Genesis (108x), Exodus (246x), Leviticus (140x), or Numbers (124x). Washburn's count is not limited to Qumran, but includes all known DSS through DJD vol. 35. Cf. Emanuel Tov, ed., *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (DJD 39; Oxford: Clarendon, 2002), 189–91.

⁸⁵ Jonathan G. Campbell, *The Use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1–8, 19–20* (BZAW 228; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995), 19–20. Campbell observes that, regardless of what one might say about the status of canon at this time, the Torah was functioning as canonical (17).

2.2.1.1 Temple Scroll

The first document to consider is both the longest scroll found at Qumran and the scroll that demonstrates more extensive Deuteronomistic influence than any other: the Temple Scroll (11QT^a=11Q19; 11QT^b=11Q20; [cf. 4Q365a, 11Q21]).⁸⁶ The Temple Scroll is a systematic rewriting of Exodus and Deuteronomy, with particular focus on Deuteronomy.⁸⁷ Indeed, Deuteronomy may be considered the base text for this document, although it also mixes in other comments and legislation from the Pentateuch and other sources.⁸⁸ Fishbane notes the significance of the Mosaic Torah in the Temple Scroll, suggesting that the author may have intended to produce a New Torah by preserving the traditional teaching while representing it in a new, reinterpreted form.⁸⁹ Michael Wise is even more explicit, claiming that the author of the Temple Scroll saw himself as a new Moses and intended to write new Deuteronomy for the eschaton.⁹⁰ Similarly, Crawford describes the Temple Scroll as a “third law” (Deuteronomy being the second law) designed to recapitulate and expand Deuteronomy by the exegetical techniques and legal interpretations of its day.⁹¹ More specifically, Wise proposes that the Temple Scroll was designed to replace the legal portions of Deuteronomy (12–26) outlining the law of the land.⁹² Columns LI–LXVI, which have been referred to as “Expanded Deuteronomy” or “Deuteronomy Paraphrase” are particularly relevant in this regard.⁹³

That the Temple Scroll was designed to be an authoritative book in the Mosaic stream⁹⁴ can also be seen in one of the most striking features of the scroll:

⁸⁶ Bowley, “Moses,” 177; Lim, “Deuteronomy,” 21, 26.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*; Geza Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (New York: Penguin, 1997), 190. The titles and translations used for these scrolls are taken from Vermes.

⁸⁸ Crawford, “Reading Deuteronomy,” 137; Bowley, “Moses,” 177. Crawford (*Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008], 12–13) considers this to be one example of “Rewritten Scripture” (or “Rewritten Bible”), “a category or group of texts which are characterized by a close adherence to a recognizable and already authoritative base text (narrative or legal) and a recognizable degree of scribal intervention into that base text for the purpose of exegesis.”

⁸⁹ Fishbane, “Use,” 351–54.

⁹⁰ Michael Owen Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Cave 11* (SAOC 49; Chicago: University of Chicago, 1990), 200.

⁹¹ Crawford, “Reading Deuteronomy,” 139.

⁹² Wise, *Temple Scroll*, 200. Wise does not believe the author knew Deuteronomy as a *book*, but rather had a Deuteronomistic *source*.

⁹³ Crawford, “Reading Deuteronomy,” 137; so Duncan, “Deuteronomy,” 201.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 139.

the widespread omission of Yahweh's name due to the depiction of Yahweh speaking in the first person singular.⁹⁵ This occurs when recounting divine revelations, and is usually found in those places from Deuteronomy where the inclusion of third person pronouns might call into question the unmediated nature of the revelation.⁹⁶ Thus, the Temple Scroll presents itself as an authoritative revelation in agreement with the Mosaic Torah, while frequently bypassing the role of Moses as the mediator of divine revelation. Nevertheless, it is clear from the Temple Scroll that it “has everything to do with Moses”⁹⁷ in large part because it has everything to do with Deuteronomy.

2.2.1.2 Damascus Document

Another document that borrows significantly from Deuteronomy is the Damascus Document (CD=4Q265–73, 5Q12, 6Q15).⁹⁸ Vermes divides the document into exhortation and statutes⁹⁹—a combination that is formally similar to Deuteronomy. The question thus arises whether the Damascus Document was consciously modeled after Deuteronomy. Given the plethora of Deuteronomic manuscripts found at Qumran that collectively attest every chapter of Deuteronomy, it is likely that Deuteronomy was commonly known to have contained significant portions of both exhortation and statutes. Moreover, Fishbane concludes that Deuteronomy has indeed “strongly influenced the style and structure of the Damascus Document.” He notes that CD I–VIII is a collection of paraenetic reviews of the national past that include exhortation (cf. CD I, 1; II, 1; III, 14). These features parallel Deut 4.1; 6.4; 9.1; 10.12. In addition, the recounting of Israel's history in CD I–VIII is followed by a litany of corporate and civil legislation in CD IX–XVI. This sequence also mirrors Deuteronomy,¹⁰⁰ and comports with

⁹⁵ Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll: The Hidden Law of the Dead Sea Sect* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1985), 65; Bowley, “Moses,” 177. Cf. Bernard M. Levinson and Molly M. Zahn, “Revelation Regained: The Hermeneutics of יָ and אֲנִי in the Temple Scroll,” *DSD* 9 (2002): 295–346.

⁹⁶ Johann Maier, *The Temple Scroll: An Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (JSOTSup 34; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), 3.

⁹⁷ Bowley, “Moses,” 177.

⁹⁸ Duncan (“Deuteronomy,” 201) notes that Deuteronomy is cited in eight fragments of CD from Qumran.

⁹⁹ Vermes, *Scrolls*, 190.

¹⁰⁰ Fishbane, “Use,” 358–59.

Campbell's stance that the use of Scripture in the Damascus Document is subtle and pervasive, going beyond mere citations or allusions. Much like the Temple Scroll, the Damascus Document viewed Moses as a prophet and esteemed the Torah as the pinnacle of prophetic work.¹⁰¹

The influence of Deuteronomy is not limited to the overall structure, but can also be seen in specific texts. CD I, 1–II, 1 exhorts the audience to obedience alongside the threat of curses, thus demonstrating “striking similarity” to Deut 28.40–42 (cf. Lev 26) in both vocabulary and order of events. More Deuteronomic influence can be seen in CD II, 14–IV, 12a. Campbell attributes the threefold occurrence of “stubbornness of their hearts” (II, 17; III, 5, 11) to the influence of Deut 29.18. Deuteronomy 9.22–24 is quoted in CD III, 7¹⁰² in an exhortatory section warning the audience not to make the same mistakes as the ancient Israelites. The Deuteronomic influence continues in CD III, 13–14, where Campbell again notes the influence of Deut 29.1–28, this time in relation to the faithful remnant in the land. Indeed, he suggests that themes from Deut 28–30 pervade CD III, 10–21. Deuteronomy is again cited in CD V, 2. Here Deut 17.17 is used as a proof text regarding marriage¹⁰³ in a section explaining the actions of David, who, it is written, apparently did not know this ordinance because it was sealed in the ark of the Covenant.

Another citation from Deuteronomy (Deut 32.28) is found in CD V, 16–17.¹⁰⁴ The Song of Moses is used here (in conjunction with Isa 27.11) in reference to Israel as a stiff-necked people. The mention in CD V, 20 of those who led Israel astray and removed boundary markers (גבול; cf. I, 16) may be indebted to the warnings against this practice in Deut 19.14; 27.17.¹⁰⁵ Deuteronomic influence is also evident in CD VI, 2–3, which is a reworking of Deut 1.13 for the purpose of justifying the community's system of courts and councils.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰¹ Campbell, *Use of Scripture*, 17, 58.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 57–59, 73, 77; cf. Vermes, *Scrolls*, 129.

¹⁰³ Campbell, *Use of Scripture*, 58, 77–78, 177n.7; cf. Vermes, *Scrolls*, 130. For four purposes of biblical proof texts at Qumran see Geza Vermes, “Biblical Proof-Texts in Qumran Literature,” *JSS* 34 (1989): 493–508.

¹⁰⁴ Vermes, *Scrolls*, 131. Campbell (*Use of Scripture*, 31) rightly points out that the audience would most likely have known this allusion.

¹⁰⁵ Campbell, *Use of Scripture*, 93.

¹⁰⁶ Fishbane, “Use,” 372; cf. Campbell, *Use of Scripture*, 94.

Numerous aspects of Deuteronomic influence can be found in CD VIII. The language of Deut 12.8, describing how the Israelites did what was right in their own eyes, is echoed in CD VIII, 7.¹⁰⁷ An excerpt from the Song of Moses (Deut 32.33) is again cited in CD VIII, 8–12.¹⁰⁸ This citation is subsequently interpreted in a pesher-like manner that contains an exegetical pun on the verse suggesting that the punishment of the community's apostates was divinely preordained.¹⁰⁹ Following this CD VIII, 15 cites two passages from Deuteronomy: Deut 9.5; 7.8.¹¹⁰ These are employed as exhortation to demonstrate the goodness in the election of Israel and the sectarian community.¹¹¹ A concern for the Mosaic covenant is evident in CD XV, which begins the list of statutes.¹¹² This section of statutes also contains citations from Deut 23.24 in CD XVI, 6–9 and Deut 5.12 in CD X, 15–16.¹¹³ This use of Deuteronomy in the discussion of various laws is not surprising, especially when one considers that Deuteronomy appears to serve as a structural exemplar for the Damascus Document. Campbell summarizes that the emphasis from Deuteronomy in the Damascus Document comes from Deut 27–32 and focuses on the sin-exile-repentance schema.¹¹⁴ At the same time, the above survey has demonstrated that the author has utilized a wide range of passages from Deuteronomy for a variety of purposes.¹¹⁵

¹⁰⁷ Campbell, *Use of Scripture*, 147; Fishbane, "Use," 357.

¹⁰⁸ Vermes, *Scrolls*, 134.

¹⁰⁹ Campbell, *Use of Scripture*, 147; Vermes, "Proof-Texts," 493–508.

¹¹⁰ Vermes, *Scrolls*, 134. The citation of Deut 7.8 here also renders it more likely that Deut 7.9 is referenced in CD VII, 6 (Campbell, *Use of Scripture*, 143; cf. Manuscript B in Vermes, *Scrolls*, 132).

¹¹¹ Fishbane, "Use," 356; Campbell, *Use of Scripture*, 148.

¹¹² Additionally, the Mosaic covenant may be in view even where the term *covenant* is not used. For the view that the covenant was often assumed in writings of this period, see E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1977), 421.

¹¹³ Cf. Vermes, *Scrolls*, 137–39.

¹¹⁴ Campbell, *Use of Scripture*, 184.

¹¹⁵ Campbell's conclusions (*Use of Scripture*, 184) are consistent with the method of the present study: "Due to the extent of linguistic and thematic connection between these [texts], of which our author appears to have been well aware, there is no great problem in assuming that, for any pious Jew familiar with the scriptures in Second Temple times, one passage or part thereof would easily connote another."

2.2.1.3 Community Rule

The blessings and curses as recorded in Deuteronomy are also evident in the Community Rule (1QS=Manual of Discipline; 4Q255–64, 4Q280, 286–87, 4Q502, 5Q11, 13). The blessings and curses of a covenant initiation ceremony are found in 1QS II,¹¹⁶ and these are pronounced by two groups of priestly representatives, just like Deut 27.9–26.¹¹⁷ Deuteronomy's influence can also be seen in the anticipation of a coming prophet (1QS IX, 11), presumably in the mold of Deut 18.18.¹¹⁸ Zeal for the commandments in 1QS IX, 23 may also derive from Deut 32.35.¹¹⁹

2.2.1.4 Additional Texts

The focus on covenantal blessings is evident in the Blessings (1QSb=1Q28b), although Deuteronomy is not cited explicitly. The Messianic Rule (1QSa=1Q28a), like 1QSb, was originally attached to 1QS and is addressed to the congregation of Israel living in the *last days*.¹²⁰ This phrase, which derives from Deuteronomy (4.30; 31.29), is also found in 4QMMT (4Q394–99).¹²¹ This document indicates in the exhortation section (4QMMT C=4Q397.14–21, 4Q398) that the time to usher in the last days was at hand, and this would happen when the people returned to the covenant.¹²² Indeed, this Deuteronomical focus on the last days seems to have been central to the community's understanding of history.¹²³ In conjunction with the last days, 4QMMT C also refers to the blessings and curses of the Book of Moses. In light of the document's context, which includes the document's only citations to

¹¹⁶ A. R. C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (NTL; London: SCM Press, 1966), 104.

¹¹⁷ Fishbane, "Use," 359.

¹¹⁸ Dale C. Allison, Jr., *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), 74.

¹¹⁹ Richard H. Bell, *Provoked to Jealousy: The Origin and Purpose of the Jealousy Motif in Romans 9–11* (WUNT II/63; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 221.

¹²⁰ John J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Routledge, 1997), 56.

¹²¹ Bell, *Provoked*, 227. There appear to be three citations to Deuteronomy in 4QMMT: Deut 7.26; 31.29; 30.1–2 (cf. Vermes, *Scrolls*, 227). The phrase is also found in CD IV, 5.

¹²² Collins, *Apocalypticism*, 61.

¹²³ Guy Waters, *The End of Deuteronomy in the Epistles of Paul* (WUNT II/221; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 45.

Deuteronomy,¹²⁴ it is likely that the Deuteronomic blessings and curses are in view.¹²⁵

The short collection of texts known as 4QFlorilegium (4Q174) also has a couple of references to the last days (4QFlor I, 2, 19). Interestingly, here the last days are characterized as the time when a remnant would practice the whole Law of Moses (4QFlor II, 2), thus underscoring the centrality of the Mosaic revelation. 4QFlor also cites Deut 23.3–4 in I, 2–5, forbidding the unworthy from the House of the Lord.¹²⁶ Likewise, 4QTestimonia (4Q175) gleams much from Deuteronomy in a short space. In particular, 4QTest associates Deuteronomy with messianic expectations.¹²⁷ After citing the words of Moses in Deut 5.28–29 (I, 1–5), the author cites Deut 18.18–19 in I, 5–7. This is the second, and clearest example heretofore encountered of the prophetic expectation in conjunction with Deut 18.¹²⁸ Deuteronomy is also utilized in connection with the priestly messiah in this document. 4QTest I, 14–20 cites from the blessing of Moses to Levi (Deut 33.8–11),¹²⁹ thus providing clear evidence of Deuteronomy’s association with messianic expectations.

Other documents that highlight the significance of *Moses* for the Qumran community also emphasize *Deuteronomy*. One example is the Words of Moses (1Q22). Vermes describes this manuscript as a Mosaic farewell discourse that is influenced by all portions of Deuteronomy.¹³⁰ Deuteronomy also seems to influence Moses Apocryphon^a (4Q375). This document that imitates the Pentateuch sets forth instructions for how to treat a person who claims to be a prophet, probably drawing from Deut 13, 18.¹³¹

¹²⁴ The citation to Deut 7.6 comes in 4QMMT B (=4Q394.3–7/4Q395), which Vermes labels “Special Laws” (*Scrolls*, 222–27). According to Vermes’s reconstruction, this immediately precedes the exhortation section.

¹²⁵ The Book of Moses here points to Deuteronomy.

¹²⁶ So Duncan, “Deuteronomy,” 201.

¹²⁷ Vermes (*Scrolls*, 495) subtitles the document “Messianic Anthology.”

¹²⁸ The first being 1QS IX, 11. Cf. Allison, *New Moses*, 74.

¹²⁹ Collins, *Apocalypticism*, 86. Some (including Collins) have suggested a reference to Deut 33.10 in 4QFlor as well, but the evidence is fragmentary. Cf. Washburn, *Catalog*, 74.

¹³⁰ Vermes, *Scrolls*, 537; cf. David M. Allen, *Deuteronomy and Exhortation in Hebrews: A Study in Narrative Re-presentation* (WUNT II/238; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 160n.30.

¹³¹ Vermes, *Scrolls*, 540; Bowley, “Moses,” 174.

The Reworked Pentateuch (4Q158, 4Q364–67), which Vermes estimates may have been the longest of all the Qumran scrolls,¹³² is also of interest. It is not surprising that Deuteronomy is attested in the fragments we have of this document, since it seems to have been a rewriting of the entire Torah. Fishbane notes that this document was “an attempt to harmonize, and integrate various texts on the theme and sequence of the revelation, the role of Moses, and the authority of his successors.”¹³³ The sequence of texts in fragments 6–12 of 4Q158 includes Deut 5.28–29, 30–31; 18.18–22, in conjunction with texts from Exodus.¹³⁴ 4Q364 contains fragments from Deut 1–14;¹³⁵ 4Q365 contains portions of Deut 2; 19–20;¹³⁶ 4Q366 includes Deut 14.13–21, as well as a juxtaposition of Deut 16.13–14/Num 29.32–30.1.¹³⁷ The Reworked Pentateuch thus illustrates the centrality of the Mosaic Law at Qumran, the community’s penchant for rearranging and reinterpreting texts for their purposes.

The so-called Joshua Apocryphon (i) (=Psalms of Joshua=4Q378–79), which recounts the story of Joshua in the form of a farewell discourse, contains a proportionately high number of references to Deuteronomy. The death of Moses (Deut 34.8) is alluded to at least twice (4Q378, fr. 14), and the description of the bounty of the land (4Q378, fr. 11) accords with similar descriptions in Deut 8.7–9.¹³⁸ The War Scroll (1QM) also references Deuteronomy in more than one passage. 1QM X, 2–5 cites Deut 20.2–4¹³⁹ in conjunction with the imagery of God as a warrior. Bell further suggests allusions to Deut 32.42 in both 1QM XII, 11–12; XIX, 4 in reference to the violators of the covenant. The influence of the Song of Moses is also apparent in the Thanksgiving Hymns (1QH=1Q36, 4Q427–32). Bell notes that allusions to two portions of the Song are evident in these hymns. One finds similar

¹³² Vermes, *Scrolls*, 442.

¹³³ Fishbane, “Use,” 352.

¹³⁴ Ibid. Cf. John M. Allegro, ed., *Qumrân Cave 4.I: 4Q158–4Q186* (DJD 5; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 3–5.

¹³⁵ Crawford, “Reading Deuteronomy,” 133; cf. Harold W. Attridge et al., eds., *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1* (DJD 13; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 204, 227–44.

¹³⁶ Ibid., 262, 311–12. Crawford (“Reading Deuteronomy,” 134) is more cautious in her conclusions, recognizing only portions of Deut 2 given the fragmentary nature of the evidence for 4Q365.

¹³⁷ Attridge et al., *Qumran Cave 4.VIII*, 337–43; Crawford, “Reading Deuteronomy,” 134–35.

¹³⁸ Vermes, *Scrolls*, 547–48.

¹³⁹ Fishbane, “Use,” 346–47.

language and imagery to the venom of serpents (Deut 32.33) in 1QH XIII, 10, 27.¹⁴⁰ In addition, the all-consuming fire of Yahweh's anger in Deut 32.22 finds expression in 1QH IV; XI, 31; XVI, 20.¹⁴¹ The Heavenly Prince Melchizedek (11Q13) cites Deut 15.2 in association with the year of Jubilee,¹⁴² and the very short fragment of The Two Ways (4Q473) is inspired by the choice of blessings or curses from Deut 11.26–28.¹⁴³

2.2.1.5 Summary: Qumran

This survey of literature indicates that all portions of Deuteronomy—including both legal and narrative—were used extensively by the Qumran community. Aside from Deuteronomy's widespread use in liturgical texts (e.g., 4QDeutⁿ), legal portions of Deuteronomy were often employed as proof texts (e.g., Temple Scroll). The blessings and curses of the latter portions of Deuteronomy are also referenced frequently (e.g., 1QS). Some documents go beyond this and use Deuteronomy's combination of exhortation and law as a structural exemplar (e.g., Damascus Document). Similarly, some authors drew from the role of Moses and the reformulation of the law in Deuteronomy to give warrant to their own re-appropriation of biblical teaching (e.g., Temple Scroll). Deuteronomy is associated with messianic expectations in documents such as 4QTest. The Song of Moses, which has been found among special use texts (e.g., 4QPhylN), is a portion of Deuteronomy that seems to have been particularly well known and utilized in sectarian scrolls (e.g., 1QH).

2.2.2 OT Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha

The role of Scripture in the OT Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha has been noted by Steven Weitzman: “One of the few characteristics shared by virtually every composition within the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha is a pronounced tendency to emulate, evoke, or echo classical biblical literature.”¹⁴⁴ This section will cover both

¹⁴⁰ Bell, *Provoked*, 219–20. The numbering for these Hymns is found in Vermes, *Scrolls*, 267–69.

¹⁴¹ Bell, *Provoked*, 219. Cf. Vermes, *Scrolls*, 245, 262, 280.

¹⁴² Duncan, “Deuteronomy,” 201.

¹⁴³ Vermes, *Scrolls*, 594.

¹⁴⁴ Steven Weitzman, “Allusion, Artifice, and Exile in the Hymn of Tobit,” *JBL* 115 (1996): 49–61.

categories of writings, beginning with the so-called apocryphal books. Significantly, James Zink has calculated that Deuteronomy and the Book of Psalms are the two most cited scriptural books in the Apocrypha.¹⁴⁵

2.2.2.1 Tobit

The Book of Tobit was one of the most widely read books of the Apocrypha in the ancient world,¹⁴⁶ as well as one that draws heavily from Deuteronomy's theology and phraseology.¹⁴⁷ Joseph Fitzmyer notes that this narrative is dominated in a special way by the teaching of Deuteronomy.¹⁴⁸ Indeed, in a recent article Micah Kiel states: "it has become commonplace to conclude that the book of Tobit bears a strongly Deuteronomic theology."¹⁴⁹ Scholars particularly note the Deuteronomic doctrine of retribution in Tobit, which offers blessings for obedience to the Torah and curses for disobedience (Deut 28–30).¹⁵⁰ In addition, Tobit's hope for restoration "resonates deeply" with Deut 30–32.¹⁵¹

The influence of Deuteronomy is perhaps clearest in Tob 13–14. Weitzman has amassed a convincing cumulative case that Tobit's hymn in Tob 13 is linked intertextually with the Song of Moses, even though the agreement is more conceptual than verbal. Thus, the reference to the God who wounds and heals, kills and makes alive in Deut 32.39 is echoed in Tob 13.2. Tobit's assurance in 13.6 that God will not hide his face from those who truly seek him (ἐπιστρέψει πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ οὐ μὴ κρύψει τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἀφ' ὑμῶν) likewise seems to have been influenced by the statement that God would turn his face from his people in Deut 32.20 (ἀποστρέψω τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἀπ' αὐτῶν). Beyond this, the view of Israel's future in Tob 13.8–17

¹⁴⁵ James Keith Zink, "The Use of the Old Testament in the Apocrypha" (Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1963), 194. According to Zink's calculations, Deuteronomy is cited 13x and Psalms 12x (he includes one reference in *4 Ezra* among the Apocrypha.)

¹⁴⁶ Bruce M. Metzger, *An Introduction to the Apocrypha* (New York: OUP, 1957), 31.

¹⁴⁷ David A. DeSilva, *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context, and Significance* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 72; Carey A. Moore, *Tobit: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB40A; New York: Doubleday, 1996), 8; Alexander A. Di Lella, "The Deuteronomic Background of the Farewell Discourse in Tob 14:3–11," *CBQ* 41 (1979): 380–89. Zink ("Use of the Old Testament," 191–204) suggests 12 total references to Deuteronomy in Tobit.

¹⁴⁸ Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Tobit* (CEJL; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003), 36.

¹⁴⁹ Micah D. Kiel, "Tobit and Moses Redux," *JSP* 17 (2008): 83–98.

¹⁵⁰ Moore, *Tobit*, 20; DeSilva, *Apocrypha*, 78; Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 47.

¹⁵¹ DeSilva, *Apocrypha*, 72. Moore (*Tobit*, 20) lists several other aspects of Deuteronomic theology in Tobit.

demonstrates similarities with Deut 32, which describes settlement in the land, apostasy, punishment, and ultimate restoration.¹⁵²

Weitzman also observes affinities between Deut 31.14–30, which introduces the Song of Moses, and Tob 12. Consistent with Yahweh’s instructions in Deut 31.19 to Moses (with Joshua by his side) to write (γράψατε; cf. 31.22, 24) the words of the song, the angel Raphael instructs Tobit and his son, Tobias, to write (γράψατε) their praise in a book (Tob 12.20). The difference here is that Tobit’s hymn is called a song of praise, whereas the Song of Moses was intended as a witness *against* Israel. However, the connection with Deut 32 is clear, especially since the Song of Moses was commonly interpreted in the Second Temple period as being a song of praise.¹⁵³ Finally, it is to be noted that both songs are performed by paragons of piety shortly before their deaths, they appear near the end of their respective books, and are followed by a farewell address.¹⁵⁴ It thus appears that Deut 32 has provided a pattern that is intentionally followed in Tob 13.

Di Lella convincingly lists nine Deuteronomistic features in the final chapter of Tobit (14):¹⁵⁵ (1) long life in the good land and prosperity are dependent on fidelity to Yahweh (Deut 4.40; 31.29/Tob 14.4). The doctrine of retribution can also be included here (Deut 28.15/Tob 14.4; Deut 28.63–65/Tob 14.7); (2) the possibility of mercy after sin and judgment (Deut 30.1–4; Tob 14.4–6; cf. 13.5–6); (3) rest and security in the land in connection with obedience (Deut 12.10–11/Tob 14.7); (4) blessing of joy and the command to rejoice (Deut 12.12/Tob 14.7); (5) the equation of fearing and loving God (Deut 10.12/Tob 14.6–7); (6) commands to bless and praise God (Deut 8.10; 32.3, 43/Tob 14.9); (7) a theology of remembering; (8) centralization of the cult (Deut 12.1–14; 16.6/Tob 14.5); (9) the inclusion of a final exhortation (Deut 30.15–20/Tob 14.9).¹⁵⁶ These observations lead Di Lella to the

¹⁵² Weitzman, “Allusion,” 50, 53–54.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, 52, 55. Weitzmann also notes an extant Hebrew version of Tobit, often referred to as the Münster text. Although the origins of this text are not clear, this Hebrew version “reformulates the narrative introduction to Tobit’s hymn *so as to heighten its similarity to the narrative of Deuteronomy 31*” (57; emphasis original).

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 53. The features of both documents here may well belong to the category of testament, a genre which is widely acknowledged to include writings influenced by Deut 31–34.

¹⁵⁵ For the list that follows, see Di Lella, “Deuteronomistic Background,” 381–84. On the similarities between Tobit and Deuteronomy, see Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 65–68.

¹⁵⁶ Building on these observations, Anne M. O’Leary (*Matthew’s Judaization of Mark: Examined in the Context of the Use of Sources in Graeco-Roman Antiquity* [LNTS 323; Edinburgh: T&T Clark,

broader conclusion that, given the extensive manner in which the author of Tobit employed Deuteronomy, the latter must have been a source of encouragement to Jews of the Hellenistic age.¹⁵⁷ Kiel adds another dimension to the Deuteronomic parallels, suggesting that the character Tobit emulates the character of Moses from Deuteronomy (and Numbers).¹⁵⁸

Tobit's parallels to Deuteronomy, however, are not limited to the end of the book, but are also evident in its opening chapter. Di Lella observes a concern for the building of the Temple in the beginning of Tobit (1.4), which is also echoed at the end (14.5), forming an *inclusio*.¹⁵⁹ This *inclusio* appears to have some merit, as it corresponds to the well-known teaching of Deuteronomy regarding the centralization of the cult (12.1–14). Similarly, O'Leary suggests the author of Tobit has “deuteronomized” the opening and closing chapters of the book.¹⁶⁰ As further evidence for this, in addition to a Temple *inclusio*, suggests that the vocabulary clusters in Tob 1.3 and 14.8 [Symmachus] (ἀλήθεια, δικαιοσύνη, ἐλεημοσύνη) evoke Deuteronomy where these themes occur together in contexts promoting justice.¹⁶¹ This particular aspect of Deuteronomic influence, however, is not as convincing, since the proposed vocabulary cluster is nowhere found in LXX Deuteronomy.¹⁶²

Nevertheless, the sum of the parallels given above provides a cumulative case that Deuteronomy was indeed of the utmost importance for the author of Tobit.

2.2.2.2 Sirach

A second apocryphal work to consider is Sirach (=Ecclesiasticus), a sapiential book in which Ben Sira emphasizes such Deuteronomic themes as care for the poor, disdain for adultery, truthfulness in speech, and the need to honor one's parents.¹⁶³

2006], 70) observes that “[t]he theology of the entire book of Deuteronomy is *distilled* into the book of Tobit's farewell discourse” (italics original).

¹⁵⁷ Di Lella, “Deuteronomic Background,” 387.

¹⁵⁸ Kiel, “Tobit and Moses,” 83–84. For example, he points to Deut 12.11–14/Tob 1.6–7 and Deut 1.9, 12/Tob 1.10 (91–92).

¹⁵⁹ Di Lella, “Deuteronomic Background,” 385.

¹⁶⁰ O'Leary, *Matthew's Judaization*, 70.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 66. Cf. Di Lella, “Deuteronomic Background,” 386.

¹⁶² O'Leary lists Deut 5.17–21; 10.12–19; 22–25 as passages where these themes are evident.

¹⁶³ DeSilva, *Apocrypha*, 162.

To this list one can add from Di Lella's study such doctrines as God, election, repentance, faith, and fear of the Lord, which lead him to conclude that Ben Sira's overall outlook is Deuteronomic. Di Lella also rightly notes in Sirach the prominence of the Deuteronomic teachings of retribution (Deut 28/Sir 9.12; 14.12, 16–17; 17.27–28), and the equation of fearing and loving the Lord (Deut 10.12–13; 30.16/Sir 2.15–16).¹⁶⁴

Gerald Sheppard has investigated how wisdom developed into a theological key by which to interpret Torah and prophetic traditions.¹⁶⁵ In this vein, he notes how Ben Sira re-appropriated various biblical motifs into his wisdom tradition, particularly those from Deuteronomy:

In sum, the writer of Sirach, while he has not cited particular OT passages, has in fact drawn freely upon the motifs of the OT narrative traditions. There is, moreover, *an unusual predilection for Deuteronomic expressions* specifically indicative of the wilderness traditions and the Mosaic allotment of land to the tribes of Israel.¹⁶⁶

These connections are most readily apparent in Sir 24, where Deuteronomy plays an “unusually prominent role.” Here, the botanic language related to Wisdom's journey in Sir 24.13–17 reflects the agricultural descriptions of the Promised Land in Deut 8.7–19; 32.13–14.¹⁶⁷

A more important example in Sir 24 is the role of Moses as lawgiver for the assembly of Jacob in Sir 24.23, which reflects verbatim the phrase “νόμον ὃν ἐνετείλατο ἡμῖν Μωσῆς κληρονομίαν συναγωγᾶς Ἰακωβ” from Deut 33.4 LXX. It is significant that this phrase is included with no indication from the author that it is a quotation. Instead, as Sheppard implies, this mingling of older tradition with a new interpretation is indicative of the way later, inner-biblical redactors would appropriate older traditions to validate their new interpretations. In this case, the author applies Deut 33.4 to both Torah and the role of Wisdom in Israel's history.¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁴ Patrick W. Skehan and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes, Introduction, and Commentary* (AB 39; New York: Doubleday, 1987), 75, 78–79, 83.

¹⁶⁵ Gerald T. Sheppard, *Wisdom as a Hermeneutical Construct: A Study in the Sapiencializing of the Old Testament* (BZAW 151; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1980), 13.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 43. Emphasis added.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 54, 63.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 60.

Beyond this, Sheppard notes even more Deuteronomic influence in Sir 24.23. After a rather detailed discussion, he summarizes the parallels between role of wisdom in Deut 4, 30, 32 and Sir 24.23:

[I]f one reads D[eu]t 4 and 32 together alongside D[eu]t 30 the conception emerges of a *book of Torah* (ch. 30) which comes *near* to Israel (chs. 4, 30) from beyond the heavens and is her *wisdom* (chs. 4, 32). This imagery coincides perfectly with the presuppositions of Sir 24.23 and probably reflects his hearing of Deuteronomy.¹⁶⁹

In other words, Ben Sira has found in Deut 4, 30, 32 elements that support his interpretation of Wisdom. Reading these passages as the background for Sir 24.23, in conjunction with the citation of Deut 33.4, suggests the probability that Ben Sira has formulated this statement based on his amalgamation of Deuteronomic themes.

Further support for Sheppard's view is adduced from Sir 51.26, where (in a way similar to 24.23) Ben Sira concludes that Wisdom *is* the book of the covenant. This seems to be based upon Ben Sira's particular reading of Deuteronomy. Shared concepts between Sir 51.26 and Deuteronomy include the nearness of wisdom (cf. Deut 4.6–7), the metaphor of a yoke (Wisdom in Sirach/Torah in Deuteronomy), and the need to seek wisdom wholeheartedly (cf. Deut 30.10).¹⁷⁰ In sum, Sheppard convincingly argues that Deuteronomy played a prominent role for the author of Sirach, who read Deuteronomy in conjunction with Wisdom.

Finally, Bell suggests several allusions to the Song of Moses in Sirach.¹⁷¹ One is Sir 49.4–7, a text that speaks of the power and glory of the kings of Judah being given to a foreign and foolish nation.¹⁷² Similarly, in Deut 32.21 Yahweh says he will provoke Israel to anger with a foolish nation. Although a conceptual parallel may exist between the two texts, it is difficult to make too much of this example since the verbal parallels are not very explicit. A second suggested allusion to Deut 32.21 is Sir 50.25–26 LXX, which mentions a no-nation and a foolish nation. The verbal parallels here are a bit more impressive, as οὐκ ἔστιν ἔθνος in Sir 50.25

¹⁶⁹ Ibid., 66. Emphasis original

¹⁷⁰ Ibid., 66–68.

¹⁷¹ See Bell, *Provoked*, 221–23.

¹⁷² LXX does not include “foolish;” this comes from the Hebrew text cited by Bell (222).

reflects οὐκ ἔθνη in Deut 32.21 LXX, and, similarly, ὁ λαὸς ὁ μωρὸς in Sir 50.26 may also evoke ἔθνη ἀσυνέτω from Deut 32.21 (so LXX). A third text is Sir 17.17 which states that Israel is Yahweh’s portion (μερὶς κυρίου Ἰσραηλ ἐστίν). This reflects closely the language of Deut 32.9 LXX (μερὶς κυρίου λαὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰακωβ).¹⁷³

The numerous thematic and verbal parallels considered above indicate that Deuteronomy was almost certainly known and utilized by Ben Sira to articulate his distinctive, sapiential ideas.

2.2.2.3 Baruch

Baruch is another book with strong ties to Deuteronomy. In Zink’s estimation, Baruch references at least 13 passages from Deuteronomy.¹⁷⁴ DeSilva notes Baruch’s commitment to Deuteronomy’s theology of history, particularly in relation to the sin-exile-repentance pattern, and this schema even unites the various sections of Baruch.¹⁷⁵ The curses alluded to in Bar 1.20 are reminiscent of Deut 28, and the Israelites’ predicament of being few in number in Bar 2.13 (κατελείφθημεν ὀλίγοι) likely echoes Deut 28.62 (καταλειφθήσεσθε ἐν ἀριθμῶ βραχεῖ). After a Deuteronomic reference to God’s holy habitation (Bar 2.16/Deut 26.15), Deut 28.62–64 again shines through in Bar 2.28.¹⁷⁶

Extensive verbal parallels to Deut 30.12–13 are found in Bar 3.29–30:

Deut 30.12–13	Bar 3.29–30
----------------------	--------------------

¹⁷³ Sheppard also sees similarities between Deut 32.9/Sir 24.9, but suggests that this reference might be mediated through Jeremiah (*Wisdom*, 45–46).

¹⁷⁴ Zink, “Use of the Old Testament,” 192–207.

¹⁷⁵ DeSilva, *Apocrypha*, 207–10.

¹⁷⁶ J. C. Dancy, *The Shorter Books of the Apocrypha: A Commentary* (Cambridge: CUP, 1972), 179–83.

<p>οὐκ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄνω ἐστὶν λέγων <u>τίς ἀναβήσεται ἡμῖν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ λήμψεται αὐτήν</u> ἡμῖν καὶ ἀκούσαντες αὐτήν ποιήσομεν</p> <p>οὐδὲ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης ἐστὶν λέγων <u>τίς διαπεράσει ἡμῖν εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ λήμψεται ἡμῖν αὐτήν</u> καὶ ἀκουστὴν ἡμῖν ποιήσει αὐτήν καὶ ποιήσομεν</p>	<p><u>τίς ἀνέβη εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ἔλαβεν αὐτήν</u> καὶ κατεβίβασεν αὐτήν ἐκ τῶν νεφελῶν</p> <p><u>τίς διέβη πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ εὔρεν αὐτήν</u> καὶ οἶσει αὐτήν χρυσοῦ ἐκλεκτοῦ</p>
---	--

These parallels demonstrate a substantial dependence of Baruch on Deuteronomy.¹⁷⁷ As is the case with Sirach, however, the author does not draw attention to this virtual citation from Deuteronomy, but incorporates it into a new context to legitimate his new interpretation.¹⁷⁸ Similarly, a few verses earlier, Bar 3.9 likely draws the language ἄκουε Ἰσραηλ from Deut 6.4.¹⁷⁹ Baruch 4 evidences at least two more references to Deuteronomy. Jerusalem's exiled children are indicted in Bar 4.7 (θύσαντες δαιμονίοις καὶ οὐ θεῶ) in terms akin to Deut 32.17 (ἔθυσαν δαιμονίοις καὶ οὐ θεῶ), and the coming wrath of a foreign nation (Deut 28.49, ἐπάξει κύριος ἐπὶ σὲ ἔθνος μακρόθεν) is fulfilled in Bar 4.15 (ἐπήγαγεν γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἔθνος μακρόθεν).¹⁸⁰

2.2.2.4 2 Maccabees

A final book from the Apocrypha to consider is 2 Maccabees, a composition which DeSilva also sees to have been profoundly influenced by Deuteronomy's theology of history.¹⁸¹ Daniel Schwartz is more specific, suggesting that the theology of history in 2 Maccabees is derived from Deut 32. This is based largely on

¹⁷⁷ Sheppard, *Wisdom*, 90–91; Dancy, *Shorter Books*, 189.

¹⁷⁸ So Sheppard, *Wisdom*, 93, 105.

¹⁷⁹ David G. Burke, *The Poetry of Baruch: A Reconstruction and Analysis of the Original Hebrew Text of Baruch 3:9–5:9* (SBLSCS 10; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1982), 77. Burke admits that this language might also come from 4 Ezra 9.30, but Deut 6 is more likely.

¹⁸⁰ Burke, *Poetry*, 178; DeSilva, *Apocrypha*, 193, 209.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 273.

the only explicit biblical quotation in the entire book, which comes in 2 Macc 7.6. Here it is noted that Moses explained in his song (ὥδῆς διεσάφησεν Μωυσῆς) that the Lord would have compassion on his servants (ἐπὶ τοῖς δούλοις αὐτοῦ παρακληθήσεται), a phrase taken directly from Deut 32.36. Indeed, Schwartz makes a convincing case that this citation provides the interpretive key for the entire book. He notes that the persecutions of God’s people come in 2 Macc 5–6, following the sins recounted in 2 Macc 4. The martyrdom of the Jews is recounted in 2 Macc 6–7, expressing the hope that their deaths would lead to the reconciliation of God and his people (2 Macc 7.38). The turning point of 2 Macc then comes in its middle chapter, where God’s wrath is turned to mercy (2 Macc 8.5). This change is brought about by the martyrs of 2 Macc 7, whose hope (which is soon realized) is expressed in the words of Deut 32.36.¹⁸²

Moreover, Schwartz points out that the sin-punishment-restoration pattern is indicative of Deut 32 as a whole, and that this perspective is also echoed in 2 Macc 5.17–20. These verses reflect the Song in that the Lord would ignore his people because of their sins (Deut 32.20), but would eventually be reconciled with his people (Deut 32.36). He further suggests that Deut 32.35 is operative in 2 Macc 5.12–13, especially in light of the Song’s probable influence in 5.17–20, but this case must be made from perceived conceptual correspondence rather than on the basis of verbal parallels. Additionally, the view in 2 Macc that Israel was God’s unique people (2 Macc 6.16 [τὸν ἑαυτοῦ λαόν]; 14.15 [τῆς ἑαυτοῦ μερίδος]) probably reflects Deut 32.9 (ἐγενήθη μερίς κυρίου λαὸς αὐτοῦ).¹⁸³

Beyond this, Schwartz notes the presence of καταλάσσω in 2 Macc 5.20; 7.33; 8.29, and argues that this term derives from Deut 32.36, even though Deut 32.36 LXX attests παρακαλέω and not καταλάσσω. Nevertheless, Schwartz observes that καταλάσσω is very rarely used in the first century B.C.E. to refer to God’s reconciliation with his people, but it is used this way three times in 2 Maccabees. The best explanation for this, according to Schwartz, is that the author of 2

¹⁸² Daniel R. Schwartz, “On Something Biblical about 2 Maccabees,” in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the First International Symposium of The Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature, 12–14 May, 1996* (ed. M. Stone and E. Chazon; STDJ 27; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 223–32. He further refers to Deut 32 as “a central biblical chapter.”

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, 228–229.

Maccabees chose καταλάσσω to render the Hebrew לְהַתְּנַחֵם from Deut 32.36.¹⁸⁴ Further supporting this claim is the recognition that 2 Macc 7.33; 8.29, along with 2 Macc 7.6, are the only places in 2 Maccabees where the Israelites are called δούλοι. This is also consistent with Deut 32.36, which uses the same term to refer to the Israelites.¹⁸⁵ In sum, for Schwartz it is “difficult, if not irresponsible” to deny the conclusion that Deut 32 has thoroughly informed the author’s thought.¹⁸⁶

The parallels given here between Deuteronomy and 2 Maccabees include both verbal and thematic. Moreover, it is certainly significant that the only explicit biblical quotation in 2 Maccabees (7.6) is from Deut 32, and this comes in a strategic point in the narrative. It is not necessary to follow all of Schwartz’s suggestions to conclude that Deuteronomy was a key book for the author of 2 Maccabees.

2.2.2.5 Testament of Moses

Several compositions from the so-called OT Pseudepigrapha evince the influence of Deuteronomy. The first to consider is the *Testament of Moses*. Likely written in the first third of the first century C.E., *T. Moses* is a prediction of Israel’s history from their entrance into the Promised Land until the end of days.¹⁸⁷ The main source for this work is clearly Deut 31–34.¹⁸⁸ This can be seen in the outline of the book as well as in scriptural allusions and theological perspective.¹⁸⁹ For example, *T. Mos.* 1 utilizes the framework of Deut 31,¹⁹⁰ heaven and earth are called as witnesses in *T. Mos.* 3.12 much as they are in Deut 4.26; 30.19; 31.28, and *T. Mos.*

¹⁸⁴ Ibid., 231. Schwartz admits that the author must have used the [proto-]LXX in 2 Macc 7.6, but for some unknown reason made his own rendering of the Hebrew in these cases.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., 230–31. A similar connection between servants and Deut 32.36 is noted by Jonathan A. Goldstein, *II Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB41A; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983), 304.

¹⁸⁶ Schwartz, “Something Biblical,” 229.

¹⁸⁷ J. Priest, *OTP*, 1:919–20.

¹⁸⁸ Daniel J. Harrington, “Interpreting Israel’s History: The Testament of Moses as a Rewriting of Deut 31–34,” in *Studies on the Testament of Moses* (ed. G. Nickelsburg; SBLSCS 4; Cambridge, Mass.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973), 59–68; George W. E. Nickelsburg, Jr., *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism* (HTS 26; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972), 41; Johannes Tromp, *The Assumption of Moses: A Critical Edition with Commentary* (SVTP 10; Leiden: Brill, 1993), 60. 1Q22, which is presented as a Mosaic farewell discourse, is similar in this respect. Cf. Vermes, *Scrolls*, 537.

¹⁸⁹ Priest, *OTP*, 1:923.

¹⁹⁰ Harrington, “Interpreting Israel’s History,” 63.

10 draws upon Deut 33.¹⁹¹ The transfer of leadership, a concern of Deut 31–32, is recounted in *T. Mos.* 11–12, although the latter seems to move beyond the former.¹⁹² Dale Allison echoes the work of R. H. Charles, suggesting that Deut 18 was influential for the author of *T. Moses*.¹⁹³ Additionally, *T. Moses* employs a Deuteronomic schema of history.¹⁹⁴ Tromp, who sees a three-fold repetition of the sin-punishment-repentance-salvation pattern, notes this most extensively: sin (2.3–9; 5.1–6.7; 7) → punishment (3.1–3; 6.8–9; 8) → repentance (3.4–4.4; --- ; 9) → salvation (4.5–9; --- ; 10).¹⁹⁵ Priest similarly notes the presence of the Deuteronomic doctrine of retribution in *T. Moses*.¹⁹⁶

2.2.2.6 Jubilees

Jubilees is an account of the revelation given to Moses during the 40 days he spent on Sinai, and draws mostly from Gen 1–Exod 24.18.¹⁹⁷ However, portions of Deuteronomy are also formative. Most prominent is *Jub.* 1, which is based on Deut 31–34.¹⁹⁸ Like Deut 31–32, *Jub.* 1.4 indicates that Moses was instructed to teach about future events. Further, the book of Moses in *Jubilees* was to function as a witness against the people, just like the Song of Moses. The bounty of the land described in *Jub.* 1.7 seems to refer to Deut 31.20, and the description of the people as stiff-necked in the same verse may allude to Deut 31.27.¹⁹⁹ Harrington maintains that the most significant parallels are those that attempt to understand Israel’s history (*Jub.* 1.8, 13–16/ Deut 31–32).²⁰⁰ In *Jub.* 1.21 Israel is referred to as the Lord’s inheritance, a sentiment that echoes Deut 9.26, 29, and the promise that the Lord will circumcise the hearts of Israel’s offspring evokes Deut 10.16; 30.6. Anticipating the

¹⁹¹ Nickelsburg, *Resurrection*, 29.

¹⁹² Robert A. Kugler, “Testaments,” in *Justification and Variegated Nomism*, vol. 2: *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism* (ed. D. A. Carson, P. O’Brien, and M. Seifrid; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 189–213.

¹⁹³ Allison, *New Moses*, 28.

¹⁹⁴ Nickelsburg, *Resurrection*, 29; Harrington, “Interpreting Israel’s History,” 61.

¹⁹⁵ Tromp, *Assumption*, 123. Cf. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection*, 29; Harrington, “Interpreting Israel’s History,” 61.

¹⁹⁶ Priest, *OTP*, 1:922.

¹⁹⁷ O. S. Wintermute, *OTP*, 2:35, 48.

¹⁹⁸ Nickelsburg, *Resurrection*, 41n.136.

¹⁹⁹ Harrington, “Interpreting Israel’s History,” 61–62.

²⁰⁰ *Ibid.* Harrington also sees an apostasy-punishment-vindication scheme here.

discussion of chapter 4, the assertion in *Jub.* 1.24–25 that the Israelites will do the Lord’s commandments and he will be a father to them likely echoes Deut 14.1. Thus, the opening verses of *Jubilees* strongly evoke portions of Deuteronomy, especially Deut 31–34.²⁰¹ The influence of these chapters, however, also extends to other parts of *Jubilees*. This can be seen in the reference to Deut 32.8–9 in *Jub.* 15.31–32,²⁰² and *Jub.* 31 may draw from priestly messianic expectations associated with Deut 33.10.²⁰³

2.2.2.7 2 *Baruch*

The influence of Deuteronomy can also be seen in 2 *Baruch*.²⁰⁴ As a preliminary observation, the purpose of 2 *Baruch*, much like Deuteronomy, is to exhort its audience to obedience to the law.²⁰⁵ In addition, M. Whitters notes that Deuteronomy’s farewell song and blessing (i.e., testament) preceded by an extended recitation of laws and exhortations is an appropriate analogy for 2 *Baruch*, which can also be viewed as an extended discourse (2 *Bar* 1–77) followed by a farewell epistle (2 *Bar* 78–87). This reflects a Deuteronomic tendency to combine a testament with a longer didactic work.²⁰⁶ A distinctive feature of Deuteronomy—the conditional sentence—is also frequent in 2 *Baruch*. In Deuteronomy the protasis of these sentences deals with obedience to divine law, and apodasis with reward for obedience. Interestingly, these conditional sentences occur 14 times in Deuteronomy and 14 times in 2 *Baruch*. The theme of remembrance is also prominent in both books. Murphy notes that language for remembering or forgetting occurs 40 times in Deuteronomy, and is at least as prominent in 2 *Baruch*, although the purposes for which the author uses it differ from Deuteronomy. The combination of wisdom and

²⁰¹ Harrington, “Interpreting Israel’s History,” 62

²⁰² Bell, *Provoked*, 223.

²⁰³ Collins, *Apocalypticism*, 86.

²⁰⁴ This is true despite the dearth of Deuteronomic connections noted by A. F. J. Klijn in his *OTP* introduction (1:619).

²⁰⁵ Frederick James Murphy, *The Structure and Meaning of Second Baruch* (SBLDS 78; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 124.

²⁰⁶ Mark F. Whitters, *The Epistle of Second Baruch: A Study in Form and Message* (JSPSup 42; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003), 158–59.

understanding, which is key in Deuteronomy (e.g., 4.6; 32.28), is also prevalent in the eschatological outlook of *2 Baruch*.²⁰⁷

The so-called epistle of *2 Baruch* (78–87) most vividly evokes the imagery of Moses and Deuteronomy, such that Baruch is portrayed as a new Moses with a new Torah.²⁰⁸ In particular, echoes of Deuteronomy resound in *2 Bar.* 84.1–8. Allison notes the similarities of this section with Deut 33–34,²⁰⁹ though the parallels with Deuteronomy go well beyond these two chapters. The mention of the Mosaic covenant and the role of heaven and earth as witnesses in *2 Bar.* 84.2 reflect Deut 4.26; 30.19; 31.28.²¹⁰ Moreover, the violation of the covenant leads to the scattering of the people (Deut 4.27; 32.26/*2 Bar.* 84.2), but with the hope of reconciliation (Deut 32.36/*2 Bar.* 84.6). The presentation of Moses in *2 Baruch* also appears to be patterned on the Deuteronomic portrait of Moses.²¹¹ Examples include *2 Bar.* 76/Deut 34, passages in which both figures are called to ascend a high mountain in order to look at lands which they are about to leave behind. Beyond this, both men are presented as teachers (Deut 4.1, 14; 5.31; 6.1; 31.22/*2 Bar.* 44–45; 84.9), and both address the people in similar ways (Deut 5.1; 9.1/*2 Bar.* 31.3). Murphy summarizes the similarities between the two books as “a certain community of forms, language, and setting.”²¹²

2.2.2.8 Miscellaneous Texts

A couple of minor references to Deuteronomy in the Pseudepigrapha may also be instructive. First is *4 Macc.* 18.19, which cites a portion of Deut 32.39 (ἐγὼ ἀποκτενῶ καὶ ζῆν ποιήσω). This passage in *4 Maccabees* is parallel to *2 Macc.* 7, which also cites Deut 32. Moreover, the portion of the Song of Moses cited in *4 Macc.* 18.19 is an apt reference for a passage dealing with resurrection, since Deut 32.39 was frequently used in reference to the resurrection in post-exilic literature.²¹³

²⁰⁷ Murphy, *Structure and Meaning*, 120–23, 127–131.

²⁰⁸ Whitters, *Second Baruch*, 159, 168.

²⁰⁹ Allison, *New Moses*, 66.

²¹⁰ Murphy, *Structure and Meaning*, 125. Cf. *T. Mos.* 3.12.

²¹¹ Murphy, *Structure and Meaning*, 125–26. Murphy also notes this characteristic in *2 Bar.* 1–9, which seems to have been influenced by Deut 9.25–29 (131).

²¹² *Ibid.*, 129, 132.

²¹³ Bell, *Provoked*, 223.

The OG of Deuteronomy 33.3 is also cited in *4 Macc.* 17.19 (καὶ πάντες οἱ ἡγιασμένοι ὑπὸ τὰς χεῖράς σου).²¹⁴ A second passage of note comes from *1 Enoch* 103.9–12, which is a pastiche of words and phrases from Deut 28 dealing with covenantal curses.²¹⁵

2.2.2.9 Summary: Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha

It has been argued here that the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical writings have gleaned language and themes from Deuteronomy. In particular, blessings and curses, a Deuteronomic schema of history, and Deut 32 seems to be especially prominent in these writings. As was the case in Qumran, several authors used Deuteronomy as a basis to legitimate new compositions. The latter chapters of Deuteronomy also seem to have been influential in testamentary forms of literature.

2.2.3 Synagogue

Although a degree of mystery still veils aspects of current knowledge of ancient synagogues, many features can be stated with confidence. It is clear that synagogues served a pivotal role for Jews in the Diaspora and in Judea by the first century C.E.²¹⁶ Further, ample evidence exists that the reading of the Torah was “universally accepted,”²¹⁷ and was a (if not *the*) central function in ancient synagogues.²¹⁸ Indeed, Levine notes that by this time the Torah had become the

²¹⁴ Cf. H. Anderson, *OTP*, 2:563.

²¹⁵ Martin McNamara, *Targum Neofiti 1: Deuteronomy. Translated, with Apparatus and Notes* (ArBib 5A; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997), 2.

²¹⁶ Lee I. Levine, *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale, 2000), 124.

²¹⁷ Charles Perrot, “The Reading of the Bible in the Ancient Synagogue,” in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. M. Mulder; CRINT II/1; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 137–59. This is consistent with the observation that the emphasis of scriptural use in Second Temple times was on the Pentateuch. Cf. Martin Hengel, “The Scriptures and their Interpretation in Second Temple Judaism,” in *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context* (ed. D. Beattie and M. McNamara; JSOTSup 166; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 158–75.

²¹⁸ Levine, *Ancient Synagogue*, 134; Stephen K. Catto, *Reconstructing the First-Century Synagogue: A Critical Analysis of Current Research* (LNTS 363; London: T&T Clark, 2007), 116, 123; Anders Runesson, *The Origins of the Synagogue: A Socio-Historical Study* (ConBNT 37; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2001), 191. Levine (137) notes the following texts in support of this statement: Josephus: *Ag. Ap.* 2.175; *Ant.* 16.43; Philo: *Legat.* 156; *Somn.* 2.127; *Hypoth.* 7.12; *Prob.* 81–82; NT: Luke 4.16–22; Acts 13.14–15; 15.21.

second holiest object in Judaism, trailing only the Temple.²¹⁹ Some, however, understand the Torah to have had an even greater significance than the Temple:

With the earliest emergence of the synagogue during the Babylonian exile, the Torah assumed the central role in Jewish life, never to relinquish it again, even through Second Temple times, where it existed side by side with a re-emerging sacrificial ritual, but always looming greater in significance than the cultus.²²⁰

Moreover, the Torah reading portion of the service was likely the most participatory and dramatic component of the worship service. These readings, in conjunction with the prophetic readings, were often used as a “springboard for instruction,” and served as a focal point for most other liturgical elements in the synagogue.²²¹

Although it is difficult to ascertain precisely *how* the readings took place, the Torah may have been read within a three to three-and-a-half year cycle (Palestine), or on a yearly cycle (Babylon).²²² It is difficult, however, to know with certainty the specifics of these supposed cycles.²²³ The key point is that by the first century of the present era a weekly ceremony centered around communal reading and study of the Torah (and other Scriptures) was standard Jewish praxis.²²⁴ Thus, the reading of Deuteronomy, as part of the Torah, would have been a common feature of the main focus of synagogue worship in the NT era. In light of the role given to instruction following the scriptural readings in the synagogues, might Deuteronomy have been particularly well-suited for such instruction given its exhortatory focus? One can do little more than pose the question at this point, but it is possible that Deuteronomy’s content would have made it especially well-disposed to be a popular basis for exposition in the synagogue.

²¹⁹ Levine, *Ancient Synagogue*, 135; cf. Runesson, *Origins*, 199–200.

²²⁰ Bernard Grossfeld, *The Targum Onkelos to Genesis. Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes* (ArBib 6; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988), 1.

²²¹ Levine, *Ancient Synagogue*, 144, 154. Levine believes the instruction that came after the scripture reading was more closely related to the prophetic reading than the Torah reading (147).

²²² Perrot, “Reading of the Bible,” 137; Levine, *Ancient Synagogue*, 140.

²²³ Catto, *Reconstructing*, 124. Bell (*Provoked*, 227) suggests that Deut 32 would have had a place in the weekly Torah reading, though this is far from certain.

²²⁴ Levine, *Ancient Synagogue*, 139.

2.2.4 Philo

Even though Philo of Alexandria did not write a commentary on Deuteronomy, he does interact considerably with it. Not surprisingly, his preferred interpretation of Deuteronomy is allegorical. For example, for Philo the divine law reveals the philanthropy of Moses and the benevolence and love of God for men, while Moses and God in Deuteronomy are the models that men must adopt among themselves. Philo also uses selected verses from Deuteronomy as the basis for arguments that he develops homiletically.²²⁵ In addition, Philo regroups the totality of the Mosaic legislation under the headings of the Decalogue since, for Philo, the specific Mosaic laws are subordinate to the Ten Commandments.²²⁶

Philo also re-appropriates the Deuteronomic teaching on blessings and curses. In *Her.* 177 he utilizes the duality of blessings and curses in a discourse on equality.²²⁷ He also draws heavily from Deut 28 (cf. Lev 26) in *Praem.* 79–162.²²⁸ On a macro level, two writings (*Virt.* 51–174; *Hypoth.* 6.1–7.19) review Mosaic history and laws with an apologetic tendency, thus exhibiting a similar purpose and structure as Deuteronomy.²²⁹ Bell further notes the extensive references (more than 30, by his count) to Deut 32 in Philo.²³⁰ Most explicit is *Virt.* 72–75, which states that Moses hymned to God with a Song (ὕμνεῖν μετ’ ᾠδῆς).²³¹ Philo’s explanation of this Song, however, is much more positive than it is in Deuteronomy, perhaps reading the Song through the hopeful lens of Deut 32.43 as preserved in the LXX.²³² Moreover, for Philo the reference to “heaven and earth” in Deut 32.1 indicates “the totality of the elements of the universe called to a universal harmony” (cf. *Virt.* 74).²³³ It should also be noted that Philo does not demonstrate an affinity for

²²⁵ Dogniez and Harl, *Deutéronome*, 69. Cf. Deut 1.17/*Somn.* 2.17–30.

²²⁶ Dogniez and Harl, *Deutéronome*, 82. Cf. *De decalogo* 154–75.

²²⁷ Peder Borgen, *Philo of Alexandria: An Exegete for His Time* (VTSup 86: Leiden: Brill, 1997), 48. Cf. Deut 27.11–13.

²²⁸ Ibid. Borgen (269n.8) lists various examples from Philo’s writings that refer to Deut 28: Deut 28.1–2, 7/*Virt.* 47–48; Deut 28.12/*Leg.* 3.104; *Deus* 156; *Her.* 76; Deut 28.14/*Post.* 102; Deut 28–29/*Her.* 250; Deut 28.49–57/*Spec.* 1.313; Deut 28.65–66/*Post.* 24–25; Deut 28.67/*Flacc.* 167.

²²⁹ Borgen, *Philo*, 59.

²³⁰ Bell, *Provoked*, 225. Dogniez and Harl (*Deutéronome*, 32) note some of these references: *Leg.* 3.105; *Post.* 121, 167; *Plant.* 59; *Deter.* 14; *Sobr.* 10; *Mut.* 182; *Somn.* 2.191.

²³¹ Philo, *Virt.* 72 (Thackeray, LCL).

²³² Bell, *Provoked*, 225.

²³³ Dogniez and Harl, *Deutéronome*, 321 (author’s translation).

messianic interpretations of Deuteronomy. Illustrative of this is Philo's apparent lack of interest in the promised prophet of Deut 18, even though he does develop the prophetic figure of Moses.²³⁴

In sum, although Philo does not show an overwhelming interest in Deuteronomy, his concern with Deuteronomic blessings and curses, the Song of Moses, and his allegorical interpretations underscore the manner in which he engaged the book. It should also be noted that Philo draws from all parts of Deuteronomy, including both legal²³⁵ and narrative portions.²³⁶

2.2.5 Josephus

Josephus summarizes and synthesizes Deuteronomy in *Ant.* 4.176–331.²³⁷ Louis Feldman has noted that Josephus was not a mere copyist of Deuteronomy, but introduces his own views—historiographical, political, religious, and cultural—into the biblical text.²³⁸ Interestingly, Josephus claims in *Ant.* 1.17 that he did not add or omit anything from the writings of Moses, but he actually does both.²³⁹ Josephus may have intended these comments in *Ant.* 1.17 to assure his readers that he had done his research honestly. Indeed, in *Ant.* 1.18 he implies that not everything he includes is dependent on Moses.²⁴⁰ At the same time, the comment in *Ant.* 1.17 may reflect Deut 4.2; 12.32 as known in the LXX.²⁴¹ In any case, Josephus's inclusion of Deuteronomy, however reworked it may be, indicates his knowledge of the book and his acknowledgement of Mosaic authority. In fact, Josephus may have been following the example of Moses himself, who he believed played a significant role in the transmission of Israel's Scriptures.²⁴²

²³⁴ Ibid., 69–70.

²³⁵ E.g., *Decal.* 154–75; *Spec.* 2.232.

²³⁶ E.g., *Somn.* 2.17–30; cf. Dogniez and Harl, *Deutéronome*, 70.

²³⁷ Lim, “Deuteronomy,” 24–25.

²³⁸ Louis H. Feldman, *Studies in Josephus' Rewritten Bible* (JSJSup 58; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 539; so Sarah Pearce, “Josephus and the Witness Laws of Deuteronomy,” in *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium: Aarhus 1999* (ed. J. Kalms; IJDMJS 6; Münster: LIT, 1999), 122–34.

²³⁹ Ibid., 539. Cf. *Ant.* 4.196.

²⁴⁰ Feldman, *Studies*, 540–41. The relevant text reads: “Ἐπειδὴ δὲ πάντα σχεδὸν ἐκ τῆς τοῦ νομοθέτου σοφίας ἡμῖν ἀνήρτηται Μωυσέος.”

²⁴¹ Louis H. Feldman, *Josephus and Modern Scholarship (1937–1980)* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1984), 123. For other possible precedents, see *idem*, *Studies*, 541–43.

²⁴² Ibid., 541–42.

Dogniez and Harl explain Josephus's use of Deuteronomy: "Le Text de Josèphe fait connaître quelques actualisations de lois, quelques explications de coutumes...Le livre du *Deutéronome* est essentiellement pour lui un sujet de fierté."²⁴³ At the same time, Feldman notes that Josephus may have been writing for a non-Jewish audience, to explain the customs of the Jewish people, while also writing in order to give his Jewish audience a defense.²⁴⁴ An example of this is found in *Ant.* 4.262. Here Josephus expands upon the pericope of the rebellious son (Deut 21.18–21) and opines that God is a Father to the whole human race. As we will see in the next chapter, Deuteronomy does speak of the fatherhood of God, but the focus of this relationship is particularly with Israel, not with the entire human race.²⁴⁵ A similar observation can be made in conjunction with Josephus's reading of the witness laws of Deuteronomy. Although Josephus does not explicitly contradict Deuteronomy in his reference to these portions of Deuteronomy (19.15–20), his discussion of Moses' teaching attributes teachings to Moses that are not found in Deuteronomy. Instead, a portrait of Moses' teaching is constructed that is consistent with the values of the Roman ruling class.²⁴⁶ Thus the content of Deuteronomy, though it was an authoritative text for Josephus, is ultimately made subservient to Josephus's larger heuristic purposes.

Harold Attridge has noted that *Ant.* 4.176–95, in addition to being a loose paraphrase of Deuteronomy, also exhibits a paraenetic quality that is "certainly based on the similar tone of Deuteronomy."²⁴⁷ He further observes that the Josephan view of providence in which God rewards virtue and punishes vice also echoes Deuteronomy.²⁴⁸ A discussion of blessings and curses, another prominent gleaning from Deuteronomy, is found in *Ant.* 4.304–8. Like some of Philo's writings, portions of *Contra Apionem* (2.157–219) are based on the form of reviewing Mosaic

²⁴³ Dogniez and Harl, *Deutéronome*, 70–71.

²⁴⁴ Feldman, *Studies*, 543–44. Cf. *Ant.* 1.5; 4.197; N. T. Wright, *Christian Origins and the Question of God*, vol. 1: *The New Testament and the People of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 171.

²⁴⁵ Depending on the reading one chooses, Deut 32.8–9 could be an exception.

²⁴⁶ Pearce, "Witness Laws," 122–23.

²⁴⁷ Harold W. Attridge, *The Interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus* (HDR 7; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1976), 90.

²⁴⁸ *Ibid.* These shared features cannot be pressed too far, however, since (as Attridge notes) the passage is a rather free composition and does not mirror Deuteronomy closely in all the details.

history and laws found in Deuteronomy.²⁴⁹ It should also be noted that Josephus uniquely understands Deut 31–32 to be recurrent rather than a once-time event.²⁵⁰ Rather than focusing on the role of Deut 32 as a witness against Israel (Deut 31.19, 26), Josephus refers to it as a *poem* in hexameter verse (ποίησις ἑξάμετρον, *Ant.* 4.303).

Like Philo, Josephus did not promote messianic interpretations of Deuteronomy. This is to be expected, since he was not an advocate of messianic interpretations of Israel’s Scriptures in general, but wrote largely in opposition to messianic movements.²⁵¹ Finally, it should be noted that, like many of the writings surveyed thus far, Josephus refers to both narrative and legal portions of Deuteronomy.²⁵²

2.2.6 Pseudo-Philo

One final corpus to consider briefly is Pseudo-Philo’s *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (*L.A.B.*). This Latin text has been variously dated to the first century C.E., probably sometime before 70 C.E.²⁵³ Deuteronomy does not receive extensive treatment in this partial recounting of Israel’s history, but chapters 31–34 of Deuteronomy are addressed in *L.A.B.* 19.²⁵⁴ *L.A.B.* 19.1 tersely summarizes Deuteronomy (“He began declaring to them the words of the Law God had spoken to them”), then establishes a testamentary framework.²⁵⁵ References to Deuteronomy in *L.A.B.* include the covenantal language of Deut 4.26/32.1 (*L.A.B.* 19.4), the partial citation of Deut 5.27 (*L.A.B.* 19.4), and Deut 31.16 in *L.A.B.* 19.6.²⁵⁶ In *L.A.B.* 19.2 Harrington observes another instance of an apostasy-punishment-vindication schema

²⁴⁹ Borgen, *Philo*, 59.

²⁵⁰ Feldman, *Modern Scholarship*, 155; cf. Waters, *End of Deuteronomy*, 65.

²⁵¹ Feldman, *Studies*, 554–55.

²⁵² For an analysis of the text(s) of the Pentateuch used by Josephus in the first four books of the *Antiquities*, see Étienne Nodet, *Le Pentateuque de Flavius Josèphe* (La Bible de Josèphe I/1; Paris: Cerf, 1996).

²⁵³ Frederick James Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo: Rewriting the Bible* (Oxford: OUP, 1993), 90; Bruce Norman Fisk, *Do You Not Remember? Scripture, Story and Exegesis in the Rewritten Bible of Pseudo-Philo* (JSPSup 37; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 3; D. J. Harrington, *OTP*, 2:299.

²⁵⁴ Harrington, “Interpreting Israel’s History,” 62. Cf. *idem*, *OTP*, 2:297.

²⁵⁵ Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo*, 267.

²⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 90–91.

of Israel's history.²⁵⁷ Thus, we can observe in Pseudo-Philo's *L.A.B.* an emphasis on the latter portions of Deuteronomy that appears to have been common in ancient Judaism.

2.2.7 Summary: Jewish Literature

The above survey of Jewish literature is by no means exhaustive. The contention of this chapter, however, is that the numerous and variegated engagements with Deuteronomy in this assortment of writings demonstrate sufficiently that Deuteronomy was an important book for both the sectarian community at Qumran and the wider traditions of Judaism. This is not surprising given the extensive circulation of Deuteronomy detailed in §2.1. As Crawford aptly summarizes: "Deuteronomy may be termed the 'second law' but clearly had attained first place in Second Temple Judaism."²⁵⁸

2.3 Use of Deuteronomy: Christian Literature

Deuteronomy was not only widely known and used as an authoritative text in Jewish literature, but a consideration of early Christian writings indicates that Deuteronomy was also an important document in the incipient church. The following analysis will include a sample from the NT and Apostolic Fathers. To be addressed here is the extent to which Deuteronomy was used as a source, and the manner in which the authors of these documents (who were roughly contemporaneous with the author of Matthew²⁵⁹) may have read Deuteronomy similarly to or differently from Jewish authors in light of the coming of Jesus Christ.

2.3.1 New Testament

2.3.1.1 Pauline Epistles

Deuteronomy is, by most counts, at least the third most referenced OT book in the NT.²⁶⁰ The present investigation of Deuteronomy in the NT begins with the

²⁵⁷ Harrington, "Interpreting Israel's History," 62.

²⁵⁸ Crawford, "Reading Deuteronomy," 140.

²⁵⁹ It is only assumed here that Matthew was written in the first century, and that the documents included in this survey were written by at least the first part of the second century.

