

THE DEATH OF JESUS IN MATTHEW'S GOSPEL AS A RECAPITULATION OF
ISRAEL'S EXILE IN THE JEWISH SCRIPTURES AND POST-BIBLICAL JEWISH
TRADITION

By

NICHOLAS J. SCHASER

Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of Vanderbilt University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in

Religion

December, 2013

Nashville, TN

Approved:

Professor Amy-Jill Levine

Professor Phillip Ackerman-Lieberman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. Introduction	1
II. Israel in Exile/Bondage and God’s Return.....	5
III. Targum and New Testament: A Comparative Method.....	9
IV. Matthew’s Method.....	23
Typology vs. Narrative Patterning.....	23
Jesus and Israel in Matthean Scholarship	27
V. “Cast Out” as Exile	33
טלטל in the Targums of Isaiah and Jeremiah.....	33
ἐκβάλλω in Classical Greek Literature.....	37
ἐκβάλλω in the LXX and its Relation to טלטל	38
VI. “Cast Out” in Matthew and the Isaiah Targum	44
Matthew’s Use of ἐκβάλλω as Exile in 8:12.....	44
The Parable of the Tenants (Mt 21:33-46) and Isaiah 5:1-7 MT.....	46
Isaiah 5:1-7 in Early Jewish and Christian Interpretation.....	48
The Parable of the Tenants and Isa Tg 5:1-7	50
VII. Exile in the Matthean Passion Narrative	57
VIII. Conclusion	67
REFERENCES	68

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Gospel writers' use of scriptural antecedents in framing the life of Jesus has long been a focus of New Testament scholarship. Matthew's Gospel, in particular, is marked by connections between Jesus and various figures and events in the Jewish Scriptures.¹ Along with the Scriptures themselves, Matthew also draws on Jewish traditions current in the first century, some of which also appear in the Targums, the Aramaic translations and paraphrases of the Scriptures. Matthew uses these traditions to cast Jesus' death as a restaging of Israel's exile, which validates Jesus' messianic credentials insofar as Israel's story is retold in the life and, in this case, the death of Israel's Messiah. Matthew argues for the necessity of a suffering and dying Messiah by drawing on texts in which God's people suffer as a result of the Babylonian siege and exile, and showing how Jesus recapitulates these events in his own suffering and death. Matthew claims that such suffering was an essential component of the messianic mission; as an embodiment of Israel, the Messiah enters into exile as a "ransom" (Mt 20:28), which pays the price for the debt that Israel had incurred through its sin.

¹ For treatments of Matthew's Jesus in relation to the biblical narrative see, for example, Leroy A. Huizenga, *The New Isaac: Tradition and Intertextuality in the Gospel of Matthew* (Leiden: Brill, 2009); Mervyn Eloff, "'Από... ἕως and Salvation History in Matthew's Gospel," in Daniel M. Gurtner and John Nolland, eds., *Built Upon the Rock: Studies in the Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008), 85-107; Jörg Frey and Jens Schröter, eds., *Deutungen des Todes Jesu im Neuen Testament* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005); David R. Bauer, "The Literary and Theological Function of the Genealogy in Matthew's Gospel," in David R. Bauer and Mark Allan Powell, eds., *Treasures Old and New: Recent Contributions to Matthean Studies* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 129-59; Michael Knowles, *Jeremiah in Matthew's Gospel: The Rejected-Prophet Motif in Matthean Redaction* (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993); Dale C. Allison, Jr., *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993).

Several scholars have developed the idea that for many in the Second Temple period Israel was still “in exile” and, according to the Gospel writers, Jesus brought about the end of exile.² This view provides the framework for Matthew’s presentation of Jesus as an individual representative of corporate Israel whose death pays the ransom-price necessary for release from exile. While first-century Jews were not in literal exile from their geographic homeland, Matthew contends that even those living in Israel were still in bondage to sin, which separated them from God. The Targums also maintain that Israel’s sin is a debt whose payment will be followed by the coming of God’s kingdom. In the Targums, as in the Jewish Scriptures, the debt is paid off through Israel’s exile; in Matthew, this debt is paid through Jesus’ death, which is explicitly patterned on Israel’s exile.

By ascertaining commonalities in the traditions that appear in Matthew and the Targums, we can isolate analogous phenomena within these distinct literatures; such analogies constitute instances in which phrases in both texts have the same meaning in similar contexts. In the case of the First Gospel, the writer utilizes Jewish traditions, which the Targums share, in order to describe Jesus of Nazareth in relation to the sacred history of Israel. Therefore, an analysis of how Matthew patterns his protagonist on Israel, as well as a survey of the patterns that New Testament scholars have already

² See N. T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 268-70; Idem., *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997), 268-74; Daniel G. Reid, “Jesus: New Exodus, New Conquest,” in Tremper Longman III and Daniel G. Reid, *God Is a Warrior* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1995), 91-118; Craig A. Evans, “Jesus and the Continuing Exile of Israel,” in Carey C. Newman, ed., *Jesus and the Restoration of Israel: A Critical Assessment of N.T. Wright’s Jesus and the Victory of God* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1999), 77-100; Idem., “Aspects of Exile and Restoration in the Proclamation of Jesus and the Gospels,” in James M. Scott, ed., *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish and Christian Conceptions* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 299-328; Mervyn Eloff, “Exile, Restoration, and Matthew’s Genealogy of Jesus’ Ο ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ,” *Neot* 38 (2004): 75-87; Richard B. Hays, “The Gospel of Matthew: Reconfigured Torah,” *HTS* 61 (2005): 165-90; Gary A. Anderson, *Sin: A History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 75-94; Nathan Eubank, *Wages of Cross-bearing and Debt of Sin: The Economy of Heaven in Matthew’s Gospel* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013), 109-32.

discovered, provides the basis for our connections between Matthew's Jesus and Israel's exile as it is presented in the Targums.

Specifically, Matthew's use of ἐκβάλλω (to cast out) to describe exile, parallels the Aramaic טלטל (to cast out), which the Targums use to describe the Babylonian exile. Though Matthew is not dependent on the Aramaic texts, the use of טלטל, particularly in the Targums of Isaiah and Jeremiah, is the clearest example of a Jewish tradition that clarifies the exilic nuance of ἐκβάλλω in the Gospel. Further, similar uses of ἐκβάλλω to describe exile, particularly in classical Greek literature and the Septuagint, form a basis for the tradition as it would appear in Matthew and the Targums.

Matthew first uses ἐκβάλλω as exile with reference to the "sons of the kingdom" who will be "cast out" into outer darkness (Mt 8:12), and then in the Parable of the Tenants (Mt 21:33-46) when the parabolic "son," who represents Jesus, is cast out of the vineyard (21:39). A parallel usage of טלטל in the targumic version of Isaiah's vineyard parable (Isa Tg 5:1-7), in which the people of Israel are cast out in exile, provides the interpretive key to reading the Parable of the Tenants as an allegorical description of Jesus reenacting Israel's exile in his death—cast out from the "land of the living" (cf. Ps 52:5; Isa 53:8; Jer 11:19). This aspect of the Parable of the Tenants shows how Matthew understands Jesus' death as a ransom payment that cancels the debt of sin and allows for reunification between God and those within Israel who choose to follow his Son.

Matthew's many allusions to Israel's exile in the Passion Narrative (Mt 26-27) support the portrayal of Jesus' death introduced in the Parable of the Tenants. While much of the material in Matthew's parable and passion is also found in Mark, Matthew's Jesus-Israel connections are more pronounced. Jesus is equated with Israel, to varying

degrees, in each of the Gospels; however, scholars have long noted that Matthew increases these equations. Moreover, because Matthew explicitly cites the Jewish Scriptures more often than Mark, and due to the shared motif of sin-debt and its relationship to exile in Matthew and the Targums, the First Gospel represents the most appropriate test case for our specific connections between Jesus and Israel's story as it was known in early Judaism. Throughout the Passion Narrative, Matthew builds on the Markan allusions to scriptures that link Israel's exile with Jesus' death. When Jesus finally dies, Matthew echoes scriptural language associated with the end of exile and the imminent return from Babylon (cf. Mt 27:50-51; Isa LXX 13:13; 24:20; 48:20-21). While these intertexts point to Jesus' resurrection, they also confirm the efficacy of Jesus as a ransom who was sent to "save his people from their sins" (Mt 1:21).

CHAPTER II

ISRAEL IN EXILE/BONDAGE AND GOD'S RETURN

The idea that Second Temple Jews viewed themselves as “still in exile,” championed most prominently by N. T. Wright, has been well established in recent scholarship. Drawing on evidence from post-exilic texts that speak of Israel’s continued bondage and the as yet unfulfilled promise that God would return to his people,³ Wright concludes, “Israel’s exile was still in progress.... Israel has returned to the land, but is still in the ‘exile’ of slavery, under the oppression of foreign overlords [i.e. the Roman Empire].... Israel’s god had not returned to Zion.”⁴ Indeed, Nehemiah notes that even after the Jews had returned to the land, they remained enslaved to foreign kings whom God had set over them because of their sins (see Neh 9:36-37). Yet, the hope remained that God would fulfill his promise to return to Zion (Isa 52:8; Zec 8:3), so that post-exilic Jews could still maintain, “God has not forsaken us in our bondage” (Ezra 9:9). Thus, it may be more accurate to say that Israel was in *bondage* rather than literal *exile*, which connotes a physical separation from the land.⁵ Nevertheless, Wright’s argument that some Jews of this time awaited God’s return to Zion still holds, and this return would be the concrete manifestation of the end of Israel’s bondage.