²⁶⁰ This count depends on how one quantifies such references. A simple enumeration of the references listed in the Index of OT quotations in UBS4 (pp. 887–88) reveals 79 citations of Psalms,

Pauline corpus—a collection that includes the earliest extant Christian writings, and also engages Deuteronomy in numerous places. Space will only permit a brief survey of selected texts, but this will be sufficient to demonstrate Paul’s²⁶¹ keen interest in Deuteronomy.²⁶²

First to be considered is Galatians, an epistle in which Paul’s use of Deuteronomy is notoriously complex. Two explicit citations to Deuteronomy (21.23; 27.26) are found among the four OT citations in Gal 3.10–13. In Gal 3.10 Paul appeals to the final curse from Deut 27 to illustrate the all-encompassing requirement of covenantal obedience, and he may have taken the phrase ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου from Deut 28.58/30.10.²⁶³ It is also to be noted that the language of the curse (κατάρα)—a word often juxtaposed with εὐλογία in the LXX in covenantal contexts²⁶⁴—is likely derived from Deuteronomy.²⁶⁵ In Gal 3.13 Paul cites Deut 21.23 in a surprising way, claiming that Jesus’ shameful death by crucifixion at the hands of the Romans was actually a means of redeeming those under the law, with the double result that the blessing of Abraham might come to the nations, and the promise of the Spirit might be received by faith. Here Paul takes a verse that dealt with the cursed²⁶⁶ status of one hanged on a tree, and asserts that Jesus’ cursing has resulted in a blessing for those he has redeemed. Thus the quotations from Deuteronomy drive the interpretation of 3.10–14, so that Paul’s

50 of Deuteronomy, 48 of Isaiah (though some of these are extended quotations). Interestingly, Index 4 in NA27 lists 48 citations of Deuteronomy, and approximately 96 of Isaiah. Despite differences in precise enumeration, there is widespread agreement that Deuteronomy, Isaiah, and Psalms, are the three most referenced OT books in the NT (see Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken, eds., *Deuteronomy in the New Testament* [LNTS 358; London: T&T Clark, 2007], 1).

²⁶¹ This investigation will focus on the undisputed letters Romans, Galatians, Philippians, 1–2 Corinthians. Thus, it will be appropriate to refer to Paul as the author of these texts.

²⁶² For a discussion on the importance of Deuteronomy to Paul, see Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 163–64.

²⁶³ Moisés Silva, “Galatians,” in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 785–812. Roy E. Ciampa (“Deuteronomy in Galatians and Romans,” in *Deuteronomy in the New Testament* [ed. S. Moyise and M. Menken; LNTS 358; London: T&T Clark, 2007], 99–117) suggests Deut 28.61; 29.20 are other possibilities for this latter phrase. Here, and for Paul in general, something close to the LXX appears to be the primary textual tradition.

²⁶⁴ BDAG, s.v.

²⁶⁵ So N. T. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 140.

²⁶⁶ The addition of ἐπικατάρατος, especially in light of similar language in 3.10, is due to its use in the context of covenantal blessings/curses in Deut 27–28. Cf. Ciampa, “Galatians and Romans,” 104.

logical flow can be described as a movement from curse to blessing. Unique to Paul is the application of a text reserved for one accursed by God and applying it to Jesus and his redemptive, messianic work. We can also note Paul's concern with covenantal features of Deuteronomy.²⁶⁷ In addition to these explicit references, Paul's warning against receiving another gospel in Gal 1.8–9 may echo the warnings against deceptive teachers from Deut 13.12–16, and the mention of God's impartiality in Gal 2.6 may derive from Deut 10.17.²⁶⁸

No Pauline epistle has more citations of Deuteronomy than Romans. Paul cites a portion of the Decalogue from Deut 5.21(/Exod 20.17) in Rom 7.7. By encapsulating this commandment with the succinct οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις, Paul broadens its scope to include all types of coveting.²⁶⁹ Portions of the Decalogue (Deut 5.17–21) are also cited in Rom 13.8–10 in order to illustrate the way the Roman Christians were to love one another. An even more creative appeal to Deuteronomy is found in Rom 10. Rom 10.6 opens with the phrase ἡ δὲ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη οὕτως λέγει, which is followed by a warning against Israel that mirrors exactly the wording of Deut 8.17; 9.4 LXX (μὴ ἐΐπης ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου).²⁷⁰ Charles Cranfield notes the opening phrase of 10.6 is “specially noteworthy” because it shows that Paul sees in Deuteronomy the doctrine of justification by faith.²⁷¹ Paul's appeal to Deuteronomy continues in the argument of 10.7–8, where he cites Deut 30.12, 14. Here Paul compares salvation in Christ to the nearness of the law given through Moses. As Douglas Moo notes, Paul here teaches “that the message about the righteousness by faith...is, like the law of God, accessible and understandable.”²⁷²

In Rom 10.19 Paul cites Deut 32.21—the first of three citations to the Song of Moses in the latter chapters of Romans—in the midst of a litany of quotations dealing with the contrasting responses of Jews and Gentiles to the gospel.²⁷³ Hays

²⁶⁷ So Waters, *End of Deuteronomy*, 103–4, 244.

²⁶⁸ Ciampa, “Galatians and Romans,” 99–100.

²⁶⁹ So Mark A. Seifrid, “Romans,” in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 607–94, here 631.

²⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 656.

²⁷¹ C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (2 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1975–79), 2:522.

²⁷² Douglas J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 656.

²⁷³ Ciampa, “Galatians and Romans,” 110.

notes that here God purposes to provoke Israel to jealousy by including the Gentiles, who are invited to join God's covenant people in praise. This last aspect is highlighted by the citation of Deut 32.43 in Rom 15.10. This citation, juxtaposed with that of Deut 32.21 (Rom 10.19), is an indication that Deut 32 contains Romans *in nuce*.²⁷⁴ The Song of Moses (Deut 32.35) is also cited a third time in Rom 12.19, where Paul urges his audience not to seek revenge but to leave room for God's judgment.²⁷⁵ Finally, Paul cites Deut 29.3 (and Isa 29.10) in Rom 11.8 to underscore Israel's hard-heartedness.

Paul cites Deuteronomy four times in the Corinthian epistles, and alludes to Deuteronomy in several other instances. The emphases of shunning sexual immorality and idolatry of the other nations are both prominent in 1 Corinthians and Deuteronomy.²⁷⁶ This can be seen in 1 Cor 5.13 (ἐξάρατε τὸν πονηρὸν ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν), which echoes the Deuteronomic injunction to expel the wicked from among the congregation of the Israelites (ἐξαρᾶτε τὸν πονηρὸν ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν; Deut 17.7; 19.19; 21.21; 22.21; 24.7).²⁷⁷ This reference is preceded by a mosaic of imagery in 1 Cor 5.11 that gives a representative list, drawn mostly from Deuteronomy, of the type of sin that warrants expulsion. These are the sexually immoral (Deut 22.21–22, 30), greedy, idolater (Deut 13.1–5; 17.2–7), reviler (Deut 19.16–19), drunkard (Deut 21.18–21), and robber (Deut 24.7).²⁷⁸ In 1 Cor 6.1–6 Paul applies the lessons of Deut 1.9–17 (and Exod 18.13–26) to the problem of Corinthian lawsuits,²⁷⁹ and the Deuteronomic teaching on divorce (Deut 24.1–4) is the background for 1 Cor 7.39–40.²⁸⁰

In addition, the *Shema* (Deut 6.4) appears to provide the foundation for Paul's argument against polytheism in 1 Cor 8.6. Following a possible allusion to Deut 6.4

²⁷⁴ Hays, *Echoes*, 164. More specifically, Hays sees the following themes from the Song of Moses in Romans: God's election of Israel (32.6–14), Israel's rebellion (32.15–18), God's judgment (32.19–35), God's final deliverance (32.36–43).

²⁷⁵ So Cranfield, *Romans*, 2:646–48.

²⁷⁶ Brian S. Rosner, "Deuteronomy in 1 and 2 Corinthians," in *Deuteronomy in the New Testament* (ed. S. Moyise and M. Menken; LNTS 358; London: T&T Clark, 2007), 118–35.

²⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 121. The textual variant here is of no great consequence for this allusion.

²⁷⁸ Roy E. Ciampa and Brian S. Rosner, "1 Corinthians," in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 695–752. Cf. Richard B. Hays, *First Corinthians* (Interpretation; Louisville: John Knox, 1997), 88.

²⁷⁹ Ciampa and Rosner, "1 Corinthians," 711; Rosner, "1 and 2 Corinthians," 125.

²⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 127.

in 1 Cor 8.4, Paul again takes up the *Shema* in 8.6. It will be helpful to show the similarities between the relevant portions of these passages:²⁸¹

Deut 6.4 LXX	1 Cor 8.6
<p>ἄκουε Ἰσραὴλ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν κύριος εἷς ἐστίν</p>	<p>ἀλλ' ἡμῖν εἷς θεὸς ὁ πατήρ ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν, καὶ εἷς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτοῦ</p>

Richard Bauckham observes the connections between the two passages:

Paul has in fact reproduced all the words of the statement about YHWH in the *Shema* ‘...but Paul has rearranged the words in such a way as to produce an affirmation of both one God, the Father, and one Lord, Jesus Christ.’²⁸²

Thus, whereas the *Shema* declares that the Lord, the God of Israel is one, Paul expands this saying to identify the Father of Jesus as the God of the *Shema* and Jesus Christ as the *Shema*’s Lord.²⁸³ Bauckham labels this phenomenon of identifying Jesus Christ as intrinsic to the identity of the one God of Jewish monotheism as *christological monotheism*.²⁸⁴

In 1 Cor 9.9 Paul applies the prohibition from Deut 25.4 against muzzling an ox while it “treads out the grain” (RSV) to illustrate his right to remuneration for his labors.²⁸⁵ Deut 32.17 (ἐθυσαν δαιμονίοις καὶ οὐ θεῷ) provides Paul with fitting language to communicate the abhorrence of implicit idolatry among the Corinthians

²⁸¹ This structure of 1 Cor 8.6 is adapted from Wright, *Climax*, 129.

²⁸² Richard Bauckham, *God Crucified: Monotheism and Christology in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 38.

²⁸³ Other scholars who argue for an expanded *Shema* in 1 Cor 8.6 include Wright, *Climax*, 125–32; Gordon D. Fee, *Pauline Christology: An Exegetical-Theological Study* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2007), 89–94; Larry W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 114.

²⁸⁴ So Bauckham, *God Crucified*, 26–27.

²⁸⁵ Ciampa and Rosner, “1 Corinthians,” 720; Hays, *First Corinthians*, 151. Cf. Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 685–88.

in 1 Cor 10.20 (ἃ θύουσιν, δαιμονίοις καὶ οὐ θεῶ),²⁸⁶ and Paul’s question in 1 Cor 10.22 asking if the Lord will be provoked to jealousy (ἢ παραζηλοῦμεν τὸν κύριον); recalls the Lord’s statement in Deut 32.21 (αὐτοὶ παρεζήλωσάν με).²⁸⁷ Other possible Deuteronomic allusions in 1 Corinthians include Deut 15.14 in 1 Cor 16.2 and Deut 31.6–7, 13 in 1 Cor 16.23.²⁸⁸ In 2 Cor 13.1 Paul cites the witness laws of Deut 19.15, possibly indicating his view that his three visits to the Corinthians were equivalent to three witnesses.²⁸⁹

Although a number of other instances of Deuteronomic influence in Pauline thought could be cited, a final passage to be considered is Phil 2.15. Here it is very likely that Paul, although no explicit citation is present, alludes to Deut 32.5.²⁹⁰ In Deut 32.5 Moses accuses Israel of revoking their status as children of God (ἡμάρτοσαν οὐκ αὐτῷ τέκνα μωμητά) as part of a crooked and distorted generation (γενεὰ σκολιὰ καὶ διεστραμμένη), whereas Paul in Phil 2.15 encourages the Philippians to be blameless children of God (τέκνα θεοῦ ἄμωμα) in the midst of a crooked and distorted generation (μέσον γενεᾶς σκολιᾶς καὶ διεστραμμένης).²⁹¹ When viewed in light of the command in 2.14 to do all things χωρὶς γογγυσμῶν καὶ διαλογισμῶν, Paul probably cites Deut 32.5 in order to urge the Philippians to submit to, and not grumble against, their leaders (cf. Exod 15.24; 16.2, 7–9, 12; Num 14.27; 17.5, 10).²⁹²

²⁸⁶ Hays, *First Corinthians*, 169–70; Rosner, “Deuteronomy in 1 and 2 Corinthians,” 130–31. 1 Cor 10.20 involves some textual questions, but the shared language with Deut 32 would be clear regardless of which variant from NA27 one might choose.

²⁸⁷ Rosner, “1 and 2 Corinthians,” 131. The references to Deut 32 in 1 Cor 10 suggest that the background of “the Rock” in 1 Cor 10.4 may also derive from Deut 32 (vv. 4, 15, 18, 30–31, 37), although this title is only found in the MT. Cf. John W. Olley, “A Precursor of the NRSV? ‘Sons and Daughters’ in 2 Cor 6.18,” *NTS* 44 (1998): 204–12.

²⁸⁸ Rosner, “1 and 2 Corinthians,” 132–33.

²⁸⁹ Peter Balla, “2 Corinthians,” in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 753–83.

²⁹⁰ So Peter T. O’Brien, *The Epistle to the Philippians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 294; Moisés Silva, *Philippians* (2d ed.; BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), 124–25.

²⁹¹ Further supporting this is the occurrence of ἄμωμητα attested in D F G Ψ 1739 1881 al. This variant has likely been influenced by the OG of Deut 32.5 (LXX: μωμητά).

²⁹² So Silva, *Philippians*, 123–24.

2.3.1.2 Synoptic Gospels and Acts

Having seen the extent to which Deuteronomy has influenced Pauline thought, attention will now be given to the various ways Deuteronomy is engaged in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts. Assuming the Two-Source Hypothesis, Mark is the earliest gospel and therefore may be considered first. Steve Moyise suggests five or six Deuteronomic citations in Mark, and at least six other significant allusions,²⁹³ which is a very conservative estimate. The first citation comes from the Decalogue (Deut 5.16/Exod 20.12) in Mark 7.10 in relation to the practice of *corban*, which actually undermined the Law's demand to honor one's parents.²⁹⁴ The interpretation of Deut 24.1–4 is the focus of the controversy over divorce in Mark 10.4. In contrast to those who sought to make divorce normative, Jesus suggests Deut 24 is “a text of concession, not a text of intention.”²⁹⁵ A second reference to the Decalogue (Deut 5.16–20/Exod 20.12–16) comes in Jesus' encounter with the rich young man in Mark 10.19, in which he affirms the need to obey the (second half of) the Decalogue, before calling the young man to sell his possessions and follow Jesus.²⁹⁶ In Mark 12.19 the Pharisees and Herodians quote Deut 25.5 in their attempt to trick Jesus, but the issue focuses more on the resurrection than on the interpretation of this passage.²⁹⁷ Significantly, Jesus identifies the *Shema* (Deut 6.4–5) as the greatest commandment only in Mark 12.29–30.²⁹⁸

Some of the more widely recognized Deuteronomic allusions in Mark include Deut 18.15, a familiar text that applies the expectation of the coming Prophet who is to be heeded (σου αὐτοῦ ἀκούσασθε) to Jesus in his Transfiguration in Mark 9.4, 7 (ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ).²⁹⁹ Less obvious, though a possibility that should not to be dismissed too quickly, is the role of Deut 30.15 in Mark 3.4. Here Jesus' healing a

²⁹³ Steve Moyise, “Deuteronomy in Mark's Gospel,” in *Deuteronomy in the New Testament* (ed. S. Moyise and M. Menken; LNTS 358; London: T&T Clark, 2007), 26–41.

²⁹⁴ So *ibid.*, 27–28.

²⁹⁵ James R. Edwards, *The Gospel according to Mark* (PNTC; Leicester: Apollos, 2002), 301. In addition, the description of Israel's σκληροκαρδία in Mark 10.5 may recall the same term in Deut 10.16. Cf. Rikk E. Watts, “Mark,” in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 111–249.

²⁹⁶ Cf. *ibid.*, 200.

²⁹⁷ So Moyise, “Deuteronomy in Mark's Gospel,” 33.

²⁹⁸ Adela Yarbro Collins, *Mark: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 572.

²⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 423–26. But see also the possible role of Exodus, noted in §6.2.3.

man with a withered hand on the Sabbath may recall the choice between life and death presented Israel in Deut 30. Watts suggests:

If [Mark had Jewish tradition] in view, then in “stretching out his hand” (cf. Sir. 15:16) in response to the Torah embodied in Jesus, the curse of powerlessness (Deut. 28:20, 32) is reversed and the man finds life (Deut. 30:15, 29) as a new hand is given to him in the house of the Lord in fulfilment of Isaiah’s new exodus (Isa. 56:4–5).³⁰⁰

Deuteronomic allusions are also found in Mark 13, including the warning against being led astray by false signs and wonders (Mark 13.22/Deut 13.1–2), and God’s gathering his people from the ends of the world (Mark 13.27 [καὶ ἐπισυνάξει τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων ἀπ’ ἄκρου γῆς ἕως ἄκρου οὐρανοῦ]/Deut 30.4 [ἀπ’ ἄκρου τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἕως ἄκρου τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐκεῖθεν συνάξει σε κύριος ὁ θεός σου]).³⁰¹

A number of citations from Deuteronomy in Luke are taken over from Mark (Luke 10.27/Deut 6.5 [or 10.12]; Luke 18.20/Deut 5.17–20 [or Exod 20.12–16]; Luke 20.28/Deut 25.5–6). Significantly, all three of Jesus’ responses to the Devil in the Temptation Narrative, which likely derive from Q, are citations from Deuteronomy (Luke 4.4/Deut 8.3; Luke 4.8/Deut 6.13 [or 10.20]; Luke 4.12/Deut 6.16).³⁰²

On a larger scale, David Moessner has argued for an organizing “fourfold Exodus typology based on the calling and fate of Moses in Deuteronomy as a heuristic principle for the plotted story in [Luke] 9:51–19:44”—a section which is previewed by a portrait of Jesus as the Prophet (9.1–50) drawn largely from Deut 18.15–19. Moessner notes some unique connections among the Synoptics between Jesus and Moses in 9.1–50, including only Luke’s version of the heavenly voice at the Transfiguration matches Deut 18.15b LXX in both vocabulary and word order.³⁰³

³⁰⁰ Watts, “Mark,” 144. For the relationship between “hand” and male genitalia (and thus the reference to Isa 56.4–5), Watts notes Song 5.4; Isa 57.8.

³⁰¹ Moyise, “Deuteronomy in Mark’s Gospel,” 38.

³⁰² Dietrich Rusam, “Deuteronomy in Luke-Acts,” in *Deuteronomy in the New Testament* (ed. S. Moyise and M. Menken; LNTS 358; London: T&T Clark, 2007), 63–81.

³⁰³ David P. Moessner, *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 7, 46, 60–61. For more parallels, see pp. 60–70.

Moessner further connects the Lukan travel narrative (Luke 9.51–19.44) to Deuteronomy in a number of ways. He observes the descriptions of the fecundity of the Promised Land (Deut 6.3; 8.8; 14.23–26; 32.13–14; etc.), the primacy of eating, drinking, and rejoicing in the Land (Deut 12–26), and Israel’s lack in the wilderness which anticipated (and warned against) their future filling (Deut 8.2–14; 28.31–33, 53–57; 31.20; 32.15). He then points out ways Jesus leads his people to a fuller, and surprising, experience of “eating and drinking” in the presence of the Lord (Luke 13.25) in ways that recall the language and concerns of Deuteronomy. In addition to Luke 13.25, Moessner notes in conjunction with meals such features as the Deuteronomic concern for the poor (Luke 14.13–14/Deut 15.1–18) and the overindulgence of the wealthy that leads to idolatry (Luke 16.14–15/Deut 11.16). Jesus, the rejected Prophet, includes in his feasting “the poor and the outcast, women and tax collectors, in short the children of the covenant... while the rest of all Israel persisting in their stubborn resistance shut themselves out.” Moessner concludes that, for Luke, the Mosaic vision of a new Exodus that was even greater than the past (Deut 30.1–10) has been accomplished in Jesus Christ, fulfilling the joy of the feast (Deut 26.1–11).³⁰⁴

Moessner’s study is perhaps most convincing in his comparisons with Jesus as the Prophet like Moses from Deuteronomy. Although it is clear that there are numerous other parallels with Deuteronomic imagery in the Lukan travel narrative, it is not as clear whether this provides the interpretive key for the entire section. Nevertheless, Moessner’s monograph makes a strong case for the importance of Deuteronomy in Luke, such that Deuteronomic themes should be given due consideration when one studies Luke’s gospel.

Deuteronomy is also cited twice in Acts, identifying Jesus as the expected Prophet of Deut 18 (Acts 3.22/Deut 18.15–20; Acts 7.37/Deut 18.15).³⁰⁵ Deut 15.4 is echoed in Acts 4.34,³⁰⁶ and Deut 21.22 serves as the background for the references to Jesus’ death on a tree in Acts 5.30; 10.39, although the theological implications

³⁰⁴ Ibid., 264–77.

³⁰⁵ Allison, *New Moses*, 89, 100; C. K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (2 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994–98), 1:207–9.

³⁰⁶ I. Howard Marshall, “Acts,” in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 513–606.

are not explored in detail as in Gal 3.13.³⁰⁷ In addition, the inheritance mentioned by Paul in Acts 20.32 may reflect the inheritance given by God to his people in Deut 33.3–4.³⁰⁸

As noted in the previous chapter, Matthew contains more citations to Deuteronomy than either Mark or Luke. By Menken's count, Matthew includes five citations to Deuteronomy from Mark (Matt 15.4/Deut 5.16 [or Exod 20.12]; Matt 19.7/Deut 24.1, 3; Matt 19.18–19/Deut 5.16–20 [or Exod 20.12–16]; Matt 22.24/Deut 25.5; Matt 22.37/Deut 6.5), and a cluster of three citations from Q (Matt 4.4/Deut 8.3; Matt 4.7/Deut 6.16; Matt 4.10/Deut 6.16[or 10.20]). In addition, four of the five uniquely Matthean citations to Deuteronomy are found in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt 5.21/Deut 5.17 [or Exod 20.13]; Matt 5.27/Deut 5.18 [or Exod 20.14]; Matt 5.31/Deut 24.1, 3; Matt 5.38/Deut 19.21 [or Exod 21.24/Lev 24.20]; cf. Matt 18.16/Deut 19.15).³⁰⁹ Additionally, as mentioned in the previous chapter, the prevalence of Deuteronomic citations enhances the plausibility that numerous other allusions to Deuteronomy abound in Matthew. Some of these will be considered in chapters 5–7, where it will also be argued that Matthew was not limited to his sources for his knowledge of Deuteronomy, and that Matthew has unique emphases that can be attributed to his reading of Deuteronomy. At this point it will suffice to note the suggestive comment of Thomas Brodie that Deuteronomy was the most influential OT book for the author of Matthew.³¹⁰

2.3.1.4 Hebrews

In a recent monograph David Allen has convincingly shown that Deuteronomy serves as a Scriptural background for the hortatory portions of Hebrews.³¹¹ He suggests 21 citations of and allusions to Deuteronomy in Hebrews,

³⁰⁷ James D. G. Dunn, *The Partings of the Ways: Between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity* (2d ed.; London: SCM Press, 2006), 78.

³⁰⁸ Marshall, "Acts," 597. Cf. Deut 4.21, 38; 12.9–10; 15.4; 19.3, 10, 14; 20.16; 21.23; 24.4; 25.19; 26.1; 31.7.

³⁰⁹ Menken, "Deuteronomy in Matthew's Gospel," 42. Menken includes two other, freer citations in the Sermon on the Mount: Matt 5.33/Deut 5.11, 20; 23.22; Matt 5.43/Deut 7.2; 20.16; 23.4, 7.

³¹⁰ Brodie, "Fish, Temple, Tithe, and Remission: The God-based Generosity of Deuteronomy 14–15 as One Component of Matthew 17:22–18:35," *RB* 99 (1992): 697–718, here 699. The significance of this statement is underscored when we consider the extent to which the OT in general is important for Matthew.

³¹¹ Allen, *Deuteronomy and Exhortation*, 12.

most of which come from Deut 28–34.³¹² More specifically, many of these derive from the Song of Moses, with some of the more explicit including Heb 1.6/Deut 32.43; Heb 3.12/Deut 32.15; Heb 10.30/Deut 32.35–36.³¹³ Another noteworthy reference for the present study is the citation of Deut 8.5 in Heb. 12.7, which compares God’s discipline of his people to a father’s discipline of his son.³¹⁴ The work of Allen also draws attention to thematic parallels including covenant, blessings/curses,³¹⁵ land,³¹⁶ and rhetorical affinities. Allen concludes that Hebrews becomes a new Deuteronomy, presenting its audience with the Deuteronomic choice between blessing and curse.³¹⁷ Allen has undoubtedly mounted an impressive cumulative argument that Deuteronomy is of primary relevance for the exhortatory portions of Hebrews.

2.3.1.5 Gospel of John and Revelation

Although the Gospel of John is not normally seen to contain explicit quotations of Deuteronomy,³¹⁸ it would be wrong to assume that there is no evidence of Deuteronomic influence in the fourth gospel. The witness laws of Deut 19.15 (and/or Deut 17.6) serve as the background for Jesus’ comments in John 8.17 (cf. 5.31–34),³¹⁹ and allusions to the expected Prophet of Deut 18.15 are numerous (John 1.21; 4.19–26; 6.14; 7.40; cf. 5.46).³²⁰ Steyn argues that Deut 6.4 (κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν κύριος εἷς ἐστίν) is in view in John 8.54 (θεὸς ἡμῶν ἐστίν), since the former is the only possible OT passage explicitly claiming that God is Israel’s God.³²¹ The

³¹² Gert Steyn (“Deuteronomy in Hebrews,” in *Deuteronomy in the New Testament* [ed. S. Moyise and M. Menken; LNTS 358; London: T&T Clark, 2007], 152–68) suggests only nine possible quotations or allusions to Deuteronomy in Hebrews. Unlike Allen, Steyn address neither the less explicit echoes, nor the thematic parallels. For a detailed discussion and demonstration of all 21 citations/allusions see Allen, *Deuteronomy and Exhortation*, 43–109.

³¹³ *Ibid.*, 43–75.

³¹⁴ Cf. William L. Lane, *Hebrews 9–13* (WBC 47A; Dallas: Word, 1991), 420.

³¹⁵ Cf. Heb 2.1–4; 6.4–8; 10.26–31; 12.14–17/Deut 11.26–32; 28.1–30.20 (Allen, *Deuteronomy and Exhortation*, 110–43).

³¹⁶ Cf. Heb 3.7–4.11; 11.1–30 (Allen, *Deuteronomy and Exhortation*, 143–55).

³¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 156–98, 225.

³¹⁸ So Andreas J. Köstenberger, “John,” in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 415–512.

³¹⁹ Michale Labahn, “Deuteronomy in John’s Gospel,” in *Deuteronomy in the New Testament* (ed. S. Moyise and M. Menken; LNTS 358; London: T&T Clark, 2007), 82–98.

³²⁰ Köstenberger, “John,” 443; Allison, *New Moses*, 89.

³²¹ Steyn, “John’s Gospel,” 87. He also argues that Deut 6.4 is in view in John 5.44 (88).

Son's priority to raise the dead and give new life in John 5.21 (γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ἐγείρει τοὺς νεκροὺς καὶ ζῶοποιεῖ, οὕτως καὶ ὁ υἱὸς οὐδὲν θέλει ζῶοποιεῖν) may reflect the similar description of God in Deut 32.39 (ἐγὼ ἀποκτενῶ καὶ ζῆν ποιήσω), and Mosaic imagery from Deuteronomy may be found, among other places, in John 5.37/Deut 4.12;³²² John 5.45/Deut 31.26.³²³ Finally, it may be noted that Jesus' promise to prepare a place for his disciples (John 14.1–2) may recall Yahweh's preparation of the Promised Land for his people (Deut 1.29–33).³²⁴

Deuteronomy is one of the many voices that can be heard from the intertextual *mélange* of Revelation—a book that is permeated by the OT more than any other NT book.³²⁵ Michael Tilly suggests 19 references to Deuteronomy in Revelation. Probable allusions include the opening of the mouth of the earth (Rev 12.16/Deut 11.6),³²⁶ the covenantal curse of “evil sores” (Rev 16.2/Deut 28.35),³²⁷ the judgments on behalf of God's people (Rev 6.10; 19.2/Deut 32.43 LXX), sacrifices to demons (Rev 9.20/Deut 32.17),³²⁸ the swearing by one who lives forever (Rev 10.5–6/Deut 32.40; cf. Dan 12.7),³²⁹ and the recognition that all of God's ways are just (Rev 15.3/Deut 32.4).³³⁰ It is therefore fitting to conclude that Deuteronomy was known and utilized by the author(s) of John and Revelation.

2.3.1.5 NT Summary

This brief survey has argued that Deuteronomy was a commonly used source for NT authors. Deuteronomy seems to be extremely important for Romans, Hebrews, and Matthew. Although certain portions of Deuteronomy may be more

³²² Ibid., 90–91.

³²³ Köstenberger, “John” 443.

³²⁴ Andreas J. Köstenberger and Scott R. Swain, *Father, Son, and Spirit: The Trinity and John's Gospel* (NSBT 24; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2008), 143n.47.

³²⁵ So G. K. Beale and Sean M. McDonough, “Revelation,” in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 1081–1158.

³²⁶ Michael Tilly, “Deuteronomy in Revelation,” in *Deuteronomy in the New Testament* (ed. S. Moyise and M. Menken; LNTS 358; London: T&T Clark, 2007), 169–88. However, Beale and McDonough (“Revelation,” 1126) focus on the parallels with Exod 15.12 in this verse.

³²⁷ Beale and McDonough, “Revelation,” 1135; Tilly, “Deuteronomy in Revelation,” 171.

³²⁸ Ibid., 173–74; Beale and McDonough, “Revelation,” 1115.

³²⁹ Ibid., 1117; Tilly, “Deuteronomy in Revelation,” 174.

³³⁰ Ibid., 1134; Tilly, “Deuteronomy in Revelation,” 176.

prevalent in the NT (e.g., Decalogue, *Shema*, Song of Moses, blessings/curses), the NT authors drew from a wide sample of Deuteronomic material to make a variety of exegetical and hortatory points.

2.3.2 Apostolic Fathers

At least two early, non-canonical Christian writings from the eclectic corpus known as the Apostolic Fathers also exhibit Deuteronomic influence. The most extensive of these is the *Epistle of Barnabas*, which can be dated somewhere between 70–135 C.E.³³¹ A central concern of the author is the correct understanding of Torah,³³² and Deuteronomy in particular. The author interprets Scripture allegorically,³³³ and claims that Christians are the true heirs of the covenantal promises.³³⁴ Deuteronomy 9.12 (καὶ εἶπεν κύριος πρὸς με ἀνάστηθι κατὰβηθι τὸ τάχος ἐντεῦθεν ὅτι ἠνόμησεν ὁ λαὸς σου οὐς ἐξήγαγες ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου) is cited in *Barn.* 4.8 (λέγει γὰρ οὕτως κύριος . . . κατὰβηθι τὸ τάχος, ὅτι ἠνόμησεν ὁ λαὸς σου, οὐς ἐξήγαγες ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου);³³⁵ the need for God's people to circumcise their hearts in *Barn.* 9.5 (Περιτιμήθητε τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν) recalls Deut 10.16 (περιτεμεῖσθε τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν); *Barn.* 10.2 names Deuteronomy explicitly (Δευτερονομίῳ), and the notion of covenant here may be taken from Deut 4.10, 13; the prohibition against idolatry in *Barn.* 12.6 (Οὐκ ἔσται ὑμῖν οὔτε χωνευτὸν οὔτε γλυπτὸν εἰς θεὸν ὑμῖν) demonstrates parallels with Deut 27.15 (ἐπικατάρατος ἄνθρωπος ὅστις ποιήσει γλυπτὸν καὶ χωνευτόν; cf. Lev 26.1); and the Decalogue (Deut 5.6–21/Exod 20.1–17) is alluded to throughout *Barn.* 19. In addition, legal portions of Deuteronomy (and/or Leviticus) are echoed in *Barn.* 10.1 (Deut 14.8–14; also Lev 11.7–15) and *Barn.* 10.11 (Deut 14.6; also Lev 11.3).

On a macro level, Deuteronomy may well have provided the overarching structure for *Barnabas*. The interplay of polemics (*Barn.* 2–17) and paraenesis

³³¹ See the introductions in Bart D. Ehrman, *The Apostolic Fathers* (2 vols.; LCL; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003), 2:7; Michael W. Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts with English Translations* (3d ed.; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 373.

³³² James Carleton Paget, “The *Epistle of Barnabas*,” in *The Writings of the Apostolic Fathers* (ed. Paul Foster; London: T&T Clark, 2007), 72–80; repr. from *ExpT* 117 (2006): 441–46.

³³³ Holmes, *Apostolic Fathers*, 372.

³³⁴ Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2:3.

³³⁵ For suggestions regarding this reference and those that follow, see the editions of Ehrman, Holmes.

(*Barn.* 18–21),³³⁶ or exegesis and ethics,³³⁷ reflects Deuteronomy’s alternation between exhortation and law. More pointedly, Rhodes suggests that the teaching of the Two Ways (*Barn.* 18–21) draws heavily from the tradition of Deut 30.15–18, and the focus on choice, walking in God’s ways, reward and retribution, and the appeal to learn from God’s righteous requirements (cf. Deut 5.1) further reflect Deuteronomy. Rhodes also suggests that it is “particularly noteworthy” that an eschatological urgency accompanies the exhortation in *Barnabas*, much like Deuteronomy, and the most significant evidence for the author’s “Christianized Deuteronomism” is in the repeated allusions to the curses upon Israel for their maltreatment of Jesus.³³⁸

Deuteronomic thought is also apparent in *1 Clement*, which, like *Barnabas*, is concerned with direct citations of the Christian OT.³³⁹ Traditionally dated 95–96 C.E.,³⁴⁰ *1 Clement* cites or references portions of the Song of Moses in at least three places. These include the allusion to the fatness of God’s beloved (*1 Clem.* 3.1/Deut 32.15), the precise, verbal correspondence to Deut 32.8–9 in *1 Clem.* 29.2,³⁴¹ and the close echo of Deut 32.39 (ἐγὼ ἀποκτείνω καὶ ζῆν ποιήσω) in *1 Clem.* 59.3 (τὸν ἀποκτείνονται καὶ ζῆν ποιῶνται). Additionally, *1 Clem.* 52.3–4 cites almost verbatim Deut 9.12–14.³⁴²

It is thus reasonable to conclude that the authors of *1 Clement* and *Barnabas*, much like a number of NT authors, utilized Deuteronomy as an important scriptural source in their articulation of Christian doctrine.

³³⁶ James N. Rhodes, *The Epistle of Barnabas and the Deuteronomic Tradition: Polemics, Paraenesis, and the Legacy of the Golden-Calf Incident* (WUNT II/188; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 90.

³³⁷ Paget, “*Barnabas*,” 77. Cf. the Damascus Document.

³³⁸ Rhodes, “*Barnabas*,” 93–107. *Barnabas* 4.14 may reference Matt 22.14, but this is disputed (Paget, “*Barnabas*,” 76n.30).

³³⁹ James Carleton Paget, “The *Epistle of Barnabas* and the Writings that Later Formed the New Testament,” in *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (ed. Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett; Oxford: OUP, 2005), 229–49.

³⁴⁰ Holmes, *Apostolic Fathers*, 36.

³⁴¹ *1 Clem.* 29.2 does, however, omit one καί.

³⁴² For textual details, see Donald A. Hagner, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome* (NovTSup 34; Leiden: Brill, 1973), 40–41.

2.4 Summary and Conclusions

The aim of this chapter has been to illustrate the wide circulation and use of Deuteronomy in Jewish and Christian literature in order to enhance the plausibility that the author of Matthew may have known and utilized Deuteronomy as an important text in his gospel. Indeed, the frequency with which Jewish and Christian authors reference Deuteronomy is immensely striking. The widespread circulation of and appeal to Deuteronomy up to and including the first century illustrates Deuteronomy's well-established place as a prominent piece of literature in its own right, and indicate an interpretive milieu that render it very likely Matthew knew Deuteronomy beyond what he might have found in his sources. A few summarizing comments of the use and transmission of Deuteronomy are in order:

1) The above survey indicates that passages from throughout Deuteronomy (i.e., both narrative/exhortatory and legal portions) were known and utilized.

2) Yet some portions of and themes from Deuteronomy were especially popular, including Deut 5–6, 8, 10–11, 27–30, 32.

3) Deuteronomic texts were interpreted in a variety of ways. Authors appealed to Deuteronomy to give rationale for new laws, to vindicate the legitimacy of Christianity, to highlight the covenantal dimensions of God's relationship to his people, and to articulate the character of the Messiah. Excerpts from Deuteronomy were also used as devotional and liturgical texts. Although Deuteronomy was an authoritative text for the authors of these writings, some of them nevertheless felt the freedom to redact Deuteronomy as supposed instruments of new revelation.

4) Deuteronomy's language and/or structure was often used as a pattern or exemplar for other writings that stand in the Deuteronomic tradition. Examples include the Damascus Document and *Barnabas*, with their alternation between legal and hortatory sections, and Hebrews, with its adaptation of Deuteronomy's exhortatory techniques.

Having thus considered the widespread influence of Deuteronomy in general, the next chapter will turn to the specific theme(s) of sonship and obedience within this prominent book.

Chapter Three

Sonship and Obedience in Deuteronomy

3.1 The Importance of Deuteronomy

As illustrated in the previous chapter, the significance of Deuteronomy in the ancient world can hardly be overstated. More recently, modern scholars have often focused on Deuteronomy as a key for such theological positions as the Tetrateuch/Hexateuch proposals of the 20th century, theories of the Deuteronomistic history,¹ and it is the lynchpin for Wellhausen's source-critical theory of the Pentateuch.² It has even been argued that Deuteronomy is the most important book for constructing an OT theology,³ and that no book is more basic for understanding the NT.⁴

One advancement in Deuteronomic studies over the past fifty years is the application of insights gained from ancient Near Eastern (ANE) suzerain-vassal treaties to the form and content of Deuteronomy.⁵ Taking its cue from such studies, this chapter

¹ J. Gordon McConville, *Deuteronomy* (ApOTC 5; Leicester: Apollos; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2002), 18, 29.

² Brevard S. Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 204.

³ Bruce K. Waltke with Charles Yu, *An Old Testament Theology: An Exegetical, Canonical, and Thematic Approach* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2007), 479. Cf. J. Gordon McConville, *Grace in the End: A Study in Deuteronomistic Theology* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1993), 12–13.

⁴ So Elizabeth Achtemeier, *Deuteronomy, Jeremiah* (Proclamation; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978), 9. Cf. Christopher J. H. Wright, *Deuteronomy* (NIBCOT 4; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1996), 1.

⁵ A brief survey includes: George E. Mendenhall, "Ancient Oriental and Biblical Law," *BA* 17 (1954): 26–46; *idem*, "Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition," *BA* 17 (1954): 50–76; Meredith G. Kline, *Treaty of the Great King: The Covenant Structure of Deuteronomy—Studies and Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963); Dennis J. McCarthy, *Treaty and Covenant: A Study in Form in the Ancient Oriental Documents and in the Old Testament* (AnBib 21; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963); Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972), 66; Peter C. Craigie, *The Book of Deuteronomy* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), 36–45; McConville, *Grace in the End*, 57–64. For a recent and thorough study of OT covenants in general, see Scott W. Hahn, *Kinship by*

will argue that one of the major ways the covenantal bond between Yahweh and his people is expressed in Deuteronomy is in terms of the father-son relationship. Indeed, the nation of Israel as son of God is important throughout the OT, and this finds its foundational expression in Deuteronomy.⁶ Despite the prominence of Israel's sonship in Deuteronomy, the perspective of the final book of the Pentateuch is often neglected in conversations dealing with the fatherhood of God or the foundations of Son of God terminology in the NT.⁷ This chapter will attempt to help alleviate such lacunae, and will particularly be interested in aspects of sonship in Deuteronomy that may be relevant for the Gospel of Matthew.

Although the present study is primarily focused on Matthew's knowledge of Deuteronomy, in order to explain most fully the relationship of sonship and obedience in Deuteronomy the covenantal context of the book must first be sketched. This is because the basis for the union of sonship and obedience in Deuteronomy is its covenantal character. Thus, "[i]t is against the background of the covenant that the divine sonship of Israel is to be understood."⁸ Even though Matthew may not have been aware of all the details pertaining to the nature of ANE covenants, brief sideways glances to the nature of ancient covenants throughout this study will be beneficial since this appears to be the immediate context providing the framework for sonship and obedience. Indeed, in chapter 4 it will be argued that the themes of sonship and obedience often reoccur in covenantal contexts. This renders it more likely that Matthew may have also connected sonship and obedience with covenant. Moreover, if, as it is argued in chapters 5–7, Matthew consciously articulated Jesus' sonship and obedience in a way that evoked Deuteronomy, it is quite likely that he was aware of the covenantal nature of

Covenant: A Canonical Approach to the Fulfillment of God's Saving Promises (AYBRL; New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2009).

⁶ So Trevor J. Burke, *Adopted into God's Family: Exploring a Pauline Metaphor* (NSBT 22; Nottingham: Apollos; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2006), 50. This study will consider son, sonship, son of God, son of Yahweh to be virtually equivalent. Assuming a NT perspective, this study will use *Yahweh* and *God* interchangeably.

⁷ This observation is foundational to the recent dissertation: James Earl Harriman, "Our Father in Heaven: The Dimensions of Divine Paternity in Deuteronomy" (Ph.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2005).

⁸ John L. McKenzie, "The Divine Sonship of Israel and the Covenant," *CBQ* 8 (1946): 320–31, here 330.

Deuteronomy (since the theme is prevalent in the book itself), even if he may not have been familiar with the specific contours of ANE covenants in general.

3.1.1 Deuteronomy and Covenant

Before surveying the primary texts in Deuteronomy that speak of the father-son relationship, the covenantal features of the book should be noted. The concept of *covenant* is often utilized as an important rubric for organizing OT studies.⁹ Moreover, Deuteronomy occupies a significant place in discussions of OT covenants given the wide recognition that it exhibits many characteristics of ANE suzerain-vassal treaties.¹⁰ Some even suggest that the entirety of Deuteronomy has been purposefully crafted to accord with the structure of such documents.¹¹ Although there is no unanimity of opinion regarding the extent to which Deuteronomy has drawn from ANE treaties, there is nevertheless widespread agreement that the book should be considered a covenant document.¹² Therefore, covenant may provide a framework for interpreting the

⁹ Two examples will suffice. First, Walter Eichrodt organized his *Theology of the Old Testament* (trans. J. Baker; 2 vols.; OTL; London: SCM Press, 1961–67), especially volume one, around the concept of covenant. Similarly, Bernhard W. Anderson's *Contours of Old Testament Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999) focuses on particular covenants made with Noah, Abraham, Moses, and David to provide the framework for his study. See also John Barton, "Covenant in Old Testament Theology," in *Covenant as Context: Essays in Honour of E. W. Nicholson* (ed. A. Mayes and R. Salters; Oxford: OUP, 2003), 22–38.

¹⁰ Much of the groundwork for this view was provided by Mendenhall, "Covenant Forms," 50–76. Some scholars hold that Deuteronomy primarily draws from Hittite treaties of the second millennium B.C.E. (Kline, *Treaty*, 28; Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 79; K. A. Kitchen, *Ancient Orient and the Old Testament* [London: Tyndale, 1966], 90–102). Others maintain that Deuteronomy has more in common with later Assyrian documents of the first millennium B.C.E. (Patrick D. Miller, *Deuteronomy* [IBC; Louisville: John Knox, 1990], 14; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomistic School*, 60).

¹¹ Kline (*Treaty*, 28ff) argues for the integrity of Deuteronomy based on the treaty structure he sees of the entire book. Others caution against making the parallels too precise, suggesting that not all the components of Deuteronomy fit neatly into a set pattern (so McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 19). A. D. H. Mayes (*Deuteronomy: Based on the Revised Standard Version* [NCB; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; London: Marshall, Morgan, and Scott, 1979], 34–35) believes many place too much emphasis on ANE documents in their studies of Deuteronomy. He notes that Deuteronomy does not set itself forth as a treaty document, and it would be improper to "transfer directly and immediately" from the literary contexts of ancient treaties to the literary context of Deuteronomy. Nevertheless, even he acknowledges that the form, vocabulary, and ideas of Deuteronomy have been affected by ANE treaties.

¹² Miller, *Deuteronomy*, 11–12; McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 19, 44; Anthony Phillips, *Deuteronomy: A Commentary* (CBC; Cambridge: CUP, 1973), 4; William L. Moran, "The Ancient Near Eastern Background of the Love of God in Deuteronomy," *CBQ* 25 (1963): 77–87; Dennis J. McCarthy, *Old Testament Covenant: A Survey of Current Opinions* (Growing Points in Theology; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1973), 22; Delbert R. Hillers, *Covenant: The History of a Biblical Idea* (Baltimore: Johns

theological distinctives of Deuteronomy.¹³ Accordingly, it will serve the present chapter well to consider passages and themes in Deuteronomy in light of its covenantal makeup.

Determining a definition for covenant is difficult due to the multiplicity of issues and traditions one must consider. However, most scholars readily agree that a central aspect of covenant in the OT, and Deuteronomy in particular, is the *special relationship* between Yahweh and Israel.¹⁴ This study will consider a covenant to be: “an elected, as opposed to natural, relationship of obligation established under divine sanction.”¹⁵ This definition highlights both the relational and obligatory aspects of the covenant.¹⁶ These two aspects are consistent with what is known of many ancient extra-biblical covenants, whereby a king (=suzerain) would seal his beneficence to a lesser people by recounting privileges bestowed,¹⁷ while also requiring certain obligations in return.¹⁸ The covenant agreement would thus establish the relationship *and* stipulations between a king and a people (or a lesser king). Similarly, the covenant as expounded in Deuteronomy

Hopkins Press, 1969), 54; Christopher J. H. Wright, *The Mission of God: Unlocking the Bible's Grand Narrative* (Nottingham: InterVarsity, 2006), 375; so G. Ernest Wright, “The Lawsuit of God: A Form-Critical Study of Deuteronomy 32,” in *Israel's Prophetic Heritage: Essay in Honor of James Muilenburg* (ed. B. Anderson and W. Harrleson; London: SCM Press, 1962), 26–67.

¹³ Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 36.

¹⁴ Jeffrey H. Tigay, *The JPS Torah Commentary: Deuteronomy* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1996), xv; McConville, *Grace in the End*, 132; Anderson, *Contours*, 3; Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 37; Mendenhall, “Covenant Forms,” 58; Meredith G. Kline, “Law Covenant,” *WTJ* 27 (1964/65): 1–20.

¹⁵ Gordon Paul Hugenberger, *Marriage as Covenant: A Study of Biblical Law and Ethics Governing Marriage Developed from the Perspective of Malachi* (VTSup 52; Leiden: Brill), 171. This working definition is also adopted (independently of the present research) by David M. Allen (*Deuteronomy and Exhortation in Hebrews: A Study in Narrative Re-presentation* [WUNT II/238; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008], 112–13).

¹⁶ To be sure, scholars often posit several types of covenants with varying degrees of responsibility (so Hahn, *Kinship*, 1–213, especially 30), but Deuteronomy is often considered to be a treaty-type covenant and these clearly entailed obligations. Cf. Moshe Weinfeld, “The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East,” *JAOS* 90 (1970): 184–203.

¹⁷ For an example see “Treaty between Tudhaliya II of Hatti and Sunashshura of Kizzuwatna,” §12 (Gary Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts* [ed. H. Hoffner; SBLWAW 7; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996], 16).

¹⁸ Weinfeld (“*B^erit*—Covenant vs. Obligation,” *Bib* 56 [1975]: 120–28) emphasizes the obligation aspect of the covenant, particularly in response to those who see it *only* as a relationship. He also takes exception to the sharp distinction made by some between *Bund*, *Abkommen*, and *Verpflichtung*. For a survey of other ancient documents that list stipulations for vassals, see Weinfeld, *Deuteronomical School*, 66–100.

distinguished Israel from the surrounding peoples,¹⁹ and effectively bound the nation in obedience to Yahweh.²⁰ These covenantal features provide the cultural backdrop for Deuteronomy.

Particularly significant for the present study is the recognition that the covenantal bond is often described in terms of a father-son relationship. Historically, ancient suzerains were often referred to as “father,” and vassal(s) as “sons” or “children.”²¹ This practice is attested in numerous texts from various kingdoms. In the Mari documents from the 18th century B.C.E. we have the record of a letter sent to king Zimri-Lim from Yatar-Ami, who calls himself the son of Zimri-Lim, although he was not Zimri-Lim’s son in the normal sense.²² Similarly, in Egyptian documents from a couple of centuries later a Hyksos king refers to a Kushite ruler as his son: “Aawoserre, the Son of Re, Apophis greets my son, the ruler of Kush.”²³ In addition, the Amarna letters from the 14th century B.C.E. contain a letter from Rib-Addi of Byblos to a ranking Egyptian official (Amanappa): “To Amanappa, my father, speak: Thus Rib-Addi, thy son: I fall down at the feet of my father.”²⁴ Here is another example of a ruler from one kingdom honoring a political figure from another kingdom using the appellation *father*.²⁵

Although none of these documents is a treaty *per se*, the language is nevertheless indicative of the manner in which kings and officials would employ familial language

¹⁹ R. E. Clements, *God’s Chosen People: A Theological Interpretation of the Book of Deuteronomy* (London: SCM Press, 1968), 32.

²⁰ So Eichrodt, *Theology*, 1:36.

²¹ F. Charles Fensham, “Father and Son as Terminology for Treaty and Covenant,” in *Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William Foxwell Albright* (ed. H. Goedicke; Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1971), 121–35; Harriman, “Our Father,” 97–106.

²² “Punishment by Fire,” translated by William L. Moran (*ANESTP*, 627). Moran notes that in this particular example, *contrary to general usage*, the filial relationship did not denote a vassal relationship, but was an expression of respect (n.56, emphasis added).

²³ “Second Kamose Stele,” lines 20–24 (Edward F. Wente, *Letters from Ancient Egypt* [ed. Edmund S. Meltzer; SBLWAW 1; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990], 26). The following citations will reflect the English translations of these documents.

²⁴ W. F. Albright and William L. Moran, “A Re-interpretation of an Amarna Letter from Byblos (*EA* 82),” in *Amarna Studies: Collected Writings* (HSS 54; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 131–39. Cf. Fensham, “Father and Son,” 122–28.

²⁵ For more on the identity of Amanappa, see the comment on line 1 of this letter in Albright and Moran, “Re-Interpretation,” 134.

when speaking of close political ties. These are relationships that are codified in suzerain-vassal treaties, such as those from the Hittites, which demonstrate parallels with Deuteronomy. For example, the great Hittite king Suppiluliuma in a certain treaty promises to adopt Shattiwaza of Mittanni as his son.²⁶ This Hittite practice is also reflected in the royal inscription of Azatiwata, where it is asserted, “every king made me a father to himself because of my *justice* and my *wisdom* and my goodness.”²⁷ Earlier the document states that Azatiwata had been made a mother and father to the city of Adanawa.²⁸ In light of both these sections, it is reasonable to infer that Azatiwata viewed the citizens of Adanawa as his children in some sense. Another example of this is the Azatiwada inscription, where it is stated, “Baʿal made me a father and a mother to the Danunians. I caused the Danunians to live.”²⁹

These texts help to explain the inclusion of similar familial language in the covenant context of Deuteronomy.³⁰ Tigay notes the metaphor of father and child is used in Deuteronomy to explain God’s actions and Israel’s responsibilities to him.³¹

²⁶ “Treaty between Shattiwaza of Mittanni and Suppiluliuma I of Hatti,” §3 (Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 45).

²⁷ “Azatiwata,” translated by J. D. Hawkins (*COS* 2.21:18).

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 2.21:3.

²⁹ “The Azatiwada Inscription,” translated by K. Lawson Younger, Jr. (*COS* 2.31). Familial imagery is also found in fraternal terms. See “Treaty between Hattusilis and Ramses II,” translated by Albrecht Goetze (*ANET*, 202). Harriman (“Our Father,” 92–106) shows evidence of such familial language in Phoenecian, Ugaritic, and the Ebla tablets. Also, this practice can be seen in Ahaz’s message to Tiglath-Pileser III of Assyria in 2 Kgs 16.7. So Victor H. Matthews and Don C. Benjamin, *Social World of Ancient Israel, 1250–587 BCE* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1993), 9.

One additional point that may be relevant for the present discussion is the claim by many ancient kings to be sons of a god(s). See “The Gebel Barkal Stela of Thutmose III,” translated by James K. Hoffmeier (*COS* 2.2B); “Treaty between the Hittites and Egypt,” translated by John A. Wilson (*ANET*, 199); “The Code of Hammurabi,” translated by Theophile J. Meek (*ANET*, 164). While this practice cannot be ruled out as an influence in Deuteronomy, it does not seem to be the best way to understand the background of the father-son relationship. Normally, such filial claims were made by powerful suzerains. In terms of ANE parallels, this kingly role is attributed to Yahweh, not to Israel, in Deuteronomy.

³⁰ See especially 1.31; 8.5; 14.1; 32.5–6, 15–20. That a *physical* relationship is not in view is the consensus. Cf. G. Fohrer, “υἱός, υἱοθεσία,” *TDNT* 8:340–54. Hahn (*Kinship*, 42) more extensively observes: “the root metaphors of covenant and kinship underwrite the father-son relationship between Yahweh and Israel throughout the various Old Testament traditions and periods of salvation history.”

³¹ Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, xv. See similarly Birger Gerhardsson, *The Testing of God’s Son (Matt 4.1–11 & Par): An Analysis of Early Christian Midrash* (trans. J. Toy; ConBNT 2; Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1966), 32.

McCarthy is even more specific, asserting that Israel's sonship to Yahweh is extremely close, if not identical, to the Deuteronomic idea of the covenant. Moreover, he states that this connection must be remembered even where explicit references to father-son relationship are not found.³² Similarly, L. Kuyper has noted that one cannot speak of the covenant relationship in Deuteronomy without referring to the father-son bond between Yahweh and Israel.³³ Thus, since covenant is a key concept in Deuteronomy,³⁴ it should not be surprising that familial language and imagery are used to communicate central Deuteronomic themes.

Although the familial language of Deuteronomy finds its context and precedent in ANE treaty language, it will be argued in this chapter that the portrayal of the character and activity of Yahweh in Deuteronomy *exceeds* what would have been expected of an earthly suzerain.³⁵ In other words, despite Deuteronomy's similarities with ANE covenants, Deuteronomy is not merely a repetition of what one might find in such documents.³⁶ Instead, the fatherhood of Yahweh in Deuteronomy exhibits a unique character. Thus, although the cultural context(s) of Deuteronomy is significant, the unique features of the father-son texts in Deuteronomy must be considered. It is further to be noted that this focus on the book of Deuteronomy is a more solid foundation for the present study, since it is clear that Matthew knew (at the very least) significant portions of Deuteronomy.³⁷

³² Dennis J. McCarthy, "Notes on the Love of God in Deuteronomy and the Father-Son Relationship between Yahweh and Israel," *CBQ* 27 (1965): 144–47.

³³ Lester J. Kuyper, "The Book of Deuteronomy," *Int* 6 (1952): 321–40. Cf. Mark S. Smith, "'Your People Shall Be My People': Family and Covenant in Ruth 1:16–17," *CBQ* 69 (2007): 242–58

³⁴ Although it would be a mistake to limit the study of covenantal themes in Deuteronomy to instances where בְּרִית is used, it is nevertheless significant that the term is used in at least 26 passages, with διαθήκη (LXX) occurring about as often.

³⁵ Harriman, "Our Father," 223–24.

³⁶ So Christopher J. H. Wright, *Knowing Jesus through the Old Testament: Rediscovering the Roots of Our Faith* (London: Marshall Pickering, 1992), 78.

³⁷ For the argument that the books of the Pentateuch (and therefore Deuteronomy) were widely collected and recognized as authoritative by the turn of the era, see the previous chapter. Cf. Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (SDSSRL; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 21–22, 60; Roger Beckwith, *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church and its Background in Early Judaism* (London: SPCK: 1985), 435–36.

An additional feature that will be important for the remainder of this study is the historical and literary foundation of Israel's sonship in Deuteronomy, which is found in the Exodus.³⁸ This is because the views of sonship in Deuteronomy and Exodus are often linked together in subsequent literature. The most prominent passage in this regard is Exod 4.22–23, where Yahweh refers to Israel as his “firstborn son” (יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּכֹרִי; LXX: πρωτότοκός μου Ισραηλ). This marks the foundational reference to Israel as the son of God in the OT.³⁹ Moreover, already in this passage a covenant relationship may be in view,⁴⁰ and thus Israel here is called to be an obedient son.⁴¹ This special relationship between Yahweh and Israel⁴² finds more formal expression in Exod 19.1–9. Although this passage is not as relevant as Exod 4, here one finds the record of Yahweh's covenant made with Israel after their escape from Egypt.⁴³ That is, the establishment of Yahweh's special relationship with Israel, along with the related obligations,⁴⁴ is found in these verses.⁴⁵ By means of this covenant, it can be said that Israel as a nation was brought into existence.⁴⁶ As will be shown below, this covenant is expounded in Deuteronomy (Deut 1.5).⁴⁷

In sum, the covenantal father-son relationship between Yahweh and Israel is prevalent in Deuteronomy, but is not unique to it. It has its canonical foundations in the book of Exodus, and finds its context in the world of ANE suzerain-vassal treaties.

³⁸ Cf. John J. Schmitt, “Israel as Son of God in Torah,” *BTB* 34 (2004): 69–79.

³⁹ So Th. de Kruijf, *Der Sohn des lebendigen Gottes: Ein Beitrag zur Christologie des Matthäusevangeliums* (AnBib 16; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1962), 5. In addition to referring to the nation of Israel, “son of God” in the OT can also refer to a divine being, the king of Israel/Judah, or theophoric personal names. Cf. P. A. H. De Boer, “The Son of God in the Old Testament,” in *Syntax and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Syntax and Exegesis* (ed. C. Labuschagne et al.; *OtSt* 18; Leiden: Brill, 1973), 188–207.

⁴⁰ William H. C. Propp, *Exodus 1–18* (AB 2; New York: Doubleday, 1998), 217.

⁴¹ De Kruijf, *Der Sohn*, 6; De Boer, “Son of God,” 198.

⁴² Brevard S. Childs, *The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster, 1974), 102.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 367; John I. Durham, *Exodus* (WBC 3; Waco: Word, 1987), 259.

⁴⁴ Childs, *Exodus*, 367.

⁴⁵ Anderson, *Contours*, 32.

⁴⁶ Mendenhall, “Biblical Law,” 28; Harriman, “Our Father,” 161.

⁴⁷ Childs, *Introduction*, 130.

3.1.2 Covenant and Filial Obedience

As noted above, the father-son relationship is best viewed as a manifestation of a covenantal relationship that entails obligations on the part of the “son.” These obligations are clear in Deuteronomy, a book which is devoted to covenantal themes (including the father-son relationship). Indeed, Deuteronomy has a pervasively “Torahic” character that sets forth the conditions of Yahweh’s covenant for Israel,⁴⁸ and Tigay adds that the “main theme of Deuteronomy is the ardent and exclusive loyalty that Israel owes to the LORD.”⁴⁹ This focus on specific commands is found throughout the book, but perhaps most notably is the concentration of commandments in chapters 12–26 of Moses’ second address (4.44–28.69).⁵⁰ More generally, the sermonic style of Deuteronomy is portrayed as Moses’ final exhortation to the Israelites to be obedient to Yahweh in the land they are about to enter.⁵¹ In addition, much of the content of the final portions of Deuteronomy, especially the blessings and curses of 27–30, reinforces the necessity for Israel’s obedience to the covenant. The choice facing Israel in these passages is clear: obedience to the covenant would lead to life and prosperity, whereas disobedience would lead to cursing and death (30.15–20).

Again the point should be made that the obedience required is a *covenantal* obedience, and therefore an obedience that was called for in light of the antecedent (filial) relationship established by Yahweh.⁵² The filial relationship is first established, and obedience is to arise within this relationship. Thus, the interplay of divine grace and Israel’s responsibility in Deuteronomy is complex, but one should not conclude that

⁴⁸ McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 43; Waltke, *Theology*, 500.

⁴⁹ Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, xiii.

⁵⁰ The next section will address issues of supposed Mosaic authorship.

⁵¹ So McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 19. In this chapter, and throughout this study, plural pronouns will be used for the singular nation of Israel for two reasons: 1) to avoid referring to the *son* of God with a feminine pronoun (as is often done when *she* is used for Israel); 2) to highlight the corporate nature of Israel as the son of God (something Deuteronomic sonship passages often do). This concurs with the insights of Fohrer (*TDNT* 8:351–52), that there is no difference between Israel as *son* and the Israelites as *sons* of Yahweh.

⁵² This point will also arise in the discussion of *election* below.

Israel's filial status before Yahweh is based wholly upon their ability to keep Torah.⁵³ Instead, Yahweh has established the relationship; Israel is to respond appropriately. Brueggemann aptly sums up the two sides of the issue: "As a *covenant partner* of Yahweh, Israel is a people defined by *obedience*."⁵⁴ This relational focus of covenantal obedience in Deuteronomy sets the stage for understanding the description and calling of Israel's sonship.

Though the remainder of this chapter will primarily be concerned with demonstrating the unique contours of Israel's sonship in Deuteronomy, it will be helpful to summarize some of the covenantal aspects of the book's theology.

1) The father-son relationship is a particular way of describing the covenantal relationship between Yahweh and Israel. Moreover, this description is not *merely* synonymous with the covenant relationship, but, as will be argued below, it deepens and adds an emotive element to it.

2) It will also be argued that since the naming of Israel as the son of God has such relational significance, it therefore represents one of the most emphatic ways to motivate obedience in the entire book. Put differently, the sonship of Israel is a prominent theme in Deuteronomy, and that sonship is predicated on obedience.⁵⁵ This factor—the necessity of Israel's filial obedience—will be very significant in the present survey of Deuteronomistic themes, and will most clearly be seen when a composite picture of the father-son references is constructed.

3) It follows from the first two observations that the relational aspect of the covenant provides the best context for interpreting the calling of Israel to be an obedient son. That is, in the father-son relationship obedience must be seen as subject to the covenant.⁵⁶ The exegetical sections that follow will argue that sonship and obedience

⁵³ So Deut 7.6–11. At the same time, the call to obedience is solemn and sincere, as the curses threatened in chapters 27–29 indicate. Cf. Gerhard von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, vol. 1: *The Theology of Israel's Historical Traditions* (trans. D. Stalker; Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1962), 230.

⁵⁴ Walter Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997), 417 (emphasis added). Cf. Hahn, *Kinship*, 67.

⁵⁵ I am indebted to Dr. Paul Foster for this pithy formulation.

⁵⁶ So Brueggemann, *Theology*, 418.

are inextricably linked in Deuteronomy, and the gravity of Israel's calling to be an obedient son deserves serious consideration.

Hahn's conclusions echo well this study's understanding of the importance of the covenantal father-son relationship in Deuteronomy:

[T]he predominance of father-son terminology in Deuteronomy, coupled with its prominence in ancient suzerain-vassal treaties (which the Deuteronomic covenant so closely resembles), strongly suggests that the suzerain-vassal arrangement between Yahweh and Israel in the Deuteronomic covenant tradition is equivalent in substance and practice to the relationship between a father and his minor son.⁵⁷

3.1.3 Approach to Deuteronomy

Before showing in greater detail the textual bases for the preceding observations, it is necessary to sketch the present assumptions and approach to Deuteronomy. This chapter will not be concerned with evaluating the history of critical studies in Deuteronomy, nor in questions of historical authorship or date. Instead, this chapter will consider Deuteronomy as it is likely to have been known to Matthew, treating the LXX as the benchmark, but also playing close attention to the MT where it may provide background for Matthew. To be sure, this approach that seeks to focus on Deuteronomy as Matthew may have known it is not devoid of difficulty given the textual diversity of Deuteronomy in the first century;⁵⁸ it is not self-evident which *Vorlage* Matthew may have known. Nevertheless, Septuagintal textual traditions do figure prominently in Matthew, although some degree of Hebrew influence is also evident, especially in Matthew's unique material.⁵⁹ Therefore, a consideration of the MT will be appropriate

⁵⁷ Hahn, *Kinship*, 91.

⁵⁸ So Timothy H. Lim, "Deuteronomy in the Judaism of the Second Temple Period," in *Deuteronomy in the New Testament* (ed. S. Moyise and M. Menken; LNTS 358; London: T&T Clark, 2007), 6–26.

⁵⁹ Krister Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament* (2d ed.; ASNU 20; Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1968), 151; Robert H. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel with Special Reference to the Messianic Hope* (NovTSup 18; Leiden: Brill, 1967), 28, 157; W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, Jr., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew* (3 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988–97), 1:33, 45. Cf. Maarten J. J. Menken, (*Matthew's Bible: The Old Testament Text of the Evangelist* [BETL 173; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2004],

alongside the critical Göttingen LXX, as the readings attested in the combination of these *Vorlagen* should provide a text that approximates reasonably well what Matthew likely knew.⁶⁰

Regarding the authorship of Deuteronomy, this study will assume Moses as the *implied* author of the text. Whereas the *real author* may be described as the historical person who composed a particular book, the *implied author* is reconstructed by the reader from the narrative.⁶¹ That is, Deuteronomy leads the reader to the conclusion that the voice of Moses should be heard throughout. As Childs notes, “the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch is an important theological affirmation” that lends authority to the laws attributed to Moses.⁶² Regardless of how much or how little of the extant book should actually be attributed to Moses,⁶³ it is most significant for this study that Moses has traditionally been understood as the author of Deuteronomy. This apparent consensus in the ancient world⁶⁴ will be important for further chapters, as many later writings (from Matthew’s perspective) would have gleaned their teachings from Deuteronomy. This chapter is chiefly concerned with Israel’s sonship and call to obedience in Deuteronomy, anticipating how this theme may be reflected in Matthew.

3.2 Exegesis

Deuteronomy offers an explanation and expansion of the laws given at Sinai.⁶⁵ The protagonist in Deuteronomy is clearly Moses, who summons Israel to obey the

7–10) who proposes that Matthew used a version of the LXX that was brought into greater conformity with the Hebrew (although he does not believe Matthew’s copy of Deuteronomy was revised in this way).

⁶⁰ It should also be noted that the LXX stands very close to the MT in Deuteronomy.

⁶¹ Mark Allan Powell, *What is Narrative Criticism?* (GBS; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 5.

⁶² Childs, *Introduction*, 134–35; so Phillips, *Deuteronomy*, 2.

⁶³ Many scholars continue to believe that at least portions of Deuteronomy can be linked back to Moses, even if they do not affirm him as the author of the entire book. Cf. S. R. Driver, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1895), lvi; Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, xxvi.

⁶⁴ Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 24–25.

⁶⁵ Cf. Deut 1.5.

covenant, using various rhetorical appeals and devices.⁶⁶ The following sections will argue that some of the most prominent persuasive means to motivate obedience used by Moses in Deuteronomy are his references to Israel as the son of Yahweh, along with Yahweh as a Father.

3.2.1 Deut 1

The first reference to Israel as a son in Deuteronomy is found in Deut 1.31a: ὡς εἴ τις τροφοφόρησαι ἄνθρωπος τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ. Here the provision of Yahweh for Israel in the wilderness is likened to a man (ἄνθρωπος) caring for his son (υἱός). In this passage, Israel is not explicitly referred to as a son, but an analogy is made that likens the care of a human father for his son with Yahweh's care for Israel.⁶⁷ Inasmuch as Moses uses this image to chide Israel for their refusal to enter the promised land (1.32), the exegete has warrant for asserting Moses understood Israel to be the son of Yahweh. Indeed, scholars are in widespread agreement that conveyed in this passage is the tender picture of a(n earthly) father lovingly caring for his son.⁶⁸ In this passage, Yahweh demonstrates care for Israel unmatched even by Moses. This fatherly compassion becomes even clearer as the book progresses, as it is repeated in more emphatic ways.⁶⁹

The word used to communicate this concern in the MT (נשא) should be noted. This word has traditionally been rendered “carried” or “bore” by most English translations.⁷⁰ Although נשא in the Qal pattern can simply mean to lift up or to carry,⁷¹

⁶⁶ One such example is the alternation between second person singular and plural verbs for emphasis. Cf. Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 5; New York: Doubleday, 1991), 15; *idem*, *Deuteronomic School*, 171–78.

⁶⁷ The last portion of this phrase, which features a possessive pronoun (αὐτοῦ/ἡ), solidifies the interpretation that “man” should be interpreted as a father. Harriman (“Our Father,” 1) rightly states that it would be wrong to assume fatherhood is in view only where the term “father” is used. Cf. Jonathan T. Pennington, *Heaven and Earth in the Gospel of Matthew* (NovTSup 126; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 218.

⁶⁸ Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 18; Nathan Macdonald, *Deuteronomy and the Meaning of ‘Monotheism,’* (FAT II/1; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 101; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomic School*, 368; De Boer, “Son of God,” 198; Duane L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy* (2 vols.; rev. ed.; WBC 6A–B; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2001–2), 1:31; Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 103.

⁶⁹ See the discussions on Deut 8, 14, 32 below. McConville (*Deuteronomy*, 57) cites the change to a singular verb (נשא) as further evidence for this intimate image in the MT. Harriman (“Our Father,” 224), however, warns that Yahweh's intimacy with Israel is not always demonstrated by such singular verbs.

⁷⁰ For the former translation: NRSV, NASB, NIV, NKJV, NJPS; for the latter: RSV, KJV, JPS.

in this context it may be read with an infused emotive element.⁷² This is also clear in the LXX, which employs τροφοφορέω, a neologism meaning “nurture, sustain” (cf. 2 Macc 7.27).⁷³ A comparison with a parallel use in Num 11.12 further corroborates this interpretation. In Num 11.12 the Qal of נשן is again found on Moses’ lips, as he asks God if he (Moses) is to carry (נשן) Israel in his bosom as a nurse might bear up (נשן) a nursing infant.⁷⁴ Here, as in Deut 1.31, נשן (though LXX is αἴρω) communicates compassionate care, with Israel being likened to a child. Further, Moses implies that it is Yahweh who bore Israel, since Moses himself could not take credit for this.⁷⁵ This perspective reflects Deut 1.31.⁷⁶

Although the Qal of נשן is used some 164 times in the MT of the Pentateuch alone, two further occurrences of this word are revealing. First, in Exod 19.4 Yahweh instructs Moses to tell Israel how he bore them up (נשן) on eagles’ wings when he delivered them from Egypt. Even though the terminology for sonship/fatherhood is not found here, the image in this passage is a tender one of Yahweh’s care for Israel and his mighty acts on their behalf. Moreover, immediately following this verse (vv. 5–6) the Israelites are, like Deuteronomy, exhorted to be faithful to the covenant. The second relevant usage of this verb is in Deut 32.11, where it is stated that Yahweh has protected Israel by bearing them (נשן/LXX: ἀναλαμβάνω) on his pinions. Interestingly, the image of an eagle is also repeated here, further connecting this passage with Exod 19. Timo Veijola takes these passages into consideration when commenting on Deut 1.31:

Sein Verfasser veranschaulicht Jahwes liebevolle Fürsorge
in fast pietistisch klingender Sprache: Im Gegensatz zu
Mose, der das Volk nicht mehr alleine zu tragen

⁷¹ L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, “נשן,” *HALOT* 2:724–27.

⁷² D. N. Freedman and B. E. Willoughby, “נשן, nāšā’,” *TDOT* 10:29–36. This emotive element is not surprising given the characteristic that Deuteronomy, as an oration, is directed “to the heart and emotions” (Weinfeld, *Deuteronomic School*, 171).

⁷³ John W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy* (SBLSCS 39; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 18–19. Wevers posits that the LXX translator specifically had the provision of manna in mind; Harriman (“Our Father,” 226) understands this image as a father carrying his son over difficult terrain.

⁷⁴ Christensen, *Deuteronomy*, 1:31–32.

⁷⁵ Jacob Milgrom, *The JPS Torah Commentary: Numbers* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1989), 85.

⁷⁶ Childs, *Exodus*, 366.

vermochte (V. 9) „trug“ Jahwe es durch die ganze Wüste (vgl. Ex 19,4; Num 11,12; Dtn 32,11f; Hos 11,3; Ps 91,11f; Apg 13,18) und zeigte darin handfest sein väterlich Güte.⁷⁷

Thus, Yahweh's fatherly care for his son is clearly communicated in Deut 1.31, and this is evident in both the LXX/MT. But Harriman has suggested that fatherhood imagery might be even more extensive, extending from vv. 30–34.⁷⁸ This is based on his analysis of the Hebrew text.⁷⁹ In 1.30 Yahweh is said to fight for Israel, which is undoubtedly something an earthly suzerain would do for a vassal.⁸⁰ Harriman, however, suggests this activity is also descriptive of a father's care for his children. He adds that treaties would often reflect the desire for suzerains, as actual fathers, to protect their families from other king(dom)s. Regardless of how extensive the fatherhood imagery is in Deut 1, Harriman is surely right to conclude that there is an immanence to the fatherhood language of Deut 1 that surpasses what would have been expected of an ANE suzerain. Indeed, it is “remarkable” to Harriman that 1.31 does not say Yahweh carried Israel as a *suzerain*, since this image was not intimate enough for the author of Deuteronomy.⁸¹

Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to suggest that ANE covenantal aspects are not in view in Deut 1. Harriman even acknowledges that in the end it is difficult to say with certainty whether the fatherly actions of Yahweh are to be sharply distinguished from his suzerainty actions. This is the case for at least two reasons. First, the mixing of suzerain and father images demonstrates the two concepts are not mutually exclusive.⁸² Second, the entirety of Deuteronomy begs to be read in a covenantal context.⁸³ Thus,

⁷⁷ Timo Veijola, *Das 5. Buch Mose Deuteronomium: Kapitel 1,1–16,17* (ATD 8,1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 39 (emphasis added).

⁷⁸ Harriman, “Our Father,” 220.

⁷⁹ Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 103n.11 also argues that 1.30–34 may indicate a single unit of thought.

⁸⁰ Harriman (“Our Father,” 220) cites the treaty between the Great King of Hatti, Mursili and his vassal Tuppi-Teshshup as an example.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 217, 221–24. While Harriman's point is valid, it is to be noted that the word used is אָבִי and not the more explicit אָבִיךָ.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 224–25.

⁸³ Christensen, *Deuteronomy*, 1:31; Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 103; contra Fensham, “Father and Son,” 128–35 who does not see covenantal themes at play in Deut 1, 8 because these passages convey non-

even when individual passages might not seem to have this notion in the forefront, the finalized form of the book is one influenced from beginning to end by covenantal features.⁸⁴

In sum, it may be said that although Deut 1.31 reflects ANE customs to a large degree, it moves beyond them by attributing deeper emotive and paternal elements to the actions of Yahweh than would normally be expected of an earthly suzerain.⁸⁵ It is true that suzerains often referred to vassals with familial language, but the tender description of Yahweh's care for Israel seems to have more in common with the actual bond of a father and a son than with the role of an ANE suzerain.⁸⁶ But regardless of the cultural background for Deut 1—which Matthew may or may not have known—it is clear that Yahweh's fatherly care for his son Israel is in view.

3.2.2 Deut 8

A second and even more significant passage that reveals the father-son relationship between Yahweh and Israel is Deut 8.5: καὶ γνώση τῆ καρδίᾳ σου ὅτι ὡς εἶ τις παιδεύσαι ἄνθρωπος τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, οὕτως κύριος ὁ θεός σου παιδεύσαι σου. Here, as in 1.31, the role of Yahweh is likened to a man's (ἄνθρωπος, i.e., father) relationship to his son (τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ). Before considering this passage in more detail, it should be affirmed at the outset that although Yahweh's fatherhood is communicated by way of metaphor (ὡς εἶ/כַּאֲשֶׁר), this in no way undermines the *reality* of this relationship. As Jon Levenson has noted, the father-son relationship in ancient Israel

covenantal images. He prefers to see covenantal themes related to the father-son relationship only in 14.1; 32.43. This view, however, fails to consider adequately the covenantal characteristics that pervade Deuteronomy and does not give due credence to the inherent call to obedience in passages such as 1.31; 8.5 as a characteristic of *covenantal* agreements.

⁸⁴ So Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 36.

⁸⁵ Harriman, "Our Father," 227–28. Marianne Meye Thompson (*The Promise of the Father: Jesus and God in the New Testament* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2000], 39) lists three roles of Israelite fathers: 1) source of a family/clan who provides an inheritance for his children; 2) protects and provides for his children; 3) required obedience and honor from his children.

⁸⁶ This is true even though the two offices often overlap.

went beyond the figurative, as the ancients did not always distinguish the biological from the non-biological,⁸⁷ or perhaps made only casual distinction between them.⁸⁸

The focus of Deut 8 is the way in which Yahweh disciplines (παιδεύω) his son Israel. This is the second major characteristic of Yahweh's fatherly love in Deuteronomy (the other being his compassionate care, 1.31).⁸⁹ The description of Yahweh as a man who disciplines his son ensures that the fatherhood of Yahweh in Deuteronomy is not to be interpreted merely in terms of tenderness devoid of authority. Instead, Yahweh as Father also requires obedience from his people, and engages in disciplinary action, if necessary, to elicit the proper response. At the same time, as a Father Yahweh's discipline is a loving action that has his people's best interests in mind.⁹⁰

The divine discipline mentioned in this passage probably recalls the manna and other provisions in the wilderness.⁹¹ Moreover, this discipline also entails Israel's lack in the wilderness,⁹² and its main aim seems to have been educational.⁹³ For Calvin, this discipline "includes everything belonging to a proper education."⁹⁴ This view is reflected by the term παιδεύω in the LXX, which always translates יסר in Deuteronomy.⁹⁵ Discipline was normally directed toward children,⁹⁶ who had the

⁸⁷ Jon D. Levenson, *The Death and Resurrection of the Beloved Son: The Transformation of Child Sacrifice in Judaism and Christianity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 40–42.

⁸⁸ Thanks to Dr. A. K. M. Adam for this additional suggestion.

⁸⁹ Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 41.

⁹⁰ Wright, *Knowing Jesus*, 120.

⁹¹ McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 170.

⁹² M. Sæbø ("יסר", *ysr*," *TLOT* 2:548–51) suggests that Yahweh's direction of history is discipline in this passage.

⁹³ Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 93; Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 108; Harriman, "Our Father," 252.

⁹⁴ Cited in C. F. Keil and Franz Delitzsch, *The Pentateuch* (vol. 1 of *Commentary on the Old Testament*; trans. J. Martin; 1866; repr., Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson, 1996), 890.

⁹⁵ Harriman, "Our Father," 250. It is unclear which edition of the LXX Harriman utilized, but his statement holds true for the Göttingen text.

⁹⁶ Branson, *TDOT* 6:129.

responsibility to respond in obedience to their fathers. To be sure, however, it also involved hardships.⁹⁷

It is significant that the father-son metaphor is utilized in Deut 8, a chapter whose tenor is argumentative, as Moses pleads with Israel to keep the laws of Yahweh.⁹⁸ Here Moses alludes a second time to the father-son relationship (in Deuteronomy) in order to motivate Israel to keep Yahweh's commandments. The call to obedience begins in v. 1, where Moses reminds Israel they are to obey *all* the commands of Yahweh.⁹⁹ This is continued in vv. 2–6, which are of primary interest for the present purposes, since father-son language is found in v. 5. It is for good reason that many commentators deal with these verses as a unit.¹⁰⁰ After instructing Israel that Yahweh disciplines them as a son, Moses continues in v. 6: καὶ φυλάξῃ τὰς ἐντολάς κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ σου, πορεύεσθαι ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ φοβεῖσθαι αὐτόν. This verse, which follows Moses' reminder to Israel that they are sons of Yahweh, is clearly another summons for Israel to keep Yahweh's commandments. Verse 6 begins with φυλάσσω (MT: שָׁמַר [Qal]), a verb frequently used in Deuteronomy to summon Israel to obedience, and which is found four times in Deut 8 alone (vv. 1, 2, 6, 11). The proximity of these numerous calls for Israel's obedience to the declaration of Israel's sonship (v. 5) sufficiently establishes that Israel, *as a son*, is to keep God's commandments.

But the case can also be made that 8.6 is the *necessary consequence* of what precedes it, especially the filial relationship of 8.5. This is more likely in the MT than the LXX, since in the Greek 8.6 begins with a typical καί. In other words, conjunctions in the LXX are rarely significant in themselves, but the LXX as a rather literal translation of a Hebrew exemplar often exhibits a paratactical structure.¹⁰¹ However, the

⁹⁷ Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 186; Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 93. Cf. R. D. Branson, “יָסַר, *yāsar*,” *TDOT* 6:127–34.

⁹⁸ McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 166.

⁹⁹ So Harriman, “Our Father,” 242.

¹⁰⁰ Christensen, *Deuteronomy*, 1:173–74; Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 184–86.

¹⁰¹ F. C. Conybeare and St. George Stock, *A Grammar of Septuagint Greek. With Selected Readings, Vocabularies, and Updated Indexes* (Boston: Ginn & Co., 1905; repr. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1995), §40.

waw consecutive suffix form in the MT may be more significant.¹⁰² Either way, the flow thought from 8.5 to 8.6 seems to be one of *logical progression*, which would certainly fit with a common use of the *waw* consecutive form.¹⁰³ If this reading is correct, it would be proper to render the beginning of v. 6 with “therefore” in English.¹⁰⁴ The sense, then, is that because Yahweh disciplines Israel *like a son*, they *therefore* are to keep his commandments. This reading would make more explicit what is already clearly present in Deut 8.1–6: as the son of Yahweh Israel is called to obedience. Indeed, even in the LXX the close association between sonship in 8.5 and obedience in 8.6 should not be missed.

This connection between sonship and obedience in Deut 8 has been noted by a number of scholars. Harriman states that being a true son of Yahweh did not first of all have to do with physical descent, but with yielding to Yahweh and obeying his commands.¹⁰⁵ Similarly, Macdonald observes that the parental actions of Yahweh here confirm that Israel was called to obedience.¹⁰⁶ The image in Deut 8.5, then, adds the aspect of discipline to the understanding of Israel as son of Yahweh. This discipline is recounted in a context that demonstrates the necessity of obedience, and the very need for discipline implies that Yahweh, as a Father, was proactively seeking the obedience of Israel.¹⁰⁷ Nevertheless, Yahweh is also likened to a treaty-initiating king who demands obedience and holds out the possibility of blessings or curses depending (in part) on his son’s response to discipline. Thus, Deut 8.5 may be another example of ANE covenantal themes used as a vehicle to communicate theological truths.¹⁰⁸ Yahweh’s discipline of his son Israel in Deut 8 is one way he seeks to procure filial obedience.

¹⁰² Bruce K. Waltke and M. O’Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990), §32.2.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, §32.2.1.c; Christo H. J. van der Merwe, Jackie A. Naudé, and Jan H. Kroeze, *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar* (BLH 3; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), §21.3.1.ii.b.

¹⁰⁴ So Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 390; NJPS.

¹⁰⁵ Harriman, “Our Father,” 264.

¹⁰⁶ Macdonald, *Monotheism*, 136.

¹⁰⁷ For the role of fathers in discipline, see Deut 21.18–21 (below), and Proverbs (e.g., 3.11–12).

¹⁰⁸ Wright, *Deuteronomy*, 3.

3.2.3 Deut 14

Deuteronomy 14.1 contains one of the most explicit references to Israel as God's son in Deuteronomy: Υἱοί ἐστε κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ.¹⁰⁹ Moreover, the relationship between Israel's status as son and their call to obedience is even more pronounced in these verses than in Deut 8. This chapter outlines a code of holiness laws (14.1–21), both internal (vv. 1–2) and external (vv. 3–21), which Israel was to follow in its day-to-day life.¹¹⁰ These laws were to be a major means by which Israel was to be distinguished from their pagan neighbors,¹¹¹ while also reflecting Israel's vertical relationship with their holy God.¹¹² That is, many of the prohibitions given to Israel were practices in which other peoples from their historical context were engaging, often in association with a foreign religion or cultic activity.¹¹³ Israel's status as sons of the LORD their God is the *reason* and *motive* for abstaining from these practices.¹¹⁴ Driver sums it up well:

[The Israelites] are Jehovah's children; and while on the one hand they are the objects of His paternal care and regard (1³¹ 8⁵), they owe to Him on the other hand filial love and obedience, they should conform their character to His, and do nothing that is unworthy of the close and intimate relation in which they stand to Him.¹¹⁵

¹⁰⁹ The plural of sons in this context may emphasize each member of the collective Israel in the role of the nation as a whole. Cf. Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 156; McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 247–48.

¹¹⁰ Christensen, *Deuteronomy*, 1:287.

¹¹¹ A. D. H. Mayes, "Deuteronomy 14 and the Deuteronomic Worldview," in *Studies in Deuteronomy: In Honor of C. J. Labuschagne on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (ed. F. Martinez et al.; VTSup 53; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 165–81.

¹¹² Christensen, *Deuteronomy*, 1:287. At the same time, the focus in Deut 14 does seem to be on Israel's holiness, whereas the parallel passage in Lev 11 focuses on Yahweh's holiness. Cf. Rolf Rendtorff, *The Covenant Formula: An Exegetical and Theological Investigation* (trans. M. Kohl; OTS; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 24.

¹¹³ Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 233.

¹¹⁴ So McCarthy, "Notes on the Love of God," 146; Kuyper, "Deuteronomy," 332; Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 229; Wevers, *Notes*, 240.

¹¹⁵ Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 156.

McCarthy adds that for Israel to indulge in these forbidden practices would be to deny the fundamental father-son relationship articulated in terms of the covenant.¹¹⁶ In a word, Deut 14 demonstrates how a true son should act.¹¹⁷

Since the Israelites are sons of Yahweh, they are set apart from the other nations. Verse 2 indicates this by the phrase: ὅτι λαὸς ἅγιος εἶ κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ. For the second time in Deuteronomy Israel is referred to as a “holy people.” The first occurrence of this phrase is found in 7.6 in the context of Yahweh’s gracious election of Israel that is based on his love, not on the moral quality of Israel.¹¹⁸ The same passage also speaks of Israel as the “special treasure” (περιούσιος/תְּשׁוּבָה) of Yahweh, a sentiment repeated in 14.2.¹¹⁹ Mayes notes that this term originally applied to the property, but came to denote the vassalage of a man to a god or king.¹²⁰ This highlights Israel’s special relationship,¹²¹ which is an apt corollary to Israel’s sonship.¹²² Indeed, in this passage sonship is virtually synonymous with holiness and election.¹²³ Thus the mantra again rings true: Israel’s sonship is predicated on obedience.¹²⁴

3.2.4 Deut 32

A fourth portion of Deuteronomy in which an understanding of the sonship of Israel is significantly developed is Deut 32. Although some consider this Song of Moses to consist of some of the oldest material in Deuteronomy, others consider it to be a later

¹¹⁶ McCarthy, “Notes on the Love of God,” 145–46.

¹¹⁷ Raymond Brown, *The Message of Deuteronomy: Not by Bread Alone* (BST; Leicester: InterVarsity, 1993), 158.

¹¹⁸ This phrase is repeated in 14.21, providing an inclusio for the purity laws (so Veijola, *Deuteronomium*, 295; Christensen, *Deuteronomy*, 1:286–95).

¹¹⁹ Of the six times this word is used of Israel in the LXX, three are found in Deuteronomy (7.6; 14.2; 26.18). It may be significant that this rare word (used only eight times in the LXX) is also applied to Israel in Exod 19.5. Cf. F. Dreyfus, “Le Thème de l’Héritage dans l’Ancien Testament,” *RSPT* 42 (1958): 3–49, especially 15–16). Cf. the discussion of Mal 3.17 in chapter 4.

¹²⁰ Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 185, quoted in Christensen, *Deuteronomy*, 1:291. The kingly aspect may explain the usage of this term for Israel primarily in covenantal contexts.

¹²¹ Macdonald, *Monotheism*, 154.

¹²² So Veijola, *Deuteronomium*, 296.

¹²³ McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 247.

¹²⁴ So Keil and Delitzsch, *Pentateuch*, 915.

addition.¹²⁵ Differing conclusions regarding the date of this section, however, should not lead one to assume that Deut 32 has been carelessly patched into the structure of the book, such that its theology fits awkwardly with the rest of Deuteronomy. Childs warns that the final chapters of Deuteronomy (31–34) should not be disregarded as a miscellaneous compendium of unrelated passages, but are “an important example of canonical shaping of the final form of ancient tradition.”¹²⁶

Indeed, one can even argue that the Song of Moses functions as the *climax* of Deuteronomy.¹²⁷ This conclusion is informed by James Watts’s study of hymns inset in Hebrew narrative. Watts notes that the form of Deut 32 is a hymn, as it includes both an invocation of praise to God and an indicative statement of praise to God (vv. 1–3).¹²⁸ He further notes: “The use of hymns to climax or conclude a narrative was an established practice of ANE literature,” and he sees no reason to deny this function is operative in Deut 32. The poetic form of the song provides its images with greater emotive power intended to impress to the audience, “as forcefully as possible,” the message of the entire book. Simply put, the Song of Moses brings Deuteronomy to a literary apex by providing a summary of Deuteronomic themes in memorable form.¹²⁹

3.2.4.1 Verses 4–6

In light of these findings by Watts, it can be asserted that the themes of Deut 32 will likely be key elements of the entire book. Of central importance for the present study is the recognition that parent-child imagery pervades Deut 32.¹³⁰ The unique feature of the filial imagery found in the Song of Moses, in comparison to the passages

¹²⁵ For discussions of dating, see Paul Sanders, *The Provenance of Deuteronomy 32 (OtSt 37)*; Leiden: Brill, 1996); McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 451–52.

¹²⁶ Childs, *Introduction*, 219.

¹²⁷ McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 450.

¹²⁸ James W. Watts, *Psalm and Story: Inset Hymns in Hebrew Narrative (JSOTSup 139)*; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), 15. See also Matthew Thiessen, “The Form and Function of the Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 32:1–43),” *JBL* 123 (2004): 401–24. For an analysis of the structure of the Song, see J. P. Fokkeman, *Major Poems of the Hebrew Bible at the Interface of Hermeneutics and Structural Analysis*, vol. 1: *Ex. 15, Deut. 32, and Job 3* (SSN; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1998), 54–149.

¹²⁹ Watts, *Psalm and Story*, 73, 78, 80.

¹³⁰ Miller, *Deuteronomy*, 230; McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 461; Harriman, “Our Father,” 145–46.

thus far surveyed, is the focus on Israel's unfaithfulness in contrast to Yahweh's faithfulness. After a few introductory remarks (vv. 1–3), Moses praises Yahweh for his faithfulness and perfection (v. 4), and rebukes the Israelites for being unfaithful children of Yahweh (vv. 5–6).¹³¹ It is to be noted that although the LXX and most English translations prefer “children” in v. 5 (LXX: τέκνα),¹³² the MT again reads “sons” (בְּנֵי).¹³³ However, there is little difference between these two options. Of more relevance is the statement in v. 5 that the Israelites are *not* sons/children of Yahweh (לֹא בְנֵי; LXX: οὐκ αὐτῶ τέκνα), but are a crooked and perverse generation (γενεὰ σκολιὰ καὶ διεστραμμένη).¹³⁴ This should not be taken to mean that Israel's filial relationship had been finally revoked. Instead, crookedness and perversity would falsify the covenant that bound Israel to Yahweh as son. Put differently, Israel's unfaithful actions were antithetical to their calling as a son of their holy, faithful Father. Indeed, v. 6 indicates that Yahweh is Israel's Father who bought (κτάομαι),¹³⁵ made (ποιέω), and created (κτίζω)¹³⁶ Israel. Fokkelman observes that in the MT the phrase “your father” in v. 6 (אָבִיךָ) stands structurally opposite of “not his sons” in v. 5.¹³⁷ This denotes the tragic unfaithfulness of Israel, who repaid the kindnesses of their Father with disobedience.¹³⁸

Of further interest in these verses is the epithet “Rock” (צוּר) used in reference to Yahweh in the MT (LXX: θεός). The image is introduced in v. 4, and is the one towards whom the sons in v. 5 have acted corruptly. Referring to Yahweh as צוּר, which is

¹³¹ For a discussion on the abrupt changes in person and perspective throughout the song, see Thiessen, “Form and Function,” 408–9.

¹³² So RSV, KJV, NIV, NASB.

¹³³ Driver (*Deuteronomy*, 351–52) includes here a helpful discussion of Israel's sonship in the OT.

¹³⁴ On the difficulties of translating this verse, see Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 377n.15.

¹³⁵ The verb קנה could also be translated *created* (L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, “קנה,” *HALOT* 3:1111–13). For more on this term, see below.

¹³⁶ The Hebrew is “established” (בָּנָה).

¹³⁷ Fokkelman, *Major Poems*, 73.

¹³⁸ So *ibid.*, 72. Regarding *when* Israel became God's son, some connect Deut 32.6 with Exod 4.22 and so see it in the Exodus (so Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 379; George A. F. Knight, *The Song of Moses: A Theological Quarry* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995], 29), but for others it is more ambiguous. C. Wright (*Knowing Jesus*, 126) finds it best to understand Israel's sonship as antecedent to the events in Exodus, based in large part on the reference to sonship in Exod 4.22, where Israel is *already* referred to as Yahweh's son *before* the Exodus. In this he follows Marie-Joseph Lagrange (“La Paternité de Dieu dans l'Ancien Testament,” *RB* 26 [1908]: 481–99).

parallel to God (אֱלֹהִים) in this verse,¹³⁹ emphasizes his faithfulness, in distinction to the unfaithfulness of Israel.¹⁴⁰ Indeed, the faithfulness of God is clearly in view in the LXX as well, even though the term “rock” is not used. God is also described as צִוּר in 32.18 (LXX: θεός) in association with his role as divine Father. To anticipate the following discussion, there is a close relationship between God as Rock and God as Father in Deut 32 (MT), with Harriman even suggesting that *rock* further emphasizes that nature of God’s *fatherhood*.¹⁴¹

3.2.4.2 Verses 15–20¹⁴²

The image of God as a Rock is found a second time in 32.18 MT. Here Israel is again reprimanded for disobedience directed toward their Rock (צִוּר) who begot them (יָלְדָם; LXX: γεννήσαντά σε), the God (אֱלֹהִים; LXX: θεός) who gave them birth (מִחֻלְלֵיהֶם; LXX: τρέφοντός σε [“nourishes you”]).¹⁴³ As it has been demonstrated in previous passages, the parental imagery for Yahweh underscores the intimacy between Yahweh and Israel.¹⁴⁴ This parent-child relationship is made more explicit by the following

¹³⁹ For a discussion of parallelism in Hebrew poetry, see J. P. Fokkelman, *Reading Biblical Poetry: An Introductory Guide* (trans. Ineke Smit; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 61–86.

¹⁴⁰ So McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 453; Michael P. Knowles, “‘The Rock His Work is Perfect’: Unusual Imagery for God in Deuteronomy XXXII,” *VT* 39 (1989): 307–22.

¹⁴¹ Harriman, “Our Father,” 165–66.

¹⁴² Deuteronomy 32.8 should also be noted. The last two words of 32.8 are difficult to establish, referring either to the sons of God, sons of Israel, or angels of God. The MT reads בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, the OG ἀγγέλων θεοῦ or more likely υἱῶν θεοῦ, which is probably closer to the original, as evidenced by Rahlfs 848 (=P.Fouad 266B) and the Hebrew of 4QDeut^d (בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים; so Wevers, *Notes*, 513). It is therefore best to understand this as a reference to heavenly/divine beings (so McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 448). The Israelites may be in view if one adopts the MT, but even then they are not portrayed as God’s son. Thus, 32.8 is not of primary relevance for the present discussion because it does not refer to Israel as the son of God, and there is no reason to think Matthew may have read it this way. For more, see Sanders, *Provenance*, 76–81, 155–59; Michael S. Heiser, “Deuteronomy 32:8 and the Sons of God,” *BibSac* 158 (2001): 52–74; Christensen, *Deuteronomy*, 2:791, 796.

¹⁴³ It is noteworthy that the primarily paternal image of Yahweh in Deuteronomy is here mingled with maternal imagery. God’s parenthood is thus not limited to fatherly aspects. Cf. Knight, *Song*, 65. Harriman (“Our Father,” 163–64) rightly maintains that fatherhood imagery is still valid here since the metaphor of Yahweh as Father relates to his *function*, not to his gender. Thus, as Father, Yahweh can embody motherly aspects as well.

¹⁴⁴ Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 383.

verses. Verse 19 refers to disobedient Israel as Yahweh's sons *and* daughters,¹⁴⁵ and v. 20 as sons in whom there is no faithfulness.

Additionally, the epithets *Rock* and *God* are also used synonymously in the MT of 32.15, just as they are in 32.4, 18.¹⁴⁶ In v. 15, however, the sonship of Israel, if it is referenced, is more veiled than in vv. 5, 18. There is no mention of begetting, parenthood, or sonship, but of God who made them (עֲשָׂהוּ), the Rock of their salvation (יִשְׁעָתוֹ). However, the verb עָשָׂה (LXX: ποιέω) is also used in 32.6, where it clearly describes the activity of God *as Father*. Thus, it may be that God's forming activity described in v. 15 is also parental.

A final connection of interest is a short chiasm noted by Fokkelman between vv. 4–5 and v. 20 in the MT, which frames vv. 7–18.¹⁴⁷ The outer edges of the chiasm are marked by the nouns אֱמוּנָה (v. 4) and אֵינָן (v. 20). The first noun describes the faithful character of God, whereas the negation of the second draws attention to the lack of faithfulness among the sons of Israel. This is in keeping with a major theme of these verses, which contrasts Yahweh and Israel. Mention of the sons (plural) of Israel is made in vv. 5, 20 in close connection with references to the fatherhood of God. Thus, it is proper to understand the sons of Israel in these verses as the sons of God—a collective description of a singular reality. Israel was the son of God as a nation, and the individual members were sons of God as a part of that nation.¹⁴⁸ The chiasm also notes the noun דָּוָר, which is used twice to describe the perverseness of the Israelites (vv. 5, 20; LXX: γεναί). This inner chiasm frames vv. 7–18,¹⁴⁹ which contains similar themes relating to the faithfulness of Yahweh and the faithlessness of the sons of Yahweh.

Although it may be too bold to think that Matthew would have been aware of these chiasmic features, the references to Israel as faithless sons (v. 20) in contrast to Israel's faithful Father (vv. 4–6) is evident from even a cursory reading of the text. The

¹⁴⁵ The inclusion of daughters at this point emphasizes the responsibility of each Israelite. So McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 461.

¹⁴⁶ 32.18 employs אֱלֹהִים for God; 32.15 employs אֱלֹהֵי.

¹⁴⁷ This paragraph is adapted from Fokkelman, *Major Poems*, 96–98.

¹⁴⁸ So Lagrange, “La Paternité,” 485.

¹⁴⁹ Fokkelman (*Major Poems*, 96) notes that the edges of the chiasm are equidistant from vv. 7, 18.

message of these verses is clear: as sons (and daughters) of Yahweh, Israel should be faithful. Instead, the Israelites were disobedient children.

3.2.4.3 Verse 43

An additional reference to the Israelites as God's sons is found in Deut 32.43 LXX and 4QDeut^q, which are noticeably longer than the MT. In these texts it is stated that God will avenge the blood of his sons (τὸ αἷμα τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ ἐκδικᾶται [LXX]; כִּי דָם בְּנֵי יְקוֹם [4QDeut^q]).¹⁵⁰ Instead of *sons*, the MT reads *servants* (עֲבָדָיו), but in this case 4QDeut^q, which is reflected in the LXX, probably stands closer to the original text.¹⁵¹ It is also to be noted that the designation of the Israelites as *sons* is more germane to the language of the Song than the Israelites as *servants*.¹⁵²

Indeed, the reference to Israel as God's son in Deut 32.43 in conjunction with similar language in 32.5 has led Angelika Strotmann to observe an *inclusio* in Deut 32 that sums up the entire Song of Moses under the theme of Israel's sonship.¹⁵³ Although one should surely be cautious when noting an *inclusio* that is based upon a disputed textual variant, there is nevertheless a strong possibility that the reference to Israel as God's sons in 32.43 LXX/4QDeut^q, as apparently the more original text, was widely known in the ancient world. It is not possible to know, however, if Matthew was aware of this connection. In any case, Deut 32.43 should be considered another reference to Israel's sonship in the Song of Moses, and as it comes at the end of the Song, also supports the view that Israel's sonship is a key feature of the entire Song.

¹⁵⁰ The first half of 32.43 LXX also includes a reference to "all the sons of God" (πάντες υἱοὶ θεοῦ), but this likely refers to lesser deities and not to Israel (so Wevers, *Notes*, 534). The reading of 4QDeut^q (כֹּל אֱלֹהִים) also suggests the reference here is to heavenly beings, and not to the Israelites.

¹⁵¹ So Arie van der Kooij, "The Ending of the Song of Moses," in *Studies in Deuteronomy: In Honour of C. J. Labuschagne on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (ed. F. García Martínez et al.; VTSup 53; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 93–100; Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 314. In support of this view, Tigay notes that the first and fourth colons lack parallel colons in the MT, which is unlike any other section in the Hebrew of the Song (516).

¹⁵² Sanders, *Provenance*, 253.

¹⁵³ Angelika Strotmann, *Mein Vater bist du! (Sir 51:10): Zur Bedeutung der Vaterschaft Gottes in kanonischen und nichtkanonischen frühjüdischen Schriften* (FTS 39; Frankfurt: Josef Knecht, 1991), 49n.76.

3.2.4.4 Sonship and Obedience in Deut 32

This brief survey has attempted to focus only on some aspects of God's fatherhood and Israel's sonship in the Song of Moses. Of primary concern is the portrayal of God as a steadfast Father, and Israel as disobedient children.¹⁵⁴ Yahweh is holy and demands Israel's devotion.¹⁵⁵ The filial relationship between Yahweh and Israel is invoked in Deut 32 to exalt the righteousness of God, while rebuking Israel for their unfaithfulness. Sons of Yahweh should reflect the character of their Father. In sum, the Song portrays Yahweh as creating, nurturing, guiding, and protecting Israel, and expects Israel to demonstrate filial loyalty in return. Instead, Israel acts "in an unfilial way."¹⁵⁶ Again the covenantal aspects of Deuteronomy provide the best lens through which to understand Israel's call to obedient sonship.

God's faithfulness in the Song also meshes well with covenantal characteristics. In suzerainty covenants, both parties undertook responsibilities.¹⁵⁷ This Song portrays Yahweh as covenantally faithful, wholly without blame. Israel, on the other hand, has not demonstrated the same level of fidelity; they are rebellious covenant members. This perspective may explain why the Song has so often been considered a covenant lawsuit.¹⁵⁸ Although the present study has focused primarily on the first half of the Song of Moses, there is ample evidence to state that the fatherhood of Yahweh and the call for Israel to be an obedient son are significant themes of the entire Song. In accord with Watts's monograph, it can further be said that sonship and obedience, as themes of this poetic segment, are therefore themes of the entire book. The *inclusio* suggested by Strotmann would further emphasize the pervasiveness of Israel's sonship throughout the Song.

¹⁵⁴ So Childs, *Introduction*, 220. Craigie (*Deuteronomy*, 377) entitles 32.4–9 "A Faithful God and a Faithless People."

¹⁵⁵ Macdonald, *Monotheism*, 145–46.

¹⁵⁶ Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 301.

¹⁵⁷ For examples of this mutual loyalty in ANE treaties, see "Treaty between Suppiluliuma I of Hatti and Huqqana of Hayasa," §§5–6 (Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 24); "Treaty between Mursili II of Hatti and Tuppi-Teshshup of Amurru," §§6–8 (Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, 55–56).

¹⁵⁸ Cf. Thiessen, "Form and Function," 401–7.

3.2.5 Deut 21

A final passage to consider is the case of the rebellious son (Deut 21.18–21). This passage will be addressed last because it does not refer to *Israel* as the son of God. Nevertheless, it does afford insights into the responsibilities of parents and children in Israel. Indeed, the disobedient son in these verses serves as an example to Israel, warning them of the dangers of filial rebellion. This chapter is found toward the end of the so-called Deuteronomistic law code (Deut 12–26).¹⁵⁹ Verse 18 begins with the description of a son who is stubborn (ἀπειθής) and rebellious (ἑρεθιστής), who will not obey his father and mother. If he still does not obey despite his parents' disciplinary actions (παιδεύω),¹⁶⁰ they are then to take him to the elders of the city, who, along with the men of the community, will stone him. By so doing, the evil will be purged from among the Israelites.

The first thing to notice in this passage is the son's obligation to be obedient to his parents;¹⁶¹ he stands under his parents' authority.¹⁶² The actions described here are an affront to the relational bond between the son and parents. The son is in effect saying, "I am not your son; you are not my parents."¹⁶³ Second, the son is described as being a glutton and a drunkard (συμβολοκοπῶν οἰνοφλυγεῖ; MT: אִשְׁמֵן וְזָלֵזֵל). It is best not to view these as isolated crimes, but as proverbial, denoting typical examples of the son's corruption.¹⁶⁴ The key aspect of this case seems to be the son's violation of the commandment to honor his father and mother (5.16).¹⁶⁵ The corollary of this is that by

¹⁵⁹ In the analysis of Waltke (*Theology*, 480–81), the macrostructure of Deuteronomy may be seen as a chiasm, with these chapters that set forth the covenant stipulations forming the pivot.

¹⁶⁰ MT: יָסַר.

¹⁶¹ Elizabeth Bellefontaine, "Deuteronomy 21:18–21: Reviewing the Case of the Rebellious Son," *JSOT* 13 (1979): 13–31; Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 196.

¹⁶² Joseph Fleishman, "Legal Innovation in Deuteronomy XXI 18-20," *VT* 53 (2003): 311–27; Fohrer, *TDNT* 8:343.

¹⁶³ Bellefontaine, "Reviewing the Case," 17.

¹⁶⁴ Christensen, *Deuteronomy*, 2:484; Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 247–48; Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 20.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 283; Christensen, *Deuteronomy*, 2:484. Christensen notes the work by D. N. Freedman (*The Nine Commandments: Uncovering the Hidden Pattern of Crime and Punishment in the Hebrew Bible* [New York: Doubleday, 2000]) that argues on a canonical level that, except coveting, all the commandments of the Decalogue have a corresponding episode of disobedience involving death. This pericope is the episode involving death that relates to the fifth commandment.

dishonoring his parents, he was at the same time dishonoring God.¹⁶⁶ Moreover, “the rejection of parental authority is tantamount to a breach of the covenant in Israel.”¹⁶⁷ The correlation between disobedience to one’s parents and disobedience to God is perhaps the key factor in understanding the harshness of the son’s sentence.¹⁶⁸ These verses do not simply speak to an isolated incident of rebellion, but to incorrigibility that threatened the entire covenant community.¹⁶⁹

To summarize, Deut 21.18–21 demonstrates the necessity of filial obedience to earthly parents, and consequently to God. The incorrigibility of the wayward son was not an isolated crime, but threatened the entire covenant community. Given the frequent references to Israel as the son of God in Deuteronomy, this passage further serves as a picture of how the Israelites were to respond to their Father, and illustrates the consequences of disobedience. The rebellious son denied the authority of his parents and rejected his filial relationship,¹⁷⁰ the very thing Israel as God’s son would be in danger of if they similarly disobeyed Yahweh’s covenant.¹⁷¹ Thus, it was of the utmost importance that Israel as son of God demonstrate filial obedience to their Father. Indeed, the existence of the covenant community depended on it.¹⁷² From a wider perspective it may be said that this passage is “almost prophetic of Israel’s future.”¹⁷³

¹⁶⁶ Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 284.

¹⁶⁷ McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 331.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁹ Bellefontaine, “Reviewing the Case,” 21; Fleishman, “Legal Innovation,” 324. Interestingly, Calvin’s sermon on this passage (1555) recognizes this corporate dimension, concluding that this sort of incorrigibility threatened the existence of the entire community in his own day. See Raymond A. Blacketer, *The School of God: Pedagogy and Rhetoric in Calvin’s Interpretation of Deuteronomy* (SEMRR 3; Dordrecht: Springer, 2006), 240.

¹⁷⁰ Bellefontaine, “Reviewing the Case,” 19.

¹⁷¹ This passage also typifies the way earthly parent-child relationships magnify the importance of the heavenly father-son relationship between Yahweh and Israel. Moreover, the prevalence of familial language throughout Deuteronomy (e.g., 4.9–10, 37–40; 5.16; 6.7, 20ff; 11.18–21; 21.15–21; al.) reinforces the obligation of Israel to be an obedient son by illustrating the importance of family in Yahweh’s covenant community.

¹⁷² Cf. Mayes, “Deuteronomy 14,” 166.

¹⁷³ Stephen G. Dempster, *Dominion and Dynasty: A Theology of the Hebrew Bible* (NSBT 15; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2003), 121; so Christensen, *Deuteronomy*, 2:488. Dempster also includes 21.22–23 in this predictive capacity.

As the rebellious son of Deut 21.18–21 was punished for disobedience, so would Israel be punished if they rebelled.¹⁷⁴

3.3 Filial Themes

Having examined five key passages in Deuteronomy that pertain to the sonship of Israel, this study will now consider three themes that further elucidate aspects of Israel's sonship and Yahweh's fatherhood.

3.3.1 Election

The prerequisite for Israel's obedience was its *election*,¹⁷⁵ or the way in which Israel became the son of God. This perspective is perhaps most clear in Deut 7, which emphasizes divine grace in the election of Israel. Deut 7.6–8 states that Israel was chosen simply because Yahweh loved them.¹⁷⁶ The election of Israel is closely related to their holy status, often expressed by the phrase *λαὸς ἅγιος* (MT: *עַם קָדוֹשׁ*).¹⁷⁷ This holiness meant that Israel was set apart from other nations because of their particular relationship to Yahweh.¹⁷⁸ Thus, the holy status was not something achieved by Israel's obedience to the law. Obedience was, however, the necessary outworking of their election.¹⁷⁹ Although Israel did not procure its covenant relationship by obedience, this was the living expression of the special relationship granted to them.¹⁸⁰ Although Israel's election was by free grace, their holy Father would not tolerate a covenant people who failed to keep his commandments.¹⁸¹

¹⁷⁴ Bellefontaine, "Reviewing the Case," 25.

¹⁷⁵ Waltke, *Theology*, 509.

¹⁷⁶ Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 179.

¹⁷⁷ Deut 7.6; 14.2, 21; 28.9; cf. 26.17–19. This phrase also demonstrates a revealing overlap with the usage of *περιούσιος/יהוָה* (7.6; 14.2). Cf. Exod 19.5.

¹⁷⁸ Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 179; Macdonald, *Monotheism*, 156.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*; Clements, *God's Chosen People*, 33.

¹⁸⁰ McCarthy, *Treaty and Covenant*, 175–76.

¹⁸¹ Christensen, *Deuteronomy*, 1:157.

3.3.2 Love

Deuteronomy has been called the book of love *par excellence*,¹⁸² and it has been suggested that love is the operative principle throughout the book.¹⁸³ Love is important for the present study for two reasons. First, in Deuteronomy love is closely related to obedience. The love required of Israel is to be expressed in loyalty, service, and unqualified obedience.¹⁸⁴ Indeed, love is virtually synonymous with covenant obedience in Deuteronomy.¹⁸⁵

This leads to the second observation, that the father-son relationship is key to understanding Israel's love for God.¹⁸⁶ Since love in Deuteronomy is portrayed in filial terms,¹⁸⁷ love should be seen as a matter of faithfulness within the father-son relationship.¹⁸⁸ Conversely, the father-son relationship is conceived of in terms that correspond to the Deuteronomic conception of covenant love.¹⁸⁹ In other words, the love commanded in Deuteronomy is the love of a father and son—language that was also employed by ANE treaties.¹⁹⁰ The proper response of Israel to Yahweh was filial obedience; this can also be described as love.¹⁹¹ Therefore, love is not merely an

¹⁸² Moran, "Love of God," 77. So Geerhardus Vos, "The Scriptural Doctrine of the Love of God," *PRR* 13 (1902): 1–37.

¹⁸³ Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 37.

¹⁸⁴ Moran, "Love of God," 78.

¹⁸⁵ McKay, "Man's Love for God," 433; Wright, *Knowing Jesus*, 124.

¹⁸⁶ McKay, "Man's Love for God," 427.

¹⁸⁷ Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 41; Vos, "Scriptural Doctrine," 7.

¹⁸⁸ Wright, *Knowing Jesus*, 124.

¹⁸⁹ McCarthy, "Notes on the Love of God," 145.

¹⁹⁰ Moran, "Love of God," 78; Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 41. In a well known parallel to Deut 6.5 a treaty of Ashurbanipal commands the vassal to "love Ashurbanipal as yourselves" (cf. Moran, "Love of God," 82n.33). Vos ("Scriptural Doctrine," 7) adds that love is in view in Deuteronomy even when not explicitly mentioned because the covenant and fatherhood of Yahweh necessitates on the indispensability of such a relational love.

¹⁹¹ So McKay, "Man's Love for God," 432, 435.

internal emotion, but something that was to be manifested in visible ways.¹⁹² It should also be noted that love is a motivation for obedience in Deuteronomy.¹⁹³

3.3.3 Inheritance

A final theme to consider is the relationship between inheritance (e.g., κληρονομία/נחלה) and sonship. For the purposes of this study, it is noteworthy that the father-son relationship is in view when Deuteronomy speaks of inheritance. Although Israel's inheritance of the land is the primary focus for this theme in Deuteronomy, Israel is also referred to as Yahweh's inheritance.¹⁹⁴ McConville observes that this latter perspective is quite similar to Israel's sonship of Yahweh, since it is sons who inherit in the ANE culture.¹⁹⁵ Indeed, the priority of sonship was demonstrated in the ANE in that, in principle, it was *only* sons who had the right to inherit.¹⁹⁶ Moreover, the firstborn son received a larger portion than anyone else. Thus, the importance of the firstborn son as an heir should not be underestimated. It is, of course, Israel who is Yahweh's firstborn son (Exod 4.22).

This interface between father-son concepts and inheritance can be seen in Deut 4. In 4.20 it is stated that Yahweh redeemed Israel so that they would be his own possession (εἶναι αὐτῷ λαὸν ἑγκληρον; MT: לְהִיְיֹוָה לֹא לְעַם לְךָ נַחֲלָה). Dreyfus suggests that the focus of the term נחלה (MT) is on the stable character and permanence of the possession.¹⁹⁷ This would again highlight the uniqueness of Israel's personal

¹⁹² This is in keeping with Deuteronomy's view that internal and external qualities cannot be separated—one involves the other (e.g., 10.16).

¹⁹³ Vos, "Scriptural Doctrine," 7. And, since love is so closely associated with sonship, this is tantamount to saying that sonship is the motivation for obedience. This comports especially well with 8.5–6; 14.1–2.

¹⁹⁴ Compare, e.g., 1.38; 3.28; 4.21, 38; 12.9; 15.4; 26.1; 31.7 with 4.20; 9.26, 29; 32.9.

¹⁹⁵ McConville, *Deuteronomy*, 108. Cf. Mendelsohn, "On the Preferential Status of the Eldest Son," *BASOR* 156 (1959): 38–40.

¹⁹⁶ E. Lipinski, "נַחֲלָה, *nāḥal*," *TDOT* 9:319–35. Eryl W. Davies ("The Meaning of *Pi Šēnayim* in Deuteronomy XXI 17," *VT* 36 [1986]: 341–47) argues for the traditional interpretation that the firstborn son received a double portion, as opposed to two-thirds as is commonly accepted. Regardless of how much more the firstborn son received as an heir, it is clear that he was given preference.

¹⁹⁷ Dreyfus, "Le Thème de l'Héritage," 8.

relationship with Yahweh,¹⁹⁸ who treats Israel more intimately than the other nations.¹⁹⁹ This favored relationship is elucidated further in 4.37, where Tigay suggests father-son imagery is again in view.²⁰⁰ He bases this largely on the love exhibited by Yahweh, and his role in assigning an inheritance.²⁰¹ Properly speaking, then, it is a son (perhaps a firstborn) who is in view when an inheritance is discussed. Furthermore, in keeping with the overall outlook of Deuteronomy, the inheritance of the land is a gift, but is also contingent on Israel's obedience.²⁰² In light of all these considerations, it may be concluded that the theme of inheritance is another way in which Israel's sonship is emphasized.

3.4 Summary and Conclusions

It has been argued in this chapter that Israel was considered to be a son of Yahweh in Deuteronomy and that this theme is not tertiary, but is highly significant in Deuteronomy. It is expressed in Deut 1, 8, 14, 32, quite possibly 21, and is corroborated by other passages and themes. It has further been argued that the father-son relationship should be viewed in its covenantal context. Although Deuteronomy certainly echoes ANE covenantal concepts, Yahweh's fatherly affection in Deuteronomy is more intimate than in similar ANE documents.

Israel as the son of Yahweh had the responsibility to be obedient. This is a characteristic that was also reflected in the father-son language of ANE treaties. Thus, what was true of covenants at the beginning of the chapter has also been found in

¹⁹⁸ So G. Wanke, “הַלָּא, *n^ahalā*” *TLOT* 2:731–34.

¹⁹⁹ See the discussion of 32.9 in Dreyfus, “Le Thème de l’Héritage,” 30.

²⁰⁰ Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 56.

²⁰¹ Deuteronomy 21.15–17 indicates that it was the *father* in ancient Israel who distributed the inheritance.

²⁰² Waltke, *Theology*, 544. The thematic connections between vv. 15–23 may be relevant for a study of Matthew. These verses contain three laws (vv. 15–17; vv. 18–21; vv. 22–23) that begin with ἐὰν δέ (MT: כִּי). The first deals with inheritance rights of the firstborn, the second with a rebellious son, and the third states that the land being given as an inheritance (κληρος/הֲרִיחַ) is not to be defiled by a body hung on a tree. Since the notion of *inheritance* is bound up with sonship, these passages have a shared foundation. Taken together, these three laws all speak of the land, the inheritance *of a son*. It will be argued in chapter 5 that Matthew was familiar with 21.18–21, and possibly 21.22–23, which may mean that he was familiar with the larger context of Deut 21 and the concept of inheritance as it relates to a son.

particular texts and themes throughout Deuteronomy, reinforcing the necessity to read Deuteronomy as a covenant document. As such the prominence of the *relationship* should not be forgotten—the covenant was not an impersonal statement of law, but a personal relationship.²⁰³ The laws in Deuteronomy were the conditions of that relationship.²⁰⁴ Put more forthrightly, the sonship of Israel in Deuteronomy demanded their obedience. Indeed, obedience may even be the *primary* significance of the father-son relationship.²⁰⁵ Similarly, McCarthy is correct that “reverential fear, loyalty, and obedience” are in view when the OT speaks of Israel as a son.²⁰⁶

Moreover, to rebuke Israel for their disobedience, the author of Deuteronomy employs filial language to demonstrate the gravity of their sin and reemphasize their duty to be obedient.²⁰⁷ Tigay rightly notes that their rebellion is characterized as unfilial conduct,²⁰⁸ which assumes sonship necessarily entails obedience. To merit the title “son of Yahweh,” Israel had to be obedient;²⁰⁹ true sons of Yahweh are those who do his will.²¹⁰ The sonship of Israel in Deuteronomy does not express Israel’s special position so much as a relationship of *obligation* (*Verpflichtungsverhältnis*).²¹¹ Therefore, when encountering Israel as son of God in Deuteronomy, it is necessary to be cognizant of the requirements that are always in view.

It has been necessary to trace these motifs in some detail due to the lack of attention normally given to Deuteronomy when discussing sonship Christology in the NT. Although Israel’s sonship is not unique to Deuteronomy, it is appropriate to consider Deuteronomy in detail since it is here that sonship finds its fullest, most foundational canonical expression. Indeed, in the next chapter it will be shown that a number of other

²⁰³ Mendenhall, “Covenant Forms,” 58.

²⁰⁴ McCarthy, “Notes on the Love of God,” 146-147.

²⁰⁵ Wright, *Knowing Jesus*, 130.

²⁰⁶ McCarthy, “Notes on the Love of God,” 145.

²⁰⁷ Macdonald, *Monotheism*, 101.

²⁰⁸ Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, xv.

²⁰⁹ Lagrange, “La Paternité,” 485.

²¹⁰ Harriman, “Our Father,” 236.

²¹¹ Paul Winter, “Der Begriff ‘Söhne Gottes’ im Moselied Dtn 32 1–43,” *ZAW* 67 (1955): 40–48.

ancient authors often associated Israel's sonship with their obedience, often in contexts that evoke Deuteronomy.

Chapter Four

Sonship and Obedience in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature

The previous chapter outlined the ways in which Israel was called to be the obedient son of God in Deuteronomy, and a case was made that this is a major theme of Deuteronomy that likely would have been recognized by Matthew. The present chapter will build on chapter 3 to show ways in which other Jewish and Christian authors re-appropriate this Deuteronomic teaching in new contexts. It will be argued that Israel's sonship is a common theme in Jewish and Christian literature, and Deuteronomic influence is often seen in those texts in which Israel is said to be in a filial relationship to their divine Father. Thus, Israel's sonship is one *particular* aspect of Deuteronomy's pervasive influence *in general* that was noted in chapter 2. As the following survey will show, it is also significant that many of the writings that demonstrate Deuteronomic influence are the same writings that most clearly connect Israel's sonship with obedience. As in Deuteronomy, this filial language for Israel frequently reflects Yahweh's covenantal love for his people and summons Israel to obedience (or underscores the inexcusable nature of their disobedience).

To this end, this chapter will survey some of the most prominent passages that refer to Israel as the son of God¹ elsewhere in the OT, other Jewish, and early Christian literature particularly inasmuch as such references may betray similarities with Deuteronomy and/or portray obedience as a necessary corollary of sonship. If it can be established that these themes were frequently related in Jewish and Christian

¹ This chapter will consider "son of God" to include references to Judah, Israel (and synonymous epithets for the Northern Kingdom), and Judah/Israel together. Thus, any passage that refers to God's people in filial terms will be relevant. *Israel* will be used as shorthand to refer to any of these options.

writings leading up to and roughly contemporaneous with Matthew, it may help explain why Matthew also linked sonship and obedience in his gospel.²

4.1 Sonship and Obedience: OT

The most significant corpus of writings to consider in conjunction with Matthew is the OT,³ the importance of which is illustrated by Matthew's numerous fulfilment citations that appeal to the OT. Significantly, many OT writings link sonship and obedience in contexts that share language and themes with Deuteronomy, and many of these are passages that Matthew seems to have known. Here, as in chapter 3, attention will be given to both the LXX—since Matthew wrote in Greek—and MT—since Matthew's text also bears marks of Hebrew influence.

4.1.1 Latter Prophets

The shared features between Deuteronomy and many portions of the Latter Prophets have led a number of scholars to conclude either that Israelite prophets consciously based their messages on the foundational Mosaic covenant as expressed in Deuteronomy,⁴ or that Pentateuchal/Mosaic *traditions* underlie the message of the prophets.⁵ Moreover, the blessings/curses offered by the prophets find their obvious

² It will not be necessary for the present study to establish the dating of each of these books. Instead, it will suffice to demonstrate theological and literary similarities between Deuteronomy and these other documents. Matthew certainly would have considered Moses to be the author of Deuteronomy, and therefore would have assumed that Deuteronomy preceded books portrayed as post-Mosaic. Thus Jeffrey A. Gibbs ("Israel Standing with Israel: The Baptism of Jesus in Matthew's Gospel (Matt 3:13–17)," *CBQ* 64 [2002]: 511–26, here 519n.35) states: "The results of modern critical scholarship regarding the dates of various sources for the OT narratives are a part neither of the worldview of the human author of [Matthew's] Gospel nor of the 'narrative world' created by the implied author of the Gospel."

³ For surveys of sonship in the OT, see Th. De Kruijf, *Der Sohn des lebendigen Gottes: Ein Beitrag zur Christologie des Matthäusevangeliums* (AnBib 16; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1962), 3–19; Joachim Jeremias, *The Prayers of Jesus* (SBT 2/6; London: SCM Press, 1967), 11–15; Sarah J. Dille, *Mixing Metaphors: God as Mother and Father in Deutero-Isaiah* (JSOTSup 398/GCT 13; London: T&T Clark, 2004), 35–39; Diane G. Chen, *God as Father in Luke-Acts* (StBL 92; New York: Peter Lang, 2006), 73–111; Jonathan T. Pennington, *Heaven and Earth in the Gospel of Matthew* (NovTSup 126; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 217–18. For a helpful discussion of the state of research, see James Earl Harriman, "Our Father in Heaven: The Dimensions of Divine Paternity in Deuteronomy," (Ph.D. diss.; Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2005), 5–19.

⁴ E.g., Bruce K. Waltke with Charles Yu, *An Old Testament Theology: An Exegetical, Canonical, and Thematic Approach* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2007), 805, 829; Douglas Stuart, *Hosea-Jonah* (WBC 31; Waco: Word, 1987), xxxii; Pamela J. Scalise, "The Logic of Covenant and the Logic of Lament in Jeremiah," *PRSt* 28 (2001): 395–401; J. A. Thompson, *Jeremiah* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 60–63.

⁵ Walter Brueggemann, *Tradition for Crisis: A Study in Hosea* (Richmond, Va.: John Knox, 1968), 13. Cf. Jon D. Levenson ("The Davidic Covenant and its Modern Interpreters," *CBQ* 41

precedent in the covenantal blessings/curses of Deut 27–30.⁶ Regardless of the actual date(s) of canonical Deuteronomy’s origins, Matthew almost certainly would have viewed the prophets’ covenantal messages to have been derived from Deuteronomy. As the following survey suggests, it is the Mosaic, covenantal tradition that explains both Israel’s designation as *sons* and their call to *obedience* in the prophets.

4.1.2 Hosea

Hosea is considered first given its strong connections with Deuteronomy and its significance for Matthean Christology. Covenant is important to Hosea,⁷ as the Exodus tradition, the establishment of the covenant, and the giving of the law lie at the heart of Hosea’s message.⁸ More specifically, Deuteronomic *material* appears to have served as the background for much of Hosea’s thought.⁹ Combining these two observations, the need for covenantal faithfulness is a central concern of Hosea as it is in Deuteronomy. Moreover, the covenantal context of Hosea also enables the reader to understand best the significance of the love language and the father-son imagery to be considered below.¹⁰ Indeed, Weinfeld concludes that the description of the love between Yahweh and Israel is the most prominent connection between Deuteronomy and Hosea.¹¹ Two sections that illustrate this are of particular relevance for the present purposes: Hos 1–2; 11.

[1979]: 205–19) who notes that almost every book in the OT is saturated with an awareness of the Sinaitic Covenant.

⁶ So Stuart, *Hosea*, 6–7.

⁷ Duane Andre Smith, “Kinship and Covenant in Hosea 11:1–4,” *HBT* 16/1 (1994): 41–53. This study will be less concerned with covenantal passages in Hosea that do not have immediate bearing on the sonship of Israel (4.1; 6.7; 8.1). For these see John Day, “Pre-Deuteronomic Allusions to the Covenant in Hosea and Psalm LXXVIII,” *VT* 36 (1986): 1–12; E. W. Nicholson, *God and His People: Covenant and Theology in the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1986), 179–90.

⁸ Hans Walter Wolff, *Hosea: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Hosea* (trans. G. Stansell; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974), xxxi, xxvi; Brueggemann, *Tradition*, 27.

⁹ For details on the shared language and theology of Deuteronomy and Hosea see Brueggemann, *Tradition*, 45–50; Francis I. Anderson and David N. Freedman, *Hosea: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 24; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1980), 75, 131, 486; Wolff, *Hosea*, xxxi; Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972), 366–70; *idem*, *Deuteronomy*, 45–49; Matthew Thiessen, “The Form and Function of the Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 32:1–43),” *JBL* 123 (2004): 401–24.

¹⁰ Wolff, *Hosea*, xxxi, 211, 298.

¹¹ Weinfeld, *Deuteronomistic School*, 368. Cf. Andreas Reichart, “Israel, the Firstborn of God: A Topic of Early Deuteronomistic Theology,” in vol. 1 of *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of*

4.1.2.1 Hos 1–2

Though Hosea’s covenantal concerns are similar to the language of Deuteronomy, he also uses the image of *marriage* as a way to speak of the covenant. The two images—father-son on the one hand, and husband-wife on the other—are not contradictory, but complementary. This is not unique to Hosea, but the prophets often mix metaphors to communicate their messages. Moreover, it is noteworthy that these are both *familial* images. This is fitting, since covenants were frequently couched in the language of kinship.¹² In the Hosean framework, the inclusion of Gomer and her *children*—who picture Israel—may be another way to indicate Israel’s collective sonship.¹³

Moreover, the name of Hosea’s third known son, Lo-Ammi (לֹא-עַמִּי; LXX: Οὐ-λαός-μου) is especially significant for its covenantal overtones. At the Exodus, Yahweh promised that Israel would be *his* people (Exod 6.7; Lev 26.12; Deut 27.9).¹⁴ In the LXX *λαός* is coupled with a possessive pronoun linking Israel to Yahweh (ἐμοί, μου, σου), and in the MT each of these passages attests עַמִּי accompanied by a possessive ל. Attention to verbal parallels in the MT also suggests that the name Lo-Ammi may be a wordplay on Deut 32.21, where the nations are God’s *non*-people (לֹא-עַמִּי; LXX: οὐκ ἔθνη).¹⁵ Clearly the name Lo-Ammi for Hosea’s son represents Yahweh’s shocking judgment on his people—who were often also likened to a son—because they had been disobedient to his covenant.¹⁶

Yet this drastic statement is not without hope; the prospect of salvation remains.¹⁷ Thus the next verse (2.1 [1.10]) repeats the phrase לֹא-עַמִּי/οὐ λαός μου but contrasts this state with the assurance that Israel would be called the sons of the Living God (בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים; LXX: υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζῶντος). This last phrase is unique to

Jewish Studies (ed. A. Shinan; Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1977), 341–349, especially 347–48.

¹² Frank Moore Cross, “Kinship and Covenant in Ancient Israel,” in *From Epic To Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 2000), 3–21; Mark S. Smith, “‘Your People Shall Be My People’: Family and Covenant in Ruth 1:16–17,” *CBQ* 69 (2007): 242–58.

¹³ For gender inclusive language of Israel’s sonship, see Deut 32.19.

¹⁴ Andersen and Freedman, *Hosea*, 198; so Francis Landy, *Hosea* (Readings; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 27.

¹⁵ Andersen and Freedman, *Hosea*, 198.

¹⁶ Wolff, *Hosea*, 27.

¹⁷ So *ibid.*, 22, 29.

Hosea,¹⁸ but the filial imagery in association with the covenant (perhaps in connection with Deut 32) is similar to the Deuteronomic passages surveyed in chapter 3.¹⁹ Furthermore, Israel’s filial designation in 2.1 provides a climactic force to the section, given its unexpectedness in light of what precedes it.²⁰ Thus, in spite of Israel’s filial rebellion, Hosea looks forward to a day when the Israelites would be called “sons of the Living God.”

It may also be significant that this portion of Hosea shares a number of linguistic parallels with Deut 8. These include Israel’s sonship, the warning against forgetting (חָשַׁח; LXX: ἐπιλανθάνομαι) Yahweh (Deut 8.11, 14, 19; Hos 2.15 [2.13]), and the rare idiom (occurring in only Deuteronomy and Hosea) “multiply silver and gold” (Deut 8.13: וַיְכַסֵּף וַיִּזְבֹּחַ וַיִּרְבֶּה-לָּךְ; LXX: πληθυνθέντων σοι ἀργυρίου καὶ χρυσίου πληθυνθέντος σοι/Hos 2.10 [2.8]: וַיְכַסֵּף הַרְבִּיתִי לָּהּ וַיִּזְבֹּחַ; LXX: ἀργύριον ἐπλήθυνα αὐτῆ).²¹ But Hos 1–2 also highlights two important features not emphasized in Deut 8: Israel’s filial *rebellion* against God,²² and the coming day of Israel’s eschatological renewal when they will be known as בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים (LXX: υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζῶντος).

4.1.2.2 Hos 11

A more widely recognized reference to Israel’s sonship is found in Hos 11.1–4, a section that has a number of telling parallels to passages considered in the previous chapter. Here the tenderness of Yahweh toward his son Israel is recounted. It is Yahweh who loved Israel, rescued them from Egypt (v. 1: διότι νήπιος Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἐγὼ ἠγάπησα αὐτὸν καὶ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου μετεκάλεσα τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ/בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וּמִמְצָרִים וַיִּצִּילֵם יְהוָה מֵאֵיִתְּנָתַיִם וַיִּזְבֹּחַ וַיִּרְבֶּה-לָּךְ), and taught them to walk (v. 3). Yet, Israel had not

¹⁸ Ibid., 27. The phrase אֱלֹהִים is used infrequently in the MT (Jos 3.10; Psa 42.3; 84.3); cf. חַיִּים אֱלֹהִים (Deut 5.26; 1 Sam 17.26, 36; Jer 10.10; 23.36; also Deut 4.33 LXX).

¹⁹ Andersen and Freedman (*Hosea*, 203) note Israel’s designation as God’s son in the Exodus as the background for this passage, and observe that “Hosea has a doctrine of redemption by recapitulation.” One might say the same of Matthew.

²⁰ Ibid., 205. Similarly, recall the important role of Israel’s sonship in the climactic Song of Moses.

²¹ Ibid., 131–132. Other connections to Deuteronomy in the MT here include the fulfilment of רָחַמְתִּים (Deut 13.18 [13.17]) in Hos 2.21 [2.19], and Deut 32.39 (וַאֲיִן מִיָּדַי מְצִיל; αὐτὸς οὐκ ἔστιν ὃς ἐξελεῖται ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν μου) is similar to Hos 2.12 [2.10] in both MT/LXX (וַאֲיִן לֹא-יִצִּילֶנָּה מִיָּדַי; καὶ οὐδεὶς οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃ αὐτὴν ἐκ χειρὸς μου).

²² Given the verbal links with Deut 32.21 noted above, it is possible that parallels to Israel’s filial rebellion from Deut 32 are present here.

responded appropriately, but had repeatedly turned to other gods (v. 2). Thus this passage, much like Deut 21.18–21, calls Israel to account for their sins with the language and form that resemble a legal setting.²³ Indeed, one of the major background themes of this section appears to be the case of the rebellious son.²⁴

However, the most significant parallel to Deuteronomy for the present purposes is the father-son relationship mentioned in 11.1. Even though the LXX reads τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ, Matthew clearly recognized this as a reference to God’s *son* as evidenced by the use of υἱός in Matt 2.15. The interrelation of Yahweh’s love (אהבה; ἡγάπησα), the father-son relationship, and Egypt connects this passage to Deuteronomy and its historical precedent of the Exodus and the giving of the covenant.²⁵ Although *covenant* is not mentioned explicitly in Hos 11, Andersen and Freedman rightly observe that the relationship in view in 11.1 is like that between a suzerain and a vassal.²⁶ Thus, there is warrant for understanding the love in 11.1 to be closely connected with *covenantal* fidelity.²⁷ This same link is evident in Deuteronomy (e.g., 6.5; 7.9; 10.12; 11.1; 30.20).²⁸

Hosea 11.4 is also relevant, but is more difficult to interpret due to apparent textual corruption.²⁹ The text may continue the imagery of Israel’s sonship, or it may compare Israel to a beast of burden cared for by Yahweh.³⁰ However, the vocabulary

²³ Peter C. Craigie, *The Twelve Prophets* (2 vols.; DSB; Edinburgh: St. Andrew, 1984–85), 1:72; so Wolff, *Hosea*, xxix.

²⁴ Marvin A. Sweeney, *The Twelve Prophets* (vol. 1; Berit Olam; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2000), 112–13.

²⁵ Cf. James Luther Mays, *Hosea: A Commentary* (OTL; London: SCM Press, 1969), 151–53.

²⁶ Andersen and Freedman, *Hosea*, 576

²⁷ Stuart, *Hosea*, 178.

²⁸ In addition, similarities to Deut 1 are seen in the characteristics of Yahweh’s affection in these verses. P. DeBoer (“The Son of God in the Old Testament,” in *Syntax and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Syntax and Exegesis* [ed. C. Labuschagne et al.; Leiden: Brill, 1973], 188–207) writes that paternal love and nurture is the focus in 11.1 just as in Deut 1.31. Similarly, Weinfeld (*Deuteronomy*, 148) connects this theme of caring/loving and guiding a child to the same concept in Deut 1. Indeed, although the verbal parallels are not exact, the language of 11.3 may recall the similar language in Deut 1.31, where Yahweh carries Israel as a Father carries his son. The “bearing up” of Israel in Deut 1.31 assumes that Yahweh carried Israel as if in his arms. Hosea 11.3 MT is not altogether clear that a similar action is in view, but might be translated woodenly “to take them on his arms.” Although Andersen and Freedman (*Hosea*, 579) note that נָקַל is not used for carrying in one’s arms, they do acknowledge that ancient versions (Syriac [Targums]) suggest that the text was generally understood by the rendering “I took them upon his arm.” This is consistent with Hos 11.3 LXX which reads ἀνέλαβον αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν βραχίονά μου. Thus the actions of Yahweh here are similar to Deut 1.31.

²⁹ See the critical apparatus of Karl Elliger (*BHS*, p. 1004).

³⁰ Stuart, *Hosea*, 179.

of yoke (עַל; δεσμός) and love (אַהֲבָה; ἀγαπήσεώς) suggest a divine-human covenantal relationship.³¹ This would comport well with the tenderness of the father-son relationship mentioned explicitly in v. 1, and would also entail Israel's need for obedience.

To summarize, Hos 11.1–4 describes Yahweh's fatherly, covenantal care for Israel. Yet, the point should not be missed that Israel has not responded appropriately. They have foolishly neglected their Father Yahweh, to whom they were bound in the covenant.³² Mays further suggests the father-son imagery provides a poignancy to this Hosean passage,³³ which is also a characteristic of the father-son relationship in Deuteronomy.

Language pertaining to the sonship of Israel does not end in 11.4, but is found again in 11.10. Stuart rightly notes that the second half of Hos 11 “reveals God's love in an especially passionate way,” as the return from Exile is described.³⁴ It is stated in 11.10–11 that Yahweh's sons (בְּנֵי; LXX: τέκνα) will return from the west (Egypt and Assyria) back to their homes,³⁵ receiving the blessing that the rebellious children in 11.1–3 could not receive.³⁶ In this sense, these verses speak of an eschatological hope for Israel.³⁷ Just as the Exodus was the defining event of salvation when God's son was originally called out of Egypt, so Hosea looks forward to a day when God's son will again come out of the land of Egypt. It may be that this combination of Israel's sonship and Hosea's eschatological expectations that made this passage so appealing to Matthew.

In sum, Hosea exhibits a striking number of thematic and verbal parallels with Deuteronomy, specifically with passages that speak of Yahweh's fatherly love and Israel's covenantal obligations. Although the Israelites had perennially been

³¹ Ibid. For love as a covenantal term see William L. Moran, “The Ancient Near Eastern Background of the Love of God in Deuteronomy,” *CBQ* 25 (1963): 77–87. For עַל as an image of Israel's covenantal relationship, see Lev 26.13; Deut 28.48.

³² So Wolff, *Hosea*, 198.

³³ Mays, *Hosea*, 154.

³⁴ Stuart, *Hosea*, 183. Exile may be seen as the chief covenant curse in Deuteronomy (Deut 4.27–28; 28.36–68; cf. Lev 26.33).

³⁵ Cf. Deut 4.30; 30.1–10.

³⁶ Stuart, *Hosea*, 182.

³⁷ In this way Hos 11 is much like Hos 2.

unfaithful sons, Hosea conveys an eschatological hope for the renewal of Israel that is intimately linked with their filial status.