³ Wright cites, among other texts, Isa 58:8-10; Ezek 43:1-7; 48:35; Neh 9:36-37; CD 1:3-11; Tob 14:5-7; Bar 3:6-8; 2 Macc 1:27-29 as reflecting the view that the exile had not ended during the Second Temple period. See *New Testament*, 268-70. In agreement with Wright’s view, Craig Evans includes further evidence in texts of the Second Temple period and shortly thereafter, including Tob 13:3; Bar 2:7-10; 2 Macc 2:7-8; 4Q504-06; Ezra 9:8-9; *1 Enoch* 89:73-75; *T. Mos.* 4:8-9; *2 Bar* 68:5-7; *Wars* 5.9.4, etc. See “Continuing Exile,” 82-87. Gary Anderson makes a similar argument based on Isa 60:1-5; Dan 9, esp. v. 24; Lam 4:22, etc. See *Sin*, 79-94.

⁴ Wright, *New Testament*, 269. Cf. *Idem.*, *Jesus*, 126-27.

⁵ Cf. Evans, “Continuing Exile,” 78.

The reason for this bondage was an outstanding debt that Israel had incurred through its sin. Isaiah speaks of the time Israel spent in exile as a “term of service” (צבאה מלאה) that had “paid her sin” (נרצה עונה) (Isa 40:1-2).⁶ However, as Gary Anderson points out, because post-exilic Jews were still under bondage and God had not returned, Second Temple texts claimed that the payment of which Isaiah speaks had not yet been fulfilled. Daniel 9:24, for example, envisions a future when the debt for “sin” would be “brought to completion” (להתם השאה).⁷

It is against this backdrop of unpaid sin-debt that Matthew presents Jesus as the one who would “save his people from their sins” by paying the debt through his death, thereby ending the effects of “exile” (or bondage to sin) and ushering in God’s return (Mt 1:21). Evidence for this view in Matthew can be found in the opening chapter, which contains the only reference to “exile” (μετοικεσία) in the Gospels. Matthew splits the genealogy of Jesus before and after the “exile to Babylon” (1:11-12). He then summarizes the generational breakdown of his genealogy: “So all the generations from Abraham to David were fourteen generations, and from David to the exile to Babylon (μετοικεσία Βαβυλῶνος) fourteen generations, and from the exile to Babylon to the Messiah fourteen generations” (Mt 1:17). Based on the juxtaposition of the exile and the Messiah, Matthew seems to offer a solution to the problem of ongoing exile. As Craig Evans notes,

The Matthean genealogy may have been intended to suggest that the exile did not really come to end until the appearance of Jesus, the Davidic Messiah. Although it is a post-Easter reflection, it may be rooted in a pre-Easter belief that as the Davidic Messiah, Jesus would deliver Israel from its exile.⁸

⁶ Cf. Anderson, *Sin*, 46-50.

⁷ See *Ibid.*, 85-93.

⁸ Evans, “Continuing Exile,” 99.

I will argue that the specific way in which Matthew's Jesus delivers Israel from exile is by reenacting that exile in his death. As a righteous representative of his people, Jesus through his passion and death marks the completion of Isaiah's term of service that would finally pay for Israel's sins.

Along with proposing a solution to Israel's ongoing exile, Matthew is also aware of the problem of Israel's debt, whose payment would effect the return of God to Zion. Matthew's version of the Lord's Prayer is the clearest example of the sin-debt metaphor.⁹ Jesus asks God to "forgive (αφεες) us our debts (οφειληματα) as we forgive our debtors" (Mt 6:12). This forgiveness for debts was a necessary component in God's kingdom (Βασιλεία) coming on earth as it is in heaven (6:10). Indeed, Matthew knows that debts needed to be paid in order for God's kingdom to come.

These ideas are also reflected in the Targums. The Aramaic version of Jer 14:10 speaks of exile as a visitation of the debts that Israel had accrued through sin:¹⁰

יהוה לא רצם עתה יזכר עונם ויפקד חטאתם

The Lord does not accept them [i.e. his people]; now he will remember their sin and punish their iniquities (Jer 14:10b)

אתפרע מנהון לאנגליותהון... יסער עלוהון חוביהון ויתפרע עויתיהון

I [i.e. the Lord] *will accept payment from them by exiling them...* he will *visit* their *debts* upon them and punish their iniquities (Jer Tg 14:10b)

This verse represents the tendency in the Jeremiah Targum (along with the rest of the Targums) to translate the Hebrew word for "sin" (עון) with the Aramaic חובא, which, along with retaining the meaning of "sin," also means "debt."¹¹ For the Targums, sin

⁹ This metaphor is also clearly present in unforgiving servant in Mt 18: 23-35. For a discussion of sin as debt in Matthew, see Anderson, *Sin*, 31-33.

¹⁰ All translations are my own unless otherwise noted.

¹¹ See Marcus Jastrow, *Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi and the Midrashic Literature* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2005), 429. For more on the nuance of חוב as debt and its relationship to sin, see Anderson, *Sin*, 27-29.

produced a debt to God, who “accepts payment” in the form of exile. Matthew also knows that the payment for sin-debt is exile, which is why he casts Jesus as an individual who undergoes Israel’s exile in order to make this payment.

Moreover, like Matthew, the Targums also anticipate a manifestation of “the kingdom of God” (מלכותא דאלהא) once Israel’s debt is paid. Whereas Isa 40:9b MT tells those who are about to come out of exile to “Behold your God” (הנה אלהיכם), the Targum proclaims, “The kingdom of your God is revealed!” (אתגליאת מלכותא דאלהכון). The Targum follows the Hebrew in the notion that the end of exile will accompany a manifestation of God, and phrases this manifestation in terms of God’s kingdom, just as Matthew does in the Lord’s Prayer. This shared view of debt, exile, and the ultimate coming of God’s kingdom provides the foundation for further comparison between Matthew and the Targums.

CHAPTER III

TARGUM AND NEW TESTAMENT: A COMPARATIVE METHOD

The Jewish literary corpus known as the Targums (תרגומים) comprises the Aramaic translations of the Hebrew Bible. These translations, which include midrashic, homiletic, and paraphrastic insertions into the original text, were compiled between roughly the first and seventh centuries CE. While the Targums include their own original exegesis, theology, and legal insights, they also contain traditions found in other Rabbinic sources, including the Mishnah, Talmud, and various collections of Midrash. For the purposes of this study, I will briefly outline the literary and chronological background of the Targums of Isaiah (Isa Tg) and Jeremiah (Jer Tg), and then offer methodological options for comparing these texts to the New Testament. Finally, I will incorporate these methods into a test case that will reflect the ways in which the Targums can deepen our understanding of Matthew, which scholars date sometime between 70 CE and the end of the first century.¹²

Bruce Chilton has shown convincingly that the Isaiah Targum was redacted during two separate time periods: the Tannaitic period (late first century/early second century) and the Amoraic period (third and fourth centuries).¹³ He notes that the text “shows signs of nationalistic eschatology which was current just after the destruction of

¹² See, e.g., Warren Carter and Amy-Jill Levine, *The New Testament: Methods and Meaning* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2013), 18; R. T. France, *The Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007), 18-19; Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999), 42-44.

¹³ Flesher, Paul V. M. and Bruce Chilton, *The Targums: A Critical Introduction*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2011), 169-197; Bruce Chilton, *The Glory of Israel: the Theology and Provenience of the Isaiah Targum* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1983), 11-12, 97-101.

the Jerusalem Temple in 70 CE as well as of the more settled perspective of the rabbis in Babylon some three centuries later.”¹⁴ For example, while the prophetic oracles of Isa Tg 21 “point toward the military power of the Sassanids and the nascent threat of Arabians” (which reflects an addition in the late Amoraic period), Isa Tg 22 “focuses on the depredations of Jerusalem, the victories of the Romans, and the fate of the sanctuary,” which were paramount concerns during the Tannaitic period.¹⁵ Thus, the Isaiah Targum underwent various phases of compilation, editing, and addition, and sometimes centuries of such redaction separate one chapter from the next.

The Targum of Jeremiah is no exception in this regard. The text developed in at least two stages: one in the first century and one two to three centuries later.¹⁶ Based on Jer Tg’s preoccupation with idolatry (which was a major concern during the reign of the Seleucids reflected in 1 and 2 Maccabees) and its criticism of the Temple priesthood, Robert Hayward has argued that the text originated in the Land of Israel during the first century CE or even before. However, concerns over idolatry and criticism of Temple priests are also prevalent in sources later than the first centuries CE, which makes Hayward’s placement of the Targum in the first century uncertain. While the elements Hayward cites in Jer Tg certainly could date to the first-century, other aspects – such as the Messiah as a teacher (e.g. Jer Tg 33:13) rather than a rebuilder of the Temple as in Tannaitic sources – point to an Amoraic addition to this first-century foundation.¹⁷ Adjustments and alterations to Jer Tg (and Isa Tg) continued until well after the

¹⁴ Flesher and Chilton, *Targums*, 173.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 176-77.