4.1.3 Jeremiah

Jeremiah has numerous connections with both Deuteronomy and Hosea, including the concern with covenantal faithfulness.³⁸ This is not surprising, since Jeremiah—regardless of whether the *book* of Deuteronomy was known to him—would likely have seen the Mosaic covenant to be fundamental.³⁹ William Holladay has even argued effectively, based in part on the similarities between Deuteronomy and Jeremiah, that Jeremiah saw himself as a successor to Moses, which may explain his interest in the unprecedented idea of the New *Covenant*.⁴⁰ The Song of Moses is also influential in Jeremiah, evidenced in the MT by the nuance of certain words and a number of phrases that are found only in Deut 32 and Jeremiah. These include the language of forsaking (נטש) God (Deut 32.15; Jer 15.6), the use of זרים for foreign gods (Deut 32.16; Jer 2.25; 3.13), and the phrase כִּי־אֵשׁ קָרְחָהּ בְּאִפִּי (Deut 32.22; Jer 15.14; 17.4).⁴¹

One significant aspect of Jeremiah's theology that corresponds to Deuteronomy is the familial imagery he attaches to the covenant.⁴² Eichrodt acknowledges the father-son relationship as one of the three most significant images in the entire book,⁴³ and the prevalence of familial imagery "sharpens the betrayal" of Israel and adds emotive elements to the character of Yahweh.⁴⁴ Eichrodt even

³⁸ Walter Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament* (trans. J. Baker; 2 vols.; OTL; London: SCM Press, 1961), 1:53; J. Gordon McConville, *Judgment and Promise: An Interpretation of the Book of Jeremiah* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1993), 19.

³⁹ Thompson, *Jeremiah*, 59–61; Jack R. Lundbom, *Jeremiah: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (3 vols.; AB 21A–C; New York: Doubleday, 1999–2004), 1:145; Scalise, "Logic of Covenant," 396.

⁴⁰ William L. Holladay, "The Background of Jeremiah's Self-Understanding: Moses, Samuel, and Psalm 22," *JBL* 83 (1964): 153–164; *idem*, "Jeremiah and Moses: Further Observations," *JBL* 85 (1966): 17–27.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 19–20. Holladay notes at least 11 noteworthy parallels between Deut 32 and Jeremiah. Lundbom (*Jeremiah*, 1:141) similarly notes the influence of Deut 32 in Jer 2.2–9.

⁴² This is also like Hosea. Cf. Lundbom, *Jeremiah*, 1:142; Thompson, *Jeremiah*, 83. Thompson adds that, like Deuteronomy, the father-son relationship is essentially the same as the covenant relationship (66).

⁴³ Eichrodt, *Theology*, 1:59. The other two are marriage and the divine shepherd.

⁴⁴ Scalise, "Logic of Covenant," 397.

suggests that Jeremiah's articulation of the father-son relationship involves the imagery of fervent love and emotion in a way that surpasses Hosea.⁴⁵ In a word, Jeremiah's focus on the covenantal father-son relationship exhibits extensive similarities with Deuteronomy, including the call to obedient sonship.⁴⁶

4.1.3.1 Jer 3–4

The first passage to consider is Jer 3–4, which is part of a collection of oracles indicting Israel for sin, calling for repentance, and threatening judgment, but with the promise of a new era of grace.⁴⁷ It is in this latter category that the first mention of Israel as Yahweh's children is found (3.14). Echoing the theme of Israel's filial faithlessness from Deut 32.5–6, 20, in Jer 3.14, 22 Yahweh identifies Israel as his faithless sons (שׁוֹכְבִים בְּנֵי; LXX: υἱοὶ ἀφροστηκότες)—referring to either Judah alone⁴⁸ or to both Israel and Judah⁴⁹—and calls them to repent. Verse 13 is clear that Israel had not heeded (שָׁמַע; LXX: ὑπακούω) the voice of their God, and thus had breached the covenant.⁵⁰ The sentiment is thus a familiar one: as sons Israel was to demonstrate obedience required by the covenant. If Deut 14.1 describes how a true son should act, Jer 3.14, 22 indicate how a son must *not* act.

It may also be relevant that 3.19 refers to Yahweh as the Father of Israel, alongside images of the inheritance (נַחֲלָה; LXX: κληρονομία) of the land. Both these issues are concerns of Deuteronomy,⁵¹ and both these references assume Israel's divine sonship. Verse 19 also opens with the possibility that Yahweh would have set his people among *his sons* (בְּבָנָי; LXX: εἰς τέκνα). However, this use of *sons* in

⁴⁵ Eichrodt, *Theology*, 1:238 (italics added). Cf. Lundbom, *Jeremiah*, 1:142; McConville, *Judgment and Promise*, 20.

⁴⁶ Thus, Lundbom (*Jeremiah*, 1:319) concludes that three sources are especially formative for the early preaching of Jeremiah: Deuteronomy, the Song of Moses, and Hosea.

⁴⁷ See *ibid.*, 299.

⁴⁸ Peter C. Craigie, Page H. Kelley, and Joel F. Drinkard, Jr., *Jeremiah 1–25* (WBC 26; Dallas: Word, 1991), 60.

⁴⁹ Lundbom, *Jeremiah*, 1:313.

⁵⁰ Thompson, *Jeremiah*, 201.

⁵¹ On the land's connection to Deuteronomy here, see Lundbom, *Jeremiah*, 1:319.

3.19 likely derives from Deut 32.8, and thus most likely refers to *the nations*. Therefore, these sons serve as a foil to Israel.⁵² Peter Craigie rightly remarks:

All along, it had been God's intention to give his people the status of "sons"; as such, they would have received as an inheritance a wonderful land, they would have called God "My father," and they would not have turned back from walking in his ways. The nostalgia lies in that he had indeed made his people sons and given them a land as an inheritance; the disappointment is to be found in the failure of the people to respond to that sonship, for they had been consistently unfaithful toward God.⁵³

Verse 20 continues the expression of God's deep compassion and Israel's unfaithfulness by utilizing the imagery of a marriage.⁵⁴ 3.21 describes the weeping of the Israelites, which is attributed to their having forgotten (שכח; LXX: ἐπιλανθάνομαι) Yahweh—a clear violation of Deuteronomy.⁵⁵ 3.22 again highlights the disobedient sonship of Israel, and offers healing if they would repent.⁵⁶ In Jer 4.22, which continues the basic outlook heretofore observed in Jer 3, Israel is called "foolish children" (בְּנֵי סִכְלִים; LXX: υἱοὶ ἄφρονές), a description which summarizes well the familial foolishness of the Israelites in Deut 32.6.⁵⁷

Thus, in Jer 3–4 there is a clear focus on Israel's need for covenantally obedient sonship, along with indications of Deuteronomic theology. Moreover, Jeremiah laments Israel's disobedience which, as in Deut 32, is shocking precisely because of the gracious filial status bestowed upon them.

4.1.3.2 Jer 31 (38 LXX)

Jeremiah 31, which anticipates a new covenant, is especially intriguing for a study of Matthew, given the explicit citation of Jer 31.15 in Matt 2.18. This is also the second significant occurrence in Jeremiah when Israel is called God's son.

⁵² So William McKane, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah* (2 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986–96), 1:78–79; Lundbom, *Jeremiah*, 1:319.

⁵³ Craigie, Kelley, and Drinkard, *Jeremiah 1–25*, 64.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*; Lundbom, (*Jeremiah*, 1:83) attributes this to Hosean influence.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 146. Cf. Deut 4.23; 6.12; 8.11, 14; 32.18.

⁵⁶ MT: שׁוֹבְבֵי־בָנִים; LXX: υἱοὶ ἐπιστρέφοντες.

⁵⁷ Lundbom, *Jeremiah*, 1:355.

Before speaking of a New Covenant in vv. 31–34, Jer 31[38] speaks of a coming day of salvation when Israel would return from Exile. Yahweh’s *love*, which is celebrated in v. 3, again communicates the father-son relationship. In v. 9 one of the reasons given for the return from Exile is Israel’s status as son of Yahweh (בְּכָרִי הוּא; לXX: ἐγενόμην τῷ Ἰσραὴλ εἰς πατέρα καὶ Ἐφραὶμ πρωτότοκός μου ἔστει).⁵⁸ Israel as *firstborn* son here links Israel’s sonship with the Exodus.⁵⁹ Additionally, the mention of streams of water in the MT (נְהַלֵּי מַיִם) may be an allusion to the same phrasing in Deut 8.7, which speaks of the fertility of the Promised Land, and follows closely a reference to Yahweh as Israel’s Father (Deut 8.5). In sum, the father-son imagery in Jer 31.9[38.9] is again climactic,⁶⁰ being one of the most significant ways to speak of both Israel’s redemption and Yahweh’s constant love.

A second reference to the sonship of Israel in Jer 31[38] comes in v. 20.⁶¹ Here Yahweh asks the rhetorical question, “Is not Ephraim a dear son to me?” (לִי הֲבֵן יָקָר; LXX: υἱὸς ἀγαπητὸς Ἐφραὶμ ἐμὸς). The rest of the verse and the surrounding context (cf. v. 9) indicate that Ephraim is indeed a very precious son to Yahweh. The imagery that accompanies this statement in the MT is most striking, as the bowels (מַעֲרָה) of Yahweh⁶² are said to be in turmoil (תָּמוּן). This illustrates the deep, emotional love of Yahweh for Israel, despite his son’s faithlessness.⁶³ As in Hosea, Jeremiah here conveys an eschatological hope that Israel, God’s son, would receive mercy from their Father and be brought back to the life of blessing (cf. 31[38].9, 20).

⁵⁸ Ephraim here is most likely refers to Northern Israel (Lundbom, *Jeremiah*, 2:425–26). For a dissenting view, see McKane, *Jeremiah*, 2:792.

⁵⁹ Cf. Exod 4.22; Thompson, *Jeremiah*, 569–570; William L. Holladay, *A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah* (2 vols.; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1986–89), 2:185; Gerald L. Keown, Pamela J. Scalise, and Thomas G. Smothers, *Jeremiah 26–52* (WBC 27; Dallas: Word, 1995), 114; Lundbom, *Jeremiah*, 2:425.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ The father-son relationship may also be alluded to in v. 18, where Ephraim’s discipline (יִסָּר; παιδεύω) by the hand of Yahweh is recounted (cf. Deut 8.5; 21.18–21). Cf. Jer10.24; 30.11; 46.28.

⁶² While this may be taken as feminine imagery of a womb, Lundbom (*Jeremiah 21–36*, 446–447) demonstrates that the same wording can be used of males, and is not convinced that Yahweh’s *fatherhood* should be abandoned.

⁶³ So Lundbom, *Jeremiah*, 2:446–47.

Jeremiah 31[38] also contains a number of features that suggest it is deeply indebted to Mosaic tradition. The references to Israel's sonship recall the wilderness wanderings, which is the historical and literary context of Deuteronomy. Further, verbal parallels to Deut 8 are found in close proximity to Israel's sonship in Jer 31[38], and (as noted above) Jeremiah's concern with a New *Covenant* indicates his interest in Mosaic themes.

These references from Jer 31[38] should be understood in conjunction with Jer 3–4 and the overall outlook of Jeremiah, which has a deep concern with the covenant. Jeremiah also includes numerous references to Israel's sonship and Israel's necessity of filial obedience. It should also not be missed that Deut 32 seems to have been important for Jeremiah. This is fitting since both Jeremiah and Deut 32 utilize the sonship metaphor to highlight the disobedience of Israel vis-à-vis the mercy of their Father. It is therefore likely that Israel's (disobedient) sonship in Jeremiah may have been understood by Matthew to have a Deuteronomic precedent.

4.1.4 Isaiah

It is instructive for the present purposes that Israel is referenced as Yahweh's sons in several Isaianic passages, and these generally demonstrate Deuteronomic influence. Although these Isaianic texts may not be cited in Matthew,⁶⁴ Isaiah was clearly an important text for Matthew. It therefore makes sense for this study to consider Isaiah in some detail.

4.1.4.1 Isa 1

The clearest similarities with Deuteronomic sonship are found in Isa 1. Isaiah 1.2 describes Israel as sons (בְּנֵי יְהוָה; LXX: υἱοῦς) who have revolted against Yahweh,⁶⁵ even though he had begotten (LXX) and reared them.⁶⁶ As a preliminary observation to this section, Israel's filial status in Isaiah must not be viewed as an extension of a generic human metaphor, but is based on Israel's *covenantal relationship* with

⁶⁴ Index 4 in NA27 suggests two Matthean allusions to Isa 1: Isa 1.15/Matt 6.7; Isa 1.17/Matt 23.23.

⁶⁵ Cf. Ezek 21.20.

⁶⁶ LXX includes ἐγέννησα. This verb is only rarely applied to Yahweh in the OT, but it is also found in Deut 32.18 and may be relevant for Matt 1.20 (see §7.1).

Yahweh established in the Exodus.⁶⁷ More specifically, the influence of the Song of Moses looms large in Isa 1. Following the logic of Deut 32, Yahweh’s fatherly care for Israel in 1.2 is contrasted with Israel’s rebellion.⁶⁸ More explicit connections with Deut 32 come in Isa 1.4, where the prophet describes Israel as “sons who act corruptly” in the MT (בְּנֵי־מִשְׁחִיתִים; LXX: υἱοὶ ἄνομοι). This language is very similar to Deut 32.5, which chastises Israel for acting corruptly as sons (לֹא לֵא בְנֵי־שָׁחַת).⁶⁹ H. Williamson, commenting on 1.4, observes that the relational aspects of 1.4a become increasingly narrow, and the woe becomes sharper.⁷⁰ Thus, the title בְּנֵי־מִשְׁחִיתִים is climactic. This passage thus highlights God’s love by referencing Israel’s sonship, while the disobedience mentioned underscores the heinousness of Israel’s sin in spite of Yahweh’s fatherly goodness.⁷¹ Thus, the “inexorable demand” for sons to be obedient underlies this verse.⁷²

Before outlining additional similarities with Deut 32 below, it is also significant that parallels to Deut 21.18–21 have been observed in these verses. Watts suggests vv. 4–7 run parallel to Deut 21.18–21, and Williamson also admits the thematic similarities between the two passages, even though the lack of verbal correspondence renders him hesitant to assert Deut 21 is explicitly referenced here.⁷³ It is possible that the reference to flogging in 1.5 (נָקָה; LXX: πλήσσω) may refer to a particular means of disciplining a rebellious son, which is stated more generally in Deut 21.18 (יָסַר; LXX: παιδεύω). This interpretation coincides with Kaiser’s view,

⁶⁷ Brevard S. Childs, *Isaiah* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 335; Otto Kaiser, *Isaiah 1–12* (trans. J. Bowden; OTL; London: SCM Press, 1983), 14.

⁶⁸ Hans Wilderberger, *Isaiah 1–12: A Commentary* (trans. T. Trapp; CC; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 12; John D. W. Watts, *Isaiah* (2 vols.; WBC 24–25; Waco: Word, 1985–87), 1:18.

⁶⁹ The root שָׁחַח in Isa 1.4 is in the Hiphil; in Deut 32.5 it is in the Piel. Deut 32.5 LXX reads τέκνα μωμητά.

⁷⁰ H. G. M. Williamson, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Isaiah 1–27* (3 vols.; ICC; London: T&T Clark, 2006–), 1:37.

⁷¹ Wilderberger, *Isaiah 1–12*, 14; Watts, *Isaiah*, 1:17; Kathryn Pfisterer Darr, *Isaiah’s Vision and the Family of God* (CBI; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994), 56. Darr however, relies more on the blood bond between a father and a son than on the covenant relationship. In keeping with Childs, it seems best to view the relationship in view as the intimate one established by the covenant at Sinai.

⁷² Kaiser, *Isaiah 1–12*, 13.

⁷³ Watts, *Isaiah*, 1:18; 34; Williamson, *Isaiah*, 1:34; so Darr, *Isaiah’s Vision*, 56.

which connects this striking with discipline, since the use of the rod was a necessary means of a son's education.⁷⁴

Returning to similarities with Deut 32, Isa 1 is often regarded as having at least some features of a covenant lawsuit, or *riḅ*.⁷⁵ In a *riḅ*—a form that may be influenced by suzerain-vassal treaties—Yahweh calls his people to answer for their breach of the [Mosaic] covenant.⁷⁶ G. E. Wright summarizes the *riḅ*:

The heavenly lawsuit implies a Suzerain, one who claims authority over all powers on earth, and who is presiding over the highest tribunal in the universe. Furthermore, it implies a covenant which the Suzerain has granted a vassal, a covenant which the vassal has broken.⁷⁷

The view that Isa 1.2–20 is such a lawsuit is based largely on the appeal to heaven and earth as witnesses in v. 2.⁷⁸ Such an appeal reflects ANE treaty language,⁷⁹ similar to what is found in Deuteronomy, especially Deut 32.1.⁸⁰ Aside from this address to heaven and earth, however, there is little evidence for seeing a *riḅ* in these verses.⁸¹ But regardless of the *Gattung* one ascribes to these verses, the most

⁷⁴ Kaiser, *Isaiah 1–12*, 20.

⁷⁵ Wilderberger, *Isaiah 1–12*, 10–11; Childs, *Isaiah*, 17; Herbert B. Huffmon, “The Covenant Lawsuit in the Prophets,” *JBL* 78 (1959): 285–95; Watts, *Isaiah*, 1:15.

⁷⁶ Huffmon, “Lawsuit,” 285–95; G. Ernest Wright, “The Lawsuit of God: A Form-Critical Study of Deuteronomy 32,” in *Israel's Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg* (ed. Bernhard Anderson and Walter Harrleson; London: SCM Press, 1962), 26–67; Wilderberger, *Isaiah 1–12*, 10.

⁷⁷ Wright, “The Lawsuit of God,” 47. Cf. Julien Harvey (“Le «Riḅ-Pattern» Réquisitoire Prophétique sur la Rupture de l'Alliance,” *Bib* 43 [1962]: 173–96) who labels Isa 1.2–20 a *riḅ* of warning (*avertissement*) for a wayward vassal.

⁷⁸ Others have seen more extensive characteristics present. For example, Harvey (“Riḅ-Pattern,” 178) breaks the *riḅ* down into five categories and assigns a portion of Isa 1.2–20 to each: 1) Introduction (v. 2); 2) Interrogation (vv. 11f); 3) Indictment (vv. 2cd–3, 15c); 4) Reference to the vanity of rituals (vv. 13–15b); 5) Declaration of culpability or threat of destruction, and assigns (vv. 16–20). This outline, however, is not commonly followed today. Huffmon (“Lawsuit,” 292) suggests that 1.2 serves as an historical prologue.

⁷⁹ Wilderberger, *Isaiah 1–12*, 10; Kaiser, *Isaiah 1–12*, 11–12.

⁸⁰ Also Deut 4.26; 30.19. Huffmon (“Lawsuit,” 295) asserts that the appeal to heaven and earth in a context like Isa 1 is ultimately dependent on the Sinaitic Covenant.

⁸¹ So Williamson, *Isaiah*, 1:27. Williamson does not understand a covenantal context for Israel's sonship in these verses, but does admit that individual elements of this passage “may be drawn by way of metaphor from the covenant lawsuit background” (27). Cf. also *idem*, “Isaiah 1 and the Covenant Lawsuit,” in *Covenant as Context: Essays in Honor of E. W. Nicholson* (ed. A. Mayes and R. Salters; Oxford: OUP, 2003): 393–406; *idem*, “Relocating Isaiah 1:2–9,” in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition* (ed. C. Eroyles and C. Evans; vol. 1; VTSup 70.1/FIOTL 1.1; Leiden: Brill, 1997): 263–77.

striking features for the present study are the clear parallels with the Song of Moses, especially the designation of the Israelites as faithless sons.⁸² In sum, the strong parallels with the Song of Moses and the additional similarities to Deut 21 render it plausible that Matthew, if he indeed knew Isa 1, may have recognized connections between Isaiah’s portrayal of Israel’s disobedient sonship and similar themes in Deuteronomy.

4.1.4.2 Isa 30

Israel’s filial rebellion is again articulated in ways similar to Deuteronomy in Isa 30. In 30.1 the leaders of the nation are described as **בְּנֵי סוֹרְרִים**, which, perhaps significantly, is the same vocabulary used to describe the rebellious son in Deut 21.18 (**בֶּן סוֹרֵר**). The LXX, however, differs more considerably (Deut 21.18: *υἱὸς ἀπειθής*/Isa 30.1: *τέκνα ἀποστάται*). Although the political leaders of Judah appear to be immediately in view in 30.1, the nation as a whole cannot be finally divorced from its leadership.⁸³ Kaiser suggests the father-son relationship here signifies Yahweh’s unconditional authority over his son, and the non-negotiable nature of obedience.⁸⁴ The context for sons in this instance is a political treaty, or covenant:⁸⁵ by agreeing to an alliance with Egypt for reasons of political expediency, the people of Judah had disregarded the covenant with Yahweh, who is said to fight for them.⁸⁶

God’s people are referred to as sons in 30.9, this time as “sons of deception” (**בְּנֵי כְּהָשִׁים**; LXX: *υἱοὶ ψευδεῖς*). Here it appears that all God’s people are in view, and the childlike obedience they should render to Yahweh is assumed.⁸⁷ This correlation, although less verbally explicit, is also consistent with the requirement of

⁸² Aside from the filial designation and appeal to heaven and other, additional parallels with Deut 32 include eating the produce of the land (Isa 1.19/Deut 32.13), God’s hiding his face (Isa 1.5/Deut 32.20), judgment by fire (Isa 1.7/Deut 32.22), destruction by sword (Isa 1.20/Deut 32.25, 42), divine vengeance (Isa 1.7, 20/Deut 32.35–36, 41, 43), and the overall forensic tone. Cf. Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (3 vols.; AB 19–19B; New York: Doubleday, 2000–3), 1:181. See also Childs, *Isaiah*, 18; Wilderberger, *Isaiah 1–12*, 12; Huffmon, “Lawsuit,” 288; Williamson, *Isaiah*, 1:32n.37.

⁸³ R. E. Clements, *Isaiah 1–39* (NCB; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 243.

⁸⁴ Otto Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39: A Commentary* (OTL; London: SCM Press, 1974), 285.

⁸⁵ Watts, *Isaiah*, 1:395. The word **ברית** is not used here, but Watts (1:392) argues that “make an alliance” is the best translation for **לְיַסְכְּרָה נִסְכָּרָה**. LXX is *συνθήκη*.

⁸⁶ Exod 23.32; Judg 2.2; cf. Deut 1.29ff.

⁸⁷ So Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39*, 294.

Israel's filial obedience in Deuteronomy. The connections with Deuteronomy are clearer in the MT of Isa 30, but that Israel should be obedient sons is beyond question even in the LXX.

4.1.4.3 Isa 40–66

Additional references to Israel as God's son are found in Isa 40–66, but these are not as important for the present purposes. Isaiah 43.1–7, which likely finds its background in the Exodus,⁸⁸ includes a reference to Yahweh's sons and daughters (43.6). Although the theme of filial obedience is not primary here, it is significant that Israel is referred to as sons *and* daughters only here and in Deut 32.19.⁸⁹

Isaiah 63.7–64.11[12] also includes several references to the sonship of Israel. Here the prophet is disconcerted with the people's rebellion, and memorializes the great day of deliverance under Moses.⁹⁰ Deuteronomy may particularly be recalled in the remembering (זכר; LXX: μνησκόμα) in 63.11 (cf. Deut 8.2, 18).⁹¹ The reference to *sons* who are not to deal falsely (בנים לא ישקר; τέκνα οὐ μὴ ἀθετήσωσι [63.8]) assumes that, as sons, Israel would be obedient to Yahweh,⁹² who had redeemed and carried (וינשאם) Israel (63.9), echoing Deut 1.31 MT (נשאך).⁹³ Verse 16 continues this concept, addressing Yahweh as Israel's Father, a theme which is also picked up in 64.7[8], although these last two verses do not explicitly link sonship with obedience.

⁸⁸ Watts, *Isaiah*, 2:133; Dille, *Mixing Metaphors*, 97; John Goldingay and David Payne, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Isaiah 40–55* (2 vols.; ICC; London: T&T Clark, 2006–7), 1:273.

⁸⁹ So Dille, *Mixing Metaphors*, 75. While Dille notes the relationship to the Exodus and Deut 32.19 in these verses, she does not believe that the covenantal relationship is the best way to view this imagery. Instead, she agrees with F. Charles Fensham that “daughter(s)” is never used in covenantal formulae. For a response to Fensham's view, see §3.2.1.

⁹⁰ Watts, *Isaiah*, 2:336; Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah*, 3:257.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 3:261; cf. Watts, *Isaiah*, 2:329–30.

⁹² Claus Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66: A Commentary* (trans. D. Stalker; OTL; London; SCM Press, 1969), 387; Childs, *Isaiah*, 523.

⁹³ The verb נשא is in the Piel in Isa 63.9, while Deut 1.31 attests the Qal. Deut 1.31 LXX communicates this by τροφοφορέω, whereas Isa 63.9 reads ἀναλαμβάνω. Other parallels to Yahweh's carrying Israel in Deut 1.31 include: 1) in Isa 40.11 Israel is compared to sheep, and Yahweh to a shepherd, who will carry them (ישא); 2) in Isa 46.3–4 Yahweh is said to have carried Israel from his womb (וינשאם בני־רחם), and he promises to carry (נשא) Israel in the future. So Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah*, 3:260; Dille, *Mixing Metaphors*, 36n.48.

To summarize, various Deuteronomic and covenantal features are found in Isaiah in conjunction with the language of Israel's sonship. Thus, much like Deuteronomy, Isaiah's references to Israel's sonship reveal Yahweh's tender care for Israel and the related necessity of Israel's obedience.

4.1.5 Malachi

Finally, Malachi also weds a deep interest in covenant with an understanding of Israel's status as the son of Yahweh. The book is saturated with covenantal language,⁹⁴ and the Mosaic Covenant is assumed throughout.⁹⁵ By way of example, covenantal aspects can be seen in the portrayal of Yahweh as a great king (=suzerain, 1.14),⁹⁶ the use of אָרַר/ἐπικατάρατος to speak of covenantal curses (1.14),⁹⁷ the description of blessings in 3.7–12 that correspond to covenantal blessings,⁹⁸ and the references to covenant in conjunction with Levi and Israel's fathers (2.1–10).⁹⁹ This covenantal context sets the framework for the relationship between sonship and obedience. As A. Hill observes: "Because covenant maker Yahweh was Israel's father (Deut 32:6–12), he was deserving of conduct appropriate to the bond (Exod 20:12; Deut 30:1–10)."¹⁰⁰ Given these broad, thematic parallels, it is not surprising that many scholars closely associate Malachi with Deuteronomy.¹⁰¹

Similarities to Deuteronomy's covenantal outlook first appear in 1.2–5. Particularly striking is the Yahweh's love for Israel stated in 1.2 (אָהַבְתִּי אֶתְכֶם; LXX: ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς). This is almost certainly the same fatherly, covenantal love noted by

⁹⁴ The term ברית (LXX: διαθήκη) is used six times in this short book. Cf. Steven L. McKenzie and Howard N. Wallace, "Covenant Themes in Malachi," *CBQ* 45 (1983): 549–63; so Elizabeth Achtemeier, *Nahum-Malachi* (IBC; Atlanta: John Knox, 1986), 172; Andrew E. Hill, *Malachi: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 25D; New York: Doubleday, 1998), 42.

⁹⁵ Pieter A. Verhoef, *The Books of Haggai and Malachi* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 180–82.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*; Ralph L. Smith, *Micah-Malachi* (WBC 32; Waco: Word, 1984), 300.

⁹⁷ McKenzie and Wallace, "Covenant Themes," 557–58. Hill (*Malachi*, 193) notes that Malachi's usage of this concept reflects Deuteronomy.

⁹⁸ McKenzie and Wallace, "Covenant Themes," 555. Cf. Lev 26.16; Deut 11.13–14; 28.11–12, 18, 28.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 551. Cf. Lev 2.2; Deut 28.12; 33.8–10.

¹⁰⁰ Hill, *Malachi*, 43.

¹⁰¹ Beth Glazier-McDonald, *Malachi: The Divine Messenger* (SBLDS 98; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 73; Smith, *Malachi*, 300.

Moran that is expounded in Deuteronomy.¹⁰² Relevant for the present study is 1.6. Here it is acknowledged that a son honors his father, and a servant his master, but the priests had not honored Yahweh their Father.¹⁰³ Consistent with the love language of 1.2, the combination of father-son and master-servant imagery in 1.6 most likely indicates that a covenant relationship is in view in 1.6, which would also make sense of the obedience that is assumed in both relationships.¹⁰⁴

Malachi 2.10–16 further touches on Israel’s sonship, identifying God as Israel’s Father and making reference to covenant(s). This first point is expressed by setting “one Father of all of us” (אָב אֶחָד לְכֻלָּנוּ;¹⁰⁵ LXX: πατήρ εἰς πάντων ἡμῶν) and “one God [who] created us” (אֱלֹהִים אֶחָד בְּרָאֵנוּ; LXX: θεὸς εἰς ἔκτισεν ὑμᾶς) in parallel in 2.10a.¹⁰⁶ Here only Yahweh is Father in the sense of being the Creator. This point is significant because only a few times in the OT is God portrayed as both Father and Creator (cf. Deut 32.6; Isa 63.16; 64.7[8]). Given the rarity of this imagery, it is likely that this passage echoes Deut 32.6, especially since Deuteronomy is one of the three main books upon which Malachi’s vocabulary seems to rely.¹⁰⁷

A final filial reference that may be indebted to Deuteronomy is Mal 3.17. Here the rare term סִגְלָה, which is found only eight times in the entire MT, is applied to Israel.¹⁰⁸ Significantly, three of the eight occurrences of this word are found in Deuteronomy in reference to Israel (7.6; 14.2; 26.18; cf. Exod 19.5).¹⁰⁹ It may also be significant that סִגְלָה is used in conjunction with father-son imagery in 3.17 much

¹⁰² Moran, “Ancient Near Eastern Background,” 77–87; McKenzie and Wallace, “Covenant Themes,” 555–56; Smith, *Malachi*, 305.

¹⁰³ Smith, *Malachi*, 311; Achtemeier, *Malachi*, 178.

¹⁰⁴ McKenzie and Wallace, “Covenant Themes,” 557. Note both categories in 2 Kgs 16.7

¹⁰⁵ This may be an *emphatic lamed*, as it stands before a noun in a verbless clause and assumes an emphatic “yes.” See Bruce K. Waltke and M. O’Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990), §11.10.i.

¹⁰⁶ Gordon Paul Hugenberger, *Marriage as Covenant: A Study of Biblical Law and Ethics Governing Marriage Developed from the Perspective of Malachi* (VTSup 52; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 99–100; so Ernst Wendland, “Linear and Concentric Patterns in Malachi,” *BT* 36 (1985): 108–21; Hill, *Malachi*, 224.

¹⁰⁷ Hill, *Malachi*, 228, 255 (also Jeremiah, Ezekiel); cf. Smith, *Malachi*, 321; Achtemeier, *Malachi*, 181.

¹⁰⁸ LXX is περιποίησις; περιούσιος is used in Deuteronomy.

¹⁰⁹ So McKenzie and Wallace, “Covenant Themes,” 561.

as it is in Deut 14.1–2. Thus the epithet סְנֵלָה for Israel links Malachi’s message with Deuteronomy, and is quite likely another way Malachi denotes the father-son relationship between Israel and Yahweh in Deuteronomic terms.

Finally, it is to be noted that these references are found in the final portion of the Twelve that stands at the end of the Latter Prophets. As such, Malachi uniquely looks ahead in eschatological hope to a new day of salvation. This would be the day when Yahweh, as Israel’s Father, would spare his people as a man might his servile, or *obedient*, son (3.17; בְּנוֹ הָעֶבֶר אָחִיו; LXX: τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν δουλεύοντα αὐτῷ).¹¹⁰ Achtemeier rightly notes the eschatological implications of the application סְנֵלָה to Israel in Mal 3: “[O]n the Day of the Lord the true Israel will stand forth and God’s covenant promise will be fulfilled. Israel, embodied in its remnant, will become as she was intended to be, a holy and faithful community, living under the reign of God.”¹¹¹

In conclusion, Malachi includes a number of passages with probable Deuteronomic influence, including imagery of God’s fatherhood and Israel’s need for obedient sonship. Additionally, the use of סְנֵלָה in Mal 3.17 MT is an important verbal parallel with Deut 14.1–2 that communicates Israel’s treasured status as sons of Yahweh.

Excursus: Proverbs

It is not clear how important Proverbs was for Matthew, but Prov 3.11–12 is particularly relevant for the present focus on Deuteronomy, sonship, and obedience. A number of similarities between Proverbs and Deuteronomy have been suggested,¹¹² but two are especially relevant here: the language of love and discipline. Here the father addresses his son, exhorting him not to reject the discipline (מוֹסֵר; LXX: παιδεία) of Yahweh, since Yahweh reproves (יִכָּה; LXX: παιδεύω) those whom he loves, as a father reproves the son in whom he delights (וְכָאֵב אָחִיבֵן יִרְצֶה; LXX: πάντα υἱὸν ὃν παραδέχεται). It is to be noted in this

¹¹⁰ See Achtemeier, *Malachi*, 194–95. She also suggests there might be an allusion here to Deut 21.18–21.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 195.

¹¹² See, e.g., Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 62–65; Joseph Fleishmann, “Legal Innovation in Deuteronomy XXI 18–20,” *VT* 53 (2003): 311–27; J. W. McKay, “Man’s Love for God in Deuteronomy and the Father/Teacher—Son/Pupil Relationship,” *VT* 22 (1972): 426–35.

passage that the discipline of Yahweh, which is designed to procure obedience, is directed toward the son whom he loves. This is quite similar to God's fatherly discipline in Deut 8.5, and especially to the discipline of the rebellious son Deut 21.18–21.¹¹³

Excursus: Royal Sonship

Sonship was not limited to national Israel in the OT, but also included the Davidic king (cf. 2 Sam 7; 1 Chron 17; Pss 2, 89, 110, 132). Although some modifications are necessary when addressing royal sonship, this should be seen as a particular incarnation of Israel's national sonship that has its foundations in the covenantal relationship established between Yahweh and his people.¹¹⁴ Thus, royal sonship is a representative way to denote the sonship of Israel—the king is the representative of God's people, and in one sense *is* the nation.¹¹⁵ And the king, as the “Epitome of the People,” was not exempt from Israel's call to an obedient filial relationship.¹¹⁶ Yahweh's promise to correct the disobedience of the king (2 Sam 7.14: יִכַּח; LXX: ἐλέγχω) is especially significant here.¹¹⁷ Therefore, Israel's national sonship and their need for obedience is maintained even when royal motifs are drawn to the fore; the sonship that distinguished Israel before the monarchy remained and was not abrogated by the particularized, royal sonship.¹¹⁸

For Matthew, both Israel as the corporate son of God and the Davidic king as son of God are important themes (though this study focuses on the former). In light

¹¹³ Bruce K. Waltke (*The Book of Proverbs: Chapters 1–15* [NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004], 249) notes that the verb יִכַּח belongs to the sphere of legal proceedings, which suggests a similar context to Deut 21.18–21.

¹¹⁴ Geralde Cooke, “The Israelite King as Son of God,” *ZAW* 73 (1961): 202–25. So Oscar Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament* (trans. S. Guthrie and C. Hall; rev. ed.; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963), 273. This concurs with the comments of G. Fohrer (“υἱός, υἱοθεσία,” *TDNT* 8:340–54) that the nation of Israel is referred to as God's son far more often than the king.

¹¹⁵ John A. Davies, *A Royal Priesthood: Literary and Intertextual Perspectives on an Image of Israel in Exodus 19:6* (JSOTSup 395; London: T&T Clark, 2004), 180–81; cf. G. B. Caird, “Jesus and Israel: The Starting Point for New Testament Christology,” in *Christological Perspectives: Essays in Honor of Harvey K. MacArthur* (ed. R. Berkey and S. Edwards; New York: Pilgrim, 1982), 58–68.

¹¹⁶ Joachim Bieneck, *Sohn Gottes als Christusbezeichnung der Synoptiker* (ATANT 21; Zürich: Zwingli, 1951), 22, 26.

¹¹⁷ Waltke, *Theology*, 661. Cf. Psa 89.30–32.

¹¹⁸ Marianne Meye Thompson, *The Promise of the Father: Jesus and God in the New Testament* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2000), 47. Recall the royal imagery for Israel already in Exod 19.6.

of the above observations, it is conceivable that Matthew would have considered Israel's sonship as articulated in the context of the Mosaic Covenant to be foundational and antecedent to the monarchy, and thus the sonship of the Davidic king would have arisen out of this Mosaic precedent.¹¹⁹

4.1.6 Preliminary Summary

Since Matthew is explicitly concerned with demonstrating how Jesus is the fulfilment of the *OT*, a preliminary summary of OT passages is in order. Israel's national sonship is not limited to a few texts, but was developed and appropriated by numerous biblical authors. Significantly, this relationship was, like Deuteronomy, to be marked by obedience.¹²⁰ Though many have argued that the prophetic books rely upon the Mosaic Covenant as articulated in Deuteronomy, it is not necessary for the present purposes to determine which actually came first. For Matthew, Moses would have been the author of Deuteronomy and, as the prophet *par excellence*, was the forerunner of all of Israel's subsequent prophets. Therefore, it only needs to be established that a sufficient number of parallels relating to sonship and obedience exist to conclude that, from Matthew's perspective, these prophetic themes were likely building in part upon Deuteronomy. The evidence above strongly suggests this is indeed the case.

4.2 Sonship and Obedience: Later Jewish Literature

It has thus far been argued that many OT compositions share with Deuteronomy an interest in the father-son relationship between Yahweh and Israel, often in conjunction with obedience. In the sections that follow these same themes will be traced through other relevant references in Jewish literature¹²¹ and early Christian writings. For the following texts it is not necessary to determine which

¹¹⁹ So David R. Bauer, "The Kingship of Jesus in the Matthean Infancy Narrative: A Literary Analysis," *CBQ* 57 (1995): 306–23. Cf. Gary N. Knoppers, "David's Relation to Moses: The Contexts, Content and Conditions of the Davidic Promises," in *Messiah and King in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar* (ed. J. Day; JSOTSup 270; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 91–118; Levenson, "Davidic Covenant," 205–19.

¹²⁰ As Bieneck (*Sohn Gottes*, 17) notes of the OT witness, *Sohn Gottes* and *Gehorsam* belong together.

¹²¹ For a detailed study of the fatherhood of God in several Jewish writings predating the NT, see Angelika Strotmann, *Mein Vater bist du! (Sir 51.10): Zur Bedeutung der Vaterschaft Gottes in kanonischen und nichtkanonischen frühjüdischen Schriften* (FTS 39; Frankfurt: Josep Knecht, 1991).

ones (if any) Matthew may have known. Instead, the purpose of the following sections is to trace the prevalence of imagery concerning Israel's sonship and the call to obedience through various texts that form part of the interpretive milieu of Matthew's day in order to establish the likelihood that Matthew may have made similar connections.

4.2.1 Qumran

4.2.1.1 Temple Scroll

As noted in chapter 2, the Temple Scroll (11QT) is a systematic rewriting of Exodus and Deuteronomy, with special emphasis on Deuteronomy.¹²² Within this framework the Qumran community's sonship and correlated call to obedience are found in 11QT XLVIII, 7–10. Although these lines are a “redactional fusion” of Lev 19.28–29; 21.5; Deut 14.1–2,¹²³ the explicit mention of the people as “sons of Yahweh, your God” (בנים אתמה ליהוה אלוהיכמה)¹²⁴ followed by specific holiness demands focused on the Land¹²⁵ strongly resembles the language and structure of Deut 14.¹²⁶ It is also noteworthy that the pericope of the rebellious son (Deut 21.18–21) is included in 11QTLXIV, 1–6.¹²⁷ Although the author(s) of the Temple Scroll does not expound in detail the relationship between Israel's sonship and obedience, the scroll may convey this connection inasmuch as it follows Deut 14, the Deuteronomic text that may be the most explicit in its correlation of sonship and obedience.

¹²² See §2.2.1. The titles and translations for these documents come from Geza Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (New York: Penguin, 1997).

¹²³ Johann Maier, *The Temple Scroll: An Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (JSOTSup 34; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), 119.

¹²⁴ Yigael Yadin, ed., *The Temple Scroll*, vol. 3: *Plates and Text* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1977), pl. 63.

¹²⁵ So Dwight D. Swanson, *The Temple Scroll and the Bible: The Methodology of 11QT* (STDJ 14; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 175.

¹²⁶ Cf. Michael Owen Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11* (SAOC 49; Chicago: University of Chicago, 1990), 239.

¹²⁷ The text of this pericope does not deviate in any significant way from Deuteronomy.

4.2.1.2 4QDibHam^a

4QDibHam^a (=4Q504) comprises collective prayers replete with biblical echoes.¹²⁸ In 4Q504 III, 4–7 the community celebrates that God had named them sons (בנים) in the eyes of the nations, and had appointed Israel “my son, my firstborn” (בני בכרי).¹²⁹ The naming of Israel as firstborn reflects the first indication of this status in Exod 4.22. Moreover, the agglutination of scriptural passages in these prayers makes it difficult to distinguish sharply between images from various biblical passages. Thus, even though Israel is not referenced as *firstborn* son in Deuteronomy, the links to Deuteronomy in 4Q504 should not be discounted. Indeed, the next phrase in 4Q504 speaks of the discipline of Israel as a son (כיסר איש את בְּנוֹ וְהִיִּסְרֵנוּ), which is likely a reference to the connection between divine discipline and Israel’s filial status in Deut 8.5 (cf. Deut 21.18).¹³⁰ These features, along with the elements of covenant, election, and Moses in the sections immediately following (4Q504 III, 9–12), suggest the Deuteronomic articulation of Israel’s sonship is operative in 4Q504.

4.2.1.3 Special Use Texts

Additionally, it is significant that Deut 8, 32—two passages that clearly convey Israel’s sonship—were not only found in copies of Deuteronomy at Qumran, but also circulated separately as special-use texts. The privileged position occupied by these texts suggests that the contents of Deut 8, 32, and consequently Israel’s filial designation, may have been even more familiar to the Qumran community than other portions of Deuteronomy or the Pentateuch.

As discussed in the previous chapter, Israel’s sonship is mentioned in Deut 8.5. Significantly, this verse often stands at the head of Deut 8 as a special-use text. For example, Deut 8.5–10 appears to have served as a basis for grace after meals in Qumran.¹³¹ In addition, 4QDeut^j includes Deut 8.5–10 in a separate column (V), which therefore also begins with a mention of Israel’s sonship. Likewise, 4QDeutⁿ

¹²⁸ Vermes, *Scrolls*, 364; Maurice Baillet, ed., *Qumrân Grotte 4.III (4Q482–4Q520)* (DJD 7; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 137.

¹²⁹ For transcriptions of the Hebrew for 4Q504, see *ibid.*, 139–68.

¹³⁰ This point, and the interrelatedness of Exod 4.22/Deut 8.5, is also made by Strotmann, *Mein Vater*, 333–34.

¹³¹ See §2.1.2.

contains only Deut 8.5–10 (column I) and Deut 5.1–6.1 (columns II–VI), and therefore may also have highlighted Israel’s sonship.¹³²

4QDeutⁱ may also draw attention to Israel’s sonship in Deut 32: column XII contains Deut 32.7–8, but may well have contained all of Deut 32.1–9, and therefore another reference to Israel’s sonship (32.5–6).¹³³ Similarly, 4QDeut^{k1} contains, among other passages, portions of Deut 32.17–18, which refers to the God who begot Israel. Moreover, 4QDeut^q contains a unique reference to Israel’s sonship in Deut 32.43 (כִּי דָם בְּנֵי יִקּוּם), and most likely would have contained several other references to Israel’s sonship if it originally contained the entire Song of Moses.¹³⁴

Although it is impossible to know whether Matthew would have been aware of the special status afforded to these texts in places such as Qumran, the inclusion of Deut 8 in the Temptation Narrative of Q (which also includes portions of another special-use text from Qumran, Deut 6) renders it feasible that Deut 8 was also a well-known text outside the Qumran community. In addition, the prevalence of Deut 32 in early Christian writings indicates it was certainly a widely known text in the first century.¹³⁵ In sum, Israel’s sonship as articulated in Deuteronomy seems to have been prominent in special-use texts at Qumran.

4.2.1.4 Damascus Document

Another relevant reference is the Damascus Document, which seems to have been patterned on Deuteronomy.¹³⁶ In CD XIII, 8–9 it is said of the Guardian of the camp: “He shall love them as a father loves his children [יִרְחֵם כְּאָב לְבָנָיו], and shall carry [שָׁקֵד] them in all their distress like a shepherd his sheep.”¹³⁷ Here the metaphor of a father and shepherd are conflated, and are applied to a human being rather than to God. Nevertheless, the language for the Guardian here picks up on

¹³² See the summary of this text in Sidnie White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 30.

¹³³ Cf. Eugene Ulrich, et al., eds., *Qumran Cave 4.IX: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings* (DJD 14; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 76, 85.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, 93, 137. LXX also attests this phrase: τὸ αἷμα τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ ἐκδικᾶται.

¹³⁵ For examples of widespread Christian usage, see §4.3 below.

¹³⁶ See chapter 2.

¹³⁷ Vermes, *Scrolls*, 142; Donald W. Parry and Emanuel Tov, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*, vol. 1: *Texts Concerned with Religious Law* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 124.

language applied to God from the OT, and thereby underscores the community's awareness of God's fatherhood. Indeed, given the influence of Deuteronomy in the Damascus Document, the image of a father's compassion may reflect such passages as Deut 1.31, although the explicit mention of compassion (רַחֵם) is more similar to Psa 103.13.

4.2.1.5 Thanksgiving Hymns

The combination of filial imagery and obedience may also be found in 1QH XVII, 35–36.¹³⁸ Here God as a Father to all his sons is contrasted with earthly parents. Worth noting is the phrase “sons of Thy truth” (בְּנֵי אֱמֶתֶךָ),¹³⁹ which likely refers to those who are faithful to God. 1QH XVII, 35 is thus a corporate statement of sonship, with the designation “sons of Thy truth” specifying the quality of those to whom God is a Father. The passage continues, comparing God to a foster-father (אֲבוֹן) who cares for all his creatures.¹⁴⁰ If this additional image intends God's tender care to be applicable to *all* creatures indiscriminately, it would deviate from Deuteronomy that attributes this relationship specifically to God's covenant people.¹⁴¹ Nevertheless, 1QH XVII clearly understands God to be a Father, and may intend this relationship to be viable especially, or only, for those who walk in obedience to him. However appropriate the thematic similarities of sonship and obedience in these two documents, the significant dearth of verbal links should caution one from making unwarranted assertions regarding the influence of Deuteronomy in the Thanksgiving Hymns.

¹³⁸ This numbering follows Vermes's adoption of E. Puech's reconfiguration of these Hymns (it was formerly IX).

¹³⁹ The reading בְּנֵי is supported by Vermes, *Scrolls*, 284; Menahem Mansoor, *The Thanksgiving Hymns: Translated and Annotated with an Introduction* (STDJ 3; Leiden: Brill, 1961), 162, and the rendering of Wise, Abegg, Cook, and Gordon as found in Donald W. Parry and Emanuel Tov, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*, vol. 5: *Poetic and Liturgical Texts* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 48.

¹⁴⁰ Maternal imagery is used for God's compassion in 1QH XVII, perhaps reflecting Isa 49.15 or Deut 32.18.

¹⁴¹ Though it might reflect other biblical passages, such as Psa 145.9.

4.2.2 Sonship and Obedience: OT Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha

4.2.2.1 Wisdom

The interrelatedness of righteousness and sonship is reflected in Wisdom of Solomon. Wisdom 2 recounts the thoughts of the ungodly regarding the righteous man:

He professes to have knowledge of God, and calls himself a child of the Lord. He became to us a reproof of our thoughts; the very sight of him is a burden to us, because his manner of life is unlike that of others, and his ways are strange. We are considered by him as something base, and he avoids our ways as unclean; he calls the last end of the righteous happy, and boasts that God is his father. Let us see if his words are true, and let us test what will happen at the end of his life; for if the righteous man is God's son, he will help him, and will deliver him from the hand of his adversaries. (Wis 2.13–18, RSV)¹⁴²

The obedience of this righteous man, the son of God, is highlighted by his reproaching the ungodly for their sins, and by his manner of life, which is different from the disobedience of others. This righteous man is referred to as παῖδα κυρίου in 2.13, which may be a collective formula representing the entire community.¹⁴³ Although the παῖς language suggests that the author may well have had in mind the Servant Song in Isa 52.13,¹⁴⁴ the next few lines use more explicit *sonship* language. In 2.16 God is claimed as his Father, and in 2.18 it is clear that the impious speaker believes the righteous man claims to be the son of God (εἰ γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ δίκαιος υἱὸς θεοῦ). Even here, however, the righteous man's significance goes beyond himself, likely referring to *all* the righteous in Israel.¹⁴⁵ Thus the righteous son of God, may be viewed as a particularization of what Israel as son of God was called to be. In short, Wis 2 clearly connects the sonship of the righteous man/remnant with

¹⁴² On the influence of Wis 2 in Matthew, see Ulrich Luz, *Matthew: A Commentary* (trans. J. Crouch; 3 vols.; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001–7), 3:539.

¹⁴³ Joseph Reider, *The Book of Wisdom: An English Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (JAL; New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957). See also C. Larcher, *Le Livre de la Sagesse ou La Sagesse de Salomon* (3 vols; EBib Nouvelle series 1; Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1983), 1:245.

¹⁴⁴ David Winston, *The Wisdom of Solomon: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 43; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1979), 119–20.

¹⁴⁵ Strotmann, *Mein Vater*, 109, 116.

obedience. Although Wis 2 lacks verbal parallels with Deuteronomy, this joining of sonship with obedience stands in clear continuity with Deuteronomy.¹⁴⁶

The connection with Deuteronomy is more readily demonstrable in Wis 11.4–14, which Strotmann has rightly argued has Deut 8.2–16 as its background.¹⁴⁷ Key here is the correlation between discipline (παιδεύω; Wis 11.9) and God’s fatherhood (Wis 11.10; πατήρ), which is also found in Deut 8.5.¹⁴⁸ In addition, the testing (ἐκπειράζω) of Israel in Wis 11.4 corresponds to the same wording in Deut 8.2, 16 LXX, and the phrase ἐκ πέτρας ἀκροτόμου is common to Wis 11.4/Deut 8.15. It is also significant that God’s role as a Father who disciplines Israel was included in the author’s retelling of the Exodus events in Wis 11. It is again important to remember that God’s fatherly discipline is necessary in order to procure obedience.¹⁴⁹ Thus these references to discipline necessarily assume the importance of filial obedience.

An additional point worth noting in Wisdom is the tendency to see divine sonship as an eschatological reality, since it will only be in the future that all will be truly holy sons.¹⁵⁰ Indeed, because the ideal state of the obedient son of God is seldom realized, this text lent itself to the possibility of later, messianic interpretation.¹⁵¹

4.2.2.2 Tobit

God’s fatherhood toward Israel is also found in Tob 13—a chapter that has already been shown to be greatly influenced by the Song of Moses.¹⁵² In Tob 13.4 it is said that the Lord God is Father to the sons of Israel. Since Tob 13 gleans heavily from Deut 32, the notion of God as Father probably also derives from Deut 32 (cf. Deut 32.6), especially since the summons in Tob 13.4 to make God’s greatness known echoes Deut 32.3.¹⁵³ Here the notion of God’s fatherhood encourages the

¹⁴⁶ See also Wis 16.26, echoing Deut 8.3.

¹⁴⁷ The following insights relating Deut 8/Wis 11 come from Strotmann, *Mein Vater*, 121–26.

¹⁴⁸ Although the term “father” is not found in Deut 8.5, there is widespread agreement (as noted in chapter 3) that Yahweh is there portrayed as Israel’s Father.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Thompson, *Promise*, 54.

¹⁵⁰ Larcher, *Sagesse*, 1:253.

¹⁵¹ De Kruijf, *Der Sohn*, 18.

¹⁵² See §2.2.2.

¹⁵³ See Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Tobit* (CEJL; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003), 308–9.

Israelite exiles to repent, since God is the one who sent them into Exile (13.3) and who would restore them again (13.5). These verses also recall the Deuteronomic doctrine of retribution corresponding to the people's actions (Tob 13.3/Deut 4.25–40; Tob 13.5/Deut 30.1–3; Tob 13.6/Deut 30.10).¹⁵⁴ Strotmann makes a similar argument, suggesting Deut 32.6 as a background for Tob 13.4 in light of the numerous Deuteronomic parallels in Tob 13 and the role of Deut 32.39 in Tob 13.2.¹⁵⁵ More generally, she also notes the prevalence of fatherly language for God in Deut 32.1–20, which further enables Deut 32 to serve as an appropriate background for Tob 13. Significantly, Tobit also connects God's fatherhood with discipline,¹⁵⁶ which is necessary because of the people's disobedience (Tob 13.2–5). In sum, Tob 13.4 derives primarily from Deut 32, and both passages share the view that the Israelites must be obedient sons.

4.2.2.3 *Jubilees*

Jubilees 1.24–25 contains an even more explicit link between Israel's sonship and their call to obedience:

And their souls will cleave to me and to all my commandments. And they will do my commandments. And I shall be a father to them, and they will be sons to me. And they will all be called "sons of the living God." And every angel and spirit will know and acknowledge that they are my sons and I am their father in uprightness and righteousness. And I shall love them. (*Jub.* 1.24–25)¹⁵⁷

Here it is those who do God's commandments that will be God's sons. Put differently, only those who are obedient to God will enjoy the filial relationship. In *Jub.* 1.23 the reason given for this is Yahweh's purification of his people, his cutting the foreskins of their hearts. This final, definitive covenant will be made only with the faithful Israelites who are submissive to the laws of the covenant.¹⁵⁸ Consistent

¹⁵⁴ Ibid.; Strotmann, *Mein Vater*, 44–51.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., 49–53.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., 38–41, 53–54; Carey A. Moore, *Tobit: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB40; New York: Doubleday, 1996), 28.

¹⁵⁷ O. S. Wintermute, *OTP*, 2:54. He suggests Deut 14.1; Jer 31.9; Hos 1.10 as scriptural background for this passage. Cf. *Jub.* 2.20; 19.29.

¹⁵⁸ Michel Testuz, *Les Idées Religieuses du Livre des Jubilés* (Paris: Minard, 1960), 69.

with Deut 14.1–2; 32.4–6, this passage adds that God is a “father in uprightness and righteousness,” indicating the necessity of obedience in light of the holiness of God himself.¹⁵⁹ Allusions to Deut 32, however, are more likely here, given the influence of Deut 31–34 in *Jub* 1.¹⁶⁰ Thus, the designation of the obedient as “sons” within a section of *Jubilees* that has most likely been modeled after Deut 31–34 lends further credibility to the claim that the author has re-appropriated Deuteronomistic teaching in a new context.

4.2.2.4 *Psalms of Solomon*

In *Pss. Sol.* 18.4 Israel bears the distinction of the Lord’s firstborn: “Your discipline for us (is) as (for) a firstborn son, an only child.”¹⁶¹ Again, Israel as firstborn reflects Exod 4.22, suggesting that the historical and literary context of the Pentateuch is in view. This is rendered more probable by the link between discipline and Israel’s collective status as son of God in *Pss. Sol.* 18.4 (cf. Deut 8.5). This discipline is viewed in conjunction with a cleansing that would precede the coming of the Messiah. Indeed, the Lord Messiah is said to bring with him a rod of discipline to direct people in righteous acts (*Pss. Sol.* 18.5–8). Combining these features, it can be said that in *Pss. Sol.* 18 Israel is the Lord’s firstborn who requires discipline in order to walk in obedience in preparation for the Messianic kingdom. In addition, it is noteworthy that it is only the righteous remnant in *Pss. Sol.* 13.4–9 that are identified as God’s sons.¹⁶² This ethical focus agrees with Deuteronomy’s vision of Israel’s calling to be God’s obedient son.

4.2.2.5 Additional Texts

Another text to consider is *T. Mos.* 10.3: “For the Heavenly One will arise from his kingly throne. Yea, he will go forth from his holy habitation with indignation and wrath on behalf of his sons.”¹⁶³ This passage likely alludes to Deut

¹⁵⁹ *Contra* Chen (*God as Father*, 126–27) who suggests that the ethical demands of sonship in *Jubilees* is a new trajectory. She does, however, correctly affirm that “for the Israelites to be called degenerate, ungrateful, and unfaithful children of God in the Old Testament is a contradiction in terms” (127).

¹⁶⁰ See the discussion in §2.2.2.6.

¹⁶¹ R. B. Wright, *OTP*, 2:669.

¹⁶² So Chen, *God as Father*, 129.

¹⁶³ J. Priest, *OTP*, 1:932. Cf. *T. Mos.* 11.12–13.

32.43 as reflected in the LXX, which states that God will avenge the blood of his *sons*.¹⁶⁴

Another possible allusion to Deut 32 is found in *6 Ezra* 1.24–25:¹⁶⁵ “‘Woe to those who sin and who do not observe my commandments,’ says the Lord... ‘Depart, you faithless children!’”¹⁶⁶ Here the children are characterized as *faithless* due to their lack of obedience to God’s commandments, which may reflect Deut 32.20.

4.2.3 Philo

Philo’s teaching on the fatherhood of God is noteworthy because of the universality he ascribes to divine paternity. Although Philo in some instances recognizes God’s special relationship with Israel, he most often portrays God as the Father of the universe.¹⁶⁷ The application of God’s fatherhood both to the universe in general and in a distinctive way to a select group is evident in *Conf.* 144–47. After commenting that, in contrast to those who believe numerous gods and fathers were responsible for the existing world, the God of the OT is the Creator and Father of all things (*Conf.* 144), Philo cites Deut 14.1; 32.6, 18 in *Conf.* 145 to indicate those who have the knowledge of the one God are the true sons of God.¹⁶⁸ Thus he affirms both God’s universal fatherhood and the need to be found worthy to be sons of God in a special sense. This status is afforded to those who submit to God’s unique Firstborn, also known as the Word, the Beginning, the Man after God’s image, and Israel (*Conf.* 146).¹⁶⁹ Although Philo’s treatment of this topic merits additional investigation beyond the scope of the present study, it will suffice here to note that his articulation of God’s peculiar fatherhood in this passage is drawn from Deuteronomic texts addressed in the previous chapter.

In addition, Philo notes in *Deus* 53–54 that the fatherhood of God in Deut 8.5 is an anthropomorphism given for the sake of instruction; it does not actually teach

¹⁶⁴ Johannes Tromp, *The Assumption of Moses: A Critical Edition with Commentary* (SVTP 10; Leiden: Brill, 1993), 234.

¹⁶⁵ Included as 2 Esdras 15.24–25 in English versions of the Apocrypha (so RSV).

¹⁶⁶ B. M. Metzger, *OTP*, 1:556.

¹⁶⁷ Chen, *God as Father*, 136. Cf. *Somn.* 2.27; *Spec.* 4.180; *Conf.* 63; *Legat.* 3.

¹⁶⁸ These scriptural references are noted in Philo, *Conf.* 145 (Colson and Whitaker, LCL).

¹⁶⁹ Language adapted from Colson and Whitaker, LCL.

God is a man.¹⁷⁰ Here Philo appears to be more interested in the *via negativa* than in making positive statements about the nature of God's fatherhood. Finally, it is suggestive that Philo has a penchant for citing portions of Deut 8 (especially vv. 17–18).¹⁷¹ Although he does not typically include vv. 1–10 in these references, his frequent appeal to this chapter of Deuteronomy is further evidence of the extent to which Deut 8 was a familiar passage in the ancient world.

4.2.4 Josephus

Josephus writes relatively little about the sonship of Israel. His comments on Deut 21.18–21, however, are insightful. In *Ant.* 4.260–262 Josephus suggests the actions of the rebellious son are an affront to God, because God is the Father of all humanity and he “regards himself as a partner in the indignity done to those who bear the same title as himself.”¹⁷² This statement of God's universal fatherhood is surely indicative of Josephus's apologetic aim to render Judaism palatable to his contemporaries. One additional point that bears repeating from chapter 2 is Josephus's familiarity with the Song of Moses, which he mentions explicitly in *Ant.* 4.303.

4.2.5 Targumic Literature

Although much (if not all) of the material contained in the targumic and rabbinic literature to be considered likely postdates the writing of Matthew, it is nevertheless worthwhile to consider the way certain Deuteronomic texts and themes were appropriated by the later Jewish community. If similarities to the literature surveyed above are also found in these (probably) later texts, it will lend added credibility to the argument that the correlation of sonship and obedience was a widely recognized relationship.

It will be helpful to consider first some Aramaic targums. *Targum Onqelos*, which was eventually adopted as the official targum of Babylonian Judaism, does not

¹⁷⁰ Cécile Dogniez and Marguerite Harl, *La Bible d'Alexandrie 5: Le Deutéronome* (Paris: Cerf, 1992), 119, 171. Cf. *Somm.* 1.237.

¹⁷¹ Dogniez and Harl, *Deutéronome*, 69.

¹⁷² *Ant.* 4.262 (Thackeray, LCL).

offer many unique Aramaic renderings, given its relatively literal character.¹⁷³ Of more interest is *Targum Neofiti*. Chilton notes that this targum, likely dating from the third century, includes a clever rendering of Deut 32.6 that emphasizes the unique fatherly relationship of God to Israel.¹⁷⁴ This is communicated by the Aramaic rendering קנא for the Hebrew קנה. Whereas the latter term can mean either “create” or “purchase,” the Aramaic term denotes “acquire” more than “create,” indicating the particularity of God’s fatherhood to Israel.¹⁷⁵ Preceding this, *Tg. Neof.* Deut 32.5 adds “beloved” before “sons,” revealing the conviction that the immensity of God’s love for Israel is seen in God’s bestowing a filial relationship upon them. The rendering of *Tg. Neof.* Deut 32.1 includes an additional reference to the Israelites as sons of the Lord, in contrast to the sons of man. The sense of this passage seems to be that the sons of the Lord enjoy a permanency not afforded to the sons of men.¹⁷⁶ McNamara also notes that in *Tg. Neof.* Deut 4.30 “the Lord your God” is replaced by “your Father.”¹⁷⁷ A further reference to God’s fatherhood comes in *Tg. Neof.* Deut 33.24, which refers to the Father of the twelve tribes who is in heaven.¹⁷⁸

The designation “beloved” is also found in *Tg. Neof.* Deut 14.1, where it replaces the designation “sons.” However, one should not conclude from this lacuna that *Tg. Neof.* did not understand the Israelites to be sons of God. This is evident from the renderings of *Tg. Neof.* Deut 1.31; 8.5, both of which refer to Israel as God’s son. Moreover, it is eminently likely that *sons* is missing from the manuscript in 14.1.¹⁷⁹ In addition, Israel is clearly understood to be in a filial relationship to God in the renderings of Deut 32 noted above, where the combination of “beloved” with

¹⁷³ Bruce Chilton, “God as ‘Father’ in the Targumim, in Non-Canonical Literatures of Early Judaism and Primitive Christianity, and in Matthew,” in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation* (ed. J. Charlesworth and C. Evans; JSPSup 14/SSEJC 2; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 151–69; Martin McNamara, *Targum and Testament. Aramaic Paraphrases of the Hebrew Bible: A Light on the New Testament* (Shannon, Ireland: Irish University Press, 1972), 173–75.

¹⁷⁴ Chilton, “God as Father,” 156–57.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 157. Later Chilton suggests that this passage may have been based on later variants from the 11th–13th centuries (158–59).

¹⁷⁶ Martin McNamara, *Targum Neofiti 1: Deuteronomy. Translated, with Apparatus and Notes* (ArBib 5A; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997), 147.

¹⁷⁷ McNamara, *Targum and Testament*, 116. However, the 1997 translation produced by McNamara (*Targum Neofiti 1*, 39) does not attest this reading.

¹⁷⁸ McNamara, *Targum Neofiti 1*, 172.

¹⁷⁹ Alejandro Diez Macho, *Neophyti 1. Targum Palestinense MS de la Biblioteca Vaticana 5: Deuteronomio* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1978), 131, 496

“sons” in *Tg. Neof.* Deut 32.5 is particularly instructive.¹⁸⁰ Chilton notes the overall prominence of God’s fatherhood in *Tg. Neof.*, asserting that it is the essential link between Israel and God in this targum.¹⁸¹

The connection between Israel’s beloved status and their position as sons is also made explicit in *Tg. Ps-J.* Deut 14.1, which reads: “you are *like beloved* sons before the Lord your God.”¹⁸² Similarly, *Tg. Ps-J.* Deut 32.5 refers to the Israelites as “dear children.”¹⁸³ Another reference to the fatherhood of God is found in the addition of *Tg. Ps-J.* Deut 28.32, which notes the ability of Israel’s “Father in heaven” to rescue Israel from foreign oppressors.¹⁸⁴ The same thought is found in *Frg. Tg.* Deut 32.6, which adds “in heaven” to the “your Father” found in the other Palestinian targums and in the Hebrew text.¹⁸⁵

Although the above references clearly echo and even expand the view of Deuteronomy that Israel was God’s son, some targums tend to avoid the phrase. Indeed, in the targums to the Prophets the designation “Father” for God is either replaced by another word or is reworked into a simile comparing God to a father. This is true for the targums of Isa 63.16; 64.7; Jer 3.4, 19; 31.9; Mal 1.6.¹⁸⁶

In sum, Israel’s sonship is clearly communicated through the targums of Deuteronomy. Some of these targums include additional references to God’s fatherhood in Deuteronomy. Thus, the targumic literature in general reflects a “rich conceptual development” of God as Father,¹⁸⁷ extending to texts that do not speak of God’s fatherhood in the Hebrew tradition. In addition, the notion that Israel is a *beloved* son is often in the foreground. Overall, these targums reflect the perspective

¹⁸⁰ McNamara also notes the equation of Israel’s beloved status with being sons of God in *m. ’Abot* 3:14 (*ibid.*, 78). Also see *Tg. Onq.* Deut 14.2 which calls Israel the “*beloved* nation” just after noting their status as God’s sons. Cf. Bernard Grossfeld, *The Targum Onqelos to Deuteronomy: Translated, with Apparatus and Notes* (ArBib 9; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988), 50.

¹⁸¹ Chilton, “God as Father,” 158.

¹⁸² Ernest G. Clarke, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Deuteronomy. Translated, with Notes* (ArBib 5B; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 43. Italics added to highlight the addition of *beloved*.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, 90.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 77; Chilton, “God as Father,” 160. McNamara (*Targum and Testament*, 116) notes that it is only in the Palestinian targums to the Pentateuch (*Neofiti, Pseudo-Jonathan, Fragmentary*) that one finds the designation “Father in heaven.”

¹⁸⁵ McNamara, *Targum and Testament*, 119.

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 115.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*

of Deuteronomy outlined in chapter 3. Thus, the acknowledgement of Israel's divine sonship extended well into the first several centuries after the turn of the era.¹⁸⁸

4.2.6 Later Jewish Writings

A few additional references from later Jewish literature reveal views consistent with the Deuteronomic portrayal of obedient sonship advanced in chapter 3. One treasure trove of materials is the complex Tannaitic midrash known as *Sifre* Deuteronomy, which dates from around 300 C.E. and systematically addresses passages from Deuteronomy, amplifying them by a variety of means.¹⁸⁹ *Sifre* Deut §48 points out the importance of Torah study, citing Deut 8.3 to affirm that “bread” refers to exegesis whereas “everything that comes out of the mouth of the Lord” refers to laws and lore.¹⁹⁰ The comments that follow affirm that obedience does not only make the heart of one's earthly father glad, but also gladdens one's heavenly Father. Beyond this, an allegory in *Sifre* Deut §48 compares a king (God) who handed a bird (Torah) to his servant (rabbinic sage) in order to keep it for his son (Israel).¹⁹¹ In addition to indicating the important role of the early rabbinic sages, this allegory is built upon the conviction that Israel's life (as God's son!) depends upon their adherence to the Torah. Thus *Sifre* Deut §48 recognizes God's fatherhood and the importance of obedience within that relationship.

Deuteronomy 14.1–2 is addressed in *Sifre* Deut §§96–97. In §96 Rabbi Judah states that one is a child of God only if that person's life is conducted in the

¹⁸⁸ The triennial, Palestinian Torah reading cycle may also give some indication of the level of awareness of the connections between Israel's sonship and Deuteronomy in Second Temple Judaism. According to Charles Perrot (“The Reading of the Bible in the Ancient Synagogue,” in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* [ed. M. Mulder; CRINT II/1; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988], 137–59), the 143rd cycle may have begun with Deut 14.1–15.6, and thus the clear statement that Israelites were sons of God. Interestingly, this likely would have been read conjunction with Isaiah 63.8ff, which indicates the waywardness of God's children. In addition, the 157th cycle would have read Deut 32 in conjunction with Isa 1.2ff—two passages that highlight the (disobedient) sonship of God's people. The combination of these two sets of passages, all of which indicate Israel's sonship, suggest that the understanding of Israel's sonship, and the prophetic critique of Israel's filial disobedience, were commonly recognized in the Second Temple period.

¹⁸⁹ Jacob Neusner, ed., *Sifre to Deuteronomy: An Analytical Translation* (2 vols.; BJS 98, 101; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 1:x. The following discussion is based on Neusner's English edition.

¹⁹⁰ This phrasing comes from Neusner, *Sifre*, 1:161.

¹⁹¹ For this interpretation, see Steven D. Fraade, *From Tradition to Commentary: Torah and Its Interpretation in the Midrash Sifre to Deuteronomy* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991), 107.

way of good children. To be sure, Rabbi Meir disagrees with this view, observing that one is a child regardless of the level of obedience. Nevertheless, this interchange reveals the existence of some debate regarding the relationship of sonship to obedience in Deut 14.1–2. *Sifre* Deut §97 draws two insights from these verses. The first is simply that the Israelites are to sanctify themselves, and the second underscores the beloved status of Israel as God’s unique possession, surpassing everyone except the original patriarchs. In sum, *Sifre* Deut §§96–97 echo the concern of Deut 14 that Israel must be holy because of their filial relationship to God, and emphasize the lofty position held by Israel by virtue of this status.