¹⁶ Robert Hayward, *The Targum of Jeremiah: Translated with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1987), 34; Flesher and Chilton, *Targums*, 211.

¹⁷ See Flesher and Chilton, *Targums*, 209.

codification of the Babylonian Talmud in the sixth century, and the text was ultimately included in a final redaction of the entire targumic corpus as late as the tenth century.¹⁸

This complex web of targumic editing and the less-than-certain dates scholars have assigned pose difficulties for comparing the Targums to other documents. If a given targumic text cannot be conclusively dated, its influence (whether direct or indirect) on Jewish writing of the first-century must remain speculative.¹⁹ Joseph Fitzmyer summarizes the issue well:

The classical (non-Qumran) targums, related to the rabbinic tradition, clearly contain motifs, allusions, and traditions which can be paralleled in writings of the first and second centuries [CE]. But no one knows when such motifs, allusions, and traditions were picked up and introduced into the targumic texts. The early date of parallels cannot be the basis of the dating of the targums, since normally one cannot establish the direction of influence.²⁰

Samuel Sandmel similarly cautioned against the establishment of influence between the New Testament and Rabbinic literature in “Parallelomania,” his 1961 Presidential Address to the Society of Biblical Literature.²¹ He defined parallelomania as the “extravagance among scholars which first overdoes the supposed similarity in passages and then proceeds to describe source and derivation as if implying literary connection flowing in an inevitable or predetermined direction.”²² Dealing primarily with the uncritical comparative method in Strack and Billerbeck’s five-volume *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*,²³ Sandmel stresses that similar content

¹⁸ See Samson H. Levey, *The Targum of Ezekiel: Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1987), 2; Fleisher and Chilton, *Targums*, 212.

¹⁹ While I will propose a comparative method that avoids questions of influence, a brief discussion of the problems with assigning such influence will show why an alternative method is necessary.

²⁰ Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “The Targum of Jeremiah: Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes,” *Theological Studies* 49.4 (1988), 738.

²¹ Published as Samuel Sandmel, “Parallelomania,” *JBL* 81 (1962): 1-13.

²² *Ibid.*, 1.

²³ See Hermann L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (Munich: Beck, 1922-1928).

found in two different texts does not show that one is dependent on, or has derived from, the other.

Martin McNamara has responded directly to the problem of parallelomania between the Targums and the NT by turning attention to the “tel-like” nature of the targumic corpus:

In a tel there are layers from various ages, sometimes deposited in chronological sequence but occasionally with disturbed stratification. When applying the principle to Targums it may be best to take each Targum as we now have it... [I]t may well be that additions made to a completed Targum need not necessarily be later in time than this Targum. They may be early exegetical traditions, even if added later to the targumic work.²⁴

McNamara asserts that a section of a Targum that seems to be a late addition may contain an earlier tradition.

McNamara does not offer an approach for assigning dependent or direct relationships between texts, but he does leave open the possibility that parallels exist between a seemingly late targumic text (which would include earlier materials) and a text in the NT. Therefore, he concludes,

The points made by Sandmel were well taken when first made, and are still timely. They do not, however, take from the need of pursuing parallels between a Jewish writing and a New Testament text... seeking an explanation for the parallels, without in any way implying direct influence and without denying due differences between the two bodies of literature.²⁵

Jonathan Z. Smith addresses the problem of dependence and derivation in his distinction between “genealogical” and “analogical” comparison. He states, “the options [for comparison] are expressed as the choice between ‘analogy’ and ‘genealogy’ (i.e. homology)” with genealogy “establishing direction relations (borrowing and dependency),” and analogy identifying “apparent similarities [as] ‘parallelisms of more

²⁴ Martin McNamara, “Targums and New Testament, A Way Forward? Targums, Tel-like Character, a Continuum,” in Martin McNamara, *Targum and New Testament: Collected Essays* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 519.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 523.

or less equal religious experiences.”²⁶ Analogy does not claim to track derivation or direction of events as a matter of historical fact; rather, it seeks to describe relations between two related entities. According to Smith, comparison is not a natural phenomenon emerging out of historical processes, but rather a constructed enterprise through which scholars make analogical conclusions for their own intellectual purposes. In this sense, Smith claims, all comparisons are analogical as opposed to genealogical.²⁷ Smith therefore goes beyond questions of diffusion, dependence, and direction (which fall under the genealogical category of comparison) and instead highlights difference, similarity, and description in order to make sense of selected data that answer specifically constructed theoretical questions (which, in our case, include what Matthew means by “cast out” and why Matthew identifies Jesus’ death with Israel’s exile).²⁸ This approach frees comparison from the pitfalls of Sandmel’s parallelomania insofar as it describes similarities between two texts without positing that one is reliant on the other or that comparison can trace the historical origin of a particular concept.

Smith also pays close attention to the role that difference plays in the comparative project. He writes, “Comparison requires the acceptance of difference... and a methodical manipulation of that difference to achieve some stated cognitive end. The questions of comparison are questions of judgment with respect to difference.”²⁹ While two distinct texts (or passages therein) may be analogous insofar as they share certain

²⁶ Jonathan Z. Smith, *Drudgery Divine: On the Comparison of Early Christianities and the Religions of Late Antiquity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), 47, 49.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 51, emphasis original.

²⁸ See, *ibid.*, 52. Smith envisions an academy made up of religious historians for whom “analogy rather than genealogy is the goal.” *Ibid.*, 118. *Contra* Donaldson who claimed, several years before Smith, “genealogical parallels are the only ones of any real significance for history-of-religions study.” T. L. Donaldson, “Parallels: Use, Misuse and Limitations,” *The Evangelical Quarterly* 55 (1983): 198.

²⁹ Jonathan Z. Smith, *To Take Place: Toward Theory in Ritual* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1992), 14; cf. *Idem.*, *Drudgery Divine*, 37-47.

similarities, any objects of comparison will inevitably maintain important differences, which are, for Smith, what makes them worthy of comparison in the first place. Certainly, objects to be compared, by virtue of their assumed comparability, can never be wholly unique. However, due to their inevitable differences, Smith claims, they can be categorized as “individual,” while still belonging to the same “class.”³⁰ In other words, approaching comparable texts analogically provides room for recognizing similarities between them without ignoring differences.

Jacob Neusner adopted Smith’s comparative categories but applied different terminology to them. What Smith calls “genealogical comparison,” Neusner calls “synchronic comparison,” which “invokes temporal parallels alone, always rejecting anachronism, and everywhere stands upon the premises of history.”³¹ In other words, synchronic comparison is concerned with tracing the parallels over time and attempts to ascertain the origin of traditions and their subsequent development and influence. Diachronic comparisons, by contrast, “seek not exact temporal parallels but rather approximate, illuminating analogies.”³² Neusner’s insistence that analogies must be approximate suggests (with Smith) that data accrued through comparison are always shaped by the interpreter to a specific intellectual end. Comparison does not yield any meaningful conclusions on its own. This approach checks the tendency to overdo supposed similarities, since any datum takes on meaning only once the scholar has compared and interpreted it.

³⁰ Smith, *Drudgery Divine*, 37.

³¹ Jacob Neusner, “Contexts of Comparison: Reciprocally Reading Gospels’ and Rabbis’ Parallels,” in Bruce Chilton, Craig A. Evans, and Jacob Neusner, eds., *The Missing Jesus: Rabbinic Judaism and the New Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 55.

³² *Ibid.*

Neusner's diachronic comparison can apply to the chronological issue with regard to the NT and the later targumic materials. He states, "diachronic comparison appeals to an other-than-historical model of describing, analyzing, and interpreting the facts of a given religion: its writings and teachings and practices." By focusing on concepts that emerge in text and practice rather than in historical events, this type of comparison can "transcend the limits of time and ascend to the level of enduring culture."³³ Within this comparative framework, material found in both the NT and the Targums can reflect similar cultural, religious, or theological ideas despite differences in chronology. In this case, the material found in a culture's sacred writings or rituals trumps time, since ideas born and nurtured in a particular religious system can endure over many centuries.

At this point, we must ask whether the Gospel of Matthew can rightly be understood as a Jewish text that is part of a Jewish religious system. There is no scholarly consensus on the ethnic identity of the community for which Matthew wrote.³⁴ Some claim that Matthew was a Jew practicing a form of (Christian) Judaism,³⁵ others see the writer as a Gentile who wished to separate Christianity from Judaism.³⁶ Thus, rather than attempting to ascertain Matthew's ethnic-religious background or the community for which the Gospel was written, we must assess the character of the text itself. As Amy-Jill Levine notes, "We only have access to the text, not the intent of its author or to the audience who first received it. Nor can we easily determine how Matthew's initial readers

³³ Ibid., 54.

³⁴ For a survey of the disagreements see Anders Runesson, "Rethinking Early Jewish-Christian Relations: Matthean Community History as Pharisaic Intragroup Conflict," *JBL* 127 (2008): 95-132.

³⁵ E.g., Donald Senior, *Matthew* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1998), 22; Alan F. Segal, "Matthew's Jewish Voice," in David L. Balch, ed., *Social History of the Matthean Community: Cross-Disciplinary Approaches* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 3-37.