Sifre Deut §308 again reveals a debate regarding sonship and obedience. Commenting on Deut 32.4–6, Rabbi Meir considers children covered with blemishes to be children of God, despite their disobedience. A rejoinder to this view is offered by Rabbi Judah, who insists that God’s children must bear no blemishes. In the end, *Sifre* Deut §308 agrees with Rabbi Meir, noting the appellation “children” for God’s people even when they are rebellious in such biblical texts as Isa 1.4; Jer 4.22; Ezek 33.31. Nevertheless, by the use of *qal wahomer* argumentation, *Sifre* Deut §308 reveals that the obedience of God’s children was a desideratum; their disobedience was a conundrum. A similar argument is found in *Sifre* Deut §320, which takes its cue from Deut 32.19–31. Again it is asked if the Israelites are God’s children when they anger him, how much more would this be true if they did not anger him?

Another perspective is found in *Sifre* Deut §32. Here prosperity in all of life is to be avoided. Instead, (citing Deut 8.5; Prov 3.12) the Lord’s chastisement of his son is necessary, since suffering is what causes the father to delight in his son.¹⁹² Finally, the preciousness of the Israelites to God is manifest in *Sifre* Deut §§36, 309. *Sifre* Deut §309 observes the special effort the Lord made to acquire Israel, which indicates Israel’s supreme value to the Lord. In §36 Israel is precious because God’s commandments surround them. Indeed, in §36 the Israelites, as God’s children, are encouraged to be marked by God’s commandments, since this would render them desirable in their Father’s sight.

¹⁹² See Reuven Hammer, ed., *Sifre: A Tannaitic Commentary on the Book of Deuteronomy* (YJS 24; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), 60.

The Palestinian Talmud also includes a relevant passage. Here the explanation of Rabbi Eleazar, following a partial citation of Deut 14.2,¹⁹³ is recorded in response to the question of the identity of “sons.” His answer is:

When Israel does the will of the Holy One, blessed be he, they are called his children, and when Israel does not do the will of the Holy One, blessed be he, they are not called his children. (y. *Qidd.* 61c)¹⁹⁴

Thus, for Rabbi Eleazar there is a direct correlation between Israel’s obedience to God’s will and their designation as sons of God. Similarly, the Babylonian Talmud states: “when you behave as sons you are designated sons; if you do not behave as sons, you are not designated sons” (b. *Qidd.* 36a).¹⁹⁵

Also relevant is *Deut. Rabb.* 7.9, where Rabbi Judah quotes God as saying that the Israelites will be called his children when they receive his words. He continues, stating that the Israelites must occupy themselves with Torah study and divine precepts in order that everyone will recognize the Israelites as God’s children.¹⁹⁶ In other words, the Israelites would be known as God’s children by knowledge of and adherence to God’s commandments.

This survey reveals a number of texts that speak of God’s fatherhood. This is in keeping with the trend of rabbinic materials in which God’s paternity is a common theme.¹⁹⁷ Moreover, these authors are clearly aware of the relationship between Israel’s sonship and their call to obedience. Indeed, in some rabbinic texts the distinguishing mark of the Israelites’ filial identity is their faithfulness to the Torah. Thus it is appropriate to recognize the frequent correlation between sonship and

¹⁹³ The partial citation reads: “For you are a holy people to the Lord your God.” Jacob Neusner, ed. (*The Talmud of the Land of Israel: A Preliminary Translation and Expansion. Qiddushin* [CSJH 26; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984], 111) is probably correct to see here a reference to Deut 14.2, since R. Eleazar’s response deals with the question of sonship, which is addressed in Deut 14.1. Vermes (*Scrolls*, 72–73) suggests R. Eleazar’s comment pertains to Deut 7.6.

¹⁹⁴ This translation comes from Neusner, *Qiddushin*, 111.

¹⁹⁵ H. Freedman, ed., *The Babylonian Talmud. Seder Nashim 8: Kiddushin* (London: Soncino Press, 1936), 177.

¹⁹⁶ For a translation of this passage, see J. Rabbinowitz, ed., *Midrash Rabbah: Deuteronomy* (London: Soncino Press, 1939), 143. See also *Deut. Rabb.* 12.7 for expositions of God’s fatherhood in Deut 1.31.

¹⁹⁷ George Foot Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim* (3 vols; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927–30), 2:203.

obedience in rabbinic materials in general, and in rabbinic comments on Deuteronomy in particular.

4.3 Sonship and Obedience: Early Christian Literature

Attention will now be given to the way in which certain Christian writers show an awareness of Israel's call to obedient sonship, particularly in relationship to Deuteronomy. The purpose of this section is to demonstrate that Matthew was by no means the only early Christian who related the themes of sonship and obedience.

4.3.1 Pauline Epistles

Philippians 2.15, which draws from Deut 32.5, is perhaps the clearest application of Deuteronomic sonship among the epistles of the NT.¹⁹⁸ Paul's use of τέκνα in Phil 2.15, in reference to the Philippians, derives from the OG of Deut 32.5. But Paul also draws upon this passage to specify that the Philippians should be *blameless* (ἄμωμα) children of God.¹⁹⁹ The Philippians are to be distinguished from their present generation by living holy lives befitting God's children, thus enabling them to shine as stars in the midst of a dark world. Although he does not employ the precise term for "son," Paul clearly recognizes the familial relationship afforded to Israel in the Song of Moses, and encourages the Philippians to live obediently in light of that relationship.

A second passage to consider is Rom 9.4. It should be admitted at the outset that there are no apparent *verbal* parallels that would necessitate Paul's use of Deuteronomy here. Nevertheless, this passage may be a significant indication of Paul's conviction that corporate Israel was called to obedient sonship, and this appears to be derived from the Pentateuch (perhaps in part from Deuteronomy). It is therefore worthy of consideration here. In Rom 9.4–5 Paul lists several privileges afforded to the Israelites, the first being adoption (υἰοθεσία), which most likely refers to Israel's unique, national sonship.²⁰⁰ Cranfield rightly notes that υἰοθεσία entails

¹⁹⁸ The basis for this allusion was given in chapter 2.

¹⁹⁹ Peter T. O'Brien (*The Epistle to the Philippians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* [NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991], 293) observes that τέκνα θεοῦ ἄμωμα stands in apposition to ἄμεμπτοι καὶ ἀκέραιοι.

²⁰⁰ So James D. G. Dunn, *Romans* (2 vols.; WBC 38A–B; Waco: Word, 1988), 2:526; C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (2 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1975–79), 2:461; Thomas R. Schreiner, *Romans* (BECNT; Grand Rapids:

the Lord's adoption of Israel in the Exodus that began his paternal relationship with Israel, and that Israel was required to respond with love, trust, and obedience.²⁰¹ Similarly, Fitzmyer observes the fatherly affection that was constantly shown to Israel, which should have led to Israel's filial obedience.²⁰² Indeed, for Paul Israel's disobedience which is evident in their apparent exclusion from God's promises, is all the more shocking in light of God's fatherly affection toward Israel, and even calls into question the faithfulness of God himself (9.6)!²⁰³

In addition, Paul's list of privileges in Rom 9.4–5 can be divided into two sets of three, with each element in the respective lists finding a conceptual correlate in the other.²⁰⁴ In this relationship, Israel's adoption/sonship corresponds to the giving of the law. It is therefore possible that Israel's sonship and the giving of the law have more in common than only their origin in the Exodus events. It may be that Paul viewed the law itself as a distinguishing mark of Israel's sonship. If so, this would be another way of intimating the need for Israel's filial obedience. This point, however, must remain only a preliminary suggestion, especially since it is not altogether clear if the process of law-giving or the content of the law is intended by νομοθεσία.²⁰⁵

Another relevant passage that speaks of God's fatherhood is 2 Cor 6.18, which mainly comprises a citation of 2 Sam 7.14. However, Paul curiously takes Nathan's oracle that David's seed would be God's son and applies it to the Corinthians, stating that they would be the Lord's *sons and daughters*. Many commentators interpret the inclusion of daughters here to come from Isaiah (e.g., 43.6; 49.22; 60.4).²⁰⁶ It is possible, however, that the plural *sons and daughters*

Baker Academic, 1998), 482–83; Douglas J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 562.

²⁰¹ Cranfield, *Romans*, 2:461.

²⁰² Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans: A New Translation, with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 33; New York: Doubleday, 1993), 545. Both Cranfield and Fitzmyer note the Deuteronomic background for understanding Israel's sonship and call to filial obedience.

²⁰³ So Schreiner, *Romans*, 482.

²⁰⁴ The two sets are: 1) adoption, glory, covenants; 2) giving of the law, worship, promises. Cf. Schreiner, *Romans*, 483.

²⁰⁵ Cranfield (*Romans*, 2:463) writes that the content of the law is in view, while Moo (*Romans*, 564) prefers the giving of the law. Schreiner (*Romans*, 483) takes a more agnostic view.

²⁰⁶ Cf. Margaret E. Thrall, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, (2 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994–2000), 2:478–79; Murray J. Harris, *The*

reflects Deut 32.19. A reference to Deut 32.19 would be fitting in light of the shared polemic against idolatry in 2 Cor 6.14–7.1 and Deut 32.7, 15–18.²⁰⁷ This is also similar to the way Paul uses Deut 32 in his argument against idolatry in 1 Cor 10.20, 22.²⁰⁸ An allusion to Deut 32.19 in 2 Cor 6.18 is also plausible in light of Phil 2.15, which calls God’s people to be *holy children* in the midst of a crooked generation (Deut 32.5). If 2 Cor 6.18 alludes to Deut 32.19, it would similarly be a reference to God’s children applied positively to Christians, though taken from a context warning against familial rebellion.

These NT passages are important inasmuch as they indicate a larger awareness of and appeal to Israel’s call to obedient sonship from the OT to the early church. Moreover, at least one of these passages (Phil 2.15) argues for filial obedience *directly* from Deuteronomy. Thus, although it will be argued that Matthew primarily applied these themes to Jesus, the passages above establish the precedent of uniquely Christian applications of Deuteronomic sonship texts.

4.3.2 Later Christian Literature

God’s fatherly discipline is addressed in *1 Clem.* 56. This section, which is devoted almost entirely to the subject, ties God’s discipline in with God’s fatherhood in at least two places. The first is the citation of Prov 3.12/Heb 12.6 at *1 Clem.* 56.3–4, which argues that God disciplines every son whom he loves. The second is found in the summary at *1 Clem.* 56.16, which states that God’s discipline is at the same time great protection, because God is a kind Father who disciplines his people that they might receive mercy.²⁰⁹ These thematic connections between God’s fatherhood and discipline, especially in *1 Clem.* 56.16, may reflect (at least in part) Deuteronomy, given the role of Deuteronomy in *1 Clem.* 52, 59.²¹⁰

Second Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 510. The term “daughters” is found only here in Paul.

²⁰⁷ So John W. Olley, “A Precursor of the NRSV? ‘Sons and Daughters’ in 2 Cor 6.18,” *NTS* 44 (1998): 204–12.

²⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 210. Cf. §2.3.1.1.

²⁰⁹ This paraphrase reflects the translation of Michael W. Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts with English Translations* (3d. ed.; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 121.

²¹⁰ See §2.3.2.

One other Christian author to consider is Athanasius (ca. 293–373), whose *Orations against the Arians* first sets forth his understanding of God’s divine fatherhood.²¹¹ Interestingly, these disputations reveal a disagreement over the nature of sonship described in *Deuteronomy*. In a portion arguing that Jesus is not *created* but *begotten* (2.58–61), Athanasius takes exception with the Arians’ exegesis of Deut 32.6, 18.²¹² According to Athanasius, his opponents equated *created* and *begot* in these verses, thereby misunderstanding the nature of begetting.²¹³

In response, Athanasius maintains a distinction between *created* and *begot*: the two terms refer to different natures, with *begot* being the more important term.²¹⁴ For Athanasius it is also significant that God is portrayed as the Creator of men in Deut 32 *before* he is portrayed as the One who begot them (*C. Ar.* 2.58).²¹⁵ This is consistent with the nature of man who must first be created, after which some are called to be sons through the unique Son (*C. Ar.* 2.59).²¹⁶ In contrast, Jesus was begotten *before* he was created (his creation being his incarnation) since God is his Father by nature (*C. Ar.* 2.61). This reveals Athanasius’s concern to defend the eternal generation of the Son.²¹⁷ For Athanasius the purpose of the begetting imagery in Deut 32 is to indicate God’s love toward men and give Moses an opportunity to reproach his audience, since they were ungrateful in spite of God’s graciousness (*C. Ar.* 2.58).

²¹¹ Peter Widdicombe, *The Fatherhood of God from Origen to Athanasius* (OTM; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 3.

²¹² The following discussion relies on *C. Ar.* 2.58–61 (NPNF² 4:380–81).

²¹³ So Widdicombe, *Fatherhood*, 219.

²¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 219–20. Widdicombe also notes that, for Athanasius, all instances of begetting in the Bible refer in some way to the Son.

²¹⁵ The exegetical methods of Athanasius are not always straightforward. Widdicombe (*Fatherhood*, 212) even suggests: “The passages of exegesis in Athanasius’ writings are often extensive, repetitious, and seemingly convoluted.” He nevertheless lists several features of Athanasius’s method, including the observation that reality is prior to words, which probably serves as part of Athanasius’s rationale in *C. Ar.* 2.58–61 (212–13, 217).

²¹⁶ It may be that Athanasius understands the generic “men” here to refer to Israel, since it is they who were called to be God’s sons and who were addressed by the Prophets (cf. *C. Ar.* 2.59).

²¹⁷ Cf. Widdicombe, *Fatherhood*, 2.

Although the writings of Athanasius are surely worthy of more detailed investigation, this brief glimpse into the controversies of his day serves as an illustration of the way later authors utilized Deuteronomy to articulate particular views of sonship. Athanasius differed with the Arians' interpretation of Deut 32 and its implications for Christology.

4.4 Summary and Conclusions

Now that the relevant literature has been considered, a more comprehensive summary is in order.

1) The concept of Israel's national sonship is found in numerous Jewish and Christian texts. The most prominent Deuteronomic passages echoed in later literature appear to have been Deut 8, 32 (as well as Deut 21), although parallels to Deut 1, 14 have also been adduced.

2) Of particular significance for the present study is the observation that Israel's sonship is frequently referenced in connection with the need for *obedience*. The frequent references to the discipline of a son should be understood as a corollary to the need for a son to be obedient.

3) Although most of the texts included above consider all Israelites to be God's sons, sometimes this designation is limited to a faithful remnant. Additionally, some authors applied God's fatherhood to all creatures in general.

4) Israel's sonship is a prominent way of underscoring Yahweh's divine, paternal love for his children. This is clear in the OT passages, but is perhaps equally prominent in later Jewish writings.

5) Deuteronomic texts were applied to new situations in a variety of ways. Especially relevant for this study is the practice of Christian authors who applied passages intended for Israel to Christian audiences. More generally, Christian writers generally reinterpreted Deuteronomic passages in light of the person and work of Jesus Christ.

In sum, it should be noted that all these features—Yahweh's love for his son Israel, along with his expectation of filial obedience—are foundationally expounded in Deuteronomy. Although it is impossible to know how many of the texts surveyed in this chapter Matthew may have known, the profusion of biblical and non-biblical texts that correlate Israel's sonship and obedience is striking. This increases the

plausibility that Matthew and his readers were aware of these connections. Furthermore, these passages not only indicate that God had loved Israel and that Israel in turn was called to filial obedience, but there is a pervasive realization that Israel had not been faithful to this calling. Some of these texts even look ahead in eschatological hope to a day when God's wayward children would be renewed in their covenantal faithfulness. In a word, many of these texts reveal that *Israel was not the obedient son they were called to be.*

Chapter Five

Deuteronomic Sonship in Matthew

Part 1: Strong and Likely Allusions

In preceding chapters it has been argued that Deuteronomy was of pre-eminent importance not only to Matthew (chapter 1), but to numerous authors in the ancient world (chapter 2); that Deuteronomy conveys a prominent message of Israel's sonship and call to obedience within that relationship (chapter 3); and that these related themes of sonship and obedience are prominent in other Jewish and Christian writings, often found in contexts that echo the language and themes of Deuteronomy (chapter 4). This study will now apply these insights to the Gospel of Matthew. It will be argued that Matthew also utilized language and themes from Deuteronomy in his articulation of Jesus' sonship and obedience to his Father. Indeed, understanding the teaching of Deuteronomy provides a significant background for the way Matthew understands Jesus' relationship to Israel and Jesus' fulfilment of the Scriptures.¹

The following sections will categorize Matthew's scriptural engagement under three main headings. The first is *strong allusions* and will focus on Matt 4.1–11, a text that most conspicuously connects Jesus' obedient sonship with Israel's sonship via Deuteronomy (Deut 8). The second category, *likely allusions*, refers to texts that incorporate textual citations/allusions, themes, and/or images from Deuteronomy in a way that highlights Jesus' obedient sonship. The third set of texts, *possible allusions*, assumes the first two categories and, as part of a cumulative argument, will suggest other texts that fit the schema suggested in the first two categories. Chapter 5 will discuss only *strong* and *likely* allusions; chapter 6 focusing on significant *possible* allusions; and chapter 7 on other possible allusions.

¹ It bears reemphasizing the extent to which Deuteronomy is cited by Matthew, as well as Matthew's penchant for alluding to those scriptural texts that form the foundation for this thought (such as the oft-cited Deuteronomy; cf. chapter 1 of this study).

These chapters seek to present a cumulative and coherent case, highlighting what Richard Hays has called “clusters” of ideas,² that describe Jesus in terms of Deuteronomy’s call for a filially faithful Israel. Although it has been argued in chapter 4 that the theme of Israel’s sonship is found in other documents besides Deuteronomy, Matthew’s clear interest in Deuteronomy (evidenced by the number of citations) and the prevalence of Israel’s sonship in Deuteronomy provide a *prima facie* likelihood that Matthew gleans from *Deuteronomy*’s perspective of sonship. Moreover, Matthew’s citations and verbal parallels with Deut 8, 32 are significant, since these are two well-known texts from Deuteronomy that highlight Israel’s sonship. The discussion below will reveal that Matthew, much like a number of other ancient authors, recognized and utilized the theme of Israel’s sonship from Deuteronomy for his own purposes. Matthew demonstrates continuity with writings that precede him, yet also exhibits a distinctive interpretation of Deuteronomy that centers around his understanding of the unique life and work of Jesus Christ. It is to these Matthean texts that most of the remainder of the study will be devoted.

5.1 Strong Allusion(s): Matt 4.1–11

The most explicit Matthean passage connecting the sonship of Jesus and the sonship of Israel in Deuteronomic terms is the Temptation Narrative (4.1–11). This passage immediately follows Jesus’ baptism and the revelation via a heavenly voice that he is God’s Son (3.13–17). After this declaration of Jesus’ sonship, he is then (τότε) in 4.1 led by the Spirit³ into the wilderness to be tested by the devil (πειρασθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου). After fasting 40 days and nights,⁴ vv. 3–11 recount three temptations presented to Jesus by the devil, along with Jesus’ responses.

² A point Hays emphasized in a conversation with the author (11 December 2008).

³ Following Raymond E. Brown (*The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke* [2d ed.; ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1993], 215) in this chapter “(Holy) Spirit” will be capitalized in accordance with recent Bible custom, without necessarily implying the passages in question necessitate a Trinitarian interpretation.

⁴ Νύκτας τεσσαράκοντα is a Matthean insertion, which is likely intended to recall Moses’ fast of 40 days and nights as recorded in Exod 34.28; Deut 9.9. This is but one indication that Matthew’s knowledge of the Pentateuch was not limited to his sources. Cf. W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, Jr., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew* (3 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988–97), 1:358. The Mosaic resonances here highlight the Mosaic background for Matthew’s thought, but it should not be assumed that Jesus as the *New Moses* (so Dale C. Allison, Jr., *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993]) and Jesus as the obedient son are *competing* themes. Rather, they are complementary, though here sonship may be stronger given the explicit testing of Jesus’ sonship (see below).

Significantly, in these temptations Jesus' divine sonship is a prominent theme, and by means of this sonship Jesus represents national Israel.⁵ The text's filial focus is evidenced in the devil's preface to the first two temptations (4.3, 6): εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ. As a number of scholars have noted, it is probably correct here to view these statements as first class conditionals, which assumes the truth of the statements.⁶ Thus, the devil is not questioning the *fact* of Jesus' divine sonship (which the heavenly voice had just declared to be true in 3.17), but the *mode* of Jesus' divine sonship. Put differently, according to this passage the proper appropriation of Jesus' divine sonship entails a proper understanding of the biblical background of sonship. This is suggested by the most relevant passage for the present purposes: the citation of Deut 8.3 in Matt 4.4 in the first temptation.

Moreover, a significant study by Birger Gerhardsson, which remains commonly invoked by scholars, suggests that Matt 4.1–11 is an haggadic midrash on Deut 6–8.⁷ Although Gerhardsson's case for *haggadic midrash* appears to be a bit speculative given his overstated emphasis on the role of the *Shema*,⁸ there is nevertheless widespread agreement with Gerhardsson that the three citations to Deut 6–8 in Matt 4 are indicative of a larger correspondence between the two passages, including themes and scenic background.⁹ Thus, Gerhardsson is probably correct that the *sonship* of Israel is key to understanding all three temptations, even though sonship is only explicitly mentioned in the first two.¹⁰ It is probably also correct that a proper understanding of Deut 6–8 provides the key to the whole episode.¹¹

⁵ On this last point, see W. D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge: CUP, 1964; repr. BJS 186; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 47; cf. Th. de Kruijf, *Der Sohn des lebendigen Gottes: Ein Beitrag zur Christologie des Matthäusevangeliums* (AnBib 16; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1962), 57.

⁶ BDF §371. Cf., e.g., Mark Allan Powell, "The Plots and Subplots of Matthew's Gospel," *NTS* 38 (1992): 187–204; Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew* (2 vols.; WBC 33A–B; Dallas: Word, 1993–95), 1:65.

⁷ Birger Gerhardsson, *The Testing of God's Son (Matt 4.1–11 & Par): An Analysis of Early Christian Midrash* (trans. J. Toy; ConBNT 2; Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1966), 11.

⁸ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:353.

⁹ An interesting, though later, parallel comes from *Deut. Rabbah* 11.5 (Str-B 1:146): here, in response to temptations posed to Moses by the *Todesengel*, Moses responds three times from Deut 32. Cf. Kenyn M. Cureton, "Jesus as Son and Servant: An Investigation into the Baptism and Testing Narratives and their Significance for Cohesion, Plot, and Christology in Matthew," (Ph.D. diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1993), 110–11.

¹⁰ Gerhardsson, *Testing*, 11.

¹¹ Jacques Dupont, *Les Tentations de Jésus au Désert* (StudNeot 4; Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1968), 12; R. T. France, *The Gospel of Matthew* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 127–28.

5.1.1 First Temptation

In Matt 4.2 Jesus is said to have fasted for 40 days and nights, after which he was hungry. The devil uses this opportunity to encourage Jesus to turn some stones into bread (4.3). Jesus responds with a most fitting citation of Deut 8.3: οὐκ ἐπ’ ἄρτω μόνῳ ζήσεται ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ παντὶ ῥήματι ἐκπορευομένῳ διὰ στόματος θεοῦ. The only difference between the Matthean version and the LXX is the omission of the definite article before ἐκπορευομένῳ.¹² Deuteronomy 8.3 is also cited in Luke 4.4, but the citation there ends after ἄνθρωπος. Here Matthew has almost certainly expanded the citation from Q (rather than Luke has truncated it)¹³ in order to highlight his concern with the word of God and Jesus’ obedience to it.¹⁴ This would also indicate that Matthew knew Deut 8 beyond what was cited in his sources.¹⁵

Following the precedent of Gerhardsson noted above, it is also possible to adduce a number of additional correspondences between Matt 4 and Deut 8. Thus, the words spoken to Israel in Deut 8.3 are found in the context of Israel’s testing when they hungered in the wilderness. Similarly, Jesus’ temptations are set in a wilderness context where he also hungers. In Deut 8.2–3 Moses reminds the Israelites how Yahweh had guided them for 40 years, a number which corresponds to Jesus’ 40-day fast. These same verses indicate that Israel’s wilderness hungers were designed to reveal their hearts, and consequently whether they would keep Yahweh’s commandments. Likewise, Jesus’ testing was designed to test his obedience in a specific situation in time of need. In both instances the divine word was more important than fleshly appetites.

It is important to note the way in which these similarities underscore what is likely the most prominent connection between Jesus and Israel in Matt 4: the parallel—or better *contrast*—between their sonships, as Jesus here relives the

¹² The MT does not contain “word.” Cf. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:363n.23.

¹³ This conclusion is reached by an impressive number of scholars, on which see Christoph Heil, ed., *Q 4:1–13, 16: The Temptations of Jesus Nazara* (DocQ; Leuven: Peeters, 1996), especially 142–46.

¹⁴ So Maarten J. J. Menken, “Deuteronomy in Matthew’s Gospel,” in *Deuteronomy in the New Testament* (ed. S. Moyise and M. Menken; LNTS 358; London: T&T Clark, 2007), 42–62; Davies and Allison, *Matthew* 1:363.

¹⁵ A similar point is made by Ulrich Luz, *Matthew: A Commentary* (trans. J. Crouch; 3 vols.; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001–7), 1:151–52.

temptations of his ancestors.¹⁶ The sonship of Israel is assumed in Deut 8.3 (and in all of Deut 8.1–10), but is specifically mentioned in Deut 8.5. Although Deut 8.5 is not explicitly cited in Matt 4, scholars are in virtually unanimous agreement that the sonship of Israel from Deut 8.5 is of the utmost importance for understanding the first temptation.¹⁷ More extensively, Davies and Allison suggest all of Deut 8.1–10 as the requisite background for understanding the devil’s temptation and Jesus’ response.¹⁸

Of course, assuming the hypothetical reconstruction(s) of Q, Matthew may not have been the first one to note these connections between Jesus and Israel. Nevertheless, Matthew demonstrates in his more extended citation of Deut 8.3 and in the details of his narrative that he was well-aware of the contents of Deut 8 and molded his narrative to compare and contrast Jesus’ sonship in his temptation with the sonship of Israel in their wilderness temptation from Deut 8.¹⁹

5.1.2 Second Temptation

As in the first temptation, in the second temptation the devil also assumes Jesus’ divine sonship, prefacing this temptation with “Εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ” (4.5). Here the devil challenges Jesus to throw himself down from the pinnacle of the Temple. The rationale given by the devil is a quotation from the OG of Psa 90.11–12 (91 MT).²⁰ Jesus responds in Matt 4.7 by quoting from Deut 6.16: οὐκ ἐκπειράσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου.

¹⁶ William Richard Stegner, “The Temptation Narrative: A Study of the Use of Scripture by Early Jewish Christians,” *BR* 35 (1990): 5–17.

¹⁷ So, e.g., Thomas Söding, “Der Gehorsam des Gottessohnes: Zur Christologie der matthäischen Versuchungserzählung (4,1–11),” in *Jesus Christus als Mitte der Schrift* (ed. C. Landmesser, H. Eckstein and H. Lichtenberger; BZNW 86; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997), 711–50; Dupont, *Tentations*, 14–16; Jeffrey A. Gibbs, *Matthew 1:1–11:1* (ConComm; St. Louis: Concordia, 2006), 193–95; Cureton, “Son and Servant,” 123; Hagner, *Matthew*, 1:64.

¹⁸ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:363. By way of example, they also mention the presence of stones [and bread!] in Deut 8.9 which they suggest was well-known to Matthew. On a different note, the term used for Jesus’ tempting in Matthew (πειράζω) may also link this account to Deuteronomy, where ἐκπειράζω (MT: פָּנָה) is used for a *covenantal* testing (cf. Deut 8.2; so Gerhardsson, *Testing*, 25). The covenant is assumed in Deuteronomy (probably even in the very concept of sonship), and Jesus’ testing, as the recapitulation of Israel’s testing, is the quintessential covenantal testing.

¹⁹ So Menken, “Deuteronomy,” 49.

²⁰ Matthew’s version reflects the LXX, excepting the omission of the second half of 90.11 and the insertion of καί.

It is to be stressed that the second temptation is also the second time the sonship of Jesus is explicitly challenged, and the second time that Jesus rebuts a temptation of the devil by quoting from Deuteronomy. Thus the primary significance of the second temptation is the demonstration of Jesus' obedient sonship in conjunction with Deuteronomy. However, another *possibility* in this passage is whether the devil's response may betray a secondary allusion to the sonship of Israel from Deut 1.31. (Thus, this is a *possible* and not a *strong* allusion. However, this possibility is considered here due to its location in the midst of strong connections to Deuteronomy.) A combination of verbal parallels (though to the Hebrew) and thematic links suggests this possibility.

Psa 90.12 LXX	Psa 91.12 MT
ἐπὶ χειρῶν ἀροῦσίμ σε μήποτε προσκόψης πρὸς λίθον τὸν πόδα σου	עַל-כַּפַּיִם יִשְׂאוּנֶךָ פֶּן-תִּגַּף בְּאֶבֶן רִגְלֶךָ

Deut 1.31 LXX	Deut 1.31 MT
καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ταύτῃ ἦν εἶδετε ὡς ἐτροφοφόρησέν σε κύριος ὁ θεός σου ὡς εἴ τις τροφοφορήσει ἄνθρωπος τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ κατὰ πάσαν τὴν ὁδὸν ἣν ἐπορεύθητε ἕως ἡλθετε εἰς τὸν τόπον τοῦτον	וּבְמִדְבָּר אֲשֶׁר רָאִיתָ אֲשֶׁר נִשְׂאָךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ כַּאֲשֶׁר יִשְׂאֵאֱלֹהִים אֶת-בְּנוֹ בְּכָל-הַדֶּרֶךְ אֲשֶׁר הִלַּכְתֶּם עַד-בְּאֶזְבְּכֵם עַד-הַמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה

The context of Deut 1, much like Psalm 90[91] speaks of God's tender care for Israel and his bearing them up. This *bearing* of Israel is communicated in Psa 90.12 LXX by ἀἴρω, whereas in Deut 1.31 it is conveyed by τροφοφορέω. However, in the MT both passages convey God's tender care by the term נשא.²¹ Significantly, this term (as noted in chapter 3) is used for God's bearing up Israel as on wings in two well-known passages: Exod 19.4; Deut 32.10–11. The importance of these passages increases the likelihood that, even though it was a common word, Matthew

²¹ So Dupont, *Tentations*, 32.

(and/or Q²²) may have known the usages of נָשָׂא in reference to God's covenantal care for Israel, and consequently connected the term with another reference to Israel's sonship in Deut 1. Indeed, it is significant that in Deut 1 this language is connected to God's *fatherhood*, since in the second temptation the issue is again Jesus' *sonship*. It is for these reasons that a number of scholars suggest that Deut 1.31 may in fact be in view in Matt 4, even though it is certainly not the *primary* OT resonance.²³

If Matthew did recognize such a connection between Psa 90[91] and Deut 1,²⁴ it is of course also possible that he was not dependent on the Hebrew, but that he knew of a variant OG reading that employed ἀἴρω in Deut 1.31. However, this theory suffers from a lack of any known variants that attest ἀἴρω in Deut 1.31.²⁵ It is more likely that, if Matthew and/or Q did intend this allusion to Deut 1, it was based on a Hebrew text.²⁶ In support of this hypothesis is the recognizable Hebrew influence in many of Matthew's OT references (as noted in chapter 1).²⁷ Thus it is not out of the question that in the midst of a gospel passage replete with Deuteronomic echoes, Matthew may have found a secondary allusion to Deut 1.31 in his inclusion of Psa 90[91]—which shares a key term with Deut 1.31 in the MT—in addition to more general, thematic correspondence. However, this should not be considered much more than a possibility. The more certain observation is that in the second temptation Jesus' sonship, most likely in contrast to Israel, is again in view.

²² To reiterate the approach of this study, although I am interested in Matthew's sources, the *composition criticism* approach is concerned primarily with the integrity of the whole gospel, so it will be assumed that Matthew understood and made his own any quotations he includes.

²³ So Gerhardsson, *Testing*, 56; D. A. Carson, "Matthew," in vol. 8 of *The Expositor's Bible Commentary: Matthew, Mark, Luke* (ed. F. Gaebelin; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984; repr., 1995), 113; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:366.

²⁴ It is also possible that a connection to Deut 1 could have been made in Q without Matthew being aware of it. However, given Matthew's clear interest in Deuteronomy throughout his gospel, it is more likely that if a link is to be found in Q, Matthew also would have recognized this.

²⁵ Cf. John William Wevers, ed., *Deuteronomium* (VTG III/2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977), 63.

²⁶ Questions such as this highlight the difficulty in identifying precisely what Matthew's OT *Vorlage(n)* may have been.

²⁷ Cf. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:33, 45; Krister Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament* (2d ed.; ASNU 20; Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1968), 151; Robert H. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel with Special Reference to the Messianic Hope* (NovTSup 18; Leiden: Brill, 1967), 28, 157.

5.1.3 Third Temptation

In addition to these first two temptations that clearly focus on Jesus' sonship, Matthew includes a third that does not explicitly mention the sonship of Jesus. However, as noted above, it may well be that the first two temptations provide the precedent for the third temptation, so the sonship of Jesus is assumed in the third as well. Luz takes this approach, observing that in *each* of the three temptations Jesus' affirms his sonship to God in obedience to the word of God from the OT.²⁸ Similarly, as noted above, it is probably correct that Deut 8 (and therefore Israel's sonship) provides the key for understanding all three temptations.²⁹ However, even if the third temptation is not to be viewed as a direct challenge of Jesus' sonship, the first two temptations provide ample warrant for understanding Jesus' temptations in general to be the reliving of Israel's temptations *as God's son*.

5.1.4 Summary and Significance

In sum, Matt 4.1–11 clearly links Jesus' sonship with Israel's sonship as articulated in Deuteronomy, while also including a vindication of Jesus' sonship that is based on his quotations from Deuteronomy. It is thus highly significant that all three of Jesus' responses to the devil are taken from Deut 6–8. These responses provide the key for understanding the entire passage.

In addition to the similarities already noted, one other correspondence between this passage and Deut 6–8 is worth noting. In both instances God's son is tested before a watershed event. In Deuteronomy Moses, who was about to leave the Israelites, exhorted them to remain faithful as they were preparing to enter the Promised Land. Moses therefore reminded them of their need for perpetual faithfulness to God's word. Similarly, Matt 4.1–11 is the final component of Jesus' preparation before he begins his public ministry (4.17). In Deuteronomy Israel was called to be God's obedient son. In Matthew's temptation narrative, Jesus recapitulates the experience of Israel's sonship and, quoting from Deuteronomy, demonstrates he is the fully obedient Son of God in the way Israel was called to be.³⁰

²⁸ Luz, *Matthew*, 1:150.

²⁹ See also R. Joel Kennedy, "The Recapitulation of Israel: Use of Israel's History in Matthew 1:1–4:11," (Ph.D. diss., University of Aberdeen, 2008), 266–67.

³⁰ Kennedy ("Recapitulation," 39) lists four elements of recapitulation: repetition, summing up, representation, embodiment.

Thus, Jesus demonstrates himself to be the true Israel who completes and fulfills Israel's history,³¹ while also serving as a representative for his people.³² More extensively, a number of scholars have observed that the basis for *all* of Matthean Christology is fundamentally established in Matt 1.1–4.16.³³ It is also argued that 1.1–4.16 should be considered a unified prologue,³⁴ since this section contains the entire gospel in kernel form.³⁵

Regardless of how one chooses to articulate the structure of Matthew, the christological focus of 1.1–4.16 that closely identifies Jesus with Israel is clear. Within this, 4.1–11 might rightly be considered the *climax* of Matthew's extended introduction to Jesus.³⁶ It is highly significant that the focus of this passage is Jesus' obedient *sonship* in contrast to Israel.

5.2 Likely Allusions

This section comprises two series of texts that should likely be considered Matthean allusions to the Deuteronomy's view of obedient sonship. Each of these focuses in some way on the sonship of Jesus or his disciples, and each text deals with obedience or disobedience in connection with either Jesus' sonship or the familial relationship of the disciples. Moreover, it will be argued that each of these texts reveals Deuteronomic influence by way of citation or extensive thematic similarities.

³¹ For Jesus as the true, obedient Israel, see, e.g., France, *Matthew*, 128; de Kruijf, *Der Sohn*, 57; Stegner, "Temptation Narrative," 11; G. H. P. Thompson, "Called—Proved—Obedient: A Study in the Baptism and Temptation Narratives of Matthew and Luke," *JTS* 11 (1960): 1–12; T. L. Donaldson, "The Vindicated Son: A Narrative Approach to Matthean Christology," in *Contours of Christology in the New Testament* (ed. R. Longenecker; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 100–21; Carson, "Matthew," 112–13.

³² William L. Kynes, *A Christology of Solidarity: Jesus as the Representative of His People in the Gospel of Matthew* (New York: University of America Press, 1991), 28; Kennedy, "Recapitulation," 39.

³³ So Söding, "Gehorsam," 711, 720; similarly John Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew* (NIGTC; Bletchley: Paternoster, 2005), 161.

³⁴ So Edgar Krentz, "The Extent of Matthew's Prologue: Toward the Structure of the First Gospel," *JBL* 83 (1964): 409–14; Jack Dean Kingsbury, *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom* (London: SPCK, 1976), 1–25. For a more extensive list, see Kynes, *Christology of Solidarity*, 9n.1.

³⁵ Gibbs (*Matthew 1:1–11:1*, 42) writes: "*The ultimate significance of Jesus, his conflict with the leaders of Israel and with Satan himself, and his ultimate triumph at the ensuing mission from Galilee are all presented, yet in kernel form*" (italics his).

³⁶ So Kynes, *Christology of Solidarity*, 9–11.

5.2.1 Sermon on the Mount (Matt 5–7)

5.2.1.1 Deuteronomic Influence in the SM

The Sermon on the Mount (SM) marks the first of Matthew’s five major discourses.³⁷ At least four things are striking about the SM for the present purposes. First is the density of citations to Deuteronomy in these three chapters (a reasonable estimate is six).³⁸ Probable citations and allusions include Matt 5.21 (Deut 5.17 [5.18 LXX]); 5.27 (Deut 5.18 [5.17 LXX]); 5.31 (Deut 24.1, 3); 5.33 (Deut 5.11, 20; 23.22); 5.38 (Deut 19.21 [cf. Exod 21.24; Lev 24.20]); 5.43c (Deut 7.2; 20.16; 23.4, 7).³⁹ Although Matthew’s SM is in many ways close to Luke’s Sermon on the Plain (Luke 6.17–49), it is instructive that that these Deuteronomic references are unique to Matthew.⁴⁰

Second, in addition to these rather explicit references, Matthew’s SM shows a number of syntactical earmarks of having been influenced by Deuteronomy. Some of these have been articulated by Paul Ellingworth.⁴¹ Ellingworth seeks to account for the frequent alternation between singular and plural second person statements in the SM by observing the similar phenomenon in the Pentateuch, especially Deuteronomy (Deut 27.2; 30.19; cf. Exod 22.22–23; Lev 19.19), which is for Ellingworth “too striking to be ignored.” In addition, he notes that in several of these alternations there are series of sayings with a wide application (e.g., ὁς ἄν [5.31]; ὁς ἐάν [5.32]; ὅστις [5.39]; πᾶς [5.22; 7.8]). This is consonant with what one finds in some of the legal precedents from the Pentateuch (Deut 18.12, 19; 22.5; cf. Exod

³⁷ Scholars are in widespread agreement that Matt 5–7 should be treated as a unit, though nothing approaching a consensus of its structure has been reached (so Nolland, *Matthew*, 196).

³⁸ This is the number given by Menken, “Deuteronomy,” 42–62.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 42.

⁴⁰ The relationship between Matthew and Luke in these passages is very complex, but it is often posited that Q underlies both sermons. However, this is far from certain. A definitive investigation of this issue is not necessary for the present study. Cf. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (AB 28–28A; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1981–85), 1:627; Graham N. Stanton, *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992), 286–89; Darrel L. Bock, *Luke 1:1–9:50* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994), 548–57. It is to be noted, however, that the standard critical edition of Q includes only the references in Matt 5.38, 43. Cf. James M. Robinson, Paul Hoffmann, and John S. Kloppenborg, eds., *The Critical Edition of Q: Synopsis Including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas with English, German, and French Translations of Q and Thomas* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000).

⁴¹ For the discussion that follows see Ellingworth, “‘Thou’ and ‘You’ in the Sermon on the Mount,” *BT* 58 (2007): 11–19. Thanks are due to Dr. Ellingworth for bringing this article to my attention.

21.12–17 et al.; Lev 11.24–27). Although Ellingworth himself is hesitant to argue for *direct* influence of Deuteronomy on the SM, he does conclude that the focus on the law in the SM (5.21–48) gives ample warrant for inferring that Deuteronomy (and Pentateuchal traditions) may be in view throughout the SM. Ellingworth has thus adduced syntactical evidence supporting the claim that Deuteronomy may have influenced the SM.

Third, another earmark that points to Deuteronomy's influence in the SM is the role of blessings and curses at its conclusion. The SM ends by outlining the blessings of obedience versus the consequences of disobedience that follow a presentation of the demands of God (7.13–27; cf. Deut 28; 30.15; also Lev 26.3–46).⁴² Similarly, France suggests that Matt 7.13–27 may reflect the two ways of Deut 11.26–32.⁴³ A closely related proposal has been offered by N. T. Wright, who sees the beatitudes of Matt 5.3–11 corresponding to the Deuteronomic blessings, whereas the woes of Matt 23.13–33 are styled after the Deuteronomic curses.⁴⁴ Wright further suggests that the Deuteronomic choice between blessing and curse has been woven into the entire narrative of Matthew.⁴⁵

These options may well be complementary, as they both point to the importance of Deuteronomy for Matthew. But it is especially noteworthy that many have seen a reference to Deuteronomy at the *end* of the SM, since this is also the end of a discourse in Matthew. This is consistent with the larger Matthean pattern in which each of Matthew's five major discourses ([1] Matt 5–7; [2] Matt 10; [3] Matt 13; [4] Matt 18; [5] Matt 24–25) concludes with a summary stating that Jesus finished his words using the aorist ἐτέλεσεν, a form which is used only five times in Matthew (7.28; 11.1; 13.53; 19.1; 26.1).⁴⁶ The last instance (26.1) closely reflects the other four statements, but the addition of “all” also serves as a culmination of all

⁴² Blaine Charette, *The Theme of Recompense in Matthew's Gospel* (JSNTSup 79; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 79; Kynes, *Christology of Solidarity*, 53.

⁴³ France, *Matthew*, 287. Cf. Jer 21.8; Psa 1.6.

⁴⁴ Additional support for this view is marshalled by Jason Hood (“Matthew 23–25: The Extent of Jesus' Fifth Discourse,” *JBL* 128 [2009]: 527–43), who argues that including chapters 23–25 in the fifth discourse highlights the connections between these chapters and the SM.

⁴⁵ N. T. Wright, *Christian Origins and the Question of God*, vol. 1: *The New Testament and the People of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 386–89.

⁴⁶ Craig A. Evans, “‘The Book of the Genesis of Jesus Christ’: The Purpose of Matthew in Light of the Incipit,” in *The Gospel of Matthew* (vol. 2 of *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels*; ed. T. Hatina; LNTS 310; London: T&T Clark, 2008), 61–72; cf. Wright, *New Testament*, 386.

five summary statements: ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς πάντας τοὺς λόγους τούτους. This statement is quite similar to the role of Moses in Deut 31.1: καὶ συνετέλεσεν Μωυσῆς λαλῶν πάντας τοὺς λόγους τούτους (cf. Deut 31.24; 32.45).⁴⁷ It is therefore highly likely that Matthew, who has an overarching interest in connecting Jesus to Mosaic themes,⁴⁸ has included Deuteronomic phraseology at the end of his widely-recognized five major discourses⁴⁹ which serves to strengthen the Mosaic parallels.⁵⁰

5.2.1.2 Sonship and Obedience in the SM

A fourth striking feature of the SM is the high concentration of fatherhood language for God in association with Jesus' quintessential ethical demands for his disciples, especially when viewed in conjunction with the pervasive Deuteronomic influence in the SM as a whole. God is referred to as *Father* seventeen times in the SM (with only one of these referring to God as *Jesus' Father*), and the disciples' sonship is mentioned another time.⁵¹ Moreover, the fatherhood of God is also mentioned at key junctures of the SM (5.16, 45, 48; 6.9; 7.21).⁵² Luz has even suggested a structure for the SM that would further highlight the fatherhood of God throughout the SM. Luz's proposal, which views the Lord's Prayer as the center of the SM, is listed below. The number of references in each section to God's fatherhood or sonship of the disciples is listed in brackets:⁵³

A) Frame: Situation (5.1–2)

B) Introduction (5.3–16) [2]

⁴⁷ Evans, "Purpose of Matthew," 67–68.

⁴⁸ So, e.g., Allison, *New Moses*.

⁴⁹ E.g., Carson, "Matthew," 50–57; Peter Fiedler, *Das Matthäusevangelium* (ThKNT 1; Stuttgart: Kolhammer, 2006), 7–12; Davies and Allison, 1:9; Wright, *New Testament*, 386–88; cf. Benjamin W. Bacon, *Studies in Matthew* (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1930), 165–249.

⁵⁰ Note also the emphasis on Deuteronomy in Hubert Frankemölle, *Jahwebund und Kirche Christi: Studien zur Form- und Traditionsgeschichte des "Evangeliums" nach Matthäus* (NTAbh 10; Münster: Aschendorff, 1974), 340; Graham N. Stanton, "The Origin and Purpose of Matthew's Gospel: Matthean Scholarship from 1945 to 1980," *ANRW* 2.25.3:1889–1951, here 1939–40.

⁵¹ Kynes, *Christology of Solidarity*, 47. A study devoted to God's fatherhood in Matthew should be noted here: David K. Lowery, "God as Father with Special Reference to Matthew's Gospel," (Ph.D. diss., University of Aberdeen, 1987). Unfortunately, neither University of Aberdeen nor the British Library was able to provide a copy of this dissertation for consultation.

⁵² So Kynes, *Christology of Solidarity*, 48.

⁵³ Adapted from Luz, *Matthew*, 1:173; Henry Pattarumadathil, *Your Father in Heaven: Discipleship in Matthew as a Process of Becoming Children of God* (AnBib 172; Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2008), 25.

- C) Introit of the Main Section (5.17–20)
- D) Main Section (5.21–48) [2]
- E) Righteousness before God (6.1–6) [4]
- X) The Lord’s Prayer with Frame (6.7–15) [4]
- E’) Righteousness before God (6.16–18) [2]
- D’) Main Section (6.19–7.11) [3]
- C’) Conclusion of the Main Section (7.12)
- B’) Conclusion (7.13–27) [1]
- A’) Frame: Reaction (7.28–8.1a)

As attractive as this structure is, it is probably best not to grant it too much weight, especially since it has not been commonly recognized in the SM, and it is questionable how symmetrical 5.21–48 and 6.19–7.11 are.⁵⁴ Nevertheless, one does not need to rely on this structure to understand that the theme of God’s fatherhood pervades the SM.

In addition to this emphasis on God’s fatherhood, it is beyond doubt that Jesus in the SM is outlining the ethical requirements for his disciples. This is clear, for example, in the choice noted above presented at the end of the SM (7.13–27). Jesus is portrayed as a new lawgiver after the pattern of Moses,⁵⁵ and Jesus’ law similarly culminates in a Deuteronomic choice between blessing and curse (as noted above). The high concentration of fatherhood language is significant because the disciples are called to be obedient *as sons of their Father in heaven*. The several (unique) allusions to Deuteronomy in the SM render it extremely likely that Matthew had Deuteronomy in mind as he constructed this portion of his gospel. It is proposed here that another indication of Deuteronomic influence is the union of ethical demands with the concept of God as the disciples’ Father, and therefore with the disciples’ status as *sons*. That is, although Jesus is portrayed in Matthew as the obedient Son in accord with Deuteronomy, Jesus also made it clear that the necessity

⁵⁴ France, *Matthew*, 155n.8; Stanton, *Gospel*, 298.

⁵⁵ Cf. Allison, *New Moses*, 174–80; Davies, *Setting*, 25.

of obedient sonship extended to his disciples. This hypothesis will now be tested by a brief survey of the relevant portions of the SM.

The first clue in the SM that the disciples are called to be sons with a particular ethical characterization is Matt 5.5: μακάριοι οἱ πραεῖς, ὅτι αὐτοὶ κληρονομήσουσιν τὴν γῆν. This, however, is only a slightly relevant text, as its main OT precedent is not Deuteronomy (cf. Deut 4.1), but more probably Psa 37.11 [36.11 LXX] and/or Isa 61.7.⁵⁶ Nevertheless, it is to be noted that to speak of an *inheritance* is to speak of that which applies to *sons* (see chapter 3). It has therefore been suggested that the concept of inheritance casts the disciples in the role of national Israel and underscores their status as sons.⁵⁷ But this filial concept receives much clearer articulation in Matt 5.9 in what some consider to be the high point of the Beatitudes:⁵⁸ μακάριοι οἱ εἰρηνοποιοί, ὅτι αὐτοὶ⁵⁹ υἱοὶ θεοῦ κληθήσονται. Although the disciples are in one sense *already* sons of God, as evidenced by the numerous references to God as their (present) Father in the SM (5.16, 48; 6.1, 4, 6, 8–9, 14–15, 18, 26, 32; 7.11), the future κληθήσονται also indicates that the disciples are *not yet* sons⁶⁰ of God in the fullest sense. Thus, Matt 5.9 offers the hope of a future, eschatological realization of the sonship of Jesus' disciples.⁶¹

Although much more could be said about the term εἰρηνοποιός, the important point for the present study is that the disciples' eschatological sonship is here associated with their task of making peace.⁶² Thus their sonship is bound up with a particular way of living that is pleasing to God, which might be glossed as *obedience*. This beatitude offering the prospect of sonship might therefore be best interpreted in a light of the covenantal context of Deuteronomy, which also

⁵⁶ So Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:450.

⁵⁷ Charette, *Theme of Recompense*, 93–94; cf. Pattarumadathil, *Your Father*, 51.

⁵⁸ So Joachim Gnilka, *Das Matthäusevangelium* (HTKNT; 2 vols; Freiburg: Herder, 1986–88), 1:126.

⁵⁹ Αὐτοί is omitted by \aleph C D et al.

⁶⁰ Although “children” is also an acceptable translation of υἱοί, “sons” will be preferred here in order to emphasize the inheritance right of sons in the ancient world (so Nolland, *Matthew*, 206) and to make the proposed parallels with Deuteronomic *sonship* more easily distinguishable.

⁶¹ So Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:458; Pattarumadathil, *Your Father*, 108.

⁶² Rudolf Schnackenburg (“Die Seligspreisung der Friedensstifter (Mt 5,9) im mattäischen Kontext,” *BZ* 26 [1982]: 161–78) correctly notes that the promise of being sons of God in Scripture is broader than this macarism, and is thus not always bound up with the idea of *peace*.

associates faithfulness to God with sonship (cf. Deut 14.1; 32.19).⁶³ Moreover, sonship in 5.9 is likely to have been understood by Matthew’s audience in light of the previous explanation of *Jesus’ sonship* in Matt 3.13–4.11, and how Jesus himself was obedient to his Father.⁶⁴ Likewise, the disciples, by obedience to their Father’s will, can also be called sons of the Father.⁶⁵ Not only so, but it is also highly likely that *sons of God* in Matt 5.9 indicates that the disciples are to reflect God’s character, who himself is the God of peace, the supreme Peacemaker.⁶⁶

Much like Matt 5.9, in 5.45, the disciples’ filial relationship to God is again associated with their call to reflect God’s character. In 5.44 the disciples are called to love their enemies and pray for those who persecute them. The result of this is found in 5.45a: ὅπως γένησθε υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς. The assumption made by this passage is that the disciples’ love for their enemies is a reflection of their Father’s character,⁶⁷ and this is a necessary characteristic for those who would be sons of God. Although 5.45 may differ from 5.9 in assuming a more realized (present), eschatological sonship,⁶⁸ it is certainly clear that obedience is to be distinctive of God’s children. The sonship of the disciples is thus a dynamic phenomenon: they are already God’s sons (5.45 al.), but await the future attaining of the fullness of their sonship as they undergo testing in this world (5.9).⁶⁹

In light of this connection between sonship and obedience, a number of commentators have suggested a similar idea is found in *b. Qidd.* 36a: “when you behave as sons you are designated sons; if you do not behave as sons, you are not

⁶³ Gnilka, *Matthäusevangelium*, 1:126; Nolland, *Matthew*, 205n.60. An echo to Hos 2.1 is also possible (so Schnackenburg, “Seligpreisung,” 177).

⁶⁴ Deut 4.1–11 was considered above; Matt 3 will be addressed in the next chapter.

⁶⁵ Luz, *Matthew*, 1:198.

⁶⁶ France, *Matthew*, 169; Gnilka, *Matthäusevangelium*, 1:126–27; Fiedler, *Matthäusevangelium*, 114–15; David L. Turner, *Matthew* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 152–53. So Rom 16.20; cf. Isa 14.30 LXX; 26.12; 54.10. *Peace* is also associated with the kingly rule of God in association with messianic hope (Isa 9.6–7; 52.7; cf. Carson, “Matthew,” 135).

⁶⁷ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:554; France, *Matthew*, 226; Turner, *Matthew*, 176n.36; Kynes, *Christology of Solidarity*, 48. Cf. Eph 5.1–2; 1 Pet 1.14–22; 1 John 4.7–12.

⁶⁸ The subjunctive here is used as final/purpose clause. Cf. BDF §369; C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek* (2d ed.; Cambridge: CUP, 1959), 138. For sonship here as a present reality see Robert H. Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 98; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:554. For the dissenting view, see Carson, “Matthew,” 159; Bonnard, *Matthieu*, 75.

⁶⁹ So Gnilka, *Matthäusevangelium*, 1:193.

designated sons.”⁷⁰ The Palestinian Talmud similarly states in *y. Qidd.* 61c: “When Israel does the will of the Holy One, blessed be he, they are called his children, and when Israel does not do the will of the Holy One, blessed be he, they are not called his children.”⁷¹ The reader will recall from the previous chapter that these comments are found in the midst of a conversation regarding how to interpret Deut 14.1–2.⁷² Moreover, the previous two chapters further indicate that the perspective that God’s sons must be obedient is a common theme, and is often linked with Deuteronomy. It is thus not surprising to find similar connections in Matthew, within a section of his gospel that also features numerous allusions to Deuteronomy. Some differences do exist, however, since the eschatological community of God’s sons in Matthew is inextricably linked with Jesus, the supremely obedient Son. But this will be considered in more detail below.

Matthew 5.48, is also relevant: Ἔσεσθε οὖν ὑμεῖς τέλειοι ὡς ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος τέλειός ἐστιν. This passage renders it even clearer that the disciples’ obedience is to be based on the character of God himself—who is named as their Father—even to the point of having *perfection* as the goal.⁷³ It is perhaps significant that the background for this admonition comes from Deut 18.13 (τέλειος ἔση ἐναντίον κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ σου) probably in conjunction with Lev 19.2 (ἄγιοι ἔσεσθε ὅτι ἐγὼ ἅγιος κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν).⁷⁴ Τέλειος in Deut 18.13 translates מַמְיָרָה, which denotes the need for God’s people to be blameless before him.⁷⁵ Matthew 5.48 is thus another passage in the SM that combines Deuteronomic influence with the disciples’ call to be obedient sons.

⁷⁰ So Nolland, *Matthew*, 268; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:554. Translation taken from H. Freedman, ed., *The Babylonian Talmud. Seder Nashim 8: Kiddushin* (London: Soncino Press, 1936), 177.

⁷¹ Translation taken from Jacob Neusner, *Talmud of the Land of Israel: A Preliminary Translation and Expansion. Qiddushin* (CSJH 26; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), 111. Cf. Str-B 1:371–73.

⁷² See §4.2.6.

⁷³ France, *Matthew*, 228.

⁷⁴ Cf. France, *Matthew*, 228; Turner, *Matthew*, 177; Nolland, *Matthew*, 271.

⁷⁵ Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew* (2 vols.; WBC 33A–B; Waco: Word, 1993–95), 1:135. It might also be relevant that in Deut 32.4 God’s works are said to be מַמְיָרָה (LXX: ἀθλιότης). Cf. Wolfgang Trilling, *Das wahre Israel: Studien zur Theologie des Matthäusevangeliums* (ETS 7; Leipzig: St. Benno, 1959), 167.

Of the numerous references to God's fatherhood in Matt 6, it is clear that the almsgiving in view in 6.4 (ἐλεημοσύνη) answers the demands of caring for the poor in Deut 15.7–11.⁷⁶ The Lord's Prayer (6.9–13) is also pertinent, as the disciples have the privilege of calling God "our Father."⁷⁷ This phrase is distinct in Matthew, as it is the only instance in the entire gospel that Jesus uses the phrase "our Father." Every other time in the gospel that God's fatherhood (including the concept of sonship) is referenced it is *either* in reference to Jesus alone (e.g., 2.15; 3.17; 7.21; 10.32–33; 11.27; 12.50; 14.33; 16.16–17; 18.10; 17.5; 20.23; 26.39), *or* to the disciples alone (e.g., 5.16; 5.45; 6.1; 6.4–8, 15, 18; 7.11; 10.20; 23.9). Only in 6.9 does Jesus speak of "our Father," but this is only in order that he might show *his disciples* how they should pray. The implication of this is the sonship of Jesus and the sonship of the disciples are not identical; Jesus stands in a unique relationship to God as his Father vis-à-vis his disciples (cf. 11.25–27). Jesus' sonship is direct and unmediated, whereas his disciples' sonship is contingent upon the sonship of Jesus.⁷⁸ It is therefore also to be noted that the filial relationship assumed in the Lord's Prayer is not applicable for everyone, but specifically for Jesus' disciples, or those who obey the will of God and follow his Son.⁷⁹

This point is made explicit in a climactic statement in the SM, 7.21: Οὐ πᾶς ὁ λέγων μοι, Κύριε κύριε, εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἀλλ' ὁ ποιῶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. Here the point is clear: doing the will of Jesus' Father is a necessary requirement for entering the Kingdom of Heaven. This passage is important not only for stressing the obedience that is required, but it also makes clear that the Father of Jesus' disciples is also the Father of Jesus. This means not only that the disciples can share in a similar filial relationship to God via Jesus the unique Son of God, but also intimates that the disciples' obedience is to reflect the obedience of Jesus himself. Indeed, it is Jesus who pre-eminently accomplishes his Father's *will* (θέλημα) in Matthew (26.42),⁸⁰ and

⁷⁶ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:578.

⁷⁷ German scholarship commonly refers to the prayer simply as the *Vaterunser*.

⁷⁸ So Richard J. Bauckham, "The Sonship of the Historical Jesus in Christology," *SJT* 31 (1978): 245–60; Eduard Schweizer, *The Good News according to Matthew* (trans. D. Green; Atlanta: John Knox, 1975), 94; Pattarumadathil, *Your Father*, 207–8; Kynes, *Christology of Solidarity*, 56.

⁷⁹ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:601.

⁸⁰ θέλημα is a Matthean redactional term (cf. Luz, *Matthew*, 1:30). See also Armin Wouters, "...*Wer den Willen meines Vaters tut*": Eine Untersuchung zum Verständnis vom Handeln im Matthäusevangelium (BU 23; Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1992), 167, 176.

his disciples are to emulate this way of life. Thus there is a *christological* focus even to the disciples' obedience. The standard to which the disciples must strive to attain is therefore not only found in Jesus' *teaching*, but also in his *behavior*.⁸¹ This is especially clear when the SM is viewed in the context of the gospel as a whole.⁸² It has been the obedience of Jesus as the Son that has heretofore been emphasized (3.15–17; 4.3, 6),⁸³ and the disciples' obedience as sons must not be abstracted from the actions of Jesus who came to fulfill all righteousness (3.15).

The unique obedience of Jesus is further evidenced in the concept of *righteousness* (δικαιοσύνη) in the SM. This significant term will be revisited in the next chapter in conjunction with 3.15, but here it is to be noted that although Jesus clearly calls his disciples to righteous living in the SM (5.6; 5.10; 5.20; 6.1; 6.33), righteousness is pre-eminently a *christological* category for Matthew; Jesus bound himself to the demands of righteousness.⁸⁴ This can be seen in 5.10–11. In 5.10 Jesus blesses those who are persecuted (δεδιωγμένοι) because of *righteousness*, and in 5.11 he blesses those who will be persecuted (διώξωσιν) because of *himself*. The implication is that one who is persecuted for righteousness is persecuted because of Jesus himself, the epitomizer of righteousness.

Similarly, the christological emphasis of *fulfill* can also be seen in the SM, in 5.17–18, where Jesus is said to *fulfill* the Law and Prophets. As with numerous portions of the SM, explanations for this phrase are legion.⁸⁵ However, the approach of Deines is quite helpful. He suggests that it is neither Jesus' teaching nor Jesus' actions that exclusively fulfills the Law and Prophets, but instead is his entire mission, including teaching, deeds, and messianic works.⁸⁶ For the present study it

⁸¹ Georg Strecker, *The Sermon on the Mount: An Exegetical Commentary* (trans. O. Dean; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988), 94.

⁸² A point urged by Stanton, *Gospel*, 305.

⁸³ So Nolland, *Matthew*, 340.

⁸⁴ Roland Deines, "Not the Law but the Messiah: Law and Righteousness in the Gospel of Matthew: An Ongoing Debate," in *Built Upon the Rock: Studies in the Gospel of Matthew* (ed. D. Gurtner and J. Nolland; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 53–84, here 81; Strecker, *Sermon*, 95.

⁸⁵ See the survey in Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:484–86. It is likely that *Law and Prophets* refers to something close to today's OT. Cf. Hagner, *Matthew*, 1:105; France, *Matthew*, 181.

⁸⁶ Deines, "Not the Law," 75. James M. Gibbs ("The Son of God as Torah Incarnate in Matthew," in *Studia Evangelica 4.1* [ed. F. Cross; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1968], 37–46) has proposed that Jesus' actions in Matthew are characterized by πληρώω and his teaching by τέλειος. However, this distinction cannot be maintained since the teaching and actions of Jesus are mutually complementary,

merits noting that 5.17–18 is a *christological* statement about the role of Jesus, which *leads to* the righteousness required of Jesus’ disciples in 5.19–20.⁸⁷ The point is Jesus’ disciples must exemplify a righteousness that surpasses that of the Scribes and Pharisees, but this cannot be understood in abstraction from Jesus, the ultimate fulfiller of righteousness. Instead, the disciples are to share in Jesus’ righteousness⁸⁸ in a way that must in some way be similar to the way in which they share in his sonship.⁸⁹

The reason for noting this christological focus in the SM is that the disciples’ call to obedience is not to be separated from the definitive obedience of Jesus. The same is true of their sonship, which is mediated through Jesus. Thus, in the SM, the disciples have the opportunity to be sons of God through Jesus the Son, and are also called to embody a righteous life after the manner and by the precedent of Jesus. The result is a combination of sonship and obedience with a clear, christological focus. This is a view of sonship that is entirely consistent with Deuteronomy, yet contains a new element.

The points of continuity between Matthew’s portrait of the disciples’ sonship and that of Deuteronomy should be clear. First, in the SM Matthew portrays sonship as something that must be marked by obedience, specifically the obedience in conjunction with God’s own character (5.45, 48). Moreover, this combination of sonship and obedience is found in a context where references to Deuteronomy abound. Second, the SM is also consistent with the hope that developed in the literature considered in chapter 4, which looked forward to a day when God’s people would be fully obedient as his sons (cf. Hos 2.1; 11.10; *Jub.* 1.24–25). Something similar seems to be in view in the eschatological expectation of 5.9, although there is also a present reality to the sonship of the disciples observable in several texts. This perspective of an obedient people who would be God’s sons is consistent with the

and therefore a unity. *Both* Jesus’ actions *and* his teaching are therefore characterized by fulfillment and perfection.

⁸⁷ Deines (“Not the Law,” 77) has labeled this transition: “From Christological Fulfillment to Disciples’ Obligation.”

⁸⁸ Deines, “Not the Law,” 81.

⁸⁹ Note also the christological thrust of τέλειος. See especially 19.21 in light of 5.48: perfection is not only a matter of conforming one’s character to the Father, but also in following Jesus.

development of obedient sonship in Deuteronomy and literature that, for Matthew, would have been derived from Deuteronomy.

The new element in Matthew's presentation of obedient sonship in the SM is the unique role assigned to Jesus in the mediation of both sonship and obedience. Although it remains that God's people, like Israel in the OT, were to be obedient to him as his sons, it is also the case that Israel is recapitulated in one man, Jesus of Nazareth. And, as the representative of the nation, Jesus also sums up and exemplifies the obedience that was required of God's people. This christological obedience enables and calls for the derivative obedience of Jesus' disciples. Thus, both Jesus' obedience as the true Israel and the disciples' obedience as sons of God (who follow Jesus) are portrayed as the obedient son(s) envisioned in Deuteronomy.

5.2.1.3 Summary

In conclusion, some key features of the SM will be restated. First, the SM contains a high density of references to Deuteronomy. Second, the fatherhood of God and the sonship of the disciples are key themes. Third, these are found in the context of Jesus' ethical teaching. The combination of these factors renders it quite likely that Matthew not only had Deuteronomy in mind as he composed the SM, but was aware of the calling in Deuteronomy for God's people to be obedient in the context of the father-son relationship as he applied this to Jesus and his disciples.

5.2.2 *Matt 11.16–19*

Matthew 11.16–19 contains a very likely allusion to the disobedient son of Deut 21.18–21 in relation to Jesus. After recounting a catalogue of messianic deeds from Isaiah (26.19; 29.18; 35.5–6; 42.7, 18; 61.1) to the messengers of John the Baptist who inquired if he was the one to come (Matt 11.2–15),⁹⁰ Jesus makes a comparison between “this generation” (τὴν γενεὰν ταύτην) and the responses of children playing traditional games. There are two major interpretations of this simile. The majority opinion relates John's ascetic ministry to those who played a dirge in 11.17b, with the lack of mourning in response to the dirge mirroring the lack of response to John's ministry. Similarly, Jesus' ministry of eating and drinking is

⁹⁰ So Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:242.

compared in 11.17a to those who played the flute (i.e., dance music),⁹¹ yet the response was again the rejection of his message.⁹² Some, however, find it better to understand those who played the flute and sang a dirge to correspond to “this generation” which prefaces the account in 11.16, especially since Matthew appears to liken “this generation” (and thus *not* John and Jesus) to the children who play the music. Moreover, the order of John→Jesus does not correspond to the order of the children who supposedly represented their ministries (flute players→dirge singers).⁹³ However, the explanatory comments in 11.18–19 make the majority interpretation more likely.⁹⁴

Regardless of the view one takes on the preceding point, the most salient portion of the passage is the characterization of Jesus (here “Son of Man”) in 11.19 as φάγος and οἰνοπότης. It is highly likely that the combination of these two words echoes Deut 21.20, and therefore characterizes Jesus as the rebellious son of Deut 21.18–21. However, Matt 11.19 is not especially close to Deut 21.20 LXX, which combines a participle and a verb and also uses different terminology (συμβολοκοπῶν οἰνοφλυγῆ). On the other hand, 11.19 is rather close to the MT (אֹכֵל וְשׂוֹמֵר) and to the targums, which associate the gluttony with the eating of meat (e.g., *Tgs. Pseudo-Jonathan, Onkelos*).⁹⁵ The impetus for this Matthean allusion may come from Q, since Luke 7.34 uses the same phrasing. But regardless of what might be posited as Matthew’s intermediate source for this allusion, the exegete who sees here a reference to Deut 21.20 is on solid ground since the wording corresponds closely to the known Hebrew tradition of Deut 21.20.

Indeed, scholars commonly do recognize a reference to Deut 21.20 in Matt 11.19.⁹⁶ The reasons for this are not only the wording (which is certainly close to the

⁹¹ So Fiedler, *Matthäusevangelium*, 241.

⁹² So Hagner, *Matthew*, 1:310; Gundry, *Commentary*, 212; Turner, *Matthew*, 296.

⁹³ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:262; cf. I. H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 300–1; Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 302–3.

⁹⁴ France, *Matthew*, 433–34.

⁹⁵ Gundry, *Use*, 80–81. Cf. *Sifre Deut* §219.

⁹⁶ E.g., Hagner, *Matthew*, 1:310; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:264; Joseph B. Modica, “Jesus as Glutton and Drunkard: The ‘Excesses’ of Jesus,” in *Who Do My Opponents Say that I Am? An Investigation of the Accusations against Jesus* (ed. S. McKnight and J. Modica; LNTS 327; London: T&T Clark, 2008), 50–75; Craig S. Keener, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 342; Marshall, *Luke*, 302. Another option is Isa 22.13 (so Craig L. Blomberg, “Matthew,” in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* [ed. G. K. Beale and D.

MT), but also the appropriateness of the contextual links. First, the associations noted by Gundry between gluttony and the eating of meat would likely be a charge relevant to Jesus who came eating and drinking, fraternizing with tax collectors and sinners (11.19). These revelrous repasts, which Jesus' adversaries disdained, probably often included a course of meat, which would have been viewed as excessive since most people would have eaten red meat only a few times a year.⁹⁷ Thus the allegation of being a wine drinker and meat eater, deriving from traditional understandings of Deut 21.20, would have been a relevant allegation.

A second reason why alleging Jesus was the rebellious son of Deut 21.18–21 is likely in this context is the dangers posed by the incorrigible son to the entire covenant community. Similarly, it appears that “this generation” in Matthew feared that Jesus' perceived libertine practices among tax collectors and sinners threatened the covenant community of its own day. As H. C. Kee has observed of the probable historical context underlying this text: “In the setting of the ministry of Jesus, his aggressive practice of welcoming aliens and the excluded into the community which he is shaping can only be regarded as rebellion and sedition by strict adherents to ritual, cultic and ethnic limits for participation in those who see themselves as the people of God.”⁹⁸ Thus, it seems as though one reason Jesus' contemporaries accused him of being an incorrigible son like Deut 21 is the threat he posed to the covenant people by his attempt to redefine the people of God.⁹⁹

A third factor that points to an allusion to Deut 21.20 in Matt 11.19 is the traditional application of Deut 21 to the nation of Israel. More specifically, the application of Deut 21.18–21 to Israel is based largely on their (filial) disobedience as a nation (Isa 1.4–7; 30.1; Jer 5.23; cf. Hos 11.1–4).¹⁰⁰ It would be entirely consistent for Matthew to draw upon a text from Deuteronomy that was often applied to national Israel—and was also a text that focuses specifically on filial *obedience*—

A. Carson; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007], 1–109, here 38), but the additional thematic correspondences noted below strongly suggest Deut 21.20 is Matthew's emphasis.