³⁶ E.g., Herbert Bassler, *The Mind Behind the Gospels: A Commentary to Matthew 1-14* (Brighton, MA: Academic Studies Press, 2009), 4, 212; Michael J. Cook, "Interpreting 'Pro-Jewish' Passages in Matthew," *HUCA* 54 (1983): 135-46.

received the text.... Before moving to the world behind the text, scholars need to assess the world in the text, the world of the narrative.”³⁷ From the perspective of the text, we can establish the Jewish nature of Matthew through an analysis of internal evidence, as well as by identifying commonalities between the Gospel and roughly contemporaneous Jewish texts.

Several aspects of Matthew’s Gospel reflect a “Jewish,” as opposed to “Gentile,” sensibility. For example, Matthew’s Jesus seems to be more concerned than Mark or Luke with Torah and questions over the correct interpretation of *halakhah* (Jewish law), often including references not found in the other Synoptics or explicating Torah in greater detail (e.g., Mt 5:17-42; 7:12; 12:1-14). Also, Matthew refers to Jesus in specifically Jewish terms. For instance, while Mark 1:1 begins by stating that Jesus is the “Son of God,” Matthew identifies him as the “Son of David, Son of Abraham” (Mt 1:1 cf. 9:27; 12:23; 15:22; 20:30-31; 21:9, 15; 22:42). In fact, Matthew’s opening genealogy is stated in specifically Jewish terms, insofar as it sets Jesus against the backdrop of Israel’s sacred history, including the exile to Babylon. Moreover, Matthew connects Jesus with specific texts from the Jewish Scriptures far more often than any other Gospel (cf. Mt 1:22; 2:15-23; 4:14-15; 8:17; 12:17-18; 13:14; etc.). Finally, we have already noted the similar worldview with regard to sin, debt, and exile shared by Matthew and the Targums. The following study will incorporate several more instances of commonality between these texts to show that Matthew has a particular resonance with Jewish texts of

³⁷ Amy-Jill Levine, “Matthew’s Portrayal of the Synagogue and its Leaders,” in Donald Senior, ed., *The Gospel of Matthew at the Crossroads of Early Christianity* (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 177-78.

the first few centuries CE. In this way, we can position Matthew (or, at least certain Jewish aspects presented by the Gospel) within a continuum of Jewish tradition.³⁸

Geza Vermes has approached the NT as being within such a continuum:

The New Testament and the rabbinic doctrine both derive from a common source, viz., Jewish traditional teaching. . . . [A] good deal of the New Testament appears as reflecting a brief moment in the age-long religious development of Israel that starts with the Bible and continues via the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, Philo, the New Testament, Josephus, Pseudo-Philo, the Mishnah, Tosefta, Targum, Midrash, Talmud – and so on and so forth.³⁹

If the NT and Targums are seen as a part of a long line of Jewish literatures that adopt, shape, and re-present earlier traditions, then questions of diffusion or borrowing between the two are less relevant, for our purposes, than questions of adoption from an earlier common source or worldview. This understanding of Jewish tradition allows for inclusion of the NT within the broader spectrum of Second Temple and Late Antique interpretation, as opposed to constituting a specifically “Christian” hybrid necessarily separated from early Judaism.⁴⁰

The view of the NT, or at least parts of it, as a Judaic literary strand that carries on earlier traditions is equally valid for the Targums and other Rabbinic literature. Building on Vermes’s view, Craig Keener has argued that “rabbinic literature. . . [represents] one useful strand of evidence by which we seek to reconstruct the broader cultural and social

³⁸ This is not to say that Matthew lacks elements that could be categorized as “Gentile.” In the present case, I focus on one particular Jewish element in Matthew (i.e., Jesus’ death as exile). For a study on these various Jewish and Gentile elements in Matthew, see Christopher Tuckett, “Matthew: The Social and Historical Context – Jewish Christian and/or Gentile?,” in Senior, *The Gospel of Matthew*, 99-130.

³⁹ Geza Vermes, *Jesus in His Jewish Context* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 78-79. This shared Judaic milieu is generally agreed upon in New Testament scholarship. See also Idem., “Bible and Midrash: Early Old Testament Exegesis,” in P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans, eds., *Cambridge History of the Bible*, vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), 228-31; Bruce Chilton, et al., eds., *A Comparative Handbook to the Gospel of Mark: Comparisons with Pseudepigrapha, the Qumran Scrolls, and Rabbinic Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), viii; Martin McNamara, “Targum and the New Testament: A Revisit,” in Reimund Bieringer, et al., eds., *The New Testament and Rabbinic Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 396-97; Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary (Volume One)*, (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003), 185-94.

⁴⁰ See Vermes, *Jewish Context*, 79-80.

milieu of early Judaism—not as if implying that the NT borrows from rabbinic tradition, but that notable commonalities probably reflect a common source in early Judaism.”⁴¹ Similarly, Herbert Bassler notes with respect to Matthew, “where we have such close literary matches between Gospel and Talmud [i.e. rabbinic literature] we cannot easily escape the conclusion that we deal with more than a shared mind, we deal with an articulated tradition that predates both our Gospel and Talmudic sources.”⁴² Thus, we might think of both a Targum and a Gospel as reflections of early Judaism’s exegetical tendencies and received traditions. Viewing these texts as repositories of traditions within the same early Jewish environment puts the NT and the Targums on equal intellectual, sociological, and comparative ground so that one can analyze analogies in thought and theology between the two texts without addressing questions of origin and influence.

Chilton has come to similar conclusions with regard to the Targums’ relevance for New Testament study.⁴³ In keeping with McNamara’s analysis of the tel-like nature of the Targums, Chilton agrees that a Targum that post-dates the NT can occasionally preserve a Jewish tradition that had its origin in the time of nascent Christianity.⁴⁴ This assertion also parallels the views of Vermes and others in that it describes a shared continuum in which the traditions preserved in both the NT and Targums exist and intersect.

⁴¹ Keener, *Gospel of John*, 187.

⁴² Bassler, *The Mind Behind the Gospels*, 13.

⁴³ Bruce Chilton, “Reference to the Targumim in the Exegesis of the New Testament,” in Eugene H. Lovering, ed., *Society of Biblical Literature 1995 Seminar Papers* 34 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 77-81. Cf. Idem., “Four Types of Comparison between the Targumim and the New Testament,” *Journal for the Aramaic Bible* 2 (2000): 163-188; Idem., *Targumic Approaches to the Gospels: Essays in the Mutual Definition of Judaism and Christianity* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America), 1987; Idem., “From Aramaic Paraphrase to Greek Testament,” in Craig A. Evans, ed., *From Prophecy to Testament* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2004), 23-43; Flesher and Chilton, *Targums*, 389-90.

⁴⁴ See Chilton, “Reference to the Targumim,” 80.

Moreover, Chilton echoes Smith’s analogical approach when dealing specifically with NT-targumic comparison. He writes, “Once the history of Targumic development is reckoned with, it becomes obvious that [the Targums’] greatest use for the student of the New Testament lies in their provision, not of antecedents, but analogies.”⁴⁵ The Targums attest to the same (or very similar) traditions that we find in the NT. When the later Aramaic texts state this common tradition more concretely or refer to it more frequently, their attestation can illuminate an analogous tradition in the NT, which may not be as thoroughly explained therein.

In order to see what such analogies look like, I will offer an example of a comparison among Matthew, the Septuagint, and the Psalms Targum. While Matthew’s Jesus is fasting in the wilderness, the devil tests him with appeal to the Psalms: “If you are the Son of God, throw yourself down, for it is written, ‘He will command his angels concerning you,’ and ‘On their hands they will bear you up, lest you strike your foot against a stone’” (Mt 4:6, cf. Ps 91:11-12). That the devil refers to Ps 91 is ironic because, according to Jewish translations of Scripture both before and after the NT, Jews understood the psalm as a prayer against demonic forces.⁴⁶

Whereas the Hebrew text contains no references to demons, devils, or spirits, the LXX hints at the presence of supernatural evil.

Ps 91:5a-6 MT	You shall not be afraid... of the pestilence (מִדְּבַר) that walks in the darkness, nor of the destruction (יִשִׁיר) that wastes at noon.
Ps 90:5a-6 LXX	You shall not be afraid... of the thing (πράγματος) that passes through in the darkness; nor of destruction, of the demon (δαμονίου), at noon.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ See 11Q11; Ps 90:5-6 LXX; Ps Tg 91:5-11a; *b. Seb* 15b; *Midr. Teh.* 91:3. For a summary of the evidence see Dale C. Allison, Jr., ed., *Matthew: A Shorter Commentary* (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 52.