⁹⁷ Modica, “Excesses,” 69, citing E. P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief: 63 BCE–66 CE* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1992), 129.

⁹⁸ Howard Clark Kee, “Jesus: A Glutton and Drunkard,” *NTS* 42 (1996): 374–93, here 391.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 391–93; cf. Modica, “Excesses,” 65.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. Elizabeth Bellefontaine, “Deuteronomy 21:18–21: Reviewing the Case of the Rebellious Son,” *JSOT* 13 (1979): 13–31; Modica, “Glutton and Drunkard,” 67; Dale C. Allison, Jr., *The Intertextual Jesus: Scripture in Q* (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2000), 40.

to Jesus. Indeed, it has already been argued from Matt 4 that Jesus is cast as the obedient Son of God in Matthew in contrast to Israel, and that much of this imagery comes from Deuteronomy. If Matthew does include here an accusation against Jesus as the disobedient son of Deut 21, it should likely be taken as *ironic*.¹⁰¹ That is, the point of view expressed by the detractors of Jesus (that he is a disobedient son) does not correlate to Jesus' actions (Jesus is the obedient son). The presence of irony in Matthew's gospel would not be surprising, since the Gospels are replete with irony. As Powell states: "the basic story lines of our Gospels are built upon extended ironies: the people of Israel reject their Messiah; God's own Son is accused of blasphemy by characters who are themselves blasphemers."¹⁰²

The irony of Matt 11.19 may run even deeper, however, than simply the charge being a false accusation against Jesus. It may be that Jesus is not only the disobedient son, but his *accusers*, as a part of "this generation" of Israel, are actually the ones who could be characterized as God's disobedient sons. Indeed, this would be consistent with the common understanding of "this generation" in Matthew. Most interpreters follow Evald Lövestam on this phrase, who argued convincingly in a 1980 article that two notoriously wicked generations of the past—those of the Flood and the wilderness wanderings—served as the precedent for the pejorative references to "(this) generation" in the Gospels (e.g., Matt 11.16; 12.39–42; 16.4; 17.17; 23.36; Mark 8.12; 9.19; Luke 7.31; 9.41; 11.29).¹⁰³ Moreover, the primary OT background for this language in Matthew (in accord with the use of the phrase elsewhere) comes mainly from Deut 32.5, 20, which describe the wilderness generation,¹⁰⁴ but this is then applied to the contemporaries of Jesus and John who did not accept the salvation that was presented to them.¹⁰⁵ They therefore accused Jesus of being something (incorrigible) of which they themselves were actually guilty.

¹⁰¹ *Irony* can be defined simply as "the true interpretation is actually contrary to the apparent meaning" (Mark Allan Powell, *What is Narrative Criticism?* [GBS; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990], 30).

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 31.

¹⁰³ Evald Lövestam, "The ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη Eschatology in Mk 13,30 parr.," in *L'Apocalypse johannique et l'Apocalyptique dans le Nouveau Testament* (ed. J. Lambrecht; BETL 53; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1980), 403–13. See also his *Jesus and 'this Generation': A New Testament Study* (ConBNT 25; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1995).

¹⁰⁴ Cf. France, *Matthew*, 433n.47; Lövestam, "ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη," 405.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 411; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:260.

Given that OT context for the negative references to “(this) generation” in Matthew likely come from Deut 32.5, 20—two verses that speak of the *disobedience* of Israel *as sons*—it may also be that the references to “(this) generation” in Matthew are used in filial contexts. That is, it may be that “(this) generation” is used to refer to the generation of Jesus’ contemporaries in a way that highlights their disbelief in response to the salvation offered to them *as sons*, and this is contrasted with Jesus, the one who epitomizes what an obedient son should be. This point is implicit in Matt 11.19, where, based on the clear references to Jesus’ obedience already included in Matthew, the reader is well aware that Jesus is *not* the disobedient son of Deut 21 (or Deut 32!), but is in reality the obedient son. This hypothesis—that Matthew’s use of “(this) generation” serves as a contrast with the obedient sonship of Jesus—will be considered further in conjunction with Matt 3, 12, 17 in following chapters.

A fourth contextual point in favor of a reference to Deut 21.20 in Matt 11.19 is the role this passage has in anticipating Jesus’ crucifixion. Immediately following Deut 21.18–21 is the well-known passage concerning a criminal who is accursed, having been hung on a tree after execution (Deut 21.22–23).¹⁰⁶ This passage was commonly understood to refer to crucifixion in the ancient world,¹⁰⁷ and it is clear that Paul understood the death of Jesus on the cross to correspond to the curse of Deut 21.23 (Gal 3.13). There is therefore sufficient evidence that Deut 21.22–23 was associated with crucifixions in the first century to infer that Matthew may also have made connections between Jesus’ crucifixion and Deut 21.23. Moreover, an allusion to the shedding of innocent blood from Deut 27.25 (ἐπικατάρατος ὃς ἂν λάβῃ δῶρα πατάξαι ψυχὴν αἵματος ἀθώου) is likely in view in Judas’ words in Matt 27.4 (Ἡμαρτον παραδοὺς αἷμα ἀθώου).¹⁰⁸ An intriguing possibility is whether Matthew may have known of the early Christian tradition, reflected for example in Paul’s epistle to the Galatians (cf. Gal 3.10, 13 citing Deut 27.26; 21.23), in which the hanging on a tree from Deut 21.23 is associated with the twelve curses of Deut 27.15–26. If so, Matthew may be another early Christian author who connected the

¹⁰⁶ Peter C. Craigie, *The Book of Deuteronomy* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), 285.

¹⁰⁷ Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “Crucifixion in Ancient Palestine, Qumran Literature, and the New Testament,” *CBQ* 40 (1978): 493–513.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:563; Nolland, *Matthew*, 1150.

(cursed) crucifixion of Jesus as being a result of the cursed actions of others (cf. Matt 27.4; Gal 3.10).

At the same time, Matthew's previous reference to Deut 21.20 brings a distinctive perspective to the conversation. As one who is accused of being the incorrigible son of Deut 21.20, Jesus would have been subject to the curse of execution if he were indeed threatening the covenant community. Although the pericope regarding the disobedient son mentions stoning and not hanging on a tree, it is quite possible that Matthew and/or his audience would have associated the fate of the rebellious son to be fulfilled by the death of Jesus. Two reasons support this. First, the rebellious son was to be executed by the covenant community, an end which ultimately befell Jesus as the Jewish leaders handed him over to Rome to be crucified. Second, the close proximity and thematic coherence between Deut 21.18–21 and 21.22–23 suggest that many may have understood these two passages quite close together, perhaps even with the hanging on the tree being a result of the execution of 21.21.¹⁰⁹

Indeed, the apogee of the irony associated with Jesus and Deut 21 is that Jesus, who is for Matthew the *obedient son*, is put to death at the behest of the generation of his contemporaries who consider him to be a *disobedient son*, though (ironically) they themselves are cast in this light by Matthew. This contrast is rendered even more likely by the presence of “(this) generation” language, which derives from the accusations against Israel as disobedient sons from Deut 32. These suggestions comport with Kee's observation that implicit in Matthew's reference to Jesus as the rebellious son of Deut 21.20 is Jesus' preparedness for his execution.¹¹⁰

5.3 Summary

This chapter has set forth three foundational texts that wed the themes of sonship and obedience with Deuteronomistic influence. The most explicit of these is Matt 4, though Matt 5–7 and Matt 11 also contain very strong links with

¹⁰⁹ Cf. §3.3.3n.201, and the similar thoughts in Allison, *Intertextual Jesus*, 41.

¹¹⁰ Kee, “Glutton and Drunkard,” 391.

Deuteronomy, obedience, and sonship. The next chapter will consider two additional texts that are highly suggestive and should likely serve as additional support for these three foundational texts.

Chapter Six

Deuteronomic Sonship in Matthew

Part 2: Significant Possibilities (Matt 3, 17)

Having considered three rather explicit Matthean passages that draw from Deuteronomy in association with a call to filial obedience, this chapter and the following chapter will consider several other texts that combine sonship and obedience and should be considered *possible* allusions to Deuteronomic sonship. This chapter will be devoted to two texts which have very strong verbal parallels with one another, and which combine a focus on Jesus' sonship with the nature of his obedience: Matt 3.15–17 and Matt 17.1–20. It will be suggested below that although these texts exhibit *possible* links with Deuteronomy, they are nevertheless *significant* possibilities. Thus, if the discussion which follows proves convincing, these texts would yield sizeable dividends for the current thesis. The reason for their significance is largely because of the foundational and climactic role these texts play in the gospel narrative.

Therefore, because of the potential significance of these texts, and because I will be setting forth a new hypothesis regarding the scriptural background for the heavenly voice in Matt 3.15; 17.5 that derives from Deut 32, these two texts have warranted a separate chapter. It is hoped that the following discussion may incline some to consider one or both of these texts as *likely allusions*, but in order not to claim too much I have refrained from categorizing either text as *likely*.

6.1 Matt 3.15–17

6.1.1 Rationale

The first additional text that is potentially significant for the present study is Matt 3.15–17. Although at first glance this passage may seem to demonstrate no explicit parallels with Deuteronomy, a deeper investigation suggests this text is

certainly worthy of consideration. Indeed, these verses contain perhaps the most explicit commentary in the entire gospel on the *obedience* of Jesus, and this obedience is explicitly linked to his *sonship*. The following discussion will note the importance of Jesus' obedience in this section, its close ties with the explicit links to Deuteronomic sonship in Matt 4, and the nature of the heavenly voice that is found both in 3.15 and 17.5.

6.1.2 Unity of Matt 3–4

Significantly, Matt 3.15–17 is a pericope that is very closely linked to the temptation narrative. Thus, many of the key elements from Matt 4.1–11 are first introduced in Matt 3.15–17. Indeed, the baptism narrative in which Jesus' sonship is clearly *declared* sets the stage and prepares the reader for the *testing* of that sonship in the temptation narrative. There is therefore widespread agreement among scholars that the baptism and testing narratives should be viewed in light of one another,¹ perhaps to an even greater degree than many other consecutive pericopes in Matthew. An extensive list of similarities is provided by Kennedy, who notes 10 verbal and thematic correspondences between Matt 3–4.² These include: (1) the use of an infinitive of purpose for baptism (3.13) and temptations (4.1); (2) the temporal use of τότε in 3.13 and 4.1 that unifies the narrative; (3) the use of υἱός for Jesus; (4) the wilderness setting; (5) John's humble diet and Jesus' fast; (6) the role of Galilee in 3.13 and 4.12; (7) divine approval of Jesus' obedience (3.16–17; 4.11); (8) "stones" in 3.9; 4.3; (9) Jesus faces hindrances from two characters who seem to recognize who he is (John the Baptist, the devil), and identical phrasing is used in reference to both characters when Jesus prevails (τότε ἀφίησιν αὐτόν); (10) Jesus' life corresponds to the exodus experience of Israel: Jesus' sonship is declared (Matt

¹ Cf. Kenyn M. Cureton, "Jesus as Son and Servant: An Investigation of the Baptism and Testing Narratives and Their Significance for Cohesion, Plot, and Christology in Matthew," (Ph.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1993), 202–10; Benno Przybylski, "The Role of Mt 3:13–4:11 in the Structure and Theology of the Gospel of Matthew," *BTB* 4 (1974): 222–35; W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, Jr., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew* (3 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988–97), 1:351; Ulrich Luz, *Matthew: A Commentary* (trans. J. Crouch; 3 vols.; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001–7), 1:151; Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew* (2 vols.; WBC 33A–B; Waco: Word, 1993–95), 1:63; R. T. France, *The Gospel of Matthew* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 127; Jeffrey A. Gibbs, *Matthew 1:1–11:1* (ConComm; St. Louis: Concordia, 2006), 191.

² For the list that follows, see R. Joel Kennedy, "The Recapitulation of Israel: Use of Israel's History in Matthew 1:1–4:11," (Ph.D. diss., University of Aberdeen, 2008), 231–44.

3.17; cf. Exod 4.22), Jesus is baptized through water (Matt 3.16; cf. Exod 14), and Jesus' sonship is tested in the wilderness (Matt 4.1–11; cf. Deut 8).³

Taken together, these observations form a convincing cumulative case that Matt 3–4 are exceptionally closely linked verbally and thematically. Of particular significance is the implication that Matt 3–4, and thus Jesus' baptism and Temptation, are best understood against the backdrop of Israel.⁴

6.1.3 Fulfilling All Righteousness

The most important connection for the present purposes is the link between Jesus' *sonship* and *obedience*,⁵ and Jesus' obedience is most clearly highlighted by the pregnant statement in 3.15. In this context Jesus comes to be baptized by John, but John does not agree to this straightaway (3.14). To this Jesus responds: "Ἀφες ἄρτι, οὕτως γὰρ πρέπον ἐστὶν ἡμῖν πληρῶσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην (3.15).⁶ John then agrees to baptize Jesus, after which a heavenly voice declares the sonship of Jesus: οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα (3.17). Thus here one finds an affirmation of Jesus' sonship closely connected to Jesus' fulfilling of righteousness. The close relationship between 3.15 (an important description of the *obedience* of Jesus) to 3.17 (a declaration of Jesus' *sonship*) warrants a close consideration of 3.15. Once the nature of Jesus' obedience in 3.15 has been established, its relationship to the heavenly voice of 3.17 and the possibility of Deuteronomic resonances in the heavenly voice will be considered.

As the first words that Jesus speaks in the entire gospel, his comments in 3.15 are highly significant. Indeed, they are programmatic for Jesus' ministry throughout the rest of the narrative.⁷ Beginning here in his baptism and culminating in the cross,

³ Another possible connection is "καὶ ἰδοὺ" in 3.17 and 4.11. So Hans-Christian Kammler, "Sohn Gottes und Kreuz: Die Versuchungsgeschichte Mt 4,1–11 im Kontext des Matthäusevangeliums," *ZTK* 100 (2003): 163–86.

⁴ So also Terence L. Donaldson, *Jesus on the Mountain: A Study in Matthean Theology* (JSNTSup 8; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), 104.

⁵ Cf. Ulrich Luz, *The Theology of the Gospel of Matthew* (trans. J. Robinson; Cambridge: CUP, 1995), 36.

⁶ Cf. Ign. *Smyrn.* 1.1.

⁷ Roland Deines, *Der Gerechtigkeit der Tora im Reich des Messias: Mt 5,13–20 als Schlüsseltext der matthäischen Theologie* (WUNT 177; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 127; Heinz Giesen, *Christliches Handeln: Eine redaktionskritische Untersuchung zum δικαιοσύνη-Begriff im Matthäusevangelium* (EHS.T 181; Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1981), 28–29.

Jesus' life will be one uniquely marked by perpetual obedience (*immerwährende Gehorsam*) to his Father.⁸ As Schlatter succinctly observes: “Das Verhalten Jesu wird als Gehorsam beschreiben.”⁹ Indeed, Söding sees 3.15 as the key to 1.1–4.11, and therefore the key to Matthean Christology in general.¹⁰ Thus, whereas 4.1–11 might be considered the *climax* of Matt 1.1–4.16, Matt 3.15 may be considered the *key* to understanding these chapters, as it prepares the reader for the climactic testing of Jesus.¹¹

The most significant portion of 3.15 for this study is the phrase “to fulfill all righteousness” (πληρῶσαι πάσαν δικαιοσύνην). The interpretations for this phrase are legion, and an exhaustive survey is not possible here.¹² However, the general consensus that δικαιοσύνη in Matthew refers to God's requirement upon humanity has much to commend it and should not be abandoned.¹³ Although some would object that this reading is tantamount to equating δικαιοσύνη with δικαίωμα,¹⁴ and others would object that δικαιοσύνη should be viewed as a gift in line with God's saving activity from the OT,¹⁵ Matthew consistently employs δικαιοσύνη in an ethical sense, elucidating what is required of the disciples (5.20; 6.1, 33; cf. 5.6, 10; 21.32).

At the same time, the divine requirement must be understood *christologically* (i.e., this *demand* of God is something that Jesus uniquely fulfills) in this passage for

⁸ Th. De Kruijf, *Der Sohn des lebendigen Gottes: Ein Beitrag zur Christologie des Matthäusevangeliums* (AnBib 16; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1962), 122.

⁹ Adolf Schlatter, *Der Evangelist Matthäus: Seine Sprache, sein Ziel, seine Selbständigkeit* (3d ed.; Stuttgart: Calwer, 1948), 89.

¹⁰ Söding, “Gehorsam,” 717.

¹¹ Cf. R. W. L. Moberly, *The Bible, Theology, and Faith: A Study of Abraham and Jesus* (CSCD; Cambridge: CUP, 2000), 199.

¹² For surveys, see Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:325–27; Otto Eissfeldt, “Πληρῶσαι πάσαν δικαιοσύνην in Matthäus 3,15,” *ZNW* 61 (1970): 209–15.

¹³ Cf. Benno Przybylski, *Righteousness in Matthew and in his World of Thought* (SNTSMS 41; Cambridge: CUP, 1981), 91; Söding, “Gehorsam,” 730; Eissfeldt, “Πληρῶσαι,” 214; France, *Matthew*, 119.

¹⁴ So Gerhard Barth, “Matthew's Understanding of the Law,” in G. Bornkamm, G. Barth, and H. J. Held, *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew* (trans. P. Scott; 2d ed.; London: SCM Press, 1972), 58–164.

¹⁵ So Donald A. Hagner, “Righteousness in Matthew's Theology,” in *Worship, Theology and Ministry in the Early Church: Essays in Honor of Ralph P. Martin* (ed. M. Wilkins and T. Paige; JSNTSup 87; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 101–20. Hagner's concern to put the requirement of God in the larger context of grace (118) may be answered in the *christological* perspective suggested below.

a number of reasons. First, even though Jesus includes John in his task of *fulfilling all righteousness* (πρέπον ἐστὶν ἡμῖν), it is clear from the primary focus on Jesus throughout the remainder of Matthew’s narrative, coupled with John’s relatively minor role in the gospel after Matt 3, that it is Jesus alone who truly fulfills *all* righteousness. John prepares the way for Jesus (3.3), but does not accompany him throughout the remainder of his ministry (cf. 14.1–12), and it is Jesus alone who is extolled by the heavenly voice. Second, the use of πᾶσαν in 3.15 should be understood as highlighting the *quantitative* nature of Jesus’ accomplishment: Jesus fulfilled *every aspect* of righteousness.¹⁶ The baptism of Jesus is thus but one example of the fulfilment of righteousness that characterizes Jesus’ ministry from beginning to end.¹⁷ Third, righteousness here should be understood primarily *christologically* given the christological force of the term πληρῶσαι in Matthew.¹⁸ This is clear in large part from the frequent application of πληρῶ to Jesus in the uniquely Matthean fulfillment citations, as well as the unique role assumed by Jesus in *fulfilling* the Law and Prophets.¹⁹ Moreover, a uniquely christological understanding of righteousness is evident not only in 3.15, but also in 5.10–11 where Matthew equates the disciples’ persecution because of *righteousness* with their persecution because of *Jesus*.²⁰

Thus the *fulfilling of all righteousness* by Jesus in Matthew is both something God requires of humanity—which is evident in Jesus’ identification with sinners in a baptism of repentance (something for which he had no need²¹)—and something that

¹⁶ So Georg Strecker, *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit: Untersuchung zur Theologie des Matthäus* (FRLANT 82; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), 141; Richard Beaton, *Isaiah’s Christ in Matthew’s Gospel* (SNTSMS 123; Cambridge: CUP, 2002), 176; BDF §275(3); C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek* (2d ed.; Cambridge: CUP, 1959), 94–95.

¹⁷ So Przybylski, *Righteousness*, 94; de Kruijf, *Der Sohn*, 121.

¹⁸ So Roland Deines, “Not the Law but the Messiah: Law and Righteousness in the Gospel of Matthew—An Ongoing Debate,” in *Built upon the Rock: Studies in the Gospel of Matthew* (ed. D. Gurtner and J. Nolland; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 53–84.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 74; C. F. D. Moule, “Fulfillment Words in the New Testament: Use and Abuse,” in *Essays in New Testament Interpretation* (Cambridge: CUP, 1982), 3–36.

²⁰ So Deines, “Not the Law,” 73–74.

²¹ This is assumed throughout Matthew, and stated explicitly in *Gos. Naz.* as found in Wilhelm Schneemelcher, ed., *New Testament Apocrypha* (trans. R. Wilson; 2 vols.; rev. ed.; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1991), 1:160. Even Paul W. Hollenbach (“The Conversion of Jesus: From Baptizer to Healer,” *ANRW* 2.25.1: 198–219), who disagrees with this position *historically*, suggests that Matthew’s apologetic aim in 3.14–15 is to demonstrate Jesus had no need for forgiveness (198–99n.4).

Jesus alone accomplishes. It is important that this christological fulfillment of righteousness not be separated from righteousness as God's requirement. Instead, it is precisely *because* God required righteousness from humanity that it was fitting (πρέπον) for Jesus to accomplish, or fulfill it. And, as the *fulfillment* of God's requirement, the *gift* or *grace* aspect of righteousness is not abrogated but *highlighted* by Jesus' supreme accomplishment of it. This gracious understanding of righteousness is inextricably linked with a christological understanding of righteousness, and is made possible by Jesus' identification with sinners in undergoing John's baptism of repentance. By agreeing to this baptism, which is one example of Jesus' programmatic righteousness, Jesus embraces the demands on Israel at that time,²² identifying himself with Israel so that their situation becomes his. John's baptism, which is here explicitly associated with repentance (and therefore sin), likely draws attention to coming eschatological judgment.²³ In this light, Jesus' baptism anticipates his own eschatological trial, whereby he will eventually pour out his blood for the forgiveness of sins (26.28; cf. 20.28).²⁴ And, as the discussion below will clarify, this *fulfilling all righteousness* is inextricably linked with the *sonship* of Jesus.

6.1.4 The Beloved, Obedient Son

6.1.4.1 Jesus as New Israel in His Baptism

This identification of Jesus with his people also highlights the representative nature of his sonship. Kynes has noted how Jesus' identification with his people is linked to fulfilling all righteousness in 3.15, since Jesus fulfills all righteousness by fulfilling the role of a righteous Israel throughout his entire life and ministry.²⁵ Thus, the identification of Jesus with his people in these verses, especially when viewed in conjunction with the declaration of Jesus' sonship in 3.17, underscores the *corporate* nature of Jesus' sonship. Indeed, a number of factors combine to suggest that the best background for understanding Jesus' sonship in 3.17 is corporate Israel.

²² So Kennedy, "Recapitulation," 245.

²³ So Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:299. Note also the symbolism associated with *baptize*. So James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered* (CM 1; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 364–69.

²⁴ Cf. Hagner, *Matthew*, 1:60; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:323.

²⁵ *Christology of Solidarity*, 26.

First, as noted above, Jesus' baptism in 3.16 is his obedience to the call to *Israel* for repentance. This focus on Israel is revealed by a number of factors, including the appeal to Israel's prophets (3.3) and the prophetic role of John (3.4 with Elijah in 2 Kings 1.8; cf. Matt 17.12–13), the regions of those who came to be baptized (Jerusalem, all Judaea, regions of the Jordan, 3.5), and the reference to true children of Abraham (3.9). Second, the wilderness setting of Matt 3 recalls, and the progression of Jesus' experiences relives, Israel's exodus experience, especially when Matt 3 is read in conjunction with the temptation narrative that follows. It is further significant that Israel's wilderness experience in Matt 3 may justly be viewed through the lens of Israel's sonship, much as it is in Matt 4.1–11. The links between Israel's sonship and Jesus' sonship in Matt 3 are summarized by Davies and Allison: "Israel was adopted and became God's 'son' at the exodus from Egypt, at the crossing of the Red Sea, and some scholars have found a new exodus motif in the story of Jesus' baptism: when Jesus comes out of the waters, new Israel is born."²⁶ Third, and building on the preceding quote, the heavenly voice in 3.17 that declares Jesus' sonship most likely does so in terms that were designed to evoke images of national Israel.

6.1.4.2 The Heavenly Voice: Overview

In 3.17 the heavenly voice declares that Jesus is God's beloved Son in whom he is well pleased. Many scholars, taking their cue primarily from the account in Mark, suggest two OT references are conflated in these passages: Psa 2.7, Isa 42.1.²⁷ For the sake of the following discussion, included here is a synopsis of the accounts in Matthew, Mark, and Luke:

Matt 3.17	Mark 1.11	Luke 3.22
------------------	------------------	------------------

²⁶ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:328.

²⁷ So Barnabas Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations* (London: SCM Press, 1961), 139–40; Matthew L. Turner, *Matthew* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008), 120–23; Craig L. Blomberg, "Matthew," in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 1–109; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:338.

<u>Οὗτός ἐστιν</u>	Σὺ εἶ	Σὺ εἶ
ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός	ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός	ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός
ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα	ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα	ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα

The primary point of interest for the present study is determining what OT reference(s), if any, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός is alluded to in Matt 3.17. Since the majority report among scholars, which is accepted here, is to view Mark as a primary source for Matthew, it is indeed important to take into consideration Mark 1.11. For Mark, it is highly likely that an allusion to the OG of Psa 2.7 is intended by the phrase σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός.²⁸ This is evidenced by the shared second person language in both Mark 1.11 (Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός) and Psa 2.7 (Υἱός μου εἶ σύ). Indeed, only in Psa 2.7 in the LXX is the term “you are” found in conjunction with God’s son.²⁹ The term ἀγαπητός in Mark 1.11, along with the final part of the quotation that indicates the divine good pleasure, is often viewed as deriving from Isa 42.1, although other passages have been suggested.³⁰ The wording in Luke 3.22 corresponds exactly to Mark, so Psa 2; Isa 42 are often suggested as the OT background for Luke as well.

6.1.4.3 The Heavenly Voice in Matthew: A Brief *Forschungsbericht*

The phrasing of the heavenly voice, however, is different in Matthew (as the underlined portions indicate above). Although this study assumes the Two-Source Hypothesis, it is even more important for the present investigation to understand the Gospel of Matthew first of all on its own terms. When this approach is taken, there is little basis for positing a reference to Psa 2.7 in the heavenly voice. Arguably the strongest links with Psa 2.7 in Mark is the second person address “you are.” When

²⁸ Joel Marcus, *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark* (SNTW; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992), 48–79.

²⁹ Ibid., 50n.10, citing H.-J. Steichele, *Der leidende Sohn Gottes: Eine Untersuchung einiger alttestamentlicher Motive in der Christologie des Markusevangeliums* (BU 14; Regensburg: Pustet, 1980), 147.

³⁰ Marcus, *Way of the Lord*, 52–53; C. E. B. Cranfield, *The Gospel according to St. Mark: An Introduction and Commentary* (2d ed.; CBC; Cambridge: CUP, 1963), 55. Cf. Gen 22; Exod 4.22–23.

the second person address is absent, as it is in Matthew, virtually the only links that remain are the words υἱός μου.³¹

It has also been suggested that Matthew's text reflects the targumic rendering of Psa 2.7, which would explain the inclusion of ἀγαπητός in the text.³² However, there are a number of problems with this view. First, the dating of *Tg. Pss.* appears to be much later than Matthew. It is not possible to be absolutely certain, but early dates suggested for this targum range from the second to fifth centuries C.E., and it may even date from the post-Talmudic age.³³ More specifically, a date before the fifth century for the text is said to be very unlikely.³⁴ Although it is true that a late date for the targum does not necessarily preclude the inclusion of earlier materials, this is difficult to determine in practice.³⁵ A second reason for the difficulty with this view is *Tg. Pss.* was not widely used, and most likely not widely known, in antiquity.³⁶ Thirdly, and even more devastating for this theory, is the observation that *Tg. Pss. 2.7* was actually a *reaction against* christological claims of the church; it was a "clear attempt to play down the divine sonship of the Messiah."³⁷ It is therefore unlikely that the phrase ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός finds support in *Tg. Pss. 2.7*.

Moreover, given Matthew's clear penchant for correlating the sonship of Jesus to the sonship of Israel, it is anything but self-evident that Matthew has in view an allusion to Psa 2 in 3.17. Indeed, it is much more likely that Matthew intends in his modified version of the heavenly voice to emphasize the role of Jesus as Son in recapitulating the role of Israel as son. Put differently, the imagery Matthew here

³¹ Although it is true that D a sy^{s,c}; Ir read σὸ εἶ, the support for this reading is not impressive.

³² Gundry, *Use*, 30, 112; Lidija Novakovic, *Messiah, the Healer of the Sick: A Study of Jesus as the Son of David in the Gospel of Matthew* (WUNT II/170; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 147.

³³ Timothy Edwards, *Exegesis in the Targum of the Psalms: The Old, the New, and the Rewritten* (GD 28/BibSt 1; Piscataway, N.J.: Gorgias, 2007), 12.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 221.

³⁵ David M. Stec, *The Targum of Psalms: Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes* (ArBib 16; London: T&T Clark, 2004), 2; cf. Anthony D. York, "The Dating of the Targumic Literature," *JSJ* 5 (1974): 49–62.

³⁶ Stec, *Targum of Psalms*, 1–2.

³⁷ Richard J. Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter* (WBC 50; Dallas: Word, 1983), 207–8. Cf. E. Lohse, "υἱός, κτλ.," *TDNT* 8:357–62; A. D. A. Moses, *Matthew's Transfiguration Story and Jewish-Christian Controversy* (JSNTSup 122; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 142.

draws upon is more *corporate/national* than *kingly/Davidic*.³⁸ The discussion that follows will support this position.

Thus, the verbal and thematic links between Psa 2.7 and Matt 3.17 are weak at best. This has led a number of scholars to suggest other possible OT references may serve as background for the first part of the heavenly voice in Matt 3.17. One possibility is to view Matthew's phrase ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα as a reference to the binding of Isaac in Gen 22. This view has recently been argued thoroughly by Leroy Huizenga, who bases his theory in large part on the widespread significance of the Akedah in the "encyclopedia" of early Judaism around the time Matthew was written.³⁹ Huizenga further notes that the use of εὐδόκησα in Matt 3.17 may be explained by the traditions associated with Isaac, who was not only a passive sacrificial victim, but was often portrayed as being fully compliant with his father's wishes.⁴⁰ Huizenga has certainly amassed a sufficient array of references to the Akedah in the "cultural encyclopedia" of Judaism to demonstrate its prominence in general, but it is less clear how important Gen 22 is for Matthew.⁴¹ Indeed, Huizenga in his survey of the texts of Matthew's "cultural encyclopedia" forthrightly admits that he is not making any claims whether or not Matthew knew the documents he includes in his survey, but is simply proposing that these writings demonstrate the pervasiveness of the Akedah in Matthew's world.

However, for Huizenga's thesis to be persuasive, more evidence would need to be brought forth in support of Isaac and/or Gen 22 material *in Matthew*. The only real indication of a possible Isaac typology thus far in Matthew's narrative is the phrase "υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ" in 1.1, but the associations with Isaac do not appear to be exploited throughout the gospel, and Gen 22 is nowhere cited.⁴² It is questionable

³⁸ So Jeffrey A. Gibbs, "Israel Standing with Israel: The Baptism of Jesus in Matthew's Gospel (Matt 3:13–17)," *CBQ* 64 (2002): 511–26. Although, it should be admitted that the Davidic Messiah could be viewed as a representative figure (so Carson, "Matthew," 109)

³⁹ Leroy Andrew Huizenga, "The Akedah in Matthew," (Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 2006). Cf. de Kruijf, *Der Sohn*, 124.

⁴⁰ "Akedah," 102.

⁴¹ Huizenga's second chapter (102–78) includes references to the MT, LXX, *Jubilees*, Judith, 4Q225, Pseudo-Philo's *L.A.B.*, *Barnabas*, *4 Maccabees*, Josephus, *1 Clement*, *Martyrdom of Polycarp*. These texts are granted, but do not speak directly to Matthew's use or non-use of the image.

⁴² Isaac is also mentioned in the genealogy (1.2), and John declares he is able to raise up children from Abraham from stones (3.9). However, the first reference is simply one of many in the genealogy,

whether Huizenga's "model reader" would have any indication in Matthew that a reference to the Akedah was intended in Matt 3, if indeed it was. In contrast, the role of Jesus as national Israel has been evident throughout the first three chapters. Admittedly, Huizenga recognizes the role of national Israel in the divine voice in 3.17, but suggests that the voice reflects an interest in *both* national Israel *and* Isaac typology.⁴³ In light of the numerous similarities between Israel and Jesus in these chapters of Matthew, the following discussion will propose that it is more likely that the entire heavenly declaration is best explained as referring to national Israel. Therefore a supposed Isaac typology, though certainly a possibility, is not the best way to explain the passage.

In light of this focus on national Israel, two other texts are worthy of consideration. One is Exod 4.22–23, which is the first passage to refer to Israel as God's son in the OT. Like Matt 3.17, Exod 4.22 includes a third person reference to God's son (υἱὸς πρωτότοκός μου Ἰσραηλ), and an allusion to Exod 4 would be fitting in light of Jesus' recapitulation of the exodus experience of Israel as God's son.⁴⁴ Moreover, P. Bretscher argued in 1968 that the term ἀγαπητός also derives from Exod 4.22, and is virtually equivalent to πρωτότοκος.⁴⁵ However, his argument for the influence of Exod 4 is not decisive since his suggestion that one Hebrew term (רִבְוֹן=πρωτότοκος) underlies the usage of three NT terms—ἐκλεκτός, ἀγαπητός, μονογενής—may be too inclusive, and may also give too much weight to Exod 4.22–23 in general. Nevertheless, Bretscher's line of thought does appear to be moving in the right direction, and the proposal that Exod 4.22–23 may be in view in the heavenly voice remains a possibility. A reference to Exod 4 would also tie in well with Matthew's concern with Deuteronomic sonship, since, as the survey of texts in previous chapters has indicated, Exod 4 was often viewed in conjunction with similar language in Deuteronomy.

A second alternative, which also entails a reference to the national sonship of Israel in the divine voice, has recently been argued admirably by J. A. Gibbs. Gibbs offers a sensitive reading of the Matthean baptismal narrative, and suggests that Jer

and the second reference appears to draw attention to Abraham and has more to do with *spiritual* descent than *physical* descent.

⁴³ Huizenga, "Akedah," 221.

⁴⁴ So Nolland, *Matthew*, 157 and n.17.

⁴⁵ Paul G. Bretscher, "Exodus 4:22–23 and the Voice from Heaven," *JBL* 87 (1968): 301–11.

38.20 (LXX; 31.20 MT) is a primary source for the heavenly voice. A reference to Jer 38.20[31.20], which speaks of Israel's (Ephraim's) sonship, would also fit the context of Matt 1–4, a section in which Jesus is compared to national Israel. It is also significant for Gibbs that this passage is one of only two places in the entire LXX where ἀγαπητός modifies υἱός. Its feasibility is further enhanced because Jer 38.15[31.15] has already been cited in Matt 2.18, and Jer 38[31] may also be in view later in Matthew in the covenant mentioned in Matt 26.28.⁴⁶ It must be admitted that Gibbs's position, even more than Bretscher's, has much to commend it, given Matthew's citation of a verse in close proximity to Jer 38.20[31.20]. However, it will be suggested below that Matthew may have been aware of (an)other textual tradition(s) that applied *beloved* to Israel as sons in association with Deuteronomy.

Although none of these alternative proposals has become a new consensus, they nevertheless represent a significant contingent of scholars who are open to considering the influence of other OT texts in the heavenly voice, since a conflation of Psa 2.7 and Isa 42.1 may not best account for the textual features of Matt 3.17.⁴⁷ It is the contention of the present study, much like the proposals of Bretscher and Gibbs, that the sonship in view in the divine voice is most closely associated with the sonship of Israel, and not with the messianic king of Psa 2. But, before this claim can be adequately defended, it must also account for the second portion of the heavenly voice. It is when the first part and the second part of the voice are taken together that the focus on Israel is clearest. Once this has been established, a new hypothesis for the first part of the voice will be suggested.

The second part of the heavenly voice conveys the divine good pleasure with Jesus. It is common to understand the second half of this phrase (ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα), and sometimes also ἀγαπητός, as a reference to Isa 42.1, which reads in part: ὁ παῖς μου ἀντιλήμψομαι αὐτοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου προσεδέξατο αὐτὸν ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἔδωκα τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ' αὐτόν. As this excerpt from Isa 42.1 suggests, on an initial reading of Matt 3.17 there do not seem to be any significant parallels to Isa 42.1. Indeed many scholars doubt that Matthew intends a reference to Isaiah in the heavenly voice. Morna Hooker, for example, is skeptical that Matthew intended a reference to Isa 42.1 in 3.17 based specifically on the lack of agreement between

⁴⁶ Gibbs, "Israel Standing with Israel," 511–26.

⁴⁷ So Huizenga, "Akedah," 202.

Matt 3.17 and 12.18, the latter of which clearly does cite Isa 42.1. Instead of a reference to Isaiah’s servant in the heavenly voice, Hooker observes that three key words in the account (υἱός, ἀγαπητός, εὐδόκησα) are all different from the normal translations of Isa 42.1, but taken together, form a concept that is applied exclusively to Israel in the OT.⁴⁸

On the other hand, those who do posit a reference to Isa 42.1 in Matt 3.17 do so in part because ἀγαπητός in 3.17 has a parallel in the citation from Isa 42.1 in Matt 12.18.⁴⁹ Other options for the origin of ἀγαπητός abound. This term may have been inserted as a natural change from ἐκλεκτός from Isa 42.1 to connect the first and second parts of the voice.⁵⁰ Similarly, it is suggested that ἀγαπητός might be a translation of בְּחִיר reflected in the MT of Isa 42.1,⁵¹ although ἀγαπητός more often translates יְחִיד, יְדִיד, or יְקִיר.⁵² Yet another view is that the use of ἀγαπητός comes from Isa 42.1 as influence by Isa 41.8–9; 44.2, both of which apply a form of ἀγαπάω (though not ἀγαπητός!) to the servant (however nebulous the concept *servant* may be).⁵³ This might further be supported by *Tg. Isa.* 42.1, which includes “beloved” (אֲהַרְעִי).⁵⁴ A related explanation for the presence of ἀγαπητός in Matt 3.17 is that it is has been influenced by the version of Isa 42.1 found in Matt 12.18.⁵⁵ However, it is not clear that Matt 3.17 has been influenced by Matt 12.18; the influence is more likely to run in the opposite direction: Matt 3.17 (and 17.5, on which see below) probably influence the form of Matt 12.18 rather than vice versa.⁵⁶

⁴⁸ Morna D. Hooker, *Jesus and the Servant: The Influence of the Servant Concept of Deutero-Isaiah in the New Testament* (London: SPCK, 1959), 71–73. This is especially true for υἱός and εὐδόκησα, on which see Psa 43.4 [44.3 EV; 44.4 MT]; 146.11; Isa 62.4; Mal 2.17; Jer 14.10.

⁴⁹ Cf. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:337–38.

⁵⁰ Nolland, *Matthew*, 157.

⁵¹ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:337.

⁵² Hooker, *Jesus and the Servant*, 70–71.

⁵³ Marcus, *Way of the Lord*, 51; Pierre Bonnard, *L’Évangile selon Saint Matthieu* (2d ed.; CNT 1; Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1963), 40; cf. Adela Yarbro Collins, *Mark: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 150.

⁵⁴ Gundry, *Use*, 30–31; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:337.

⁵⁵ See Walther Zimmerli and Joachim Jeremias *The Servant of God* (rev. ed.; SBT 20; London: SCM Press, 1965), 82–83.

⁵⁶ So Gundry, *Use*, 30; Huizenga, “Akedah,” 202, 207; Beaton, *Isaiah’s Christ*, 131; Maarten J. J. Menken, *Matthew’s Bible: The Old Testament Text of the Evangelist* (BETL 73; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2004), 85.

Jeremias proposed an even more extensive influence of Isa 42.1 in this account, and suggested that υἱός in the first part of the voice was a clarification of the ambiguous παῖς (i.e., *servant* or *son*) from Isa 42.1.⁵⁷ However, this explanation must assume a two-stage Greek development of the tradition, which is an unnecessary conclusion given the dearth of evidence that υἱός often replaces an original παῖς.⁵⁸ Moreover, the close connection between this pericope with the Temptation narrative makes it all the more likely that a reference to sonship is intended in the baptismal voice.⁵⁹ It is thus best not to view the entirety of the heavenly voice as an extended reference to Isa 42.1.

In sum, it must be admitted that ἀγαπητός in the first half of Matt 3.17 *may* be influenced by Isa 42.1.⁶⁰ But it is perhaps more certain that Isaianic influence is to be found in the phrase ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα, the second half of the heavenly voice.⁶¹ It is true that this phrase is not found in Isa 42.1 LXX, but the later translations of Symmachus and Theodotion do include εὐδόκησεν.⁶² Moreover the phrase in Matthew closely (though not precisely) reflects the wording of Isa 42.1 MT (יְשִׁיבֵנוּ הַרְצֵהוּ).⁶³ Hooker again doubts that Isa 42.1 is in view because ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα does not conform with the explicit citation of Isa 42.1 in Matt 12.18 (εἰς ὃν εὐδόκησεν), but this deviation can be explained if Matthew was also working with Markan material.⁶⁴ Moreover, the thematic link of the Spirit's resting on Jesus in Matt 3.16 further links Matthew with Isa 42.1, and Matthew's wording ἐπ' αὐτόν likely indicates that he was aware of the same wording in reference to the Spirit in Isa 42.1.⁶⁵

A slightly different question than the origin of the phrase ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα is what the last term conveys. It has been observed that εὐδοκέω with ἐν is used in the LXX in reference to God's taking pleasure in a person or people, and this is most

⁵⁷ Zimmerli and Jeremias, *Servant*, 81–83.

⁵⁸ Lindars, *Apologetic*, 140; Hooker, *Jesus and the Servant*, 69–70.

⁵⁹ Gundry, *Use*, 30.

⁶⁰ Another option for the origin of this term will be proposed below.

⁶¹ Although see the objections in Huizenga, "Akedah," 206–7.

⁶² So Beaton, *Isaiah's Christ*, 124n.5.

⁶³ France, *Matthew*, 123.

⁶⁴ Gundry, *Use*, 31.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.* Matthew (and Luke) differ here from Mark 1.10, which reads εἰς αὐτόν.

often stated with respect to the nation of Israel.⁶⁶ Another perspective focuses more on the NT data and suggests that εὐδοκέω is frequently used of God in the NT to indicate his sovereign, inscrutable decree. Used in the aorist with reference to Christ in Matt 3.17, εὐδοκέω is said to indicate God's (past) pleasure in electing Jesus the Messiah.⁶⁷

These options are not necessarily mutually exclusive, but if there is a pretemporal approval of Jesus revealed here, the impetus for the declaration of that pleasure comes from the *obedience* of Jesus. It is in the actions of Jesus in his baptism that the divine approbation is first pronounced. And, as noted above, Jesus' baptism is but one aspect of his all-encompassing, programmatic obedience. Moreover, this obedience in the context of Matt 1–4 (and especially Matt 3–4) is the obedience *of a son*. This is clear from the main thrust of the divine declaration in 3.17, and in the Temptation account that follows, which are both focused on Jesus' sonship.⁶⁸

Thus, the divine pleasure declared in the heavenly voice is a response to Jesus' obedience. It has already been argued that Jesus, the obedient Son, is portrayed in Matt 3–4 as one who fulfills the role of national Israel. This corporate focus comports with Hooker's observation that the three key terms of the baptism (υἱός, ἀγαπητός, εὐδοκέω), and especially God's pleasure as conveyed with εὐδοκέω + ἐν, refer most often to the nation of Israel.⁶⁹ In the baptism Jesus is portrayed as God's truly obedient Son in a way that corresponds to the role of Israel *as son*.⁷⁰ Thus, it makes best sense of both the context of Matt 1–4 in general, and the two halves of the divine voice in particular, to understand Jesus in corporate terms in Matt 3.17.⁷¹ Although a reference to Psa 2.7 might be able to convey this by means

⁶⁶ Hooker, *Jesus and the Servant*, 71.

⁶⁷ Marcus, *Way of the Lord*, 73; Gundry, *Use*, 31–32; Carson, "Matthew," 109. Cf. the options for the aorist in Turner, *Matthew*, 120–21.

⁶⁸ Gundry, *Use*, 30.

⁶⁹ Hooker, *Jesus and the Servant*, 71–72; cf. Kennedy, "Recapitulation," 252; Kynes, *Christology of Solidarity*, 27–28.

⁷⁰ David D. Kupp, *Matthew's Emmanuel: Divine Presence and God's People in the First Gospel* (SNTSMS 90; Cambridge: CUP, 1996), 66; Moberly, *Bible*, 199; Dale C. Allison, Jr., "The Son of God as Israel: A Note on Matthean Christology," *IBS* 9 (1987): 74–81.

⁷¹ Hooker (*Jesus and the Servant*, 73) suggests that Isa 42.1 points to this conclusion since it was a song that seems to refer to Israel as a whole.

of a representative, kingly figure, it has already been argued that the verbal links between Matt 3.17 and Psa 2.7 are unimpressive. The answer is more likely to be found elsewhere. Indeed, the option should also be left open that Matthew does not intend a precise quotation, but conveys a number of Scriptural texts and images via the divine voice.⁷² In addition, given the unity of the two halves of the heavenly voice (i.e., the two halves may come from different sources, but are united into a single statement in Matthew), the *beloved* son is known as such primarily because of his *obedience*.⁷³ This supports the observation that Jesus is known as the “beloved Son” in contexts where he is completely obedient to his Father’s will.⁷⁴ The reference to Isa 42.1 in the second half of the verse is not the main focus of the heavenly voice, but is grammatically and thematically subordinate to the main declaration of Jesus’ sonship. As such, Isa 42 elucidates the sonship of Jesus, so that Jesus’ sonship is defined by *servanthood*; *Son* is a title for Matthew, while *servant* describes Jesus’ sonship.⁷⁵

6.1.4.4 The Heavenly Voice: Sonship, Obedience, and Deut 32

So, the divine voice is proclaimed in the midst of a section of Matthew in which Jesus is portrayed as national Israel, and in the midst of two more specific chapters where Jesus is portrayed as the obedient Son. It is the contention of this chapter that several elements—Jesus’ *obedience* as *Son of God* who is also portrayed in the light of *servant* imagery—are joined together in the heavenly voice. To this end, a new hypothesis will now be suggested that attempts to account for the evidence and hold these themes together.

To state the hypothesis succinctly, it is suggested here that the phrase υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός is based on an interpretive tradition drawn from Deuteronomy, particularly Deut 32.5 and/or 32.19–20 as reflected in *Tg. Neofiti*, *Tg. Pseudo-Jonathan*. Before arguing for the specific influence, the general Deuteronomic influence on the heavenly voice should be noted as a possibility. Building on the

⁷² Cf. France, *Matthew*, 123; Kennedy, “Recapitulation,” 253, 257.

⁷³ De Kruijf, *Der Sohn*, 54.

⁷⁴ Charles B. Puskas and David Crump, *An Introduction to the Gospels and Acts* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 95.

⁷⁵ Birger Gerhardsson, *The Mighty Acts of Jesus according to Matthew* (SMRSHLL 5; Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1979), 89; Beaton, *Isaiah’s Christ*, 176.

observation that Jesus is portrayed in terms of national Israel in Matt 3, G. Thompson has observed a number of features of this text that may derive from Deuteronomy. In Deut 4.36–37 God’s voice addresses Israel from heaven, reminding Israel of their divine election. Moreover, it is stressed that Israel is a privileged people to hear God’s voice, since this distinguished them from all other peoples.⁷⁶ Thompson also observes that the purpose of the heavenly voice in Deuteronomy was to urge Israel to obedience and warn them against disobedience, but the unfortunate reality of Israel’s history is that they were persistently disobedient. To support this suggestion, Thompson notes the close relationship between Matt 3–4 and the typological link between Israel’s calling and the beginning of Jesus’ ministry. Thus, in Deuteronomy the divine voice is closely associated with the call of Israel to be God’s people, and the divine voice at Jesus’ baptism calls Jesus to be God’s true son, like Israel.⁷⁷

Thompson’s thesis has much to commend it, especially in his focus on the correlation between national Israel and Jesus and the role Deuteronomy may play in this correlation. Another feature that might support Thompson’s position (which he does not note) is the role of Israel’s *discipline* in Deut 4 in relation to their sonship, since discipline is an important aspect of Israel’s sonship. God’s discipline is mentioned in both Deut 4.36 (which Thompson sees as background for the heavenly voice in Matt 3.17) and in Deut 8.5. If Deut 4.36–37 is (at least part of) the background for Matt 3.17 it would link the sonship of Jesus to Israel via Deuteronomy and the heavenly voice, and would likely also mean that Matthew was aware of God’s fatherly *discipline* in Deut 8.5, which serves as the background for Jesus’ filial testing in Matt 4.1–11. Thus the concept of God’s *discipline* might be a way to connect Matt 3–4 with the Deuteronomic notion of sonship.

But an even more intriguing aspect of Thompson’s argument states that there is a contrast drawn in this passage between Israel’s disobedience and Jesus’ obedience.⁷⁸ This is plausible because Jesus is contrasted to Israel *as a Son*. But, although Deut 4.36–37 may be the background, or part of a matrix of background imagery, for the heavenly voice, the obedient sonship of Jesus may better be contrasted with the disobedient sonship of Israel via another passage: Deut 32.

⁷⁶ G. H. P. Thompson, “Called,” 9; cf. Przybylski, *Righteousness*, 308.

⁷⁷ Thompson, “Called,” 9–10.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

Indeed, it is the present contention that a reference to Deut 32 in the heavenly voice accounts for the textual features of the passage quite well. First, Deut 32 is addressed to national Israel and refers to the nation of Israel as *sons* (and daughters) in several verses, including 32.5, 19–20. Although 32.5 LXX reads τέκνα, the MT reads בנים. It is therefore quite possible that Matthew’s OT *Vorlage* either reflects the MT at this point, Matthew has brought a proto-LXX reading into greater conformity with the Hebrew, or Matthew understands τέκνα to be focused in the representative sonship of Jesus.⁷⁹ The connection with sonship is even more explicit in Deut 32.19–20 LXX, as God’s sons (υἱῶν) (and daughters [θυγατέρων]) are mentioned in 32.19, and 32.20 refers to Israel as *sons* in whom is no faithfulness, which is set in parallel to a perverted generation (γενεὰ ἐξεστραμμένη).

Another possibility is revealed in the second reason why a reference to Deut 32.5 and/or 32.20 may be in view: *Tg. Neof.* and *Tg. Ps.-J.* Deut 32.5 read “beloved sons” (*Tg. Neof.*: בנייה חביביה; *Tg. Ps.-J.*: בניא חביביא).⁸⁰ In addition, both *Tg. Neof.* and *Tg. Ps.-J.* in Deut 32.19 also refer to Israel as “beloved sons/children” (*Tg. Neof.*: חביבין...בן; *Tg. Ps.-J.*: בניא חביביא). In fact, the term *beloved* (חביב) occurs about⁸¹ nine times in *Tg. Neof.* Deuteronomy, and at least three of these refer to Israel beloved *sons* or *children* (Deut 14.1; 32.5, 19), with additional references to Israel in general as beloved (Deut 7.6; 26.18) and to literal children (Deut 13.7).⁸² It is also found similarly in, e.g., *Tg. Ps.-J.* Deut 7.6; 14.2; 26.18.

These occurrences of *beloved* in the targums noted above, however, do not prove anything in themselves. As implied above in conjunction with the proposal that *beloved* (חביב) *son* was derived from *Tg. Pss. 2.7*, an appeal to targums to demonstrate the background for NT texts can be highly problematic.⁸³ Bruce Chilton has suggested eight theses regarding the use of targums for NT studies, which help to

⁷⁹ See also Matthew’s understanding of Hos 11.1 (MT: בן; LXX τέκνα) in reference to Jesus as υἱός in 2.15.

⁸⁰ This phrase is also found in *Tg. Neof.* in Deut 33.3 and likely (originally) in Deut 14.1. Cf. Alejandro Díez Macho, *Neophyti 1. Targum Palestinense MS de la Biblioteca Vaticana 5: Deuteronomio* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1978), 131, 496

⁸¹ Not all the occurrences are certain.

⁸² Cf. Stephen A. Kaufman and Micael Sokoloff, *A Key-Word-in-Context Concordance to Targum Neofiti: A Guide to the Complete Palestinian Aramaic Text of the Torah* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993), 508.

⁸³ For a discussion of possible Hebrew/Aramaic words underlying ἀγαπητός, see Marcus, *Way of the Lord*, 51n.12; Gundry, *Use*, 30–31n.7.

provide parameters for the use of targumic literature for NT research. Chilton observes that most of the targums were composed after, and with little reference to the chief concerns of, the NT.⁸⁴ He further points out that there is no Palestinian, pre-Christian targum. At best some elements in the targums may antedate or be contemporaneous with NT documents, but the case for these must be made and not assumed. So, the best use of targums may be in finding *analogous* material to the NT.⁸⁵

This study basically follows the approach of Chilton for dealing with targumic evidence, which almost certainly postdates Matthew. It should also be noted, however, that the Palestinian Targums (including *Tg. Neof.*, *Tg. Ps.-J.*) were much more widely known and used than some other targums, such as *Tg. Pss.*⁸⁶ In addition, a comparatively early date (circa third–fourth century) is likely at least for *Tg. Neof.*⁸⁷ and Robert Hayward is an example of one who has challenged the notion that *Tg. Ps.-J.* represents a late, Islamic date.⁸⁸ None of these factors, of course, means that Matthew knew or used *Tg. Neof.* or *Tg. Ps.-J.* Targums were certainly in existence at the time of the early church, but this is different than saying that the targums known today date from the same time.⁸⁹ The key point, then, is that the targumic literature, especially those with a Palestinian provenance, may well reflect interpretative traditions available around the time of Matthew. This is far from certain, but the possibility remains.

Moreover, the *concept* of beloved sonship in Deuteronomy is not completely dependent upon explicit targumic renderings to this effect. As argued in chapter 3,

⁸⁴ Bruce Chilton, “Eight Theses on the Use of Targums in Interpreting the New Testament,” in *Judaic Approaches to the Gospels* (USFISFCJ 2; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994), 305–15; cf. York, “Dating,” 49.

⁸⁵ Chilton, “Eight Theses,” 311–14.

⁸⁶ Cf. Bruce M. Metzger, “Important Early Translations of the Bible,” *BSac* 150 (1993): 35–49.

⁸⁷ Martin McNamara, *Targum Neofiti I: Genesis. Translated, with Apparatus and Notes* (AB 1A; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992), 45; Bruce Chilton, “God as ‘Father’ in the Targumim, in Non-Canonical Literatures of Early Judaism and Primitive Christianity, and in Matthew,” in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation* (ed. J. Charlesworth and C. Evans; JSPSup 14/SSEJC 2; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 151–69.

⁸⁸ Robert Hayward, “The Date of Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Some Comments,” *JJS* 40 (1989): 7–30; *ibid.*, “Red Heifer and Golden Calf: Dating Targum Pseudo-Jonathan,” in *Targum Studies I: Textual and Contextual Studies in the Pentateuchal Targums* (ed. P. Flesher; SFSHJ 55; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 9–32.

⁸⁹ Gundry, *Use*, 172; York, “Dating,” 62.

the *concept* of beloved sonship (in conjunction with obedience) is present in Deuteronomy even if the precise *phrase* “beloved son” does not occur. Given the difficulty in establishing precise biblical language in Matthew’s heavenly voice and the possibility that the heavenly voice might reflect scriptural language in general, the background of *Israel* as a “beloved son” in the vein of Deuteronomy should be considered in Matt 3.17.

Admittedly the above reconstruction is a bit tenuous, but it is strengthened when four additional factors are considered. First, Matthew likely alludes to Deut 32.5, 20 in Matt 17.17, and probably also in 12.39, 45; 16.4, so he must have known at least portions of Deut 32 in some form.⁹⁰ Although Matthew’s main impetus for his reference to Deut 32 may have come from Mark and/or Q, it is highly unlikely that his knowledge of Deut 32 would have been *limited* to his sources. As one who was undoubtedly steeped in Israel’s Scriptures (not least of which was the Torah!) and perhaps even knew them by heart,⁹¹ Matthew almost certainly would have been familiar with the Song of Moses. Additionally, if Matthew were responsible for reworking 12.18 to make it closer to 3.17 and 17.5 (which Beaton and others recognize) then it is not out of the realm of possibility that, if Deut 32 is in view in any of these other passages, it is also in view in 3.17. Indeed, the similar phrasing in Matt 17.5 is closely followed by a reference to Deut 32.5, 20 in 17.17. Moreover—and this is the second additional factor to consider—the Song of Moses was particularly well-known and widely used among Pentateuchal literature, as the surveys in chapters 2, 4 have indicated. Given the widespread knowledge of Deut 32, it would not be surprising if interpretive traditions surrounding this text (such as those later included in *Tg. Neof.*, *Tg. Ps.-J.*) were also rather widely known. Thus, Matthew’s allusions to Deut 32, his knowledge of the Torah in general, and the widespread circulation of the Song of Moses make it plausible that Matthew knew this text and alluded to it elsewhere in his gospel, perhaps even in Matt 3.17.

A third additional factor in support of a possible reference to Deut 32 in Matt 3.17 is the thematic correspondence relating to Jesus’ obedience. Put simply, in Matt

⁹⁰ On Matthew’s use of Deut 32, see Brandon D. Crowe, “The Song of Moses and Divine Begetting in Matt 1,20,” *Bib* 90 (2009): 47–58, especially 51–52. Recall that Matthew’s references to “(this) generation” probably also reflect Deut 32.5, 20.

⁹¹ So Dale C. Allison, Jr., *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), 95.

3 Jesus' filial obedience is articulated in terms of Israel's national sonship. In Deut 32.5 Israel is portrayed as disobedient *sons*. And, if an interpretive tradition similar to that which is included in the Palestinian Targums was extant at the time of Matthew's composition, then Israel is portrayed as *beloved* sons who were disobedient. The reference to Jesus in Matt 3.17 would then be a way of highlighting his status as a beloved Son who was like Israel inasmuch as he was God's Son, but unlike Israel inasmuch as he was *obedient* as God's beloved Son. Indeed, this thematic correspondence between the two texts may be one of the most significant features to consider. Moreover, this comports with the observation of Gibbs who has suggested that there is a progression of Jesus' portrayal in relation to Israel in Matt 2–4. In Matt 2.13–15 Jesus is very much *like* Israel in his exodus, and in Matt 4.1–11 Jesus is *unlike* Israel in his successful overcoming of a temptation similar to that faced by Israel. In Matt 3.13–17 Jesus is *both* like and unlike Israel: Jesus is like Israel in his identification with Israel through his baptism and the related exodus imagery, but he is unlike Israel in his role as the fulfiller of all righteousness, and therefore, in his obedience.⁹²

A fourth additional factor in support of Deut 32 as (at least part of) the background for Matt 3.17 is the role of the Spirit in Deut 32.11. On the one hand, it is certainly true that one of the most prominent points of contact between Isa 42.1 and Matt 3.17 is the descent of the Spirit,⁹³ on the other hand this thematic parallel does not have to be limited to one text. In fact, if Deut 32 is referenced in conjunction with Isa 42, the heavenly voice would then be evoking *two* texts which refer to God's Spirit.⁹⁴ In Deut 32.11 (speaking of Israel's Exodus!) Yahweh is said to hover over Israel as an eagle hovers over its young. This might serve as background for the descent of the dove in Matt 3.16. Significantly the image of a bird in Deut 32.11 is also connected to Gen 1.2 via the rare Piel of רָחַף (found only in these two passages in the MT).⁹⁵ When these two texts are viewed together it is clear

⁹² Gibbs, "Israel Standing with Israel," 525–26.

⁹³ So Joachim Gnilka, *Das Matthäusevangelium* (HTKNT; 2 vols.; Freiburg: Herder, 1986), 1:79; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:338.

⁹⁴ Admittedly Deut 32.11 is found *between* Deut 32.5, 20, but if the argument here holds that Matthew knew the entire Song of Moses (at least vv. 5–20), then there is no reason why he would not have known v. 11. See further on Matt 1.20.

⁹⁵ This connection is found only in the MT, but given Matthew's knowledge of Hebrew, it is possible that he would have been aware of this tradition.

that the presence of God's Spirit in Gen 1.2 is likened to ornithological hovering. These connections between Matt 3.16 and Gen 1.2 may suggest new creation imagery in Jesus' baptism,⁹⁶ and if it is so this probably also necessitates Matthew's knowledge of Deut 32.11 in a proto-MT tradition, without which the connection between God's Spirit and a bird would be much less clear.⁹⁷ Moreover, in further support of Deut 32.11, it has also been noted that there is reference made in the second-century *b. Ber.* 3a to a divine voice that coos like a dove, and *Tg. Cant.* 2.12 interprets the voice of the turtledove as the voice of the Holy Spirit.⁹⁸ Thus there are interpretive traditions that relate the descent of God's Spirit to a bird and to creation, and Deut 32.11 is an important passage that serves as an important text for this matrix of imagery. This suggestion does not disallow the influence of Isa 42 in Matt 3.16, but Deut 32.11 is suggested as a fitting corollary that dovetails nicely with Isa 42.⁹⁹

6.1.4.5 The Heavenly Voice: Summary

Thus, there are at least six reasons that form a cumulative case for why Deut 32 should at least be entertained as a possibility as a background text for Matt 3. The six points can be summarized: (1) both Deut 32 and Matt 3 have a corporate focus on sonship; (2) interpretative traditions surrounding Deut 32 refer to Israel as *beloved sons*, and it is Jesus who is the *beloved son* in Matt 3; (3) Matthew clearly references the relevant portions of Deut 32 (vv. 5, 20) elsewhere in his gospel; (4) Deut 32 was a widely known and referenced text in the ancient world; (5) thematically, Deut 32.5, 20 chastises Israel for being God's *disobedient* sons, and Matt 3 lauds Jesus for being God's *obedient* Son; (6) the descent of the Spirit in Matt 3 may reveal knowledge of similar imagery in Deut 32.11. It is, however, recognized that Deut 32 is by no means the only plausible possibility for the background of Matt 3.17. Genesis 22, Isa 42, Jer 38[31], and even Exod 4 cannot be dismissed as possibilities. But it is

⁹⁶ So Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:334.

⁹⁷ For more on the relationship between Gen 1, Deut 32, and Matthew, see §7.1.

⁹⁸ France, *Matthew*, 122.

⁹⁹ It is to be recalled that Isaiah and Deuteronomy are the two most frequently cited portions of the OT in Matthew.

suggested that the six features above that derive from Deut 32 may best fit the overall context of Matt 3.¹⁰⁰

In the end, it is difficult to state with certainty what texts Matthew intends in his heavenly voice. Certainly the majority view that Psa 2.7 and Isa 42.1 are conflated remains a possibility, but other options must also be considered. It has been argued that there is sufficient warrant that Matthew may have in view OT texts that speak more explicitly of national Israel's sonship in Matt 3, especially since this is such a prominent aspect of the first four chapters of Matthew specifically, and the entire gospel in general. It has been suggested that a reference to Deut 32, perhaps as reflected in the targumic literature, is at least as likely, and apparently more likely, than the common suggestion of Psa 2.7 and/or *Tg. Pss. 2.7*. The hypothesis suggested here is by no means a definitive solution to the problem, but does provide a plausible explanation for the data and fits the narrative of Matthew's gospel. A more certain conclusion, however, could only be reached with additional research.

6.1.5 Summary of Matt 3.15–17

In light of all these connections, it is reasonable to conclude that both Matt 3 and 4 should be viewed against a common background. It is clear in Matt 4 that this background is Deuteronomy and Israel's sonship; it is therefore also likely that these are in view in Matt 3. The more explicit link to Deuteronomistic sonship in Matt 4 affects the way the baptism narrative in Matt 3 is to be viewed.¹⁰¹ This coincides with Kennedy's view that "[t]he treatment of the baptism and testing narratives together is important because...the testing narrative colors one's reading of the

¹⁰⁰ Since this section has argued for a possible Deuteronomistic background for the heavenly voice in Matt 3.17 that is based in part on targumic evidence, some other suggestions appealing to targumic translations should also be considered. Huizenga ("Akedah," 212), in conjunction with his overall thesis that an Isaac typology pervades Matthew, has pointed out some other targumic renderings that may support his thesis. In particular, he has noted that the terms *יחיד*, *בְּחִיר* are both used of Isaac in the targums of Gen 22, and specifically in *Tg. Neof. Lev 22.27*, and these terms may further be associated with Matthew's use of *εὐδοκέω*. However, the question remains how important these texts were for Matthew. The hypothesis of Deut 32 argued here has the advantage of being an *additional* reference to a text Matthew cites at least once elsewhere in his gospel (17.17), and probably more (12.39, 45; 16.4; 17.17).

There is also evidence that "beloved" (*אֲהָבָה*) is used in *Tg. Isa. 42.1*, and may therefore serve as background for *beloved son* in Matt 3.17. Given the likelihood that Isa 42.1 is in view in the second half of the heavenly voice, this is an option that cannot be dismissed. Nevertheless, it is proposed here that the confluence of the six features in favor of Deut 32 noted above better fit the textual evidence.

¹⁰¹ This statement assumes that Matthew was a document to be read/heard more than once (so Luz, *Matthew*, 1:6).

baptism narrative when these two sections are rightly viewed together within an overall narrative framework.”¹⁰²

6.2 Matt 17.1–21

Matthew’s Transfiguration account includes a divine voice that declares Jesus’ sonship (17.5), which is almost identical to 3.17. Matthew 17 is therefore best considered in light of the precedent of Matt 3 and the close relationship evident between Matt 3–4. The only difference in the divine voice is the addition of the phrase ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ in 17.5. The chart below compares the two passages:

Matt 3.17	Matt 17.5
Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα	Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα· <u>ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ</u>

The most significant aspect of Matt 17.5 for the present study is, as in Matt 3.17, the first part of the voice from the cloud. This is an appropriate focal point because the divine voice is the high point of the pericope.¹⁰³ It has already been argued in the discussion of Matt 3 that there are at least six reasons why a reference to Deut 32 in the heavenly voice fits well with the elements of Matthew’s narrative. These six factors cited in Matt 3 remain relevant for the present passage, but Matt 17 also provides additional support for this hypothesis.

6.2.1 Relationship to Matt 3–4

Before the divine voice of Matt 17 is considered in more detail, additional connections with Matt 3–4 should be noted. The most apparent point of contact is the recurrence of the divine voice almost precisely as found in 3.17.¹⁰⁴ Furthermore, Matthew, by adding ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα to the voice from the cloud in 17.5 (contra Mark, Luke), appears to have brought 17.5 and 3.17 in close correspondence with one

¹⁰² Kennedy, “Recapitulation,” 230.

¹⁰³ Gnllka, *Matthäusevangelium*, 2:96.

¹⁰⁴ One other variation in the Matt 17 account is the voice speaks not *from heaven* but from *a cloud* (ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης).

another.¹⁰⁵ It should also be noted that Jesus' Transfiguration takes place on a high mountain (ὄρος ὑψηλόν; 17.1), which may echo the similar location from Jesus' Temptation (Matt 4.8).¹⁰⁶ The divine voice, however, is the most explicit connection with Matt 3–4. The precise verbal correspondence between the voices, excepting only an additional phrase, renders it highly likely that 17.5 should be understood similarly to 3.17.¹⁰⁷ Thus it is suggested here that the voice from the cloud in 17.5 is, like 3.17, a combination of scriptural language deriving mainly from Deut 32, Isa 42, with the addition of a probable allusion to Deut 18. And these texts are again associated with Jesus' obedience.

6.2.2 Obedient Sonship and Suffering

Jesus' programmatic obedience is first declared in Matt 3 as he is said to fulfill all righteousness in association with his baptism. In Matt 16 the obedience of Jesus has begun to take on a new shape, the shape of *suffering*, though this was already anticipated in his baptism, as Jesus identified with Israel's baptism of repentance. Jesus' identification with his people is an indication that he intends to save his people from their sins (1.21), which he will do by pouring out his blood for the forgiveness of sins (26.28). Moreover (although this is debated), it is likely that Jesus is portrayed as Isaiah's (suffering) servant in Matt 3, given the likely allusion to Isa 42.1.¹⁰⁸

Although Jesus' suffering is anticipated in Matt 3, it is declared more explicitly beginning at Caesarea Philippi where Jesus declares in 16.21 that it was necessary for him to suffer, die, and rise again. Thus Jesus' task becomes more clearly one of suffering from Matt 16 onward, and the *obedience* of Jesus from this point is therefore bound up more obviously with his *suffering*, which culminates in

¹⁰⁵ Moses, *Matthew's Transfiguration*, 138; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:693; Gundry, *Commentary*, 344.

¹⁰⁶ John Paul Heil, *The Transfiguration of Jesus: Narrative Meaning and Function of Mark 9:2–8, Matt 17:1–8, and Luke 9:28–36* (AnBib 144; Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2000), 202–3; Luz, *Matthew*, 2:394.

¹⁰⁷ It is worth noting that, as in 3.17, a number of scholars also doubt that Matthew intended any reference to Psa 2.7, or to Davidic Christology, in the first part of 17.5. Indeed, the verbal correspondences between Psa 2.7 and 17.5 are weak. Cf. Moses, *Matthew's Transfiguration*, 140, 145. Those who see a reference to Psa 2.7 here often see this as an enthronization scene (so Gnllka, *Matthäusevangelium*, 2:96; Luz, *Matthew*, 2:397).