The LXX reads the Hebrew דבר not as “pestilence” (דִּבְרָה) but rather as “thing” (דְּבַר) – the difference being in the way one reads the vowel points, which would not have been present in the Greek translator’s Hebrew text.⁴⁷ Likewise, the LXX glosses the Hebrew שָׂר (destruction) with a subsequent translation of the Hebrew homograph שָׂר (demon) so that the LXX transforms the original text from a prayer for protection against natural disasters into a prayer for protection against demonic agents – evil “things” that walk in the darkness. It should not be surprising, then, that around the same time that the LXX was completed (or a century or so later) the Qumran community included Ps 91 in a group of texts apparently used in connection with exorcism (11Q11).⁴⁸

In the Aramaic version of Ps 91, there is a marked expansion of the demonic reading begun with the LXX. The Targum states,

You will not be afraid of the terror of the demons (מְזִיקֵי) that go about in the night, nor of the arrow of the angel of death that he shoots in the daytime. Nor of the death that goes about in the darkness, nor of the company of demons (שִׂידֵי) that destroy at noon.... No evil shall befall you, and no plague or demons (מְזִיקֵי) shall come near your tent, for [God] will command his angels concerning you. (Ps Tg 91:5-6, 10-11a)

The swell of references to demons in the Psalms Targum, whose final form probably does not precede the 4th century,⁴⁹ shows that the singular reference to demons in the LXX had developed within Jewish tradition over the course of several centuries.

⁴⁷ Based on the context of the verse the Hebrew is better read as “pestilence” than “thing,” as the LXX renders it. Pestilence, as a destroyer of crops and livestock, parallels “destruction” in the second half of the verse. By comparison, “thing” in the initial half of the LXX verse would be awkward from the perspective of poetic Hebrew parallelism. For the LXX, however, translating “thing” makes more sense, as the Greek wants to parallel “demon,” rather than “destruction.”

⁴⁸ Scholars have associated these texts with exorcism due to the repeated references therein to demons, calling on angels to combat them, and healing those who are afflicted by demonic forces. See Geza Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (London: Penguin, 1997), 316; James VanderKam and Peter Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity* (New York: HarperCollins, 2002), 127-28; Michael Wise, Martin Abegg Jr., and Edward Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (New York: HarperOne, 2005), 588-89; Allison, *Matthew*, 52.

⁴⁹ See David M. Stec, *The Targum of Psalms: Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2004), 2.

Moreover, the identification of Ps 91 as an apotropaic text continued well past the Targum into the Babylonian Talmud and the later Midrash on the Psalms (cf. *b. Seb.* 15b; *Midr. Teh.* 91:3). The comparison among these texts provides an example of what Keener calls the “general cultural continuum”⁵⁰ of early Judaism attested in the Septuagint, Dead Sea Scrolls, New Testament, Targum, Talmud, and Midrash – each of which Vermes says reflects a stage in the “religious development of Israel.”⁵¹ The appearance of Ps 91 in Matthew, Second Temple texts, and rabbinic literature reveals an analogous use of a common Jewish tradition that associated the psalm with demons or, in Matthew’s case, the devil. Matthew makes the most overt connection between Ps 91 and evil forces available to us until the Targum. The Targum then confirms the fact that the relationship between demons and Ps 91 had indeed become well known by the early centuries CE.

The importance of the Psalms Targum for understanding Mt 4:6 is twofold. First, the Targum strengthens the possibility that Matthew’s readers would have understood Ps 91 as apotropaic and so the devil’s use is both ironic and doomed to fail. Whereas the Targum explicitly includes references to demons in its rendering of the Psalm, Matthew avoids any verses in Ps 91 traditionally associated with demons to convey implicitly the irony (even humor) inherent in the devil’s recitation. The reference to Ps 91 in Matthew preserves an analogy to the Aramaic translation of the Psalms rather than an exact parallel not only because the Targum is a translation/paraphrase and Matthew offers a select quote but also because Matthew’s quote depends for its effect in part on what is not made explicit.

⁵⁰ Keener, *John*, 190.

⁵¹ Vermes, *Jewish Context*, 79.

Second, the Targum shows that Matthew represents one stage of a developing tradition within a Jewish continuum (rather than its *terminus ad quem*). This is the same outcome that appears in Matthew's use of ἐκβάλλω and the Targums' use of טלטל. What the Targums make explicit helps to reveal what Matthew is content to suggest implicitly. Moreover, Matthew takes up a common Jewish tradition presented most clearly and frequently in the Targums (and employs that tradition to develop his Christology).

CHAPTER IV

MATTHEW'S METHOD

Typology vs. Narrative Patterning in Matthew

Matthew's presentation of Jesus as an embodiment of Israel is predicated upon events and images drawn from the story of Israel in the Jewish Scriptures, what NT scholarship has traditionally deemed, "typology."⁵² In its most basic sense, typology is "concerned with persons, events, *etc.* which are viewed as models or patterns for other persons, events, *etc.*"⁵³ Scholars have assessed typology in terms of both chronological history and theological symbol. According to the first view, the acts and events of Jesus' life portrayed in the Gospels recapitulate and so fulfill past events, particularly in the history of Israel. G. W. H. Lampe argues that typology "consists in a recognition of historical correspondences and deals in terms of past and future... [in which] there is a real correspondence between the type in the past and the fulfillment in the future."⁵⁴ Thus, in this version of typology, earlier events in Israel's history find their actualized, theological significance in the life of Jesus.

In response to the historical view of typology, M. D. Goulder distinguishes between history, which he equates with "fact," and symbol, which he equates with

⁵² I will prefer the term "narrative patterning" for Matthew's intertextual project; however, an initial definition of typology is necessary in order to see how narrative patterning emerges as a more precise term.

⁵³ France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, 38 (italics original).

⁵⁴ G. W. H. Lampe, "The Reasonableness of Typology," in G. W. H. Lampe and K. J. Woollcombe, *Essays on Typology* (London: W. and J. Mackay, 1957), 30. Lampe's colleague, K. J. Woollcombe, similarly defines typology as "linkages between events, persons or things *within the historical framework of revelation*," by which he means the sacred history of Israel presented in the Old Testament. See K. J. Woollcombe, "The Biblical Origins and Patristic Development of Typology," in *Essays*, 40 (italics original).

“type.” In his treatment of Acts, he argues that Luke never set out to write a “true” history that merely recounts facts, but rather had a “symbolic motive” in Acts, for which typological connections serve as an aid to theological understanding.⁵⁵ Whereas Lampe sees all typological correspondences resulting from a realized, historical process, Goulder argues that NT typology often indicates a lack of historicity. According to him, “*where there are no types, [the NT] is intended to be factual*” but “*the thicker the types, the less likely is the passage to be factual.*”⁵⁶ While Goulder admits that we cannot prove that history and typology never overlap, he is skeptical of typological details being fulfilled in historical experience, and therefore he prefers to see typology as a literary-theological mechanism used to highlight the meaning of an event, rather than its factuality.

In the current study, both historical and symbolic approaches are appropriate. The parallelism between Matthew and the Targum depends upon how each text makes its own distinct reference to the Babylonian exile, which both Gospel writer and targumist know to be an historical fact. Each author regards the exile—and, in Matthew’s case, Jesus’ death in relationship to it—not only as mere history, but also as an event that is imbued with theological significance. Moreover, both texts present this historio-theological event in the context of an allegory, which, by its very nature, is replete with symbolism. Therefore, a hard bifurcation between the “historical” and the “symbolic” is unwarranted (if not impossible) in the case of the texts under examination.

However, “typology” also contains the idea that the so-called Old Testament only finds its true meaning in the New Testament narrative. Lampe states that, for “the

⁵⁵ M. D. Goulder, *Type and History in Acts* (London: SPCK, 1964), 180-81. For a concise summary of Goulder’s approach to typology see Frances Young, “Typology,” in Stanley E. Porter, Paul Joyce, and David E. Orton, eds., *Crossing the Boundaries: Essays in Biblical Interpretation in Honour of Michael D. Goulder* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 29-30.

⁵⁶ Goulder, *Type and History*, 181-82 (emphasis original).

Christian” (whom he distinguishes from “the Jew”), “The great acts of God in Israelite history acquired significance because of their character as foretastes of what was later accomplished in Christ,” so that the Old Testament is merely a foreshadowing or “a mystery revealed in Christ,” which cannot be rightly understood or appreciated on its own terms.⁵⁷ In contrast to these claims of typology, which have been assumed in Christianity since the patristic period, I see Matthew as patterning his Gospel on the Scriptures in order to make a theological claim about Jesus, rather than viewing scriptural figures and events as mere “types” with no significance independent of Jesus.

Similarly, Iaian Provan sees the New Testament as engaging in “narrative patterning” in order to remind its readers of scriptural events without ascribing a lesser import those events in light of the NT.⁵⁸ Commenting on the Jewish Scriptures, Provan notes that the material in a given book is recalled and recapitulated by subsequent writers who thereby establish a narrative pattern that the NT writers would eventually adopt and adapt:

The kings of Judah are compared and contrasted with David; Jeroboam is painted in the colors, first of Moses, and then of Aaron; both Manasseh and Josiah in their own ways remind us of Ahab; and so on. It is also apparent in the NT, whose authors tell us the story of Jesus in ways that constantly remind us of Kings, whether at the general thematic level... or at the level of individual character and event.⁵⁹

Rather than viewing the NT in typological terms, namely as borrowing or coopting the Jewish Scriptures in order to establish a “final copy,” Provan describes a more literarily and historically precise NT presentation of Jesus as continuing a lengthy narrative pattern – not to relieve the Jewish Scriptures of their own meaning, but rather to validate Jesus as

⁵⁷ Lampe, “Typology,” 28, 30.

⁵⁸ See Iaian W. Provan, *1 & 2 Kings* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995), 14-15, 293. Richard Hays also refers to “narrative patterns” that Matthew draws from the Jewish Scriptures in “Reconfigured Torah,” 174.

⁵⁹ Provan, *Kings*, 14.

a Messiah whose life is teleologically linked to that of past Israelites as they are presented in the biblical narrative and the sacred history of Israel itself.

In light of Provan's comments, the following example of narrative patterning from the Jewish Scriptures illustrates the NT writers' links between Jesus and Israel. Upon first appearing to Moses, God states, "Take your sandals off your feet, for the place on which you are standing is holy ground (כי המקום אשר אתה עומד עליו ארמת קדש הוא) (של נעליך מעל רגליך) (Exod 3:5). Similarly, when Joshua is leading the Israelites into the land of Canaan, the captain of the Lord's army tells him, "Take your sandals off your feet, for the place on which you are standing is holy" (המקום אשר אתה עמד עליו קדש הוא) (של נעליך מעל רגליך כי) (Jos 5:15). In repeating, nearly verbatim, the phrase from Exodus, the Deuteronomic historian validates the eponymous protagonist as the rightful heir to Mosaic leadership. In no way does the writer minimize Moses' significance in doing this, nor does the writer suggest that all that preceded Joshua is now only meaningful in light of what Joshua will do. In fact, the opposite is true, insofar as Joshua's role can only properly be understood in light of Moses' role; just as God uses Moses to lead his people, so God continues to lead his people through Joshua.

Michael Fishbane similarly highlights this kind of narrative patterning in the Jewish Scriptures attested by the prevalent Hebrew clause כן ... כאשר "just as... so."⁶⁰ Among other examples, this construction appears when the Israelites validate Joshua as the new recipient of Moses' authority by saying, "Just as in all [things] (ככל אשר) we listened to Moses, so (כן) we will listen to you. Only the Lord your God will be with you, just as (כאשר) he was with Moses" (Jos 1:17 cf. Jos 1:3. 5; 3:7). Matthew carries on this

⁶⁰ See Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 352.

construction, albeit in Greek, with direct reference to Jesus recapitulating the experiences of figures in the Jewish Scriptures. Matthew's Jesus states, "For just as (ὡσπερ) Jonah was in the belly of the large fish three days and three nights, so (οὕτως) shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth" (Mt 12:40). This "just as... so" formula can be applied to the whole of Matthew's Gospel in relation to Jesus: whereas Mt 12:40 claims, "just as with Jonah, so with Jesus," Matthew's Gospel, on the whole, claims, "just as with Israel, so with Israel's Messiah."

While there is not necessarily a one-to-one correspondence between Jesus and Israel, and while Matthew's Jesus often succeeds where Israel faltered, Matthew acknowledges the history of Israel on its own terms and presents this history as reenacted in the coming of Jesus of Nazareth.⁶¹ For Matthew, Jesus must reenact this history if he is to be a legitimate messianic candidate: Just as Joshua re-experiences Moses' encounter at the burning bush, the Messiah—being the greatest of Israel's leaders—must re-experience the whole of Israel's history rather than a single episode in the life of his predecessor(s). Furthermore, Matthew's Jesus must recapitulate Israel in order to pay for its sins; after living Israel's experiences, Jesus can rightly cancel Israel's debt by experiencing its exile.

Jesus and Israel in Matthean Scholarship

Scholars have long identified parallels between events in Israel's history and Matthew's Jesus. While such parallels have most commonly been found in Matthew's

⁶¹ An example of Matthew showing Jesus as succeeding where Israel faltered is in the Gospel's portrayal of Jesus' time in the wilderness in Mt 4:1-11. While Israel's time in the wilderness was marked by a series of rebellions and missteps (e.g., Exod 17:1-7; 32; Num 21:4-9; 25:10-18), Matthew has Jesus standing up under temptation and casting the devil away (4:10).

genealogy (Mt 1:1-17) and Jesus' birth, early life, and public teaching (Mt 2-7), such connections also appear in Jesus' passion and crucifixion. These parallels between the Jewish Scriptures and the First Gospel illustrate Matthew's approach to his particular project of narrative patterning. While an exhaustive survey of all such typologies in Matthew is outside our present scope, the following examples of Matthew's method will lay the exegetical foundation for further typological analysis between Matthew and the Jewish traditions preserved in the Targums.

In his summary of Jesus' genealogy, Matthew concludes, "So all the generations from Abraham to David were fourteen generations, and from David to the exile to Babylon fourteen generations, and from the exile to Babylon to the Messiah fourteen generations" (1:17). That the birth of Jesus comes at the end of a genealogy that spans the whole of Israel's history shows that it represents the apex in that historical narrative; the birth of Jesus is a providential outgrowth of national Israel. The genealogy also reveals narrative patterns as it draws upon Israel's history for framing Jesus' messianic mission. Goulder suggests, "Each of the three fourteens [of generations] foreshadows Jesus' mission."⁶² According to Goulder, the first group, which consists substantially of figures from the Torah, points to Jesus as the one who fulfills the Torah (cf. Mt 5:17). Similarly, the references to David and Solomon in the second group point to Jesus as the messianic son of David (cf. Mt 9:27; 12:23; 15:22; 20:31; 21:9, 15; 22:42) and a greater Solomon (Mt 12:42). Finally, with reference to the Babylonian exile at the start of the third group, Goulder claims that Jesus' mission corresponds to "the μετοικεσία Βαβυλωνος, which dominates the end of the Gospel."⁶³ However, Goulder offers no examples of how the

⁶² M. D. Goulder, *Midrash and Lection in Matthew* (London: SPCK, 1974), 233.

⁶³ *Ibid.*

Babylonian exile “dominates the end of the Gospel.” Nevertheless, Goulder’s treatment of Matthew’s genealogy as a summation of Jesus’ life that parallels Israel’s history is a helpful start for understanding Matthew’s use of the antecedent tradition.

Mt 2-7 has also been fertile ground for Jesus-Israel comparisons. In his classic monograph on Matthew’s use of Scripture, Robert H. Gundry discusses the textual evidence that links the story of Israel’s slavery in, and exodus from, Egypt (Exod 1-14) and Israel’s wilderness wanderings (Exod 16-Deut) to the life of Jesus. He states,

Jesus is the representative Israelite in whose individual history the history of the whole nation... is recapitulated and anticipated.... [Jesus] is preserved in and comes out of Egypt (2:15). In the temptation narrative, the quotation of the three Deuteronomic verses having to do with Israel’s probation in the wilderness draws a parallel between Jesus’ temptation in the wilderness and Israel’s temptation the wilderness (4:4, 7, 10).⁶⁴

Connections between Jesus and the story of Israel in the Torah continue into Mt 5. The Sermon on the Mount (Mt 5-7), in which Jesus delivers a commentary on Torah commandments, corresponds to Moses giving the Law at Sinai.⁶⁵ Based on the volume of Matthean passages that recall events in the Jewish Scriptures, the reader can see that Matthew’s patterning “is *cumulative*.... There is nowhere in the New Testament so extended, continuous, and transparent a passage modeled upon the Old Testament as Matt. 1—5.”⁶⁶ Just as patterns from past Scriptures frequently appear in the first five chapters, Matthew continues this typological schema throughout the Gospel.⁶⁷

⁶⁴ Robert H. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew’s Gospel with Special Reference to the Messianic Hope* (Leiden: Brill, 1967), 210. Cf. Allison, *New Moses*, 140-142; France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, 50-53; Amy-Jill Levine, *The Misunderstood Jew: The Scandal of the Church and the Jewish Jesus* (New York: HarperCollins, 2006), 3. For a monograph on parallels to the Jewish Scriptures in Mt 1-4, see Joel Kennedy, *The Recapitulation of Israel: Use of Israel’s History in Matthew 1:1-4:11* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008).

⁶⁵ For more on the connections between Moses at Sinai and Jesus’ Sermon on the Mount, see Douglas R. A. Hare, *Matthew* (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1993), 34. Cf. Allison, *New Moses*, 172-180.

⁶⁶ Goulder, *Type and History*, 2, 6 (author’s emphasis).

⁶⁷ For a discussion of OT typology over the course of Matthew’s Gospel, see George Wesley Buchanan, *Typology and the Gospel* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1987), 40-59.

Scholars have identified connections between the passion of Matthew’s Jesus and the rejection of figures in Israel’s sacred history, albeit with a smaller number of connections compared to the Gospel’s opening chapters. Michael Knowles states, “Matthew, it appears, has cast Jesus in the role of Jeremiah as a rejected prophet of doom who speaks words against the Temple (and the city), who suffers reproach and judgment as a result.”⁶⁸ Knowles also points out Matthew’s allusions to Jesus experiencing the trials of Jerusalem presented in the book of Lamentations. Speaking of the recently destroyed Zion, Lam 2:15a LXX states, “All those who pass by (οἱ παραπορευόμενοι)... have clapped their hands at you; they have hissed and wagged their heads (ἐκίνησαν τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτῶν) at the daughter of Jerusalem.” Mt 27:39 closely parallels the language of Lamentations with reference to Jesus: “Those who passed by (οἱ παραπορευόμενοι) derided him, wagging their heads (κινουντες τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν).” Matthew replicates the substantive phrase οἱ παραπορευόμενοι (“those who pass by”) in Lam 2:15 and only diverges in the present tense reference to “wagging their heads” rather than the past tense of the Septuagint.