¹⁰⁸ Carson, "Matthew," 108; Turner, *Matthew*, 120. Note also the likely anointing of Jesus in 3.16, which may reflect a messianic understanding of Isa 61.1 (so France, *Matthew*, 472; cf., e.g., 4Q521).

his obedience unto death on a cross. This is significant because of the close connection of Matt 17.1–8 not only with 3.15–17, but also with 16.13–28. In Matt 16.16, which is the nadir of the first half of the gospel and one of the most significant pericopes in the entire book,¹⁰⁹ Peter confesses that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the Living God. This confession, which is not a verbatim citation of any OT passage, combines the concepts of the Davidic Messiah (χριστός)¹¹⁰ and divine sonship, with particular emphasis on the Jewish understanding of God as “the Living God.”¹¹¹ It is also possible that Matthew intends the two titles in 16.16 to convey both what Jesus *does* (Messiah) and who Jesus *is* (God’s Son).¹¹²

Although it is true that Peter’s confession of Jesus as the Christ draws more explicit attention to Jesus’ role as Messiah, it should not be missed that Peter is at the same time confessing Jesus *as Son of (the Living) God*. Peter’s declaration of Jesus’ sonship in Matt 16 is confirmed in the divine declaration of Jesus’ sonship in Matt 17,¹¹³ but in the new context of his glorious Transfiguration. So, Peter’s declaration of Jesus’ messianic sonship is followed immediately by Jesus’ declaration that his task as Messiah is to suffer, die, and rise again (16.21), and his call for his disciples to follow after him (16.24–28). It was after this (perhaps bewildering) sequence of events (who would expect that God’s Son must *suffer*?) that Matthew’s audience then encounters Jesus in a transfigured state, and the glorious nature of his sonship is revealed.¹¹⁴ Thus, the Transfiguration account of 17.1–8 is God’s response to the impending suffering of his Son.¹¹⁵ Davies and Allison also suggest, however, that (despite the glorious vision of Jesus in the Transfiguration) Matt 17.1–8 is like Matt 16.13–23 in that Jesus’ sonship is qualified by means of suffering service. This is

¹⁰⁹ So, e.g., Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew*, 2:474; Gnllka, *Matthäusevangelium*, 2:47; France, *Matthew*, 612.

¹¹⁰ Cf. Nolland, *Matthew*, 661–65.

¹¹¹ Note especially Deut 5.26; Hos 1.10. Th. De Kruijf (*Der Sohn des lebendigen Gottes: Ein Beitrag zur Christologie des Matthäusevangeliums* [AnBib 16; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1962], 87) suggests that “Son of the Living God” is parallel to “Christ” and is bound up with several images, including Servant, Son of Man, New Israel, and New Moses.

¹¹² France, *Matthew*, 619.

¹¹³ Moses, *Matthew’s Transfiguration*, 139; cf. Luz, *Matthew*, 2:394.

¹¹⁴ Cf. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:705–6; France, *Matthew*, 642.

¹¹⁵ Hagner, *Matthew*, 2:489; de Kruijf, *Der Sohn*, 88.

evidenced by the reference to Isa 42.1 in the voice from the cloud.¹¹⁶ Thus, for Matthew, suffering and glory are not antithetical, but in some way complementary.

Jesus' obedient suffering as God's Son is not only apparent in Matt 16–17, but also in his crucifixion (Matt 27.32–54). On the cross, much like Matt 4.1–11, Jesus is again tempted three times.¹¹⁷ Significantly, the first temptation on the cross in 27.40 echoes the precise wording of Matt 4.3, 6: εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ.¹¹⁸ Similarly, the second temptation on the cross also focuses on Jesus' sonship (27.43).¹¹⁹ Although the mockers do not understand how Jesus, the supposed Son of God, could undergo such suffering, it is clear from Matthew's gospel that Jesus' suffering was an integral part of his filial obedience. Davies and Allison note several other possible correspondences, or contrasts, between Matthew's Transfiguration and Crucifixion accounts, all of which find coherence in the shared christological claim that Jesus is God's Son.¹²⁰

Luz makes another valid observation about Jesus as God's Son in Matt 17.5: Matthew's audience has already been introduced to Jesus as the Son of God in the gospel, and the divine declaration in 17.5 directs the audience back to the macrotext of the gospel to discover in more detail who the Son of God is. For Luz, the answer (in part) is that Jesus is the *obedient* Son.¹²¹ It is also not to be missed that, like 3.17, the reference to Isaiah's servant is focused on the divine good-pleasure in Jesus' *actions*. The significant point for the present study of the coalescence of all these texts is the way in which Jesus' *obedience* is seen in his *suffering*, and this is part and parcel of his *sonship*. Indeed, a momentous confession comes from a Roman centurion who recognizes Jesus' divine sonship *after* Jesus' suffering and death (27.54). Thus: "Once Jesus has died in faithful obedience to the divine will of his

¹¹⁶ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:706.

¹¹⁷ These are (1) passers-by (27.39–40); (2) chief priests, scribes, elders (27.41–43); (3) two thieves (27.44); cf. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:607.

¹¹⁸ Cf. Terence L. Donaldson, "The Mockers and the Son of God (Matthew 27.37–44): Two Characters in Matthew's Story of Jesus," *JSNT* 41 (1991): 3–18.

¹¹⁹ Matt 27.43: πέποιθεν ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν, ῥυσάσθω νῦν εἰ θέλει αὐτόν· εἶπεν γὰρ ὅτι Θεοῦ εἰμι υἱός, likely echoing Wis 2.13.

¹²⁰ For a list of these corresponding features, see Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:706–7.

¹²¹ Luz, *Matthew*, 2:399.

Father, then his true, profound identity as God's Son can be publicly proclaimed, even by the Gentiles."¹²²

6.2.3 Obedient Sonship vs. Disobedient Sonship

Not only is Jesus' obedient sonship highlighted by his task of suffering, but Matt 17 also contrasts Jesus' obedient sonship to the inveterate recalcitrance of Israel via an allusion to Deut 32.5, 20 in 17.17. This provides additional support for the hypothesis that Matthew is drawing upon Deut 32 and/or interpretive traditions surrounding Deut 32 to articulate Jesus' filial obedience. After Jesus descends from the Mount of Transfiguration with Peter, James, and John he encounters a problem: the father of a boy who had a demon brought his son to Jesus' disciples, but they were unable to heal him. The father then besought Jesus to heal his son, which he did (17.18). The failure of Jesus' disciples serves as a stark contrast to the glorious revelation of Jesus on the mountain, and to his divine, obedient sonship.

Before Jesus healed the boy, he registered a specific complaint against his generation, calling it faithless (ἄπιστος) and perverse (δυστραμμένη). This language almost certainly reflects Deut 32, as γενεά, δυστραμμένη in 17.17 echo the same vocabulary from Deut 32.5 LXX, and γενεά, ἄπιστος echo γενεά, οὐκ ἔστιν πίστις from Deut 32.20 LXX.¹²³ Thus the allusions to Deut 32 in Matt 17.17 come from two verses (vv. 5, 20) that not only refer to a wicked generation, but *both* portions do so in conjunction with Israel's sonship; in Deut 32.5, Israel as a crooked and perverted generation has sacrificed their position as sons (or children, LXX), and in Deut 32.20 Israel as a perverted generation is equated with Israel as faithless sons. It is therefore significant that the chastisement of Jesus' generation in 17.17 immediately follows the climactic Transfiguration account in which he is declared to be God's Son (17.5). A contrast between Jesus and Israel, and co-ordinately between their statuses as *sons*, is therefore quite likely in Matt 17.¹²⁴ Jesus, as indicated by

¹²² Heil, *Transfiguration*, 249.

¹²³ Similar links with Deut 32 are noted by, e.g., Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:354; Gnllka, *Matthäusevangelium*, 2:107; Keener, *Matthew*, 367; Pierre Bonnard, *L'Évangile selon Saint Matthieu* (2d ed.; CNT 1; Neuchatel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1963), 260; Fiedler, *Matthäusevangelium*, 298; Turner, *Matthew*, 424; France, *Matthew*, 660–61; Blomberg, "Matthew," 56; cf. Index 4 in NA27.

¹²⁴ *Ipsa facto*, this also enhances the plausibility that a reference to Deut 32 in conjunction with the sonship of Jesus may be in view in Matt 3.17.

the voice from the cloud, is God's well-pleasing Son; the disciples and the crowd,¹²⁵ by contrast, are like the infamous generation of Moses' day: sons who demonstrated a lack of faith despite the wonders God had wrought among them.¹²⁶

It is also significant that "(this) generation" language, deriving from Deut 32, is again used by Matthew in association with Jesus' sonship. This has already been shown from Matt 11.16–19, and in Matt 17 the pattern emerges again. Indeed, it seems to be the case that Matthew links the "(this) generation" language from Deut 32 with various perspectives of what is required of God's children. This increases the probability that Matthew was aware of the sonship/child language of Deut 32.5, 20 and may be assuming these images as the background for these portions of his gospel.¹²⁷

An additional piece of evidence that may support the proposed allusions to Deut 32 is the Mosaic influence that pervades the Transfiguration account. This is evident in a number of Matthean features.¹²⁸ First, Matthew has changed Mark's order of the appearance of Elijah and Moses (Mark 9.4) to the appearance of Moses and Elijah (Matt 17.3), which probably emphasizes Moses. Second, in addition to the shining clothes of Jesus Matthew adds that Jesus' face shone like the sun (17.2), which is an echo of what happens to Moses in Exod 34.29–35. Third, the cloud that appears in Matthew is paradoxically said to be bright (φωτεινή). This is most likely a reference to the Shekinah that filled the wilderness tabernacle and the cloud which Moses entered in Exod 24.18. Fourth, in Exod 24.15–18 Moses ascended a mountain where he stayed for six days. Similarly, in his Transfiguration Jesus ascends a mountain after six days (Matt 17.1).

¹²⁵ It is probably best to maintain a distinction between the crowds and the disciples, but in this passage the actions of the disciples had become like that of the crowds which led Jesus to lament them both. Cf. Luz, *Matthew*, 2:408; J. R. C. Cousland, *The Crowds in the Gospel of Matthew* (NovTSup 102; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 22.

¹²⁶ Lövestam, "ἡ γενεὰ αὐτή," 411.

¹²⁷ Although the resonances with Deut 32 proposed here are also found in Luke 9.41, and therefore probably in Q, it is again to be noted that it would be misguided to assume that Matthew was *only* aware of Deut 32 from his sources (see above on 3.17). Additionally, it should also be recalled that the present approach is concerned primarily with sources as they are appropriated in Matthew, and not as source in themselves.

¹²⁸ For the first three points, see Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:685–87.

Fifth, the new addition to the voice not found in Matt 3.17 (ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ) is a Mosaic resonance.¹²⁹ Most understand this phrase to be a reference to the prophet predicted by Moses in Deut 18.15 (LXX: αὐτοῦ ἀκούσεσθε).¹³⁰ A reference to Deut 18.15 might also be reflected in the readings of, e.g., C L W Θ f¹³, which attest αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε and therefore stand closer to the LXX. Thus, Matthew has redacted his sources to make the Mosaic imagery more explicit. This in no way proves an allusion to Deut 32 in 17.5 and/or 17.17, but allusions to the Song of Moses in this portion of the gospel would be consistent with Matthew's sustained interest in Mosaic imagery in Matt 17. It may also be significant that the divine voice instructs Peter, James, and John to listen to Jesus, which is tantamount to instructing them to *obey* Jesus.¹³¹ The divine voice may therefore anticipate the lack of faith of the disciples and the uniqueness of Jesus as the one in whom the disciples are to place their faith in 17.17–20.¹³²

6.2.4 Summary of Matt 17.1–21

In the end, the OT background for Matthew's Transfiguration account is probably meant to be polyvalent—the audience is to recognize various elements, but all these fit together.¹³³ Thus, as with Matt 3.17, it is difficult to say with certainty which texts Matt may have understood as the background for the voice from the cloud in 17.5; Matthew may well have intended a number of passages, or scriptural language in general, to account for the voice. Given this difficulty in establishing the precise background for Matthew's language, it has been suggested above that Deut 32 should be considered a possibility. A reference to Deut 32 in Matt 17.5 would be especially fitting in light of Matthew's allusion to Deut 32.5, 20 in Matt 17.17, and it and would also comport with his concern to emphasize Jesus as the obedient Son of God in contrast to the disobedience that was characteristic of Israel.

¹²⁹ All these Mosaic resonances correlate well with the allusions to Deut 32 and the (Mosaic) wilderness generation in Matt 17.17.

¹³⁰ So a majority of commentators, including Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:686; Bonnard, *Matthieu*, 255; Gnllka, *Matthäusevangelium*, 2:96; France, *Matthew*, 650; Nolland, *Matthew*, 704; Luz, *Matthew*, 2:395–96; de Kruijf, *Der Sohn*, 57; cf. Marcus, *Way of the Lord*, 81. Another possibility (suggested by my colleague Daniel Johannson) is Exod 23.21.

¹³¹ BDAG *s.v.*(4).

¹³² Cf. Turner, *Matthew*, 418.

¹³³ So Luz, *Matthew*, 2:397.

6.3 Summary: Matt 3, 17

The preceding discussion has set forth a new hypothesis that the influence of Deut 32 may be found in the heavenly voices of Matt 3.17; 17.5. The Song of Moses was clearly known by Matthew, and the thematic parallels contrasting Jesus' obedient sonship with Israel's disobedient sonship are especially striking. Moreover, the contexts of Matt 3.15–17 (focusing on sonship and obedience in light of Israel, and its close relationship to Matt 4), and Matt 17.1–8 (followed closely by verbal parallels to Deut 32) further support this hypothesis. Taken together, these texts are significant possibilities, perhaps even probabilities, that may reveal Matthew's concern in articulating Jesus' obedient sonship in light of Deuteronomy.

Before concluding this study, three additional *possible allusions* to Deuteronomic sonship will be considered in the next chapter.

Chapter Seven

Deuteronomic Sonship in Matthew

Part 3: Possible Allusions

Having considered strong and likely allusions to Deuteronomic sonship in Matthew (chapter 5), and some significant possibilities (chapter 6), attention will now be given to several Matthean texts that fit with the present proposal and may also betray the influence of Deuteronomy in association with obedient sonship.

7.1 Matt 1.20

Given the prominence of the Song of Moses in the ancient world, along with the numerous allusions to Deut 32 in Matthew, it is proposed here that Deut 32.18 serves as a scriptural precedent for the unique imagery of Jesus' begetting by the Holy Spirit in Matt 1.20.¹ Matthew 1.18–25 recounts the revelation to and response of Joseph to the angelic message that Mary was with child. The key verse for the present purposes comes in 1.20: τὸ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθῆν ἐκ πνεύματός ἐστιν ἁγίου.² It is highly significant that the verb γεννάω is used to describe God's begetting of Israel in Deut 32.18 (θεὸν τὸν γεννήσαντά σε), and the ascription of this activity to God is exceedingly rare in the LXX. Moreover, this term here translates the Hebrew יָלַד (Qal), a verb that is attributed to God even more rarely in the MT than γεννάω is in the LXX.³ Relevant LXX passages include Isa 1.2; 66.9; Psa 2.7; Prov 8.25, and Psa 109.3 LXX attests a slightly different verb (ἐκγεννάω). Texts from the MT to consider include Num 11.12; Psa 2.7 (with 1QSa II, 11 being another

¹ This section summarizes Brandon D. Crowe, "The Song of Moses and Divine Begetting in Matt 1.20," *Bib* 90 (2009): 47–58.

² The construction of the last three words is a bit awkward, but similar constructions referring to the Holy Spirit occur in Luke 2.25; Acts 1.5.

³ Roland S. Hendel ("'Begetting' and 'Being Born' in the Pentateuch: Notes on Historical Linguistics and Source Criticism," *VT* 50 (2000): 38–46) notes that the Hiphil of יָלַד came to replace the Qal by exilic and post-exilic times when speaking particularly of a father's (causal) role in begetting. However, he considers Deut 32.18 to be pre-exilic and therefore predates this practice.

possible parallel). If one were to search for an OT allusion in the reference to Jesus' begetting by the Holy Spirit in Matt 1.20, any of these texts might be considered a possibility. However, it may be that the language of divine begetting in combination with the prominence of filial language throughout Deut 32 render the associations between Deut 32.18 and Matt 1.20 stronger than these other possibilities.⁴ Four reasons support this.

First, allusions to Deut 32.5, 20 throughout Matthew⁵ indicate that Matthew almost certainly knew Deut 32, specifically the portions that refer to Israel as God's son. Second, the thematic link of divine sonship links Deut 32 with Matt 1. The theme of divine sonship has already been expounded from Deut 32, and a similar concept of Jesus as the Son of God is likely in view in Matt 1. This last point, however, is contested.⁶ Some have argued instead that Matt 1 primarily concerns Jesus' *Davidic* sonship rather than his *divine* sonship.⁷ However, the motif of Jesus' Davidic sonship, though clearly a concern of Matthew here and throughout the gospel, does not eclipse Jesus' divine sonship. Instead, *both* Jesus' divine sonship *and* his Davidic sonship are key themes for Matthew and these cannot be ultimately separated.⁸ However, if one must distinguish the two it appears that Jesus' divine sonship is the *basis for* his Davidic sonship: "Matthew indicates that Jesus is able to function as son of David *precisely because* he is also the Son of God who has been conceived by the Holy Spirit (1:18, 20)."⁹

A third reason to see an allusion to Deut 32.18 in Matt 1.20 is the way this would anticipate two important themes already noted throughout Matthew. These

⁴ A polyvalent textual background for this image should not be disallowed. I am simply suggesting that Matt 1.20 may be a more prominent allusion.

⁵ See above on Matt 11 (chapter 5), and Matt 3, 17 (chapter 6).

⁶ Those that see divine sonship in Matt 1 include Rudolf Pesch, "Der Gottessohn im mattsäischen Evangelienprolog (Mt 1–2): Beobachtungen zu den Zitationsformeln der Reflexionszitate," *Bib* 48 (1967): 395–420; Oscar Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament* (trans. S. Guthrie and C. Hall; 2d ed.; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963), 296; Lidija Novakovic, *Messiah, the Healer of the Sick: A Study of Jesus as the Son of David in the Gospel of Matthew* (WUNT II/170; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 46–47.

⁷ So John Nolland, "No Son-of-God-Christology in Matthew 1:18–25," *JSNT* 62 (1996): 3–12.

⁸ So Marshall D. Johnson, *The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies: With Special Reference to the Setting of the Genealogies of Jesus* (2d ed.; SNTSMS 8; Cambridge: CUP, 1988), 224–28.

⁹ David R. Bauer, "The Kingship of Jesus in the Matthean Infancy Narrative: A Literary Analysis," *CBQ* 57 (1995): 306–23; so Gerhardsson, *Mighty Acts*, 89.

are: (1) Jesus as the obedient Son of God, in contrast to (2) disobedient Israel.¹⁰ As demonstrated above, Matthew clearly portrays Jesus as the obedient Son of God in contrast to Israel elsewhere in his gospel (especially in chapters 1–4), and this passage may be one more indication of this pattern. Although Matt 1.20 would be only a veiled reference to Jesus’ filial obedience, it would lie squarely in the trajectory that becomes clearer as the first few chapters of Matthew unfold. Jesus’ obedience is also highlighted by the pronouncement in 1.21 that he will save his people from their sins.¹¹ Whatever one’s view on who Matthew intends by the phrase τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ in 1.21,¹² a probable allusion to Psa 129.8 LXX (130.8 MT), which speaks of *Israel’s* redemption, and the lengths to which Matthew has gone in the genealogy to link Jesus with Israel’s history, suggest 1.21 must refer in some sense to Israel. If it is correct to see in Jesus’ begetting by the Holy Spirit an allusion to Israel’s divine begetting in Deut 32.18, this would link Jesus anaphorically to Israel’s failures in the exile (1.11–12, 17), and cataphorically to Israel’s need of redemption (1.21). Indeed, the sin in view in 1.21 includes Israel’s exile mentioned in the genealogy,¹³ which was a primary curse of Deuteronomy in general (Deut 28.36–38), and the Song of Moses in particular (Deut 32.21). Thus, the application of a text that speaks of Israel’s divine begetting from the Song of Moses to Jesus would both closely identify him with Israel and distinguish him from them as their Deliverer who will be seen to “fulfill all righteousness” (3.15).

A fourth reason that supports a possible reference to Deut 32.18 in Matt 1.20 is the shared imagery of creation.¹⁴ The understanding of βίβλος γενέσεως has been

¹⁰ J. R. C. Cousland (*The Crowds in the Gospel of Matthew* [NovTSup 102; Leiden: Brill, 2002], 22) observes that the Jewish people in Matthew are portrayed as both a lost flock who are drawn to Jesus, their true Shepherd, and as the obdurate people of God who have perennially and consistently rejected God’s messengers. Cousland’s study suggests that the paradox of the crowds is the paradox of the Jewish people. The emphasis on obduracy is also a major emphasis in the Song of Moses.

¹¹ Note also that Matt 9.13 identifies God’s people as sinners. So Mark Allan Powell, “The Plots and Subplots of Matthew’s Gospel,” *NTS* 38 (1992): 187–204.

¹² For various options on this phrase see Ulrich Luz, *Matthew: A Commentary* (3 vols.; trans. J. Crouch; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001–7), 1:95; R. T. France, *The Gospel of Matthew* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 53; W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, Jr., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew* (3 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988–97), 1:210; David L. Turner, *Matthew* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 67–68.

¹³ Boris Repschinski, “‘For He Will Save His People from Their Sins’ (Matthew 1:21): A Christology for Christian Jews,” *CBQ* 68 (2006): 248–67.

¹⁴ This portion of the argument continues the discussion of Deut 32 in Matt 3 from chapter 6.

widely debated in Matt 1.1, and one aspect of the debates centers around whether some notion of (new) creation is intended by Matthew. If Deut 32—a chapter which has already been shown to echo language and imagery from Gen 1.2 (cf. Deut 32.11)—has been employed in the account of Jesus’ conception, this would support the interpretation that Matt 1 evokes elements of creation from the Book of Genesis.¹⁵ Indeed, this connection with creation would also help to explain how Deut 32.18 could be in view in Matt 1.20 since Matthew, unlike Deut 32, does not attribute the begetting to God, but to the Holy Spirit. However, this is ultimately not a problem when one considers in greater detail the role Matthew attributes to the Spirit.

Among the Synoptics, Matthew most closely associates the Spirit with God the Father.¹⁶ Illustrative of this is Matt 4.1, as the Spirit leads Jesus into the wilderness. The verb used here is ἀνάγω, which suggests a more personal agent than Mark’s ἐκβάλλω as it recalls Yahweh’s personal direction in the wilderness wanderings.¹⁷ Other texts that closely relate the Spirit to God the Father include Matt 3.16; 10.20; 12.18, 31. From the entirety of Matthew’s teaching on the Spirit one can conclude that, for Matthew, the Spirit is God’s powerful and empowering agent to accomplish God’s purposes in the world. Thus, although Matt 1.20 does not explicitly state that *God* had begotten the child in Mary, in light of the Spirit’s close connection with God the Father throughout Matthew, the divine implications are unavoidable: for Mary to be with child by the Holy Spirit is for her to be with child by God himself. This is not to posit a male role for the Spirit, but instead it is best to identify the activity of the Spirit so closely with God that Jesus’ conception by the Spirit is virtually equivalent to stating God is the one who wrought this event in Mary. Once this has been established, one can justifiably speak of Jesus’ divine sonship in this passage.

It may also be significant that the Spirit was commonly understood to be the agent of creation; the role of the Spirit in Jesus’ conception likewise suggests *new*

¹⁵ For creation imagery in Matt 1, see Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:149–54; France, *Matthew*, 28; André Paul, *L’Évangile de l’Enfance selon Saint Matthieu* (LiBi 17; Paris: Cerf, 1968), 48.

¹⁶ Jane Schaberg, *The Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit: The Triadic Phrase in Matthew 28.19b* (SBLDS 61; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1982), 24. She also notes the close connection with Jesus and the Spirit, especially in the infancy narrative.

¹⁷ So Craig S. Keener, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 137. Cf. Exod 15.22; Deut 8.2; Luke 4.1 (ἀγω).

creation. The creative role of the Spirit may further explain the use of Deut 32 in Matt 1, since (as noted above) only in Gen 1.2 and Deut 32.11 does one find the Piel of רָחַף, as the Spirit of God hovers over the waters on the one hand, and Yahweh hovers over Israel on the other. In addition, language from Gen 1.2 is apparent in Deut 32.10, where Egypt, like the primordial world, is described as תְּהוֹ. The reference here to the Exodus is significant because this paradigmatic event is portrayed as the *creation* of the nation of Israel as God’s special people (and therefore as God’s *son* [Exod 4.22]), and Exodus imagery is clearly important for Matthew. The overlap between Israel’s redemption and creation is especially conveyed by the term קָנָה in Exod 15.16; Deut 32.6, the latter of which is related explicitly to God as Israel’s Father.¹⁸ Thus, in Deut 32 Israel’s deliverance is related to Israel’s sonship by means of creational language. An allusion to Deut 32.18 in Matt 1.20 may evoke this creative imagery and redemptive imagery, further connecting the beginning of the gospel with Deut 32 and Gen 1.¹⁹ It has been argued that there are insufficient grounds for connecting the spirit’s activity in Jesus’ birth with new creation because the latter does not offer an adequate explanation of Jesus’ divine sonship.²⁰ However, a reference to Deut 32 in Matt 1 is able to link the supernatural begetting of Jesus with (new) creation via Israel, thereby answering this objection. Again it is to be noted that a number of the links between Gen 1 and the Song of Moses are only apparent in the MT,²¹ so if Matthew did observe these connections, he probably did so from a Hebrew text.

In sum, these four factors point to the possibility that Matthew may have intended the begetting of Jesus by the Holy Spirit to recall Israel’s national, divine begetting in Deut 32. This would be an additional example of Jesus connecting the sonship of Jesus to that of Israel by means of Deut 32, and might also anticipate the obedience of Jesus as the fulfillment of Israel.

¹⁸ S. R. Driver, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1895), 354; Brevard S. Childs, *The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary* (OTL; Louisville: John Knox, 1974), 251. Deut 32.6 LXX employs κτίζω.

¹⁹ There may also be hints of messianic expectations wrapped up in conception by the Spirit, which was thought to have a *recreating* and *revivifying* power in the days of the Messiah. Cf. C. K. Barrett, *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition* (London: SPCK, 1966), 21–24.

²⁰ So Novakovic, *Messiah*, 46–50.

²¹ Note especially Deut 32.10–11 in relation to Gen 1.2

7.2 Matt 12.46–50

An additional passage that relates the concepts of sonship and obedience in close conjunction with Deut 32 is found in Matt 12. This passage, however, has more thematic coherence than verbal parallels with Deuteronomy. In response to a bystander who told Jesus that the physical brothers and mother of Jesus were nearby and wanted to speak to Jesus, Jesus took the opportunity to explain who his true family is, declaring in 12.49 that his disciples are his mother and brothers. He then explains this in 12.50: ὅστις γὰρ ἂν ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς αὐτός μου ἀδελφὸς καὶ ἀδελφὴ καὶ μήτηρ ἐστίν. It has already been noted that θέλημα is a favorite Matthean word, and it is used again here.²² As in 7.21, in 12.50 doing the will of Jesus' Father must characterize Jesus' disciples, which here are portrayed as his true family.²³

It is to be noted that Jesus is portrayed here as “Son” through the reference to his Father. Indeed, the phrase “τοῦ πατρὸς μου” that highlights Jesus' sonship is a Matthean redaction. More broadly, θέλημα for Matthew is always the θέλημα of the *Father* (primarily *Jesus' Father*, but also the *Father of the disciples*—but this is the same Father; cf. 6.10; 7.21; 12.50; 18.14; 26.42),²⁴ and thus is indissolubly associated with Jesus' sonship. The claim that Jesus' sonship is in view here finds further support when the overall familial context of the pericope is considered. The focus in this passage is certainly on the disciples of Jesus who are to do his Father's will, but Jesus' statement also necessarily assumes that he himself accomplishes his Father's will.²⁵ Indeed, Matthew's preference for “the will of my Father” highlights not only Jesus' filial relationship to God, but also the obedient nature of Jesus' sonship.²⁶ This is similar to the concept of *righteousness* in Matthew: Jesus

²² Matthew here (and only here) follows Mark's use of θέλημα (Mark 3.35), but this is Mark's only use of the term.

²³ It is to be noted that Jesus' family here extends to both male and female (brothers, sisters, mother). Cf. Deut 32.19.

²⁴ The only exception to this is 21.31, The Parable of the Two Sons, which nevertheless refers to the will of a father. See similarly Henry Pattarumadathil, *Your Father in Heaven: Discipleship in Matthew as a Process of Becoming Children of God* (AnBib 172; Rome Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2008), 76.

²⁵ This goes one step farther than Stephen C. Barton (*Discipleship and Family Ties in Mark and Matthew* [SNTSMS 80; Cambridge: CUP, 1994], 189) who focuses on Jesus as the ultimate *revealer* of the Father's will.

²⁶ So Brian M. Nolan, *The Royal Son of God: The Christology of Matthew 1–2 in the Setting of the Gospel* (OBO 23; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), 219.

uniquely accomplishes righteousness, but call his disciples to righteous living. Similarly, Jesus is the definitive accomplisher of his Father’s will (26.42), yet instructs his disciples that they too must share in the accomplishment of his will.²⁷ One can even say that Jesus not only proclaims the Father’s will, but is also himself its complete identity.²⁸ Donald Verseput summarizes the significance of Jesus and the will of Jesus’ Father for Matthew well: “The implication of Matthew’s unique introduction of the divine Fatherhood language into the account, plus his explicit equation between being a disciple of Jesus and doing the Father’s will, is obvious: the Father and Son enjoy a complete unity of purpose.”²⁹

The call to obedient sonship in this passage may further be underscored by a contrast to the sonship of Israel from Deut 32. Matthew 12.46 begins with the genitive absolute³⁰ (and Matthean redactional phrase) “Ἐπι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος,” which also occurs in 17.5; 26.47. In all three of these occurrences, along with 9.18, the genitive absolute connects the following accounts closely to the words of Jesus that precede them. Significantly, negative references to “(this) generation” are found in 12.39, 41–42, 45, with at least 12.39 (and perhaps also the other three occurrences to a lesser extent) most likely echoing Deut 32.5.³¹ It should also be noted that 12.45 is an additional reference to “(this) generation” that is likely not found in Matthew’s sources.³² Thus it is clear in 12.39–45 that Jesus—likely drawing from Deut 32—is chastising the generation of his contemporaries for being like the generation of Moses’ day, and this is closely related conceptually and syntactically to the call for Jesus’ disciples to do the Father’s will (after the manner of Jesus) in 12.46–50.

²⁷ R. W. L. Moberly, *The Bible, Theology, and Faith: A Study of Abraham and Jesus* (CSCD; Cambridge: CUP, 2000), 224.

²⁸ Wolfgang Trilling, *Das Wahre Israel: Studien zur Theologie des Matthäusevangeliums* (ETS 7; Leipzig, St. Benno, 1959), 163.

²⁹ Donald J. Verseput, “The Role and Meaning of the ‘Son of God’ Title in Matthew’s Gospel,” *NTS* 33 (1987): 532–66, here 544. Cf. de Kruijf, *Der Sohn*, 125.

³⁰ BDF §423.

³¹ Admittedly, only γενεά is shared vocabulary with Deut 32.5 LXX in Matt 12.39, but a number of commentators recognize the influence of Deut 32.5 here, including Davies and Allison (*Matthew*, 2:354), Keener (*Matthew*, 367), Gnilka (*Matthäusevangelium*, 465), Donald A. Hagner (*Matthew* [2 vols.; WBC 33A–B; Waco: Word, 1993–95], 1:354), France (*Matthew*, 367), Turner (*Matthew*, 326); cf. Index 4 in NA27.

³² So Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:362.

In sum, the role of 12.46–50 for the present thesis is primarily thematic. Here is another account in which sonship and obedience are linked. The focus is on the disciples, but the assumption of the passage is that Jesus is able to demand obedience to his Father’s will because he himself is the ultimate fulfiller of his Father’s will. Moreover, familial obedience in 12.50 may be contrasted with Israel’s disobedient sonship from the Song of Moses. This is possible because of the four negative references to “(this) generation” in 12.39–45, a concept which has likely been influenced by Deut 32.5 in Matthew.

7.3 Matt 21.28–22.14

Matthew 21.28–22.14 contains what has been called “Matthew’s Trilogy of Parables,” all of which are focused around Israel’s story.³³ These parables are significant for the present study because all three address the theme(s) of sonship and obedience, and this thematic link is strong enough to suggest a Deuteronomic understanding of sonship is in view. Moreover, the function of the parables in Matthew may reveal some of Matthew’s christological concerns. It will thus be argued below that a Deuteronomic background sheds light on, and is perhaps the presupposition of, these three parables. These parables thus may provide important corroborative evidence for the present thesis as part of a larger cumulative case.

6.3.1 The Two Sons

The first parable is commonly known as “The Two Sons.”³⁴ Before any investigation of this parable can be made, the text critical problems in this passage must be addressed. The main issue is whether the first son said he would not go and work in the father’s vineyard, but then later repented and did work, or if this was actually the second son. The other son (whether he comes first or second in the parable) in both readings says he will work, but ultimately does not. Two major readings are proposed for this passage.³⁵ The first reading, which is the majority

³³ So Wesley G. Olmstead, *Matthew’s Trilogy of Parables: The Nation, the Nations, and the Reader in Matthew 21.28–22.14* (SNTSMS 127; Cambridge: CUP, 2003), esp. 128.

³⁴ The text actually reads τέκνα, but the subject matter of working in a vineyard would likely have been more naturally assumed to be the task of a son rather than a daughter (cf. Luz, *Matthew*, 3:30). Although daughters cannot be ruled out altogether, it is not likely that they are in view in this parable (although Nolland [*Matthew*, 861n.53] leaves this possibility open).

³⁵ For a discussion of the issues, see Olmstead, *Trilogy*, 170–76; Paul Foster, “A Tale of Two Sons: But Which One Did the Far, Far Better Thing? A Study of Matt 21.28–32,” *NTS* 47 (2001): 26–37.

opinion at present, holds that it is the *first* son who did not respond with alacrity, but then regrets his decision and decides to work.³⁶ This reading has the distinction of having probably the best external evidence ((**8**) C L W (Z) D *f*¹ 33 *M* al.). However, the external evidence is not conclusive, as the “C” rating in UBS4 indicates. Moreover, as Foster notes, this reading only became the printed reading in the 26th edition of the Nestle-Aland text; in the 25th edition the editorial committee opted for the present minority position (in which the second son obeyed) attested in B Θ *f*¹³ 700 al.³⁷

This second reading, though with slightly less external support, best accords with the internal evidence of Matthew, and fits especially well with the other two parables in the trilogy.³⁸ Olmstead summarizes six parallel features in this trilogy of parables that favor the second reading:³⁹ (1) each parable begins with an invitation issued by an authority; (2) the invitation goes out repeatedly; (3) the invitation is repeatedly spurned (and ambassadors despised); (4) each parable includes characters who accept the invitation; (5) all three pronounce judgment on the unfaithful; (6) all three announce the replacement of the unfaithful with a scandalous cast that yields to the man’s wishes. More broadly, there is a salvation-historical element that favors the second reading. In this parable the first son, who according to the preferred reading here agrees to do the father’s will, represents the Jewish leadership who did not do the will of Jesus’ Father. The second son, who is ultimately obedient, represents the church or church leaders who have come to replace the antagonistic Jewish leadership of Jesus’ generation (!).⁴⁰ Moreover, this is the order in which the

There is also a third option: that the (second) son who merely *promised* to work was the one who did the father’s will. This is supported by D it sy^{s(c)}. This reading is certainly the most difficult, and could explain the rise of the other readings, but it is more likely a conflation of the other two readings. It also likely assumes the Pharisees knowingly gave the wrong answer. There is not, however, any reason to think this the case in the text, and this reading (which borders on the nonsensical) should be dismissed. A variant of the third option has been proposed by J. Ramsey Michaels (“The Parable of the Regretful Son,” *HTR* 61 [1968]: 15–26), but his reconstructed reading suffers from having no extant textual witness. Cf. Olmstead, *Trilogy*, 169.

³⁶ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:167n.18; Luz, *Matthew*, 3:25–26; Nolland, *Matthew*, 860.

³⁷ Foster, “Tale,” 27.

³⁸ Scholars who opt for the second reading include Foster; Olmstead (*Trilogy*, 170–76); D. A. Carson (“Matthew,” in vol. 8 of *The Expositor’s Bible Commentary: Matthew, Mark, Luke* [ed. F. Gaebelain; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984; repr., 1995], 449).

³⁹ Olmstead, *Trilogy*, 172–73.

⁴⁰ So Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:184; Foster, “Tale,” 35–36. It is to be stressed that Matthew’s concern in this salvation-historical scheme is not Jews vs. Gentiles, but may be described

characters of Jesus' parables normally appear: the respectable appearing first, which gives way to the unlikely. In sum, although neither of the two major readings is without difficulties, the second reading best aligns with the internal evidence and has sufficient external evidence to suggest that it is the original Matthean text.

Nevertheless, whichever of the two main readings one chooses, it is clear that it is the son who eventually *worked* in the vineyard, and not the son who merely *said* he would, that does the will of the father.⁴¹ The thought articulated in this parable is thus closely akin to the words of Jesus in 7.21; 12.50:⁴² participation in the kingdom of God is not a matter of words, but a matter of actions. Matthew's concern here is to emphasize the necessity of obedience to Jesus, and he uses the concept of filial obedience, and the necessity of the disciples' own filial obedience, to make his point.

The phrase *θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς* has already been noted above in association with 7.21; 12.50, but its presence in this passage is also suggestive. In these other two occurrences of this phrase in association with the verb *ποιέω*, the role of Jesus as the Son—the Son who does the will of his Father—is assumed. It is quite likely that the similar phrasing in the Parable of the Two Sons would recall for Matthew's audience these preceding passages. Indeed, it may even be that this parable has christological overtones that suggests *Jesus* is the Son who does the will of the Father.

This inevitably leads to a larger question of the christological role of parables in general, a question that is tied up with concepts of allegory. Many early church fathers had an affinity for allegorical interpretations of the parables, such as Augustine's well-known reading of The Good Samaritan (Luke 10.25–37) in which every portion of the parable correlates to various aspects of Christianity that seemingly have little basis in the text.⁴³ The prevailing approach of the early 20th century, as represented by Adolf Jülicher, was to reject allegory altogether.⁴⁴ This

either as segments *within* Israel, or alternatively as religious leaders vs. public sinners. Cf. Turner, *Matthew*, 510; Carson, "Matthew," 450.

⁴¹ So Luz, *Matthew*, 3:30.

⁴² See also Trilling, *Israel*, 161–63; Olmstead, *Trilogy*, 100.

⁴³ For a summary of Augustine's reading, see C. H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom* (4th ed.; London: Nisbet, 1936), 11–12.

⁴⁴ Adolf Jülicher, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu. Erster Teil. Die Gleichnisreden Jesus im Allgemeinen* (2d ed.; Freiburg: Mohr Siebeck, 1899), 50. Jülicher discusses allegory because: "Man muss den Feind kennen, wenn man ihn zu vernichten wünscht"!

approach was followed in large degree by Dodd and Jeremias, although they were critical of Jülicher's approach that focused primarily on the generic elements in the parables.⁴⁵ However, many scholars today admit that the exegete cannot so easily dismiss all allegorical elements of parables.⁴⁶ There is, however, a distinction between *Allegorie* and *Allegorese* which is to be maintained. Whereas the latter is an exegetical method that disregards authorial intent and reads correlations into a text arbitrarily and thus should not be followed, the former recognizes authorial intent in which symbolism has been woven into the text and should be heeded.⁴⁷

As Snodgrass correctly notes, most parables are more overtly *theocentric* than *christocentric*.⁴⁸ It thus behoves the exegete to consider the primary focus of the parable before asking questions of a more christological nature.⁴⁹ Nevertheless, the parables must not be read in isolation from the larger gospel narratives. As Olmstead, writing from a narrative-critical perspective, perceptively observes: “Gospels [*sic*] parables help shape both the characterisation of the story's leading players and its developing plot. Conversely, the impact of the wider story leaves its mark upon the reader's reception of these parables.”⁵⁰ Therefore, questions of Christology are valid for parables inasmuch as they contribute to the overall narrative of the gospel. Moreover, it is not always easy to distinguish Jesus' teaching from his self-revelation. Davies and Allison trenchantly note:

It is also not unthinkable that Jesus' parables, like so much of his other teaching, was intentionally infused with an implicit Christology which would be apparent only to some, and that Jesus purposely composed

⁴⁵Dodd, *Parables*, 24; Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus* (trans. S. Hooke; London: SCM Press, 1954), 16.

⁴⁶ So Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:380.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*; Klyne Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent: A Comprehensive Guide to the Parables of Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 4–6, 16–17, 581n.19, 587n.79.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 20.

⁴⁹ An intriguing possibility is articulated by J. Ramsey Michaels (*Servant and Son: Jesus in Parable and Gospel* [Atlanta: John Knox, 1981], especially 103–7), who suggests that Jesus' parables may have been (visionary) revelations from God to Jesus. Michaels proposes that if Jesus did indeed hear/see such stories from his Father, he may have found himself in the story (particularly as servant or son), and may have asked how he himself related to the parable. Michaels does not consider this to be *allegorical* interpretation, but labels it “audience identification.” Michaels thus considers parables to be at the very root of Christology since they may have powerfully shaped Jesus' self-understanding. Michaels's hypothesis is a fascinating possibility, but this study will not adopt his approach.

⁵⁰ Olmstead, *Trilogy*, 15 (emphasis original).

literary units whose depths could be reached only by the protracted pondering of those willing to explore beneath the surface.⁵¹

Inasmuch as this is the case, christological questions should likely not be disregarded altogether for any parable.

However, there is nothing in this particular parable that necessitates an allegorical or christological interpretation.⁵² In fact, Davies and Allison suggest that the reason τέκνα is used instead of υἱός is to distinguish these parabolic sons from Jesus himself.⁵³ Nevertheless, although it is probably going too far for this parable to suggest an overtly christological interpretation, it is clear that the obedient son in this parable does the *will of his father*. In the overall narrative this is exactly what Jesus himself does, and what his disciples are called to do. And, although this passage does not contain any perceptible references to Deuteronomy, the concurrence of this parable with other Matthean passages (especially 7.21; 12.50) suggests that this may be another way for Matthew to emphasize the necessity of filial obedience, even as it relates to Jesus. Thus a conceptual correspondence with Deuteronomic sonship—which Matthew shows awareness for elsewhere—is possible in this parable from Matthew’s *Sondergut*.

7.3.2 The Tenants

The second parable in this trilogy, The Parable of the (Wicked) Tenants (21.33–46) is more explicitly allegorical, and therefore christological. Indeed, although allegorical interpretations of Jesus’ parables are often eschewed, a striking number of commentators recognize allegorical elements in this highly significant parable, which therefore gives it a christological focus.⁵⁴ In this parable a landowner plants a vineyard, hires tenants to work it, and then departs. When the harvest came,

⁵¹ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:382. See similarly J. J. Vincent, “The Parables as Self-Revelation,” in *Studia Evangelica* (ed. K. Aland et al.; Berlin: Akademie, 1959), 79–99; Joseph Ratzinger, *Jesus of Nazareth: From the Baptism in the Jordan to the Transfiguration* (New York: Doubleday, 2007), 199.

⁵² So Snodgrass, *Stories*, 274.

⁵³ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:166.

⁵⁴ Jeremias, *Parables*, 55; Matthew Black, “The Parables as Allegory,” *BJRL* 42 (1960): 273–87; Arland J. Hultgren, *The Parables of Jesus: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 362; Snodgrass, *Stories*, 276. Herm. Sim. V.2.1–11 seems to be an early christological understanding of the Tenants.

the tenants beat, killed, and stoned the successive servants who came to collect the harvest. A second wave of servants was sent, but they were abused to a greater extent. Finally—and this is the key to the parable—the landowner sends his son, but the tenants treat him worst of all and seek his inheritance for their own. The tenants threw the son out of the vineyard and killed him.⁵⁵ The account concludes with an accusation made by Jesus against the religious leaders indicating that their desire to kill Jesus correlated to the tenants in the vineyard, and he then applied Psa 118.22–23 (117 LXX) to himself.

Several points should be noted about this parable. First, and perhaps most obviously, Jesus is portrayed as the *son* of the landowner (=God) in this passage. He thus comes as God’s final envoy, following in the footsteps of the servants (=prophets).⁵⁶ Interestingly, Matthew refers to the son simply as τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ (21.37), whereas Mark and Luke read “beloved son” (Mark 12.6: υἱὸν ἀγαπητόν; Luke 20.13: τὸν υἱόν μου τὸν ἀγαπητόν).⁵⁷ One wonders why Matthew would omit “beloved” if it were extant in his sources, but it may be that he wanted to reserve it for the Baptism and Transfiguration.⁵⁸ Regardless of the origin of Matthew’s text at this point, it is clear that the death of the son at the hands of the tenants mirrors the desires of the religious leaders whom Jesus was addressing, who would actually succeed in killing Jesus the Son (21.43–46).

Second, since most recognize that this parable is about Israel, the OT background to this passage is significant. Four texts will be noted here. The primary text is surely Isaiah’s Song of the Vineyard (Isa 5.1–7), which likens Israel to a vineyard who produces bad fruit, even though the LORD cared for it.⁵⁹ A second key text is Psa 118.22–23 [117 LXX] (cited in 21.42)—a psalm that was likely

⁵⁵ In Mark and Luke the son is killed inside the vineyard.

⁵⁶ Luz, *Matthew*, 3:40. This term adapted from Marinus de Jonge, *God’s Final Envoy: Early Christology and Jesus’ Own View of His Mission* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).

⁵⁷ The textual tradition for Matthew is remarkably stable at this point. The Nestle-Aland apparatus lists no witnesses in which ἀγαπητός is found in Matt 21.37.

⁵⁸ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:182n.48. Ivor Jones (*The Matthean Parables: A Literary and Historical Commentary* [NovTSup 80; Leiden: Brill, 1995], 382) thinks the omission is pre-Matthean.

⁵⁹ Although in Isaiah the vineyard is destroyed, whereas in Matthew the wicked tenants are replaced with new tenants. Cf. Turner, *Matthew*, 514. Additionally, the link with the landowner in this passage with Isa 5.2 confirms that God is the landowner (Nolland, *Matthew*, 869). Moreover, Snodgrass (*Stories*, 288) observes that Isa 5 was often connected with the Temple, and there is most likely a Temple polemic implicit in this parable.

understood messianically by Matthew.⁶⁰ France notes an interesting correlation between Isa 5 and Psa 118: if the rejected stone of Psa 118 refers to Israel's triumph over the other nations, and if it was Jesus himself who linked this psalm with Isaiah's vineyard account, then this would help explain the preponderance of "new Israel" typology for Jesus among the early Christians.⁶¹ Thus, there may be in this passage a typology that links *Jesus* to *Israel* as the quintessential *Son*⁶²—being what Israel was called to be—which is exactly what has been seen in previous passages. A third possible textual background for the Tenants is the phrase “δεῦτε ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτόν” found in both 21.38 and Gen 37.20 (spoken by Joseph's brothers).⁶³

Before considering a fourth possible OT background, it should be observed that the three passages noted above (Isa 5; Psa 118; Gen 37) indicate that there is not simply one passage that serves as the background for this parable.⁶⁴ Thus it is possible that another collage of texts should be considered here—Deuteronomy's teaching on inheritance—since inheritance is a key element in the Tenants.⁶⁵ In Deut 21.15–17 the inheritance rights of the firstborn son are set forth, and this may be the legal presupposition of inheritance in this passage. But an even more intriguing possibility, and one that meshes best with the focus on *Israel* in this parable, is if the inheritance refers in some way to Israel's national inheritance.⁶⁶ As God's son in Deuteronomy, Israel was entitled to the inheritance of the Promised Land (e.g., Deut 1.38; 3.28; 4.21, 38; 12.9; 15.4; 26.1; 31.7), but this inheritance was contingent upon their obedience. In this parable, the tenants are eager to receive an inheritance for their own benefit, but their contumacy is evident in their rejection of the servants and

⁶⁰ So Luz, *Matthew*, 3:41; Nolland, *Matthew*, 878. Cf. Matt 21.9, 15.

⁶¹ *Matthew*, 815.

⁶² Snodgrass, *Stories*, 294.

⁶³ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:183.

⁶⁴ Additionally, although it is omitted by some witnesses (D 33 it Or al.), 21.44 likely alludes to Dan 2.34–35. So G. K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God* (NSBT 17; Leicester: Apollos; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2004), 185–86.

⁶⁵ See §3.3.3.

⁶⁶ Another possibility should be noted as well. J. C. De Moor (“The Targumic Background of Mark 12:1–12: The Parable of the Wicked Tenants,” *JSJ* 29 [1998]: 63–80), picking up on the term “beloved” in Mark's account, has observed that all Israelites are referred to as “beloved sons” in the targumic renderings of Hos 11.4; Amos 9.7, provided they keep God's commandments, and that *Tg. Isa.* 5.1 refers to Israel as “my people, my beloved one Israel.” Matthew's version does not read “beloved,” but nevertheless it is significant that de Moor recognizes the importance of Israel as God's son(s) for this parable.

murder of the landowner's son. Thus, as representatives of Israel, the tenants deny their inheritance (and therefore their *sonship*)—and indeed even their collective *status* as an inheritance (Deut 4.20; 9.26–29; 32.9)—by rejecting the *son* who, fittingly, was due the inheritance.⁶⁷ Thus, it is possible to see an interaction between the themes of Israel, sonship, and inheritance on a number of levels.

The sum of the matter is the inheritance in this parable must come through the son (Jesus) who has the rights of inheritance as the true Son and true Israel. The tenants are those who seek the inheritance for their own account, but can never achieve it by disobeying the landowner (God) and rejecting his Son. Although he does not recognize the possibility of Deuteronomic influence, the comments of Jones are apropos: “Those to whom the promise of the inheritance was originally made have been deprived of their hope. Now God’s representative and theirs has come to claim it. The leaders of the people receive the blame and the Son opens up a way for the promise to be recovered.”⁶⁸ If such connections are to be found in the concept of inheritance, the testimony of Deuteronomy as the pre-eminent exposition of Israel’s inheritance (and of Israel *as* an inheritance!) would be of key importance.⁶⁹

A final factor to note of this parable is the climactic role of the Tenants in Matthew’s narrative.⁷⁰ Jesus is not only portrayed here as the landowner’s son, but as the final messenger among many who were rejected before him. The application of this parable and citation of Psa 118.22–23 sounds a note of finality to the forthcoming death of Jesus, but also to his vindication in his subsequent resurrection. Jesus’ filial obedience—particularly his obedience *unto death*—is again seen here. In the parable of the Tenants the focus is on the wickedness of those who reject Jesus. But it remains that their obduracy contrasts sharply with the parabolic son (and therefore to Jesus as Son) who obeys his father, despite what dangers might be involved.

⁶⁷ The tenants would presumably have had some sort of participation in the inheritance had they been faithful to their task. See again Herm. *Sim.* V.2.1–11.

⁶⁸ Jones, *Parables*, 384.

⁶⁹ A similar point is recognized by de Moor (“Targumic Background,” 77). Given the close parallels between Matt 21.33–46; Mark 12.1–12; Luke 20.9–19, this claim would likely also apply to these latter two accounts.

⁷⁰ So Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:177–78

7.3.3 The Wedding Banquet

The final parable of Matthew's trilogy (22.1–14) is of more limited relevance, but should nevertheless be considered. This parable, often known as the Wedding Banquet, tells the story of a king who hosts a feast for his son, the bridegroom, but the first two waves of guests reject the invitation. The invitation then goes out to the highways and hedges to bring in unlikely guests for the feast. This parable is different from the first two because the son is passive in the story—he simply has a feast in his honor.⁷¹ But, this parable is very much like the Tenants in that the son represents Jesus as the Son. Davies and Allison note four reasons why this is the best interpretation: (1) the son of the previous parable is clearly Jesus; (2) Matt 9.15; 25.1 refer to Jesus as the bridegroom; (3) God is portrayed as a king in Matthew; (4) other early Christian texts speak of an eschatological wedding feast of Jesus the Messiah.⁷² Thus, the Wedding Banquet is the third of a cluster of three Matthean parables that focus on (1) sonship and obedience (especially Two Sons, Wicked Tenants), and (2) the sonship of Jesus.⁷³

7.4 Deuteronomic Sonship in Matthew: Comprehensive Summary and Conclusions

In chapters 5–7 three main degrees of Matthean references to Deuteronomic sonship have been considered. The clearest allusion to this concept is found in Matt 4.1–11. Here Jesus is the obedient Son of God who is portrayed as the new Israel and Deuteronomy three times in the course of his testing. The parallels with Israel's sonship from Deuteronomy are clear, as is the contrast in Jesus' obedience in distinction from Israel's disobedience.

The second group of texts considered likely allusions to the relationship of sonship and obedience in accordance with Deuteronomy. These were Matt 5–7; 11.16–19. The SM combines an interest in Deuteronomy with the call for Israel to be obedient children, and this was based on the authority and example of Jesus himself.

⁷¹ So Snodgrass, *Stories*, 283.

⁷² Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:198–99; cf. Luz, *Matthew*, 3:52; Edward P. Blair, *Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew* (New York: Abingdon: 1960), 60; Olmstead, *Trilogy*, 119; Hultgren, *Parables*, 343.

⁷³ Cf. D. A. Carson, "Christological Ambiguities in Matthew," in *Christ the Lord: Studies Presented to Donald Guthrie* (ed. H. Rowdon; Leicester: InterVarsity, 1982), 97–114, here 111.

Matthew 11.16–19 likely reflects the accusation raised against Jesus from Deut 21.18–21—that he was rebellious son who threatened the covenant community. Ironically, however, Jesus was fully obedient in contrast to “this generation” of his accusers.

Beyond these foundational texts, five additional passages were suggested as possible allusions to Deuteronomic sonship. Chief among these are Matt 3, 17, which are considered *significant* possibilities. In the Baptism and Transfiguration, Jesus is declared to be God’s beloved Son, and his obedience is a primary factor in the divine approbation of Jesus. There may be influence of interpretive traditions surrounding Israel as God’s beloved son in these passages, as Jesus is filial obedient in contrast to the filial disobedience of Israel (Deut 32.5, 20).

Finally, three other possible allusions were considered in chapter 7. It is argued that Jesus’ conception in Matt 1.20 is a subtle echo of Israel’s divine begetting from the Song of Moses, and this may further contrast Jesus with Israel. Matthew 12.50 closely mirrors the statement of Jesus in 7.21 and is another indication that the disciples’ sonship (like that of Jesus) must be characterized by doing the Father’s will. Lastly, Matthew’s climactic trilogy of parables also combines the elements of sonship and filial obedience, and when taken in conjunction with the other passages covered, these parables may be further indications that Matthew’s understanding of obedient sonship is deeply entrenched in his thinking, and demonstrates remarkable consistency with Deuteronomy.

The presupposition of chapters 5–7 has been threefold:

1) Jesus as the Son of God is of central importance for Matthew, and this sonship is perhaps most often portrayed in terms of national Israel.

2) Matthew portrays Jesus as the *obedient* Son of God.

3) Matthew has a strong interest in Deuteronomy, as his numerous citations and allusions indicate.

Thus, it has been prudent to ask if Matthew may have gleaned from the Deuteronomic perspective of sonship—that Israel must be obedient as God’s son—in his portrayal of Jesus as the obedient Son of God. To this end, a cumulative case has been mounted based on these clusters of ideas that Matthew has invoked Deuteronomy for his evangelistic purposes of portraying Jesus as the obedient Son

and calling his disciples to their filial obedience as well. The precedent for other authors articulating a similar perspective has been mounted in chapter 4, and it is proposed in chapters 5–7 that Matthew should be viewed in this interpretive context. In this light, it is striking that Matthew seems to apply the concept of Deuteronomic sonship messianically: Jesus is the one who fulfills what Israel was called to do. This messianic application accords with the appeal to these themes by some authors who preceded Matthew, but is also unique in its focus on one obedient Israelite who calls others to follow after his manner of sonship. Thus, for Matthew Jesus' obedience as God's true Son does not negate his disciples' need to be obedient themselves. Instead, Jesus' sonship enables his disciples sonship and calls for their own filial obedience.

Chapter Eight

Conclusions

8.1 Summary and Implications: Chapters 1–4

It has been argued in this study that the best backdrop for understanding the obedient sonship of Jesus in Matthew is the call for Israel to be filially obedient as it is foundationally set forth in Deuteronomy. This argument is cumulative in nature. Thus, the Matthean texts surveyed in chapters 5–7 must not be viewed in abstraction from the evidence found in chapters 1–4.

In chapter 1 it was argued that the OT is centrally important for Matthew, and that these Scriptures are formative for the author's thought even in places where no textual *citation* is present. Therefore, if one is to understand the theology of Matthew most fully, one must consider all forms of OT influence. Although this approach might theoretically lead to baseless and fanciful interpretations, the present study has recognized the preponderance of citations to Deuteronomy in Matthew as a legitimate foundation to ask whether other portions of Matthew may bear marks of Deuteronomistic influence beyond those texts where citations are present. In addition, an historical case was mounted in chapter 2 that Deuteronomy was very widely circulated and utilized in ancient Jewish and Christian circles. Indeed, the evidence indicates that Deuteronomy was one of the most important Jewish texts in the Second Temple period at the dawn of the NT era. Chapter 2 thus has provided a considerable boost to the argument by establishing the historical plausibility of Deuteronomistic intertextual interpretations. When this evidence is combined with the high frequency of citations to Deuteronomy in Matthew, it appears to be very likely that Deuteronomy may have served as a key text that illumines for the present day reader the background of Matthew's thought.

Another important aspect to the argument was introduced in chapter 3, where it was argued that the sonship of Israel to Yahweh is a key theme of Deuteronomy (1.31; 8.5; 14.1; especially Deut 32; cf. 21.18–21), and this relationship was one of

both benevolence and obligation: Israel's sonship was a gift, but also necessitated obedience. Further supporting this conclusion are the texts included in chapter 4, a striking number of which correlate sonship and obedience (both Jewish and Christian). Indeed, a most remarkable pattern has been detected in which the sonship of Israel is almost always invoked either to (a) summon Israel to obedience, or (b) chastise Israel for disobedience. It is thus assumed in the key texts of chapter 4 that sonship is predicated on obedience. Moreover, a surprising number of these texts also echo Deuteronomic language, themes, and imagery. Thus, the argument in chapter 3 that sonship and obedience are key themes in Deuteronomy finds additional support in chapter 4, in which later authors (from Matthew's perspective) seem to have consistently re-appropriated the Deuteronomic teaching on obedient sonship. It was also shown in chapter 4 how—in an observation that further corroborates the survey of chapter 2 and the exegetical argument from chapter 3—Deut 32 was frequently appealed to in this regard.

A few key implications from chapters 1–4 as they relate to the present argument should be underscored. First, the claim that Deuteronomy was important for Matthew has significant support. This is evident not only from his numerous citations to Deuteronomy, but also from the widespread circulation and use of Deuteronomy detailed in chapter 2. Deuteronomy greatly influenced several early Jewish and Christian authors on a number of levels, and the purported use of Deuteronomy by Matthew, an early Christian who argued from the OT, is entirely consistent with this picture.

Second is the prominence of Deut 32. Not only was this text especially widely used and echoed in ancient literature (chapter 2), but it was also discovered that this chapter serves as a climactic summary to the theology of Deuteronomy, and prominent in this Song of Moses is the chastisement of Israel for being disobedient sons of Yahweh (chapter 3). It is therefore perhaps not surprising that one finds echoes of Deut 32 in numerous texts that call Israel to *filial* obedience (chapter 4).

A third related point that arises from chapters 1–4 is the historical precedent for other authors who apparently gleaned a concept of obedient sonship from Deuteronomy (chapter 4). Just as the survey in chapter 2 enhances the plausibility that Matthew may have used Deuteronomy in general, the conclusions of chapter 4 (in association with chapters 2–3) strongly suggest that Matthew would by no means have been the first Jewish or Christian author to recognize Israel's need for filial

obedience as it is stated in Deuteronomy. Instead, a steady stream of interpretive tradition that wrestled with the disobedience of Israel of sons in light of their summons to covenantal obedience appears to have preceded (and followed) the writing of Matthew's gospel.

8.2 Summary and Implications: Chapters 5–7

Chapters 1–4 thus form an integral part of this study. Once it has been established that Deuteronomy was important for Matthew; that the union of sonship and obedience is central to Deuteronomy; and that intertextual interpretations to Deuteronomy and Deuteronomic sonship have historical warrant in Matthew's interpretive milieu, it is quite reasonable to consider whether similar themes may have influenced Matthew, for whom Jesus as the obedient Son of God is clearly an important perspective.

In chapter 5 several texts were considered in which Deuteronomy is cited or alluded to rather explicitly. Chief among these is the temptation narrative, especially the first temptation in which Jesus explicitly quotes from Deut 8 in order to demonstrate his obedient sonship. This citation, along with several other texts, especially in Matt 1–4, indicates that Jesus as the Son of God for Matthew is often seen in light of Israel, particularly when referring to Jesus as the Son of God. Other strong allusions considered include the Sermon on the Mount, where one finds a strong concentration of fatherhood language, citations to Deuteronomy, and the call for the disciples to be obedient children. Another strong allusion is Matt 11.16–19, a text in which Jesus is ironically viewed as the disobedient son of Deut 21 by those in the covenant community who actually fulfill this role in Matthew's narrative.

Chapters 6–7 pick up on a key text for Matthew, which was Deut 32.5, 20. This text is cited in Matt 17, and is likely in view in other texts that speak of a crooked/evil generation, or even "this" generation. These suggestions have exceptionally high probability given the widespread usage of Deut 32 in general (chapter 2), and the appeal to Deut 32 in relation to Israel's sonship (chapters 3–4). It was further suggested that Deut 32, as a key text in the ancient world, may even be in view in the heavenly voices in Matt 3.17; 17.5. Certainly this conclusion is not definitive, but a number of lines of textual and historical evidence converge to render this possibility quite feasible and contextually appropriate. The Song of Moses has also been suggested as possible background for the divine begetting of Jesus in Matt

1.20. Beyond these texts, one must wrestle with the additional texts that unite sonship and obedience in Matthew, especially in relation to Jesus as Son of God. It has been suggested in this study that the best explanation for the sum of these texts is the interpretive background—particularly from Deuteronomy—of Israel’s sonship and their perennial disobedience in light of their call to filial obedience.

8.3 Suggestions for Further Study

Before offering a few final thoughts on this study, some suggestions for further study should be noted. First, the background for the obedience of Israel in Deuteronomy is clearly *covenant*. Although this concept has been studied quite extensively in Pauline literature (especially since E. P. Sanders’s seminal work), surprisingly little has been done by way of covenantal studies in the Gospels.¹ Thus, it would be fruitful to study how covenant might be an operative category for Matthew, in particular, and how this might relate to the filial obedience of Jesus in light of Deuteronomy.

A second topic that could be addressed is whether Matthew also recognizes the organic link between sonship and obedience in other OT texts he references that seem in context to echo the perspective of Deuteronomy. Thus, in its larger context, Hos 11.1 (cited in Matt 2.15) is found in a context in which Israel as Son of God is being rebuked for disobedience and looks ahead in eschatological hope for God’s children. Likewise, Jer 31.15 (cited in Matt 2.18) is found wedged between two texts that speak of Israel’s failures as God’s son and their hopes for future restoration as God’s beloved son (Jer 31.9, 20). Thus one could argue that Matthew has a penchant for citing OT passages in which Israel is referred to as son of God. Since these texts also demonstrate the need for Israel’s filial obedience (see chapter 4), pursuing these texts might provide further support for the present thesis.

A third question that could be pursued is the ways in which obedience and sonship are united in other NT texts, and whether these may also have a background in Deuteronomy. Hints of this have already been found in Rom 9.4–5; Phil 2.15; and may also be seen in texts such as 1 Peter 1.14–19, and in the other three gospels. Thus, Matthew may not have been the only author to contribute a perspective to the

¹ So Scott W. Hahn, *Kinship by Covenant: A Covenantal Approach to the Fulfillment of God’s Saving Promises* (AYBRL; New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2009), who notes this lacuna and seeks to start filling this gap.

stream of interpretive traditions surrounding these themes. Indeed, the prominence of the union between sonship and the need for obedience in chapter 4 strongly suggests that sonship and obedience were prominently related, and were in many ways a prevalent paradigm for understanding the relational obligations of God's covenant people. It may also be that the background for obedient sonship in Matthew provides the proper foundation for the common sentiment that Jesus' sonship inherently entails his obedience.²

A fourth possibility for further study is how the early church may have read Deuteronomy in association with the sonship of Jesus. It has already been considered in chapter 4 how Athanasius engaged in theological debates with the Arians regarding the details of Jesus' sonship from Deuteronomy. It has not been possible to pursue this trajectory in any detail in this study, but it is quite possible that more research would uncover other early Fathers who also engaged texts from Deuteronomy as a part of early Christian theological and christological reflection in association with NT texts.

8.4 Concluding Synthesis

The conclusions can be summarized thus: since Jesus as Son of God (for Matthew) must to some degree be bound up with Jesus as Israel; and since Israel's sonship is to be defined by obedience in Deuteronomy and related literature; and since Deuteronomy is clearly a key text for Matthew; therefore, it is quite likely that Matthew derived his understanding of and need for obedient sonship (both for Jesus and his disciples) in large measure from Deuteronomy. It is thus proposed that the evidence from chapters 1–4 coheres well with the argument of chapters 5–7, and even explains to a large degree why Matthew may have seen the need to articulate Jesus' obedience the way he did. Once one comes to grips with the reality that *sonship* necessitated *obedience* for God's people, the need to articulate Jesus' *obedience* as *Son of God* becomes clear for Matthew. The covenantal obedience required of God's people was a standard to which they never attained in the OT storyline. Matthew recognizes this and thus articulates the story of Jesus in contrast to Israel, using *Son of God* as a primary means for conveying this asymmetrical

² See, e.g., Oscar Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament* (trans. S. Guthrie and C. Hall; rev. ed.; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963), 272–305.

correspondence. It was thus necessary for Matthew to demonstrate that Jesus fulfills God's design for Israel, and in so doing is able to mediate his sonship to his disciples and enable their own obedience. Hence Jesus, as the obedient Son of God, is able to grant the privilege of sonship also to his disciples, who are therefore called to follow in his path of filial obedience. The obedience of Jesus as the fulfillment of God's requirements for Israel thereby enables those who are unable themselves to "fulfill all righteousness" to be part of God's family through the Son who has proven obedient on their behalf.

Bibliography

Critical Biblical Editions

Aland, Barbara et al., eds. *The Greek New Testament*. 4th rev. ed. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1993.

_____. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 27th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993.

Aland, Kurt, ed. *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum. Locis parallelis evangeliorum apocryphorum et patrum adhibitis edidit*. 14th rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1996.

Elliger, K. and W. Rudolph, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. 5th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1977.

Rahlfs, Alfred and Robert Hanhart, eds. *Septuaginta*. Rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006.

Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum. 20 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931–.

Primary Sources

Abegg, Martin, Jr., Peter Flint, and Eugene Ulrich, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*. New York: Harper Collins, 2004.

Allegro, John M, ed. *Qumrân Cave 4. I. 4Q158–4Q186*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 5. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.

Aly, Zaki and Ludwig Koenen. *Three Rolls of the Early Septuagint: Genesis and Deuteronomy*. Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen 27. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1980.

Apostolic Fathers, The. Translated by Bart D. Ehrman. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Athanasius. *Orations against the Arians*. In vol. 4 of *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Series 2. Edited by Philip Schaff. 1886–1889. 14 vols. Repr. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.

- Attridge, Harold W. et al., eds. *Qumran Cave 4. VIII. Parabiblical Texts, Part 1. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 13*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.
- Baillet, Maurice, ed. *Qumrân Grotte 4.III (4Q482–4Q520)*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 7. Oxford: Clarendon, 1982.
- Barthélemy, D. and J. T. Milik, eds. *Qumran Cave 1*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 1. Oxford: Clarendon, 1955.
- Beckman, Gary. *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*. Edited by Harry A. Hoffner, Jr. Society of Biblical Literature Writings from the Ancient World 7. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- Berger, Klaus. “Das Buch der Jubiläen.” Pages 273–575 in vol. 2 of *Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit: Unterweisung in erzählender Form*. Edited by Hermann Lichtenberger et al. Gütersloher: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1983.
- Charlesworth, James H., ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983–85.
- Clarke, Ernest G. *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Deuteronomy. Translated, with Notes*. The Aramaic Bible 5B. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.
- Diez Macho, Alejandro. *Neophyti 1. Targum Palestinense MS de la Biblioteca Vaticana 5: Deuteronomio*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1978.
- Feldman, Louis H. *Judean Antiquities 1–4: A Translation and Commentary*. Boston: Brill Academic, 2004.
- Freedman, H. ed. *The Babylonian Talmud. Seder Nashim 8: Kiddushin. Translated into English with Notes, Glossary and Indices*. London: Soncino Press, 1936.
- Grossfeld, Bernard. *The Targum Onqelos to Genesis. Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes*. The Aramaic Bible 6. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988.
- _____. *The Targum Onqelos to Deuteronomy. Translated, with Apparatus, and Notes*. The Aramaic Bible 9. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988.