In light of this scriptural echo, Knowles concludes, “just as Lam. 2.15 announced the mocking of ‘the daughter of Jerusalem’ because of the ruin wrought by false prophets in her midst (Lam. 2.14), so by means of this allusion Matthew highlights the mocking of Jesus.”⁶⁹ The passers-by who wag their heads at the crucified Jesus mirror those who passed by Jerusalem after the Babylonian exile. Matthew likens Jesus’ fate to the fate of

⁶⁸ Knowles, *Jeremiah in Matthew’s Gospel*, 222. Similarly, Leonard Goppelt notes, “Every aspect of Jesus’ prediction of his passion—his suffering, death, and resurrection—have their scriptural basis in the typology of the prophets.” Leonard Goppelt, *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 81. Buchanan juxtaposes the death of Jesus in Mt 27:27-50 with the death of Joshua in Josh 24:29-30 but does not explain the specific connections. See Buchanan, *Typology*, 57.

⁶⁹ Knowles, *Jeremiah in Matthew’s Gospel*, 204.

destroyed Jerusalem, so that Jesus replays the Babylonian siege and exile in his crucifixion. This connection supports the notion (which I will develop further) that Jesus must undergo exile in order to pay the ransom for his people whose sins have kept them separated or “exiled” from God.

George Buchanan finds a somewhat reworked reference to the burial of Joseph’s bones in Joshua 24:32 in Jesus’ burial by Joseph of Arimathea in Mt 27:57-60. Buchanan writes, “Even such details [in Joshua] as the burial of Joseph’s bones in a different tomb [were] reflected by a Joseph in Matthew who placed Jesus’ body in a new tomb.”⁷⁰

Buchanan highlights a possible echo based on name association and assumes that the biblically informed reader would notice a (fairly loose) correlation between the patriarch’s final resting place in Joshua and Jesus’ temporary resting place before his resurrection.⁷¹ Although Buchanan does not develop the implications of this connection, Matthew may have seen the removal of Joseph from his initial tomb as a hint at resurrection, in that Jesus also emerges from his tomb at his resurrection. Moreover, Matthew may be showing Jesus to be greater than Joseph, insofar as while the patriarch’s mummified remains go forth from his tomb, Jesus would emerge from his tomb in an animated body.

N. T. Wright recaps Matthew’s connections between Israel and Jesus’ life and then explicitly draws the connection between Jesus’ death and Israel’s exile:

The gospels are... the story of Jesus *told as the history of Israel in miniature*.... Matthew gives us, in his first five chapters, a Genesis (1:1), an Exodus (2.15), and a Deuteronomy (5-7); he then gives us a royal and prophetic ministry, and finally an exile (the cross) and restoration (the resurrection).⁷²

⁷⁰ Buchanan, *Typology*, 58.

⁷¹ Buchanan admits, “Since there was no resurrection in Joshua, Matt 28 extends beyond the limits of the Hexateuch in the HS [Hebrew Scriptures].” *Ibid.*

⁷² Wright, *New Testament*, 402 (emphasis original).

Wright inadvertently demonstrates the gap in textual research with regard to Matthew's Jesus-Israel patterning. While he cites the Gospel texts in which Jesus corresponds to Israel through chapter 7, he offers no scriptural references to support the notion that "the cross" corresponds to the exile or that "the resurrection" corresponds to Israel's restoration. In what follows, I propose to fill this gap by offering intertextual evidence for Wright's cross-as-exile assertion. One piece of evidence hinges on the exilic descriptor **טלטל** in the Targums of Isaiah and Jeremiah, which parallels Matthew's use of **ἐκβάλλω** as an exilic punishment applied to Jesus' rejection and crucifixion as allegorically described in the Parable of the Tenants.

CHAPTER V

“CAST OUT” AS EXILE

טלטל in the Targums of Isaiah and Jeremiah

In describing the exile, the Targums of Isaiah and Jeremiah constantly employ the verb טלטל. Among its primary meanings is to move (or remove) a given object by way of forceful throwing or hurling.⁷³ The Aramaic root is related to the Hebrew טול, which means to cast, to hurl, or to throw.⁷⁴ In their respective English translations of the Isaiah Targum (Isa Tg), both J. F. Stenning and Chilton translate every instance of טלטל as “to cast out.”⁷⁵

In the Isa Tg, טלטל often finds its way into the text by means of creative additions to the original Hebrew:

קחי כנור סבי עיר זונה נשכחה היטיבי נגן הרבי שיר למען תזכי

Take a harp around the city, forgotten whore; make a beautiful melody, sing many songs, so that you may be remembered (Isa 23:16).

יקריך איטלטל למדינא קרתא דהות כנפקת ברא אתרחקת הפוכי כינריך לאבלא וזמריך
לאליא מא אם ייעול דוכרניך אתחלף

⁷³ Definitions for טלטל include “to move, carry, handle”, “to wander”, “to shake”, “to make unsteady”, “to remove”, “to banish”, “to exile”, and “to go into exile.” See Jastrow, *Dictionary of the Targumim*, 536; Michael Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period*, 2nd ed. (Ramat-Gan, Israel and Baltimore, MD: Bar Ilan University Press and The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002), 225. Gustaf Dalman includes “forttragen” (to carry off) in *Aramäisch-Neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud und Midrasch* (Hildesheim, Germany: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1967), 170.

⁷⁴ F. Brown, S. Driver, and C. Briggs, eds., *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*. 13th Edition (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2010), 376; Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament: Study Edition, Vol. I* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 373; David J.A. Clines, ed., *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew, Vol. III טז* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 361.

⁷⁵ Isa. Tg. 5:6; 16:2, 8; 22:3, 17; 23:16; 27:13; 37:13; 49:7; 51:21; 57:17; 58:7. J.F. Stenning, *The Targum of Isaiah* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949); Bruce D. Chilton, *The Isaiah Targum* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1987).

*Your glory has been overthrown, cast out to a province, the city that was as a harlot is rejected! Turn your harp to lamentation and your music to keening, that you might be remembered (Isa Tg 23:16).*⁷⁶

לבזה נפש למתעב גוי

[God says] to him [i.e. Judah] whose life is despised, whom nations abhor... (Isa 49:7a).

לרבסירין ביני עממיא לדמשלטין ביני מלכותא

[God says] to *those despised among the Gentiles* [lit. peoples], to *those cast out among the kingdoms*... (Isa Tg 49:7a).

The targumic verses reflect God's intent for the Judeans immediately after (23:16) and many years after (49:7) their exile to Babylon. In 23:16 Isaiah declares judgment on the people of Judah whose idolatrous inclinations have resulted in exile and God's temporary rejection of his chosen ones. In 49:7, however, the prophet reminds his people of God's continued favor despite having exiled them "among the Gentiles" and "among the kingdoms." These contexts clearly show that *טלטל* functions as a descriptor of exile.

In Targum Isaiah's prophetic poetry, *טלטל* is often the conceptual equivalent to the more literal word for "to go into exile," *גלי* – the verbal form of *גלותא* (exile):⁷⁷

כל שלטונך אישלטלו כחדא מן קדם מתח קשתא גלו

All your rulers *were cast out* together, *before the archer they went into exile* (Isa Tg 22:3 cf. 22:17-18).

וייתון דגלו לארעא דאתור ודאטלטלו לארעא דמצרים ויסגרון קדם יי

Those who were *exiled* in the land of Assyria and those who were *cast out* to the land of Egypt will come and worship *before* the Lord (Isa Tg 27:13b).

אן מלכא דחמת דארפד ומלכא דלקרתא ספרוים הלא טלטלונון ואגליאנון

Where is the king of Hamath, the king of Arpad, the king of the city of Sepharvaim, *did they not cast them out and exile them?* (Isa 37:13 cf. 57:17).

⁷⁶ Chilton, *Isaiah Targum*, 46. All quotations from the Isaiah Targum are from Chilton's translation, unless otherwise noted. The italics in Chilton's translations denote where the Aramaic diverges from the MT.

⁷⁷ Jastrow, *Dictionary of the Targumim*, 247-248; Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic*, 129-130.

In the first example, טלטל and גלו comprise the first half of the poetic parallel: being cast out and being exiled are synonymous. In the second example, the words function in much the same way (i.e., as different ways to convey the same idea) in describing the removal of the exiles from Jerusalem to foreign nations. Finally, in Isa 37:13, the one term directly follows the other and thus the two function as descriptive equivalents – to be cast out is to be exiled.

Unlike the Isaiah Targum, the Jeremiah Targum directly translates the Hebrew טול with the Aramaic טלטל. With reference to the imminent exile, the Hebrew text states, “So I will cast you out (והטלתי אתכם) of this land into a land that you have not known” (Jer 16:13a). Similarly, addressing King Coniah ben Jehoiakim of Judah, Jeremiah announces, “I will cast you out (והטלתי אתך), and your mother who bore you, into another land where you were not born; and there you will die” (Jer 22:26). In these verses, the Hebrew טול denotes the expulsion of the people from their homeland to Babylon.⁷⁸

Rendering these verses into Aramaic, the Targum closely follows the Hebrew by translating טול with טלטל:

ואטלטיל יתכון מועל ארעא דלא ידעתון אתון

So I will cast you from this land, to a land that you have not known (Jer Tg 16:13a).