- Hallo, William W., ed. *Monumental Inscriptions from the Biblical World*. Vol. 2 of *The Context of Scripture*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2000.
- Hammer, Reuven, ed. *Sifre: A Tannaitic Commentary on the Book of Deuteronomy*. Yale Judaica Series 24. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1986.
- Harrington, Daniel J. "Pseudo-Philo: A New Translation and Introduction." Pages 297–377 in vol. 1 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1985.
- Holmes, Michael W., ed. *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts with English Translations*. 3d ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Josephus*. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray et al. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1926–65.
- Kenyon, Frederic G. *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible*. Fasciculus 5: *Numbers and Deuteronomy*. London: Walker, 1935–58.
- Klijn, A. F. J. "2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch: A New Translation and Introduction." Pages 615–52 in vol. 1 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983.
- McNamara, Martin. *Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis. Translated, with Apparatus and Notes*. The Aramaic Bible 1A. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992.
- _____. *Targum Neofiti 1: Deuteronomy. Translated, with Apparatus and Notes*. The Aramaic Bible 5A. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997.
- Metzger, Bruce M. "The Fourth Book of Ezra: A New Translation and Introduction." Pages 517–59 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983.
- Milik, J. T., ed. *Qumrân Grotte 4. II/2. Tefillin, Mezuzot et Targums (4Q128–4Q157)*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 6. Oxford: Clarendon, 1977.
- Neusner, Jacob, ed. *Sifre to Deuteronomy: An Analytical Translation*. Brown Judaic Studies 98, 101. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.

- _____. *The Talmud of the Land of Israel: A Preliminary Translation and Explanation*. Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism 9–12, 14–15, 17–35. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982–93.
- Parry, Donald W. and Emanuel Tov, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*. 6 vols. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2003–5.
- Philo*. Translated by F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1929–62.
- Pritchard, James B., ed. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950.
- _____. *The Ancient Near East: Supplementary Texts and Pictures Relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.
- Priest, J. “Testament of Moses: A New Translation and Introduction.” Pages 919–34 in vol. 1 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. London: Dartmon, Longman & Todd, 1983.
- Rabbinowitz, J., ed. *Midrash Rabbah: Deuteronomy*. London: Soncino Press, 1939.
- Roberts, C. H., ed. *Two Biblical Papyri in the John Rylands Library Manchester*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1936.
- Robinson, James M., Paul Hoffmann, and John S. Kloppenborg, eds. *The Critical Edition of Q: Synopsis Including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas with English, German, and French Translations of Q and Thomas*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000.
- Schneemelcher, Wilhelm, ed. *New Testament Apocrypha*. Translated and edited by R. McL. Wilson. 2 vols. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003–6.
- Skehan, Patrick W., Eugene Ulrich, and Judith E. Sanderson, eds. *Qumran Cave 4. IV. Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 9. Oxford: Clarendon, 1992.
- Stec, David M. *The Targum of Psalms: Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes*. The Aramaic Bible 16. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Stenning, J. F. *The Targum of Isaiah*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949.

- Ulrich, Eugene et al., eds. *Qumran Cave 4. IX. Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 14. Oxford: Clarendon, 1995.
- Vermes, Geza. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. New York: Penguin, 1997.
- Wente, Edward F. *Letters from Ancient Egypt*. Edited by Edmund S. Meltzer. Society of Biblical Literature Writings from the Ancient World 1. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- Wintermute, O. S. "Jubilees: A New Translation and Introduction." Pages 35–142 in vol. 2 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1985.
- Wright, R. B. "Psalms of Solomon: A New Translation with Introduction." Pages 639–70 in vol. 2 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1985.
- Yadin, Yigael, ed. *The Temple Scroll*. 3 vols. and supplementary plates. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1977–83.

Secondary Sources

- Achtemeier, Elizabeth. *Deuteronomy, Jeremiah*. Proclamation Commentaries. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978.
- _____. *Nahum-Malachi*. Interpretation. Atlanta: John Knox, 1986.
- Albright, W. F. "A Biblical Fragment from the Maccabean Age: The Nash Papyrus." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 56 (1937): 145–76.
- _____. "Some Remarks on the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy XXXII." *Vetus Testamentum* 9 (1959): 339–46.
- Albright, W. F. and William L. Moran. "A Re-Interpretation of an Amarna Letter from Byblos (EA 82)." Pages 131–39 in *Amarna Studies: Collected Writings*. Harvard Semitic Studies 54. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2003.
- Allen, David M. *Deuteronomy and Exhortation in Hebrews: A Study in Narrative Re-presentation*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II/238. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

- Allison, Dale C., Jr. *The Intertextual Jesus: Scripture in Q*. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press, 2000.
- _____. "Matthew and the History of its Interpretation." *Expository Times* 120 (2008): 1–7.
- _____. *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993.
- _____. "The Son of God as Israel: A Note on Matthean Christology." *Irish Biblical Studies* 9 (1987): 74–81.
- Andersen, Francis I. and David Noel Freedman. *Hosea: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 24. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1980.
- Anderson, Bernhard W. with Steven Bishop. *Contours of Old Testament Theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999.
- Anderson, A. A. *2 Samuel*. Word Biblical Commentary 11. Dallas: Word, 1989.
- Arnold, Bill T. and John H. Choi. *A Guide to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Attridge, Harold W. *The Interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus*. Harvard Dissertations in Religion 7. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1976.
- Bacon, Benjamin W. *Studies in Matthew*. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1930.
- Balla, Peter. "2 Corinthians." Pages 753–83 in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Barrett, C. K. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. 2 vols. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994–98.
- _____. *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition*. London: SPCK, 1966.
- Barth, Karl. *Dogmatics in Outline*. Translated by G. T. Thompson. London: SPCK, 1949.
- Barton, John. "Covenant in Old Testament Theology." Pages 22–38 in *Covenant as Context: Essays in Honour of E. W. Nicholson*. Edited by A. D. H. Mayes and R. B. Salters. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

- Barton, Stephen C. *Discipleship and Family Ties in Mark and Matthew*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 80. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Bauckham, Richard J. *God Crucified: Monotheism and Christology in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- _____. *Jude, 2 Peter*. Word Biblical Commentary 50. Dallas: Word, 1983.
- _____. "The Sonship of the Historical Jesus in Christology." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 31 (1978): 245–60.
- Bauckham, Richard, ed. *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Bauer, David R. "The Kingship of Jesus in the Matthean Infancy Narrative: A Literary Analysis." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 57 (1995): 306–23.
- Bauer, Walter. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* [BDAG]. Revised and edited by Frederick William Danker. 3d ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Beale, G. K. *John's Use of the Old Testament in Revelation*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 166. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- _____. *The Temple and the Church's Mission. A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*. New Studies in Biblical Theology 17. Leicester: Apollos; Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2004.
- Beale, G. K. and D. A. Carson, eds. *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic; Nottingham: Apollos, 2007.
- Beale, G. K. and Sean M. McDonough. "Revelation." Pages 1081–1158 in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Beaton, Richard C. "How Matthew Writes." Pages 116–34 in *The Written Gospel*. Edited by Markus Bockmuehl and Donald A. Hagner. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

- _____. "Isaiah in Matthew's Gospel." Pages 63–78 in *Isaiah in the New Testament*. Edited by Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- _____. *Isaiah's Christ in Matthew's Gospel*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 123. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Beckwith, Roger. *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church and its Background in Early Judaism*. London: SPCK, 1985.
- Bell, Richard H. *Provoked to Jealousy: The Origin and Purpose of the Jealousy Motif in Romans 9–11*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II/63. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994.
- Bellefontaine, Elizabeth. "Deuteronomy 21:18–21: Reviewing the Case of the Rebellious Son." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 13 (1979): 13–31.
- Bieneck, Joachim. *Sohn Gottes als Christusbezeichnung der Synoptiker*. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neue Testaments 21. Zürich: Zwingli, 1951.
- Bildstein, Gerald. *Honor Thy Father and Mother: Filial Responsibility in Jewish Law and Ethics*. Library of Jewish Law and Ethics. New York: KTAV Publishing, 1975.
- Black, Matthew. "The Parables as Allegory." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 42 (1960): 273–87.
- Blacketer, Raymond A. *The School of God: Pedagogy and Rhetoric in Calvin's Interpretation of Deuteronomy*. Studies in Early Modern Religious Reforms 3. Dordrecht: Springer, 2006.
- Blair, Edward P. *Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew*. New York: Abingdon, 1960.
- Blass, F. and A. Debrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Edited and translated by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Isaiah: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 19–19B. New York: Doubleday, 2000–3.

- Block, Daniel I. "Marriage and Family in Ancient Israel." Pages 33–102 in *Marriage and Family in the Biblical World*. Edited by Ken G. Campbell. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2003.
- Blomberg, Craig L. "Matthew." Pages 1–109 in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Bock, Darrel L. *Luke 1:1–9:50*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994.
- Bockmuehl, Markus. *Seeing the Word: Refocusing New Testament Study*. Studies in Theological Interpretation. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006.
- Bonnard, Pierre. *L'Évangile selon Saint Matthieu*. Commentaire du Nouveau Testament 1. 2d ed. Neuchatel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1963.
- Borgen, Peder. *Philo of Alexandria: An Exegete for His Time*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 86. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997.
- Bornkamm, Günther, Gerhard Barth, and Heinz Joachim Held. *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*. Translated by Percy Scott. New Testament Library. London: SCM, 1963.
- Botterweck, G. Johannes and Helmer Ringgren, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Translated by J. T. Willis, D. E. Green, and D. W. Scott. 12 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974–.
- Bowley, James E. "Moses in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Living in the Shadow of God's Anointed." Pages 159–81 in *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation*. Edited by Peter W. Flint. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- Bretscher, Paul G. "Exodus 4:22–23 and the Voice from Heaven." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 87 (1968): 301–11.
- Brodie, Thomas L. "Fish, Temple, Tithe, and Remission: The God-based Generosity of Deuteronomy 14–15 as One Component of Matthew 17:22–18:35." *Revue Biblique* 99 (1992): 697–718.
- Brown, Raymond. *The Message of Deuteronomy: Not by Bread Alone*. Bible Speaks Today. Leicester: InterVarsity, 1993.

- Brown, Raymond E. *The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke*. Rev. ed. Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 1993.
- _____. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 1997
- Brueggemann, Walter. *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997.
- _____. *Tradition for Crisis: A Study in Hosea*. Richmond, Va.: John Knox, 1968.
- Burke, David G. *The Poetry of Baruch: A Reconstruction and Analysis of the Original Hebrew Text of Baruch 3:9–5:9*. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 10. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1982.
- Burke, Trevor J. *Adopted into God's Family: Exploring a Pauline Metaphor*. New Studies in Biblical Theology 22. Nottingham: Apollos; Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2006.
- Burridge, Richard A. *What Are the Gospels? A Comparison with Greco-Roman Biography*. 2d ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Dearborn, Mich.: Dove, 2004.
- Caird, George B. "Jesus and Israel: The Starting Point for New Testament Christology." Pages 58–68 in *Christological Perspectives: Essays in Honor of Harvey K. McArthur*. Edited by Robert F. Berkey and Sarah A. Edwards. New York: Pilgrim, 1982.
- _____. *New Testament Theology*. Completed and edited by L. D. Hurst. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.
- Campbell, Jonathan G. *The Use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1–8, 19–20*. Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 228. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1995.
- Carson, D. A. "Christological Ambiguities in Matthew." Edited by Harold H. Rowdon. Pages 97–114 in *Christ the Lord: Studies Presented to Donald Guthrie*. Leicester: InterVarsity, 1982.

- _____. “Matthew.” Pages 1–599 in vol. 8 of *The Expositor’s Bible Commentary: Matthew, Mark, Luke*. Edited by Frank E. Gaebelein. 12 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984. Repr., 1995.
- Catto, Stephen K. *Reconstructing the First-Century Synagogue: A Critical Analysis of Current Research*. Library of New Testament Studies 363. London: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Charette, Blaine. *The Theme of Recompense in Matthew’s Gospel*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 79. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.
- Chen, Diane G. *God as Father in Luke–Acts*. Studies in Biblical Literature 92. New York: Peter Lang, 2006.
- Childs, Brevard S. *The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster Press, 1974.
- _____. *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.
- _____. *Isaiah*. Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- Chilton, Bruce. “Eight Theses on the Use of Targums in Interpreting the New Testament.” Pages 305–15 in *Judaic Approaches to the Gospels*. University of South Florida International Studies in Formative Christianity and Judaism 2. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.
- _____. “God as ‘Father’ in the Targumim, in Non-Canonical Literatures of Early Judaism and Primitive Christianity, and in Matthew.” Pages 151–69 in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth and Craig A. Evans. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 14 / Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity 2. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Christensen, Duane L. *Deuteronomy*. 2 vols. Rev. ed. Word Biblical Commentary 6A–B. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2001–02.
- Ciampa, Roy E. “Deuteronomy in Galatians and Romans.” Pages 99–117 in *Deuteronomy in the New Testament: The New Testament and the Scriptures*

- of Israel*. Edited by Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken. Library of New Testament Studies 358. London: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Ciampa, Roy E. and Brian S. Rosner. "1 Corinthians." Pages 695–752 in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Clements, R. E. *God's Chosen People: A Theological Interpretation of the Book of Deuteronomy*. London: SCM Press, 1968.
- _____. *Isaiah 1–39*. New Century Bible. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.
- Coggan, F. D. "Note on St. Matthew iii.15: ἄφες ἄρτι· οὕτω [sic] γὰρ πρέπει ἐστὶν ἡμῖν πληρῶσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην." *Expository Times* 60 (1949): 258.
- Coggins, Richard J. *Sirach*. Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Collins, Adela Yarbro. *Mark: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.
- Collins, John J. *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Conybeare, F. C. and St. George Stock. *A Grammar of Septuagint Greek. With Selected Readings, Vocabularies, and Updated Indexes*. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1905. Repr., Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1995.
- Cooke, Geralde. "The Israelite King as Son of God." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 73 (1961): 202–25.
- Court, John M. "The Birth of Jesus Christ according to Matthew and Luke." Pages 13–25 in *New Testament Writers and the Old Testament*. Edited by John M. Court. London: SPCK, 2002.
- Cousland, J. R. C. *The Crowds in the Gospel of Matthew*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 102. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2002.
- Craigie, Peter C. *The Book of Deuteronomy*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976.
- _____. *The Twelve Prophets*. 2 vols. Daily Study Bible. Edinburgh: Saint Andrew, 1984–85.

- Craigie, Peter C., Page H. Kelley, and Joel F. Drinkard, Jr. *Jeremiah 1–25*. Word Biblical Commentary 26. Dallas: Word, 1991.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. 2 vols. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1975–79.
- _____. *The Gospel according to St. Mark: An Introduction and Commentary*. 2d ed. Cambridge Greek Bible Commentary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.
- Crawford, Sidnie White. “Reading Deuteronomy in the Second Temple Period.” Pages 127–40 in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretations*. Edited by Kristin de Troyer and Armin Lange. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 30. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2005.
- _____. *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*. Grand Rapids: Cambridge, 2008.
- Cross, Frank Moore. “The Contribution of the Qumrân Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text.” *Israel Exploration Journal* 16 (1966): 81–95. Repr. pages 278–92 in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*. Edited by Frank Moore Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975.
- _____. “The History of the Biblical Text in Light of Discoveries in the Judean Desert.” *Harvard Theological Review* 57 (1964): 281–99. Repr. pages 177–95 in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*. Edited by Frank Moore Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975.
- _____. “Kinship and Covenant in Ancient Israel.” Pages 3–21 in *From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 2000.
- Cross, Frank Moore and Shemaryahu Talmon, eds. *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975.
- Crowe, Brandon D. “The Song of Moses and Divine Begetting in Matt 1,20.” *Biblica* 90 (2009): 47–58.

- Cullmann, Oscar. *The Christology of the New Testament*. Translated by S. Guthrie and C. Hall. Rev. ed. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963.
- Cureton, Kenyn M. "Jesus as Son and Servant: An Investigation of the Baptism and Testing Narratives and Their Significance for Cohesion, Plot, and Christology in Matthew." Ph.D. diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1993.
- Dancy, J. C. *The Shorter Books of the Apocrypha: A Commentary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.
- Darr, Katheryn Pfisterer. *Isaiah's Vision and the Family of God*. Literary Currents in Biblical Interpretation. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994.
- Davies, Eryl W. "Inheritance Rights and the Hebrew Levirate Marriage." *Vetus Testamentum* 31 (1981): 138–44, 257–68.
- _____. "The Meaning of *Pi Šēnayim* in Deuteronomy XXI 17." *Vetus Testamentum* 36 (1986): 341–47.
- Davies, John A. *A Royal Priesthood: Literary and Intertextual Perspectives on an Image of Israel in Exodus 19.6*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 395. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Davies, W. D. *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964. Repr., Brown Judaic Studies 186. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- Davies, W. D. and Dale C. Allison, Jr. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew*. 3 vols. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988–97.
- Day, John. "Pre-Deuteronomistic Allusions to the Covenant in Hosea and Psalm LXXVIII." *Vetus Testamentum* 36 (1986): 1–12.
- De Boer, P. A. H. "The Son of God in the Old Testament." Pages 188–207 in *Syntax and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Syntax and Exegesis*. Edited by C. J. Labuschagne et al. *Oudtestamentische Studien* 18. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973.
- De Jonge, Marinus. *God's Final Envoy: Early Christology and Jesus' Own View of His Mission*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

- De Moor, Johannes C. "The Targumic Background of Mark 12:1–12: The Parable of the Wicked Tenants." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 29 (1998): 63–80.
- De Kruijf, T. *Der Sohn des lebendigen Gottes: Ein Beitrag zur Christologie des Matthäusevangeliums*. Analecta Biblica 16. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1962.
- De Vaux, Roland. *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*. Translated by John McHugh. London: Darton, Longman, & Todd, 1961.
- Deines, Roland. *Der Gerechtigkeit der Tora im Reich des Messias: Mt 5,13–20 als Schlüsseltext der matthäischen Theologie*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 177. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- _____. "Not the Law but the Messiah: Law and Righteousness in the Gospel of Matthew—An Ongoing Debate." Pages 53–84 in *Built upon the Rock: Studies in the Gospel of Matthew*. Edited by Daniel B. Gurtner and John Nolland. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Delamarter, Steve. *A Scripture Index to Charlesworth's The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- Dempster, Stephen G. *Dominion and Dynasty: A Theology of the Hebrew Bible*. New Studies in Biblical Theology 15. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2003.
- DeSilva, David A. *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context, and Significance*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002.
- Di Lella, Alexander A. "The Deuteronomistic Background of the Farewell Discourse in Tob 14:3–11." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 41 (1979): 380–89.
- Dille, Sarah J. *Mixing Metaphors: God as Mother and Father in Deutero-Isaiah*. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series* 398 / Gender, Culture, Theory 13. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Dodd, C. H. *According to the Scriptures: The Substructure of New Testament Theology*. London: Nisbet & Co, 1952.
- _____. *The Parables of the Kingdom*. 4th ed. London: Nisbet, 1938.
- Dodewaard, J. A. E. van. "La Force Évocatrice de la Citation mise en lumière en prenant pour base l'Évangile de S. Matthieu." *Biblica* 36 (1955): 482–91.

- Dogniez, Cécile and Marguerite Harl. *La Bible d'Alexandrie 5: Le Deutéronome*. Paris: Cerf, 1992.
- Donaldson, Terence L. *Jesus on the Mountain: A Study in Matthean Theology*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 8. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985.
- _____. "The Mockers and the Son of God (Matthew 27.37–44): Two Characters in Matthew's Story of Jesus." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 41 (1991): 3–18.
- _____. "The Vindicated Son: A Narrative Approach to Matthean Christology." Pages 100–21 in *Contours of Christology in the New Testament*. Edited by R. N. Longenecker. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Dreyfus, F. "Le Thème de l'Héritage dans l'Ancien Testament." *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologie* 42 (1958): 3–49.
- Driver, S. R. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1895.
- Duncan, Julie A. "Deuteronomy, Book of." Pages 198–202 in vol. 1 of *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Christology in the Making: An Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*. London: SCM, 1980.
- _____. *Jesus Remembered. Christianity in the Making* 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- _____. *The Partings of the Ways: Between Christianity and Judaism and Their Significance for the Character of Christianity*. 2d. ed. London: SCM, 2006.
- _____. *Romans*. Word Biblical Commentary 38A–B. Waco, Tex.: Word, 1988.
- Dupont, Jacques. *Les Tentations de Jésus au Désert*. Studia Neotestamentica 4. Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1968.
- Durham, John I. *Exodus*. Word Biblical Commentary 3. Waco, Tex.: Word, 1987.
- Edgar, S. L. "Respect for Context in Quotations from the Old Testament." *New Testament Studies* 9 (1962/63): 55–62.

- Edwards, James R. *The Gospel according to Mark*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Leicester: Apollos, 2002.
- Edwards, Timothy. *Exegesis in the Targum of the Psalms: The Old, the New, and the Rewritten*. Gorgias Dissertations 28 / Biblical Studies 1. Piscataway, N.J.: Gorgias, 2007.
- Eichrodt, Walter. *Theology of the Old Testament*. Translated by J. A. Baker. 2 vols. Old Testament Library. London: SCM Press, 1961–67.
- Eissfeldt, Otto. “Πληρῶσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην in Matthäus 3,15.” *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der ältern Kirche* 61 (1970): 209–15.
- Ellingworth, Paul. “‘Thou’ and ‘You’ in the Sermon on the Mount.” *The Bible Translator* 58 (2007): 11–19.
- Ellis, E. Earle. *The Old Testament in Early Christianity: Canon and Interpretation in the Light of Modern Research*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991.
- Eloff, Mervyn. “‘Από . . . ἕως and Salvation History in Matthew’s Gospel.” Pages 85–107 in *Built Upon the Rock: Studies in the Gospel of Matthew*. Edited by Daniel M. Gurtner and John Nolland. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Evans, Craig A. “Are the ‘Son’ Texts at Qumran Messianic? Reflections on 4Q369 and Related Scrolls.” Pages 135–53 in *Qumran-Messianism: Studies on the Messianic Expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth, Hermann Lichtenberger, and Gerbern S. Oegema. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.
- _____. “‘The Book of the Genesis of Jesus Christ’: The Purpose of Matthew in Light of the Incipit.” Pages 61–72 in *The Gospel of Matthew*. Vol. 2 of *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels*. Edited by Thomas R. Hatina. Library of New Testament Studies 310. London: T&T Clark, 2008.
- _____. “Listening for Echoes of Interpreted Scripture.” Pages 47–57 in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 83 / Studies in Early Judaism and Christianity 1. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.

- _____. “The Scriptures of Jesus and His Earliest Followers.” Pages 185–95 in *The Canon Debate*. Edited by Lee M. McDonald and James A. Sanders. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002.
- Evans, Craig A., and James A. Sanders, eds. *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 83 / Studies in Early Judaism and Christianity 1. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- _____. *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 148 / Studies in Early Judaism and Christianity 5. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Fee, Gordon D. *Pauline Christology: An Exegetical-Theological Study*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2007.
- Feldman, Louis H. *Josephus and Modern Scholarship (1937–1980)*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1984.
- _____. *Studies in Josephus’ Rewritten Bible*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 58. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1998.
- Fensham, F. Charles. “Father and Son as Terminology for Treaty and Covenant.” Pages 121–35 in *Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William Foxwell Albright*. Edited by Hans Goedicke. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1971.
- Ferguson, Everett. *Backgrounds of Early Christianity*. 3d ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Fiedler, Peter. *Das Matthäusevangelium*. Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 1. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2006.
- Fishbane, Michael. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1985.
- _____. “Use, Authority and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran.” Pages 339–77 in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by Martin Jan Mulder. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum II/1. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.

- Fisk, Bruce Norman. *Do You Not Remember? Scripture, Story and Exegesis in the Rewritten Bible of Pseudo-Philo*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 37. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "Crucifixion in Ancient Palestine, Qumran Literature, and the New Testament." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 40 (1978): 493–513.
- _____. *The Gospel according to Luke: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. Anchor Bible 28–28A. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1981–85.
- _____. *Romans: A New Translation, with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 33. New York: Doubleday, 1993.
- _____. *Tobit*. Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003.
- Fleishman, Joseph. "Legal Innovation in Deuteronomy XXI 18–20." *Vetus Testamentum* 53 (2003): 311–27.
- Fokkelman, J. P. *Major Poems of the Hebrew Bible at the Interface of Hermeneutics and Structural Analysis*. Vol. 1: *Ex. 15, Deut 32, and Job 3*. Studia Semitica Neerlandica. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1998.
- _____. *Reading Biblical Poetry: An Introductory Guide*. Translated by Ineke Smit. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- Foster, Paul. "A Tale of Two Sons: But Which One Did the Far, Far Better Thing? A Study of Matt 21.28–32." *New Testament Studies* 47 (2001): 26–37.
- _____. *Community, Law and Mission in Matthew's Gospel*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II/177. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
- Fraade, Steven D. *From Tradition to Commentary: Torah and Its Interpretation in the Midrash Sifre to Deuteronomy*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1991.
- France, R. T. "The Formula-Quotations of Matthew 2 and the Problem of Communication". *New Testament Studies* 27 (1981/82): 233–51.
- _____. *The Gospel of Matthew*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2007.

- _____. *Jesus and the Old Testament*. London: Tyndale Press, 1971.
- _____. *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher*. Exeter: Paternoster, 1989.
- Frankemölle, Hubert. *Jahwebund und Kirche Christi: Studien zur Form- und Traditionsgeschichte des "Evangeliums" nach Matthäus*. Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 10. Münster: Aschendorff, 1974.
- Gamble, Harry Y. *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Gentry, Peter J. "The Text of the Old Testament." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 52 (2009): 19–45.
- Gerhardsson, Birger. "Gottes Sohn als Diener Gottes: Messias, Agape und Himmelscheschaft nach dem Matthäusevangelium." *Studia Theologica* 27 (1973): 73–106.
- _____. *The Mighty Acts of Jesus according to Matthew*. Scripta Minora Regiae Societas Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis 1978–79: 5. Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1979.
- _____. *The Testing of God's Son (Matt 4.1–11 & Par): An Analysis of Early Christian Midrash*. Translated by John Toy. Coniectanea Biblica–New Testament Series 2. Lund, Sweden: CWK Gleerup, 1966.
- Gibbs, James M. "The Son of God as the Torah Incarnate in Matthew." Pages 37–46 in *Studia Evangelica IV: Papers Presented to the Third International Congress on New Testament Studies held at Christ Church Oxford, 1965*. Part I: *The New Testament Scriptures*. Edited by F. L. Cross. Berlin: Akademic-Verlag, 1968.
- Gibbs, Jeffrey A. "Israel Standing with Israel: The Baptism of Jesus in Matthew's Gospel (Matt 3:13–17)." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 64 (2002): 511–26.
- _____. *Matthew 1:1–11:1*. Concordia Commentary. St. Louis: Concordia, 2006.
- Giesen, Heinz. *Christliches Handeln: Eine redaktionskritische Untersuchung zum δικαιοσύνη-Begriff im Matthäus-Evangelium*. Europäische Hochschulschriften 23/181. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1981.

- Glazier-McDonald, Beth. *Malachi: The Divine Messenger*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 98. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- Gnilka, Joachim. *Das Matthäusevangelium*. 2 vols. Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Freiburg: Herder, 1986–88.
- Goldingay, John and David Payne. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Isaiah 40–55*. 2 vols. International Critical Commentary. London: T&T Clark, 2006–7.
- Goldstein, Jonathan A. *II Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 41A. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983.
- Goodacre, Mark. *The Case against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem*. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2002.
- Goodwin, Mark J. “Hosea and ‘the Son of the Living God’ in Matthew 16:16b.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 67 (2005): 265–83.
- Green, Joel B. *The Gospel of Luke*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Green, William S. “Doing the Text’s Work for It: Richard Hays on Paul’s Use of Scripture.” Pages 58–63 in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 83 / Studies in Early Judaism and Christianity 1. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- Gundry, Robert H. *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- _____. *The Use of The Old Testament in St. Matthew’s Gospel with Special Reference to the Messianic Hope*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 18. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967.
- Hagner, Donald A. *Matthew*. 2 vols. Word Biblical Commentary 33A–B. Waco, Tex.: Word, 1993–95.
- _____. “Righteousness in Matthew’s Theology.” Pages 101–20 in *Worship, Theology and Ministry in the Early Church: Essays in Honor of Ralph P. Martin*. Edited by Michael J. Wilkins and Terence Paige. Journal for the

- Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 87. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.
- _____. *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 34. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973.
- Hahn, Scott W. *Kinship by Covenant: A Canonical Approach to the Fulfillment of God's Saving Promises*. Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2009.
- Hamerton-Kelly, Robert. *God the Father: Theology and Patriarchy in the Teaching of Jesus*. Overtures to Biblical Theology. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.
- Harriman, James Earl. "Our Father in Heaven: The Dimensions of Divine Paternity in Deuteronomy." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2005.
- Harrington, Daniel J. "Interpreting Israel's History: The Testament of Moses as a Rewriting of Deut 31–34." Pages 59–68 in *Studies on the Testament of Moses*. Edited by George W. E. Nickelsburg, Jr. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 4. Cambridge, Mass.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973.
- Harris, Murray J. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Harvey, Julien. "Le «Rîb-Pattern» Réquisitoire Prophétique sur la Rupture de l'Alliance." *Biblica* 43 (1962): 173–96.
- Hartman, L. "Scriptural Exegesis in the Gospel of St. Matthew and the Problem of Communication." Pages 131–52 in *L'évangile selon Matthieu: Rédaction et théologie*. Edited by M. Didier. Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1972.
- Hays, Richard B. "Can the Gospels Teach Us How to Read the Old Testament?" *Pro Ecclesia* 11 (2002): 402–18.
- _____. *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- _____. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.

- _____. *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1–4:11*. 2d ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- _____. *First Corinthians*. Interpretation. Louisville: John Knox, 1997.
- _____. “The Gospel of Matthew: Reconfigured Torah.” *Hervormde theologiese studies* 61 (2005): 165–90.
- _____. “‘Who has Believed Our Message?’ Paul’s Reading of Isaiah.” Pages 205–25 in vol. 1 of the *SBL Seminar Papers, 1998*. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 37. 2 vols. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.
- Hayward, Robert. “The Date of Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Some Comments.” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 40 (1989): 7–30.
- _____. “Red Heifer and Golden Calf: Dating Targum Pseudo-Jonathan.” Pages 9–32 in *Targum Studies 1: Textual and Contextual Studies in the Pentateuchal Targums*. Edited by Paul V. M. Flesher. South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism 55. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Heil, Christoph, ed. *Documenta Q: Q 4:1–13, 16: The Temptations of Jesus Nazara*. Leuven: Peeters, 1996.
- Heil, John Paul. *The Transfiguration of Jesus: Narrative Meaning and Function of Mark 9:2–8, Matt 17:1–8 and Luke 9:28–36*. Analecta Biblica 144. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2000.
- Heiser, Michael S. “Deuteronomy 32:8 and the Sons of God.” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 158 (2001): 52–74.
- Hendel, Ronald S. “‘Begetting’ and ‘Being Born’ in the Pentateuch: Notes on Historical Linguistics and Source Criticism.” *Vetus Testamentum* 50 (2000): 38–46.
- Hengel, Martin. “The Scriptures and their Interpretation in Second Temple Judaism.” Pages 158–75 in *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context*. Edited by D. R. G. Beattie and M. J. McNamara. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 166. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994.

- _____. *The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish–Hellenistic Religion*. Translated by John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.
- Hill, Andrew E. *Malachi: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 25D. New York: Doubleday, 1998.
- Hill, Charles E. *The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Hill, David. “Son and Servant: An Essay on Matthean Christology.” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 6 (1980): 2–16.
- Hillers, Delbert R. *Covenant: The History of a Biblical Idea*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1969.
- Holladay, William L. “The Background of Jeremiah’s Self–Understanding: Moses, Samuel, and Psalm 22.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 83 (1964): 153–64.
- _____. *A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah*. 2 vols. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1986–89.
- _____. “Jeremiah and Moses: Further Observations.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 85 (1966): 17–27.
- Hollenbach, Paul W. “The Conversion of Jesus: From Baptizer to Healer.” *ANRW* 25.1: 198–219. Part 2, *Principat*, 25.1. Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1982.
- Hood, Jason. “The Extent of Matthew’s Fifth Discourse.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 128 (2009): 527–43.
- Hooker, Morna D. *Jesus and the Servant: The Influence of the Servant Concept of Deutero-Isaiah in the New Testament*. London: SPCK, 1959.
- Howell, David B. *Matthew’s Inclusive Story: A Study in the Narrative Rhetoric of the First Gospel*. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series* 42. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990.
- Huffmon, Herbert B. “The Covenant Lawsuit in the Prophets.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 78 (1959): 285–95.

- Hugenberger, Gordon Paul. *Marriage as Covenant: A Study of Biblical Law and Ethics Governing Marriage Developed from the Perspective of Malachi*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 52. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994.
- Huizenga, Leroy Andrew. "The Akedah in Matthew." Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 2006.
- Hultgren, Arland J. *The Parables of Jesus: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Hurtado, Larry W. *The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- _____. *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Instone-Brewer, David. *Techniques and Assumptions of Jewish Exegesis before 70 CE*. Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 30. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992.
- Jenni, Ernst and Claus Westermann, eds. *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Translated by Mark E. Biddle. 3 vols. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1997.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *The Parables of Jesus*. Translated by S. H. Hooke. London: SCM Press, 1954.
- _____. *The Prayers of Jesus*. Studies in Biblical Theology. Second Series 6. London: SCM Press, 1967.
- Johnson, Marshall D. *The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies: With Special Reference to the Setting of the Genealogies of Jesus*. 2d ed. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 8. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Jones, Ivor H. *The Matthean Parables: A Literary and Historical Commentary*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 80. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995.
- _____. "Matthew." Pages 59–69 in *Early Christian Thought in its Jewish Context*. Edited by John Barclay and John Sweet. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Juel, Donald. *Messianic Exegesis: Christological Interpretation of the Old Testament in Early Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.

- Jülicher, Adolf. *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu. Erster Teile. Die Gleichnisreden Jesu im Allgemeinen*. 2d ed. Freiburg: Mohr Siebeck, 1899.
- Kaiser, Otto. *Isaiah 1–12*. Translated by John Bowden. Old Testament Library. London: SCM Press, 1983.
- _____. *Isaiah 13–39: A Commentary*. Translated by R. A. Wilson. Old Testament Library. London: SCM Press, 1974.
- Kammler, Hans-Christian. “Sohn Gottes und Kreuz: Die Versuchungsgeschichte Mt 4,1–11 im Kontext des Matthäusevangeliums.” *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 100 (2003): 163–86.
- Kaufman, Stephen A. and Michael Sokoloff. *A Key-Word-in-Context Concordance to Targum Neofiti: A Guide to the Complete Palestinian Aramaic Text of the Torah*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.
- Kee, Howard Clark. “Jesus: A Glutton and a Drunkard.” *New Testament Studies* 42 (1996): 374–93.
- Keener, Craig S. *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Keil, C. F. and Franz Delitzsch. *Commentary on the Old Testament*. Translated by James Martin. 10 vols. 1866. Repr., Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1996.
- Kennedy, R. Joel. “The Recapitulation of Israel: Use of Israel’s History in Matthew 1:1–4:11.” Ph.D. diss., University of Aberdeen, 2008.
- Keown, Gerald L., Pamela J. Scalise, and Thomas G. Smothers. *Jeremiah 26–52*. Word Biblical Commentary 27. Dallas: Word, 1995.
- Kiel, Micah D. “Tobit and Moses Redux.” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha*. 17 (2008): 83–98.
- Kirk, J. R. Daniel. “Conceptualising Fulfillment in Matthew.” *Tyndale Bulletin* 59 (2008): 77–98.
- Kitchen, K. A. *Ancient Orient and the Old Testament*. London: Tyndale, 1966.
- Kingsbury, Jack Dean. *Matthew*. Proclamation Commentaries. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.
- _____. *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom*. London: SPCK, 1976.

- _____. *Matthew as Story*. 2d ed. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.
- Kline, Meredith G. "Law Covenant." *Westminster Theological Journal* 27 (1964/65): 1–20.
- _____. *Treaty of the Great King: The Covenant Structure of Deuteronomy—Studies and Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963.
- Kloppenborg [Verbin], John S. *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000.
- Knight, George A. F. *The Song of Moses: A Theological Quarry*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Knoppers, Gary N. "David's Relation to Moses: The Contexts, Content and Conditions of the Davidic Promises." Pages 91–118 in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*. Edited by John Day. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 270. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Knowles, Michael. *Jeremiah in Matthew's Gospel: The Rejected-Prophet Motif in Matthean Redaction*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 68. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- _____. "'The Rock, His Work is Perfect': Unusual Imagery for God in Deuteronomy XXXII." *Vetus Testamentum* 39 (1989): 307–22.
- Koehler, Ludwig, Walter Baumgartner, and J. J. Stamm, eds.. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Translated and edited by M. E. J. Richardson. 4 vols. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994–99.
- Koester, Helmut. *Introduction to the New Testament*. 2 vols. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1982.
- Kooij, Arie van der. "The Ending of the Song of Moses." Pages 93–100 in *Studies in Deuteronomy: In Honour of C. J. Labuschagne on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Edited by F. G. Martínez et al. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 53. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994.
- Köstenberger, Andreas J. "John." Pages 415–512 in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.

- Köstenberger, Andreas J. and Scott R. Swain. *Father, Son, and Spirit: The Trinity and John's Gospel*. New Studies in Biblical Theology 24. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2008.
- Krentz, Edgar. "The Extent of Matthew's Prologue: Toward the Structure of the First Gospel." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 83 (1964): 409–14.
- Kugler, Robert A. "Testaments." Pages 189–213 in vol. 1 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism: The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*. Edited by D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid. 2 vols. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.
- Kümmel, Werner G. *Introduction to the New Testament*. 14th ed. Translated by A. J. Mattill, Jr. London: SCM Press, 1966.
- Kupp, David D. *Matthew's Emmanuel: Divine Presence and God's People in the First Gospel*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 90. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Kuyper, Lester J. "The Book of Deuteronomy." *Interpretation* 6 (1952): 321–40.
- Kynes, William L. *A Christology of Solidarity: Jesus as the Representative of His People in Matthew*. New York: University of America Press, 1991.
- Labahn, Michael. "Deuteronomy in John's Gospel." Pages 82–98 in *Deuteronomy in the New Testament: The New Testament and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken. Library of New Testament Studies 358. London: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Lagrange, Marie-Joseph. "La Paternité de Dieu dans l'Ancien Testament." *Revue Biblique* 26 (1908): 481–99.
- Larcher, C. *Le Livre de la Sagesse ou La Sagesse de Salomon*. 3 vols. Études Bibliques Nouvelle Série 1. Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1983–85.
- Landy, Francis. *Hosea*. Readings: New Biblical Commentary. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Lane, William L. *Hebrews 9–13*. Word Biblical Commentary 47B. Dallas: Word, 1991.
- Learney, A. R. C. *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*. New Testament Library. London: SCM Press, 1966.

- Levenson, Jon D. "The Davidic Covenant and its Modern Interpreters." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 41 (1979): 205–19.
- _____. *The Death and Resurrection of the Beloved Son: The Transformation of Child Sacrifice in Judaism and Christianity*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1993.
- Levey, Samson H. *The Messiah: An Aramaic Interpretation—The Messianic Exegesis of the Targum*. Monographs of the Hebrew Union College 2. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1974.
- Levine, Lee I. *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale, 2000.
- Levinson, Bernard M. and Molly M. Zahn. "Revelation Regained: The Hermeneutics of כִּי and מֵאֵן in the Temple Scroll." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 9 (2002): 295–346.
- Lim, Timothy H. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Very Short Introduction*. A Very Short Introduction 143. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- _____. "Deuteronomy in the Judaism of the Second Temple Period." Pages 6–26 in *Deuteronomy in the New Testament: The New Testament and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Maarten J. J. Menken and Steve Moyise. Library of New Testament Studies 358. London: T&T Clark, 2007.
- _____. *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997.
- Lindars, Barnabas. *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations*. London: SCM Press, 1961.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.
- _____. *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity*. Studies in Biblical Theology. Second Series 17. London: SCM Press, 1970.
- _____. "The Foundational Conviction of New Testament Christology: The Obedience/Faithfulness/Sonship of Christ." Pages 473–88 in *Jesus of Nazareth: Essays on the Historical Jesus and New Testament*

- Christology*. Edited by Joel B. Green and Max Turner. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.
- Lövestam, Evald. “The ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη Eschatology in Mk 13,30 parr.” Pages 403–13 in *L’Apocalypse johannique et l’Apocalyptique dans le Nouveau Testament*. Edited by J. Lambrecht. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 53. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1980.
- _____. *Jesus and ‘this Generation’: A New Testament Study*. Coniectanea Biblica: New Testament Series 25. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1995.
- Lundbom, Jack R. *Jeremiah: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. 3 vols. Anchor Bible 21A–C. New York: Doubleday, 1999–2004.
- Luz, Ulrich. “Intertexts in the Gospel of Matthew.” *Harvard Theological Review* 97 (2004): 119–37.
- _____. *Matthew: A Commentary*. Translated by James E. Crouch. 3 vols. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001–7.
- _____. *The Theology of the Gospel of Matthew*. Translated by J. B. Robinson. New Testament Theology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- _____. “Thesen zur Christologie des Matthäus.” Pages 221–35 in *Anfänge der Christologie: Festschrift für Ferdinand Hahn zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by Cilliers Breytenbauch and Hennig Paulsen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.
- Macdonald, Nathan. *Deuteronomy and the Meaning of ‘Monotheism.’* Forschungen zum Alten Testament II/1. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- Maier, Johann. *The Temple Scroll: An Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 34. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985.
- Manson, T. W. *The Teaching of Jesus: Studies of Its Form and Content*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1931.
- Mansoor, Menahem. *The Thanksgiving Hymns: Translated and Annotated with an Introduction*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 3. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961.

- Marchel, W. *Abba, Père! La Prière du Christ et des Chrétiens*. Rev. ed. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1971.
- Macus, Joel. *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark*. Studies of the New Testament and its World. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992.
- Marshall, I. Howard. "Acts." Pages 513–606 in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- _____. *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.
- Martínez, F. García. "Les Manuscrits du Désert de Juda et le Deutéronome." Pages 63–82 in *Studies in Deuteronomy: In Honour of C. J. Labuschagne on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Edited by F. G. Martínez et al. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 53. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994.
- Matera, Frank J. *New Testament Christology*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1999.
- Mathews, Victor H. and Don C. Benjamin. *Social World of Ancient Israel, 1250–587 BCE*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1993.
- Mawhinney, Allen. "God as Father: Two Popular Theories Reconsidered." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 31 (1988): 181–89.
- Mayes, A. D. H. *Deuteronomy: Based on the Revised Standard Version*. New Century Bible Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; London: Marshall, Morgan, and Scott, 1979.
- _____. "Deuteronomy 14 and the Deuteronomic Worldview." Pages 165–81 in *Studies in Deuteronomy: In Honour of C. J. Labuschagne on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Edited by F. G. Martínez et al. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 53. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994.
- Mays, James Luther. *Hosea: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. London: SCM Press, 1969.

- McCarter, P. Kyle, Jr. *II Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 9. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1984.
- McCarthy, Dennis J. "Covenant in the Old Testament: The Present State of Inquiry." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 27 (1965): 217–40.
- _____. "Notes on the Love of God in Deuteronomy and the Father-Son Relationship between Yahweh and Israel." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 27 (1965): 144–47.
- _____. *Old Testament Covenant: A Survey of Current Opinions*. Growing Points in Theology. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1972.
- _____. *Treaty and Covenant: A Study in Form in the Ancient Oriental Documents and in the Old Testament*. Analecta Biblica 21. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963.
- McConnell, Richard S. *Law and Prophecy in Matthew's Gospel: The Authority and Use of the Old Testament in the Gospel of St. Matthew*. Basel: Friedrich Reinhardt, 1969.
- McConville, J. Gordon. *Deuteronomy*. Apollos Old Testament Commentary 5. Leicester: Apollos; Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2002.
- _____. *Judgment and Promise: An Interpretation of the Book of Jeremiah*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1993.
- _____. *Grace in the End: A Study in Deuteronomistic Theology*. Studies in Old Testament Biblical Theology. Carlisle: Paternoster, 1993.
- McDonald, Lee Martin and James A. Sanders, eds. *The Canon Debate*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002.
- McKane, William. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah*. 2 vols. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986–96.
- McKay, J. W. "Man's Love for God in Deuteronomy and the Father/Teacher – Son/Pupil Relationship." *Vetus Testamentum* 22 (1972): 426–35.
- McKenzie, John L. "The Divine Sonship of Israel and the Covenant." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 8 (1946): 320–31.
- McKenzie, Steven L. and Howard N. Wallace. "Covenant Themes in Malachi." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 45 (1983): 549–63.

- McNamara, Martin. *Targum and Testament. Aramaic Paraphrases on the Hebrew Bible: A Light on the New Testament*. Shannon, Ireland: Irish University Press, 1972.
- Mead, Richard T. "A Dissenting Opinion about Respect for Contexts in Old Testament Quotations." *New Testament Studies* 10 (1963/64): 279–89.
- Mendelsohn, I. "On the Preferential Status of the Eldest Son." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 156 (1959): 38–40.
- Mendenhall, George E. "Ancient Oriental and Biblical Law." *Biblical Archaeologist* 17 (1954): 26–46.
- _____. "Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition." *Biblical Archaeologist* 17 (1954): 50–76.
- Menken, Maarten J. J. *Matthew's Bible: The Old Testament Text of the Evangelist*. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 173. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2004.
- _____. "Deuteronomy in Matthew's Gospel." Pages 42–62 in *Deuteronomy in the New Testament: The New Testament and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken. Library of New Testament Studies 358. London: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Merwe, Christo H. J. van der, Jackie A. Naudé and Jan H. Kroeze. *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*. Biblical Languages: Hebrew 3. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Metzger, Bruce M. "Important Early Translations of the Bible." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 150 (1993): 35–49.
- _____. *An Introduction to the Apocrypha*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1957.
- _____. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2d ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.
- Michaels, J. Ramsey. "The Parable of the Regretful Son." *Harvard Theological Review* 61 (1968): 15–26.
- _____. *Servant and Son: Jesus in Parable and Gospel*. Atlanta: John Knox, 1981.

- Milgrom, Jacob. *The JPS Torah Commentary: Numbers*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1989.
- Miller, Patrick D. *Deuteronomy*. Interpretation. Louisville, John Knox, 1990.
- _____. "Israelite Religion." Pages 201–37 in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Modern Interpreters*. Edited by Douglas A. Knight and Gene M. Tucker. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
- Moberly, R. W. L. *The Bible, Theology, and Faith: A Study of Abraham and Jesus*. Cambridge Studies in Christian Doctrine. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Modica, Joseph B. "Jesus as Glutton and Drunkard: The 'Excesses' of Jesus." Pages 50–75 in *Who Do My Opponents Say that I Am? An Investigation of the Accusations against Jesus*. Edited by Scot McKnight and Joseph B. Modica. Library of New Testament Studies 327. London: T&T Clark, 2008.
- Moessner, David P. *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.
- Moo, Douglas J. *The Epistle to the Romans*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- _____. *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*. Sheffield: The Almond Press, 1983.
- _____. "The Problem of *Sensus Plenior*." Pages 175–211 in *Hermeneutics, Authority and Canon*. Edited by D. A. Carson and J. D. Woodbridge. Leicester: InterVarsity, 1986.
- Moore, Carey A. *Tobit: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 40A. New York: Doubleday, 1996.
- Moore, George Foot. *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim*. 3 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927–30.
- Moore, Stephen D. *Literary Criticism and the Gospels: The Theoretical Challenge*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University, 1989.
- Moran, William L. *Amarna Studies: Collected Writings*. Harvard Semitic Studies 54. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2003.

- _____. “The Ancient Near Eastern Background of the Love of God in Deuteronomy.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 25 (1963): 77–87.
- Moses, A. D. A. *Matthew’s Transfiguration Story and Jewish-Christian Controversy*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 122. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Moule, C. F. D. “Fulfillment Words in the New Testament: Use and Abuse.” Pages 3–36 in *Essays in New Testament Interpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- _____. *An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek*. 2d. ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959.
- Moyise, Steve. “Deuteronomy in Mark’s Gospel.” Pages 26–41 in *Deuteronomy in the New Testament: The New Testament and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken. Library of New Testament Studies 358. London: T&T Clark, 2007.
- _____. *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 115. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- _____. “Intertextuality and the Study of the Old Testament in the New Testament.” Pages 14–41 in *The Old Testament in the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. L. North*. Edited by Steve Moyise. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 189. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Moyise, Steve and Maarten J. J. Menken, eds. *Deuteronomy in the New Testament: The New Testament and the Scriptures of Israel*. Library of New Testament Studies 358. London: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Mulder, Martin Jan, ed. *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum II/1. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.
- Müller, Mogens. “The Theological Interpretation of the Figure of Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew: Some Principal Features in Matthean Christology.” *New Testament Studies* 45 (1999): 157–73.

- Murphy, Frederick James. *Pseudo-Philo: Rewriting the Bible*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- _____. *The Structure and Meaning of Second Baruch*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 78. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.
- New, David S. *Old Testament Quotations in the Synoptic Gospels, and the Two-Document Hypothesis*. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 37. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.
- Nicholson, E. W. *God and His People: Covenant and Theology in the Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1986.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E., Jr. *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism*. Harvard Theological Studies 26. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972.
- Nodet, Étienne. *Le Pentateuque de Flavius Josèphe*. La Bible de Josèphe I/1. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1996.
- Nolan, Brian M. *The Royal Son of God: The Christology of Matthew 1–2 in the Setting of the Gospel*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 23. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.
- Nolland, John. *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Bletchley: Paternoster, 2005.
- _____. “No Son-of-God Christology in Matthew 1.18–25.” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 62 (1996): 3–12.
- _____. “What Kind of Genesis Do We Have in Matt 1.1?” *New Testament Studies* 42 (1996): 463–71.
- Novakovic, Lidija. “Jesus as the Davidic Messiah in Matthew.” *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 19 (1997): 148–91.
- _____. *Messiah, the Healer of the Sick: A Study of Jesus as the Son of David in the Gospel of Matthew*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II/170. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- O’Brien, Peter T. *The Epistle to the Philippians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.

- O’Leary, Anne M. *Matthew’s Judaization of Mark: Examined in the Context of the Use of Sources in Graeco-Roman Antiquity*. Library of New Testament Studies 323. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Olley, John W. “A Precursor of the NRSV? ‘Sons and Daughters’ in 2 Cor 6.18.” *New Testament Studies* 44 (1998): 204–12.
- Olmstead, Wesley G. *Matthew’s Trilogy of Parables: The Nation, the Nations and the Reader in Matthew 21.28–22.14*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 127. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Orton, David E. *The Understanding Scribe: Matthew and the Apocalyptic Ideal*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 25. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
- Paget, James Carleton. “The *Epistle of Barnabas*.” Pages 72–80 in *The Writings of the Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by Paul Foster. London: T&T Clark, 2007. Repr. from *Expository Times* 117 (2006): 441–46.
- _____. “The *Epistle of Barnabas* and the Writings that Later Formed the New Testament.” Pages 229–49 in *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by Andrew F. Gregory and Christopher M. Tuckett. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Pattarumadathil, Henry. *Your Father in Heaven: Discipleship in Matthew as a Process of Becoming Children of God*. Analecta Biblica 172. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2008.
- Patte, Daniel. *The Gospel according to Matthew: A Structural Commentary on Matthew’s Faith*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.
- Paul, André. *L’Évangile de l’Enfance selon Saint Matthieu*. *Lire la Bible* 17. Paris: Cerf, 1968.
- Pearce, Sarah. “Josephus and the Witness Laws of Deuteronomy.” Pages 122–34 in *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium: Aarhus 1999*. Edited by Jürgen U. Kalms. Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum Münsteraner Judaistische Studien 6. Münster: LIT, 1999.
- Pedersen, Johannes. *Israel: Its Life and Culture*. Translated by Aslaug Møller. 4 vols. London: Oxford University Press, 1926.

- Pennington, Jonathan T. *Heaven and Earth in the Gospel of Matthew*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 126. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2007.
- Perrot, Charles. "The Reading of the Bible in the Ancient Synagogue." Pages 137–59 in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by Martin Jan Mulder. *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum II/1*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.
- Pesch, Rudolf. "Der Gottessohn im mattäischen Evangelienprolog (Mt 1–2): Beobachtungen zu den Zitationsformeln der Reflexionszitate." *Biblica* 48 (1967): 395–420.
- Phillips, Anthony. *Deuteronomy: A Commentary*. Cambridge Bible Commentary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- Porter, Stanley E. "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology." Pages 79–96 in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series* 148 / *Studies in Early Judaism and Christianity* 5. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Powell, Mark Allan. "The Plots and Subplots of Matthew's Gospel." *New Testament Studies* 38 (1992): 187–204.
- _____. *What is Narrative Criticism?* Guides to Biblical Scholarship: New Testament Series. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
- Propp, William H. C. *Exodus 1–18: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 2. New York: Doubleday, 1998.
- Przybylski, Benno. *Righteousness in Matthew and in his World of Thought*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 41. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- _____. "The Role of Mt 3:13–4:11 in the Structure and Theology of the Gospel of Matthew." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 4 (1974): 222–35.
- Puskas, Charles B. and David Crump. *An Introduction to the Gospels and Acts*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.

- Rad, Gerhard von. *Deuteronomy: A Commentary*. Translated by Dorothea Barton. Old Testament Library. London: SCM Press, 1966.
- _____. *Old Testament Theology*. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. 2 vols. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1962–65.
- Ratzinger, Joseph. *Jesus of Nazareth: From the Baptism in the Jordan to the Transfiguration*. New York: Doubleday, 2007.
- Reichert, Andreas. “Israel, the Firstborn of God: A Topic of Early Deuteronomic Theology.” Pages 341–49 in vol. 1 of *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies*. Edited by Avigdor Shinan. Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1977.
- Reider, Joseph. *The Book of Wisdom: An English Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Jewish Apocryphal Literature. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957.
- Rendtorff, Rolf. *The Covenant Formula: An Exegetical and Theological Investigation*. Translated by Margaret Kohl. Old Testament Studies. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.
- Repschinski, Boris. “‘For He Will Save His People from Their Sins’ (Matthew 1:21): A Christology for Christian Jews.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 68 (2006): 248–67.
- Rhodes, James N. *The Epistle of Barnabas and the Deuteronomic Tradition: Polemics, Paraenesis, and the Legacy of the Golden-Calf Incident*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II/188. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
- Rosner, Brian S. “Deuteronomy in 1 and 2 Corinthians.” Pages 118–35 in *Deuteronomy in the New Testament: The New Testament and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken. Library of New Testament Studies 358. London: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Rothfuchs, Wilhelm. *Die Erfüllungszitate des Matthäus-Evangeliums: Eine biblische-theologische Untersuchung*. Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament 88. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1969.

- Runesson, Anders. *The Origins of the Synagogue: A Socio-Historical Study*. Coniectanea biblica: New Testament Series 37. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2001.
- Rusam, Dietrich. "Deuteronomy in Luke-Acts." Pages 63–81 in *Deuteronomy in the New Testament: The New Testament and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken. Library of New Testament Studies 358. London: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Saldarini, Anthony J. *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community*. Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1994.
- _____. "Reading Matthew without Anti-Semitism." Pages 166–84 in *The Gospel of Matthew in Current Study: Studies in Memory of William G. Thompson, S. J.* Edited by David E. Aune. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- Sanders, E. P. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1977.
- Sanders, Paul. *The Provenance of Deuteronomy 32*. *Oudestamēntische Studiën* 37. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996.
- Senior, Donald. "Directions in Matthean Studies." Pages 5–21 in *The Gospel of Matthew in Current Study: Studies in Memory of William G. Thompson, S. J.* Edited by David E. Aune. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- Scalise, Pamela J. "The Logic of Covenant and the Logic of Lament in the Book of Jeremiah." *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 28 (2001): 395–401.
- Schaberg, Jane. *The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit: The Triadic Phrase in Matthew 28.19b*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 61. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1982.
- Schlatter, Adolf. *Der Evangelist Matthäus: Seine Sprache, sein Ziel, seine Selbständigkeit*. 3d ed. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1948.
- Schmitt, John J. "Israel as Son of God in Torah." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 34 (2004): 69–79.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *Jesus in the Gospels: A Biblical Christology*. Translated by O. C. Dean, Jr. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995.

- _____. “Die Seligpreisung der Friedensstifter (Mt 5,9) im mattäischen Kontext.” *Biblische Zeitschrift* 26 (1982): 161–78.
- Schreiner, Thomas R. *Romans*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1998.
- Schwartz, Daniel R. “On Something Biblical about 2 Maccabees.” Pages 223–32 in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the First International Symposium of The Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 May, 1996*. Edited by Michael E. Stone and Esther G. Chazon. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 27. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1998.
- Schweizer, Eduard. *The Good News according to Matthew*. Translated by David E. Green. Atlanta: John Knox, 1975.
- Seifrid, Mark A. “Romans.” Pages 607–94 in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Sheppard, Gerald T. *Wisdom as a Hermeneutical Construct: A Study in the Sapientializing of the Old Testament*. Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 151. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1980.
- Silva, Moisés. “Galatians.” Pages 785–812 in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- _____. *Philippians*. 2d ed. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005.
- Sim, David C. *The Gospel of Matthew and Christian Judaism: The History and Social Setting of the Matthean Community*. Studies of the New Testament and its World. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.
- Skehan, Patrick W. and Alexander A. Di Lella. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes, Introduction, and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 39. New York: Doubleday, 1987.

- Smith, Duane Andre. "Kinship and Covenant in Hosea 11:1–4." *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 16/1 (1994): 41–53.
- Smith, Mark S. "'Your People Shall Be My People': Family and Covenant in Ruth 1:16–17." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 69 (2007): 242–58.
- Smith, Ralph L. *Micah-Malachi*. Word Biblical Commentary 32. Waco, Tex.: Word, 1984.
- Snodgrass, Klyne R. *Stories with Intent: A Comprehensive Guide to the Parables of Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Soares Prabhu, George M. *The Formula Quotations in the Infancy Narrative of Matthew: An Inquiry into the Tradition of Mt 1–2*. Analecta Biblica 63. Rome: Biblica Institute Press, 1969.
- Söding, Thomas. "Der Gehorsam des Gottessohnes: Zur Christologie der matthäischen Versuchungserzählung (4,1–11)." Pages 711–50 in *Jesus Christus als die Mitte der Schrift*. Edited by Christof Landmesser, Hans-Joachim Eckstein, and Hermann Lichtenberger. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 86. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997.
- Stanley, Christopher D. *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 69. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- _____. "The Social Environment of 'Free' Biblical Quotations in the New Testament." Pages 18–27 in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 148 / Studies in Early Judaism and Christianity 5. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Stanton, Graham N. *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992.
- _____. "Matthew." Pages 205–19 in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture—Essays in Honor of Barnabas Lindars*. Edited by D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

- _____. “The Origin and Purpose of Matthew’s Gospel: Matthean Scholarship from 1945 to 1980.” *ANRW* 25.3: 1889–1951. Part 2, *Principat*, 25.3. Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1985.
- Stegner, William Richard. “The Temptation Narrative: A Study in the Use of Scripture by Early Jewish Christians.” *Biblical Research* 35 (1990): 5–17.
- Stendahl, Krister. “Quis et Unde? An Analysis of Matthew 1–2.” Pages 94–105 in *Judentums, Urchristentum, Kirche: Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias*. Edited by Walther Eltester. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 26. Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1960.
- _____. *The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament*. 2d ed. Acta seminarii neotestamentici upsaliensis 20. Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1968.
- Steyn, Gert J. “Deuteronomy in Hebrews.” Pages 152–68 in *Deuteronomy in the New Testament: The New Testament and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken. Library of New Testament Studies 358. London: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Stockhausen, Carol K. “2 Corinthians 3 and the Principles of Pauline Exegesis.” Pages 143–64 in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 83 / Studies in Early Judaism and Christianity 1. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- Strack, Hermann L. and Paul Billerbeck. *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*. 6 vols. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1922–61.
- Strecker, Georg. *The Sermon on the Mount: An Exegetical Commentary*. Translated by O. C. Dean. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988.
- Strecker, *Der Weg Gerechtigkeit: Untersuchung zur Theologie des Matthäus*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 82. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962.
- Strotmann, Angelika. *Mein Vater bist du! (Sir 51.10): Zur Bedeutung der Vaterschaft Gottes in kanonischen und nichtkanonischen frühjüdischen Schriften*. Frankfurter theologische Studien 39. Frankfurt: Josef Knecht, 1991.

- Stuart, Douglas. *Hosea–Jonah*. Word Biblical Commentary 31. Waco, Tex.: Word, 1987.
- Suggs, M. Jack. *Wisdom, Christology, and Law in Matthew's Gospel*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970.
- Sundberg, Albert C., Jr. "The Septuagint: The Bible of Hellenistic Judaism" Pages 68–90 in *The Canon Debate*. Edited by Lee M. McDonald and James A. Sanders. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002.
- Swanson, Dwight D. *The Temple Scroll and the Bible: The Methodology of 11QT*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 34. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995.
- Sweeney, Marvin A. *The Twelve Prophets: Volume 1*. Berit Olam. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 2000.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu. "Aspects of the Textual Transmission of the Bible in the Light of Qumran Manuscripts." *Textus* 4 (1964): 95–132. Repr. pages 226–63 in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*. Edited by Frank Moore Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975.
- Tasker, David R. *Ancient Near Eastern Literature and the Hebrew Scriptures About the Fatherhood of God*. Studies in Biblical Literature 69. New York: Peter Lang, 2004.
- Temporini, Hildegard, and Wolfgang Haase, eds. *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*. Part 2, *Principat*, 25.1, 3. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1982, 1985.
- Testuz, Michel. *Les Idées Religieuses du Livre des Jubilés*. Paris: Minard, 1960.
- Thackeray, Henry St. John. *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909.
- Thiessen, Matthew. "The Form and Function of the Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 32:1–43)." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 123 (2004): 401–24.
- Thiselton, Anthony C. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

- Thompson, G. H. P. "Called—Proved—Obedient: A Study in the Baptism and Temptation Narratives of Matthew and Luke." *Journal of Theological Studies* 11 (1960): 1–12.
- Thompson, J. A. *The Book of Jeremiah*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.
- Thompson, Marianne Meye. *The Promise of the Father: Jesus and God in the New Testament*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2000.
- Thrall, Margaret E. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. 2 vols. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994–2000.
- Tigay, Jeffrey H. *The JPS Torah Commentary: Deuteronomy*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1996.
- Tilborg, Sjeff van. *The Jewish Leaders in Matthew*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972.
- Tilly, Michael. "Deuteronomy in Revelation." Pages 169–88 in *Deuteronomy in the New Testament: The New Testament and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken. Library of New Testament Studies 358. London: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Tov, Emanuel. "The Septuagint." Pages 161–88 in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by Martin J. Mulder. Compendia Rerum Judaicarum ad Novum Testamentum II/1. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.
- _____. "Some Reflections on the Hebrew Texts from which the Septuagint was Translated." *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 19 (1993): 107–22.
- _____. *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. 2d ed. Jerusalem: Simor, 1997.
- _____. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Tov, Emanuel, ed. *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 39. Oxford: Clarendon, 2002.

- Trilling, Wolfgang. *Das Wahre Israel: Studien zur Theologie des Matthäusevangeliums*. Erfurter theologische Studien 7. Leipzig: St. Benno, 1959.
- Tromp, Johannes. *The Assumption of Moses: A Critical Edition with Commentary*. Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigraphica 10. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1993.
- Tuckett, Christopher. "Paul, Scripture and Ethics." Pages 71–97 in *New Testament Writers and the Old Testament: An Introduction*. Edited by John M. Court. London: SPCK, 2002.
- Turner, C. H. "ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός." *Journal of Theological Studies* 27 (1926): 113–29.
- Turner, David L. *Matthew*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.
- Ulrich, Eugene. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- _____. "Septuagint Manuscripts from Qumran: A Reappraisal of Their Value." Pages 49–80 in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings (Manchester, 1990)*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 33. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Van Iersel, B. M. F. *'Der Sohn' in den synoptischen Jesusworten: Christusbezeichnung der Gemeinde oder Selbstbezeichnung Jesu?* Supplements to Novum Testamentum 3. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961.
- VanderKam, James C. "Questions of Canon Viewed through the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 91–109 in *The Canon Debate*. Edited by Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002.
- VanGemeren, Willem A. "‘*ʾABBĀ*’ in the Old Testament?" *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 31 (1988): 385–398.
- Veijola, Timo. *Das 5. Buch Mose Deuteronomium: Kapitel 1,1–16,17*. Das Alte Testament Deutsch 8,1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004.

- Verhoef, Pieter A. *The Books of Haggai and Malachi*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
- Vermes, Geza. "Biblical Proof-Texts in Qumran Literature." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 34 (1989): 493–508.
- Verseput, Donald J. "The Role and Meaning of the 'Son of God' Title in Matthew's Gospel." *New Testament Studies* 33 (1987): 532–66.
- Vincent, J. J. "The Parables of Jesus as Self-Revelation." Pages 79–99 in *Studia Evangelica: Papers Presented to the International Congress on "The Four Gospels in 1957" held at Christ Church Oxford, 1957*. Edited by Kurt Aland et al. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959.
- Vos, Geerhardus. "The Scriptural Doctrine of the Love of God." *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* 13 (1902): 1–37.
- Waltke, Bruce K. *The Book of Proverbs: Chapters 1–15*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Waltke, Bruce K. and M. O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Waltke, Bruce K. with Charles Yu. *An Old Testament Theology: An Exegetical, Canonical, and Thematic Approach*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2007.
- Washburn, David L. *A Catalog of Biblical Passages in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Society of Biblical Literature Text-Critical Studies 2. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002.
- Waters, Guy. *The End of Deuteronomy in the Epistles of Paul*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II/221. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- Watson, Francis. *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Watts, James W. *Psalm and Story: Inset Hymns in Hebrew Narrative*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 139. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.
- Watts, John D. W. *Isaiah*. 2 vols. Word Biblical Commentary 24–25. Waco, Tex.: Word, 1985–87.

- Watts, Rikki E. "Mark." Pages 111–249 in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. "B^erit—Covenant vs. Obligation." *Biblica* 56 (1975): 120–28.
- _____. "The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 90 (1970): 184–203.
- _____. *Deuteronomy: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 5. New York: Doubleday, 1991.
- _____. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1972.
- _____. "Grace after Meals in Qumran." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 111 (1992): 427–40.
- Weitzman, Steven. "Allusion, Artifice, and Exile in the Hymn of Tobit." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 115 (1996): 49–61.
- Wendland, Ernst. "Linear and Concentric Patterns in Malachi." *The Bible Translator* 36 (1985): 108–121.
- Westermann, Claus. *Isaiah 40–66: A Commentary*. Translated by David M. G. Stalker. Old Testament Library. London: SCM Press, 1969.
- Wevers, John William. *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy*. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 39. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- _____. *Text History of the Greek Deuteronomy*. Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 13. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978.
- White, Sidnie Anne. "4QDtⁿ: Biblical Manuscript or Excerpted Text?" Pages 13–20 in *Of Scribes and Scrolls: Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins*. Edited by Harold W. Attridge, John J. Collins, and Thomas H. Tobin. Resources in Religion 5. Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1990.
- Whitters, Mark F. *The Epistle of Second Baruch: A Study in Form and Message*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 42. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003.

- Widdicombe, Peter. *The Fatherhood of God from Origen to Athanasius*. Oxford Theological Monographs. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.
- Wilderberger, Hans. *Isaiah 1–12: A Commentary*. Translated by Thomas H. Trapp. Continental Commentary. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- Williamson H. G. M. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Isaiah 1–27*. 3 vols. International Critical Commentary. London: T&T Clark, 2006–.
- _____. “Isaiah 1 and the Covenant Lawsuit.” Pages 393–406 in *Covenant as Context: Essays in Honor of E. W. Nicholson*. Edited by A. D. H. Mayes and R. B. Salters. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- _____. “Relocating Isaiah 1:2–9.” Pages 263–77 in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*. Edited by Craig C. Eroyles and Craig A. Evans. Vol. 1. Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum* 70.1 / Formation and Interpretation of Old Testament Literature 1.1. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997.
- Willitts, Joel. *Matthew’ Messianic Shepherd-King: In Search of the Lost Sheep of the House of Israel*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche 147. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007.
- Winston, David. *The Wisdom of Solomon: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 43. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1979.
- Winter, Paul. “Der Begriff ‘Söhne Gottes’ im Moselied Dtn 32 1–43.” *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 67 (1955): 40–48.
- Wise, Michael Owen. *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11*. Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilizations 49. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1990.
- Wolff, Hans Walter. *Hosea: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Hosea*. Translated by Gary Stansell. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974.
- Wouters, Armin. “...wer den Willen meines Vaters tut”: *Eine Untersuchung zum Verständnis vom Handeln im Matthäusevangelium*. Biblische Untersuchungen 23. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1992.

- Wright, Christopher J. H. *Deuteronomy*. New International Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament 4. Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson, 1996.
- _____. *God's People in God's Land: Family, Land, and Property in the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Exeter: Paternoster, 1990.
- _____. *Knowing Jesus through the Old Testament: Rediscovering the Roots of our Faith*. London: Marshall Pickering, 1992.
- _____. *The Mission of God: Unlocking the Bible's Grand Narrative*. Nottingham: InterVarsity, 2006.
- Wright, G. Ernest. "The Lawsuit of God: A Form-Critical Study of Deuteronomy 32." Pages 26–67 in *Israel's Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg*. Edited by Bernhard W. Anderson and Walter Harrelson. Preacher's Library. London: SCM Press, 1962.
- Wright, N. T. *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- _____. *The New Testament and the People of God. Christian Origins and the Question of God 1*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- _____. *Paul: In Fresh Perspective*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005.
- Würthwein, Ernst. *The Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Biblia Hebraica*. Translated by Erroll F. Rhodes. 2d. ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Yadin, Yigael. *The Temple Scroll: The Hidden Law of the Dead Sea Sect*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1985.
- York, Anthony D. "The Dating of the Targumic Literature." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 5 (1974): 49–62.
- Zimmerli, Walter and Joachim Jeremias. *The Servant of God*. Rev. ed. Studies in Biblical Theology 20. London: SCM Press, 1965.
- Zink, James Keith. "The Use of the Old Testament in the Apocrypha." Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1963.