ואטלטיל יתך וית אמך דילידתך לארע אחרי דלא אתילידתון תמן ותמן תמותון

So I will cast you and your mother who bore you into another land where you were not born; and there you will die (Jer Tg 22:26).⁷⁹

⁷⁸ Cf. Clines, *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, 361.

⁷⁹ My translation.

In these verses, **טלטל** in the Targums means the same thing that the Hebrew **טול** means: “to cast” or “to hurl” out of one country and into another. The Jeremiah Targum’s language of casting out refers to God having subjected his people to exile.

In fact, **טלטל** is so closely related to “exile” in targumic Aramaic that dictionaries cite the word as potentially meaning, “to be exiled.”⁸⁰ This definition accounts for the majority of instance of **טלטל** being translated as “to be exiled” in Robert Hayward’s English translation of the Jeremiah Targum.⁸¹ This translation then forces Hayward to use a different English phrase for **גלי** when it parallels **טלטל**, in order to show that two different Aramaic words are used:

Both the birds of heaven and the wild beasts are *exiled* (**אטלטלו**), they are gone *into captivity* (**גלו**) (Jer Tg 9:9b cf. 50:3b).⁸²

Both **טלטל** and **גלי** convey exile.

That **טלטל** can mean “to exile” is shown most clearly in two separate translations of Jer 31 in which the Targum uses **גלי** and **טלטל** within the same context of Israelite mourning after the exile:

בבכי יבאו ובתחנונים אובילם

They shall come with weeping, and with pleas for mercy I will lead them back (Jer 31:9a).

במגליהון כד הוו בכן גלו ובמתבהון מביני גלותהון ברחמין סניאין אקריבינון

When they were exiled, when they were weeping, they were taken into *exile*: but on their return from among *their exiles* I will bring them near with great mercies (Jer Tg 31:9a).

שמוע שמעתי אפרים מתנודד יסרתנו

⁸⁰ Jastrow, *Dictionary of the Targumim*, 536; Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic*, 225; Dalman, *Aramäisch-Neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch*, 170.

⁸¹ Jer Tg 9:9; 12:15, 17; 14:9; 22:26; 23:2; 27:10, 15; 30:17; 48:27; 50:17; 51:34.

⁸² The following Aramaic translations in this section come from Hayward, *The Targum of Jeremiah*.

I have surely heard Ephraim grieving over himself, “You have disciplined me” (Jer 31:18a).

שמוע וגלי קדמי בית ישראל דבכך ומתאנחין על דאיטלטלו ארמון איתתא עלנא יסורין
The house of Israel is heard and revealed before me, for they weep and lament
because they are exiled, saying: “You have brought sufferings upon us” (Jer Tg
31:18a).

While the first verse uses גלי to describe the reason for Israel’s distress, the second, only nine verses later, has טלטל. This shows that the Jeremiah Targum uses the latter term not only to describe exile, or merely as a motive verb that expresses exile, but also to mean “exile.”

ἐκβάλλω in Classical Greek Literature

As with טלטל in the Targums, the Greek ἐκβάλλω is used to describe exile. In extra-biblical Greek literature, the word is applied to the driving out of populations from their land. Herodotus speaks of the army of the Scythians which succeeds in “casting out (ἐκβαλόντες) the Kimmerians from Europe” (Hdt. 1.103.16). The term is also applied to individuals who are banished or exiled. Josephus recounts how Onias “cast out the sons of Tobias from the city [of Jerusalem] (ἐξέβαλε τῆς πόλεως τοὺς Τωβία υἱούς)” (*War* 1.1.31). In Aristophanes’s *Plutus*, Poverty accuses Chremylus of “seeking to cast [her] out (ἐκβαλεῖν) from every country” (430). Further, ἐκβάλλω is used to describe exile from one’s place of origin, which carries with it a sense of shame. Euripides writes of the mighty Cadmus who will become “an exile, cast out from his home, a dishonored [man] (ἐκ δόμων ἄτιμος ἐκβεβλήσομαι)” (*Bacchae* 1313).

Plato couples the term not only with violence and dishonor, as in other classical sources, but also with execution and the disposal of the dead. The verb describes the act

of tyrants who exile people from their city (ἐκβάλλει ἐκ πόλεως) with other evil acts such as putting someone to death or confiscating a person's property (*Gorgias* 468d).

Expulsion is linked with death, insofar as Plato speaks of casting out the naked corpse from the city (ἔξω τῆς πόλεως ἐκβαλλόντων γυμνόν)" (*Leg.* 873b cf. 909c).⁸³ Thus, Greek texts predating the Septuagint lay the definitional foundation for how the LXX would use ἐκβάλλω in its translation of the Hebrew texts.

ἐκβάλλω in the LXX and its Relation to טלטל

When the Septuagint uses ἐκβάλλω it usually translates the Hebrew גרש (to drive or cast out); the most frequent use describes God driving out the Canaanite populations.⁸⁴ In these and other cases, ἐκβάλλω denotes forced, often violent, expulsion.⁸⁵ On occasion, the Septuagint also uses ἐκβάλλω to describe Israel's exile. For example, it uses the word to translate גרש in describing the exile of the northern kingdom of Israel by the Assyrians in the 8th century:

Hos 9:15b MT I will drive them out (אֲגִרְשֶׁם) of my house, I will not love them anymore; all their princes are rebels.

Hos 9:15b LXX I will cast them out (ἐκβαλῶ αὐτούς) of my house, I will not love them anymore; all their princes are disobedient.

⁸³ For Plato's use of ἐκβάλλω with reference to casting out executed bodies across city borders as a means of corpse disposal, see Danielle S. Allen, *The World of Prometheus: The Politics of Punishing in Democratic Athens* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 219.

⁸⁴ See Exod 23:28-31; 33:2; 34:11, 24; Deut 11:23; 29:27; 33:27; Jos 24:12, 18; Jdg 6:9; 2 Sam 7:23; Hos 9:15; Ps 77:55; 79:9; 1 Chron 17:21. For the reverse situation, i.e. the nations attempting to drive out the Israelites, see Num 22:6, 11; 2 Chron 20:11. When the Targums encounter גרש as it applies to the nations, they tend to use תרך in Babylonian Aramaic or טרר in Palestinian Aramaic.

⁸⁵ This is also true for individuals, including Adam and Eve's expulsion from Eden (Gen 3:24), Cain from the presence of the Lord (4:14), Hagar and Ishmael from Abraham and Sarah (21:10), etc. See also Jdg 9:14; 11:7; 1 Sam 26:19; 1 Kgs 2:27; 2 Chron 11:14, 16.

The LXX also uses ἐκβάλλω to translate various other Hebrew words, which, like גרש, describe the exile of God's people:

- Zec 7:14 MT And I scattered them (ואסערם) with a whirlwind among all the nations that they had not known. The land that they left behind was desolate so that no one passed through or returned and the pleasant land was made desolate.
- Zec 7:14 LXX And I will cast them out (ἐκβαλῶ αὐτούς) among all the nations, whom they do not know; and the land behind them shall be made utterly destitute of any passing through or returning; they have made the choice land a desolation.
- Isa 5:29 MT Their [i.e. the Babylonians'] roaring is like a lion, like young lions they roar; they growl and seize their prey; they carry off (ויפליט) and none rescues.
- Isa 5:29 LXX They rage as lions, and draw near like a lion's young, and he [i.e. the King of Babylon] shall seize, and roar as a wild beast, and he shall cast them out (ἐκβαλεῖ) and there shall be none to deliver them.

The Septuagint also employs ἐκβάλλω in some of the same instances that the Targums use טלטל with reference to Israel's exile. Speaking of a future when the Israelites will turn to other gods, Deut 29:28[27 LXX/Tg] reads,

Deut 29:28 MT	Deut 29:27 LXX	Deut 29:27 Tg Onqelos
And the Lord uprooted (ויחשם) them from their land in anger and fury and great wrath, and cast them (וישלכם) into another land, just as [it is] today.	And the Lord removed (ἐξηρεν) them from their land in anger and wrath and great aggravation, and cast them out (ἐξέβαλεν) into another land as it is now.	And the Lord cast them out (וטלטילינין) from upon their land in wrath and fury and great anger, and I will exile them (ויאגלינין) to another land, as [it is] today (cf. Deut 29:27 Tg PsJ).

In this verse, the Greek translates the Hebrew שלך (to send or cast) with ἐκβάλλω, and the Aramaic translates the same word with גלי (to exile), choosing to translate נתש (to uproot)

with טלטל. Not only does the LXX use ἐκβάλλω with reference to exile, but the Targum uses both טלטל and גלי, the two words that it employs most often to describe exile.

The parallel use of ἐκβάλλω and טלטל is even clearer in Isa 22:17, in which the Tg and the LXX translate an appearance טלטל in the Hebrew text:

The Lord is surely going to cast you out (מטלטלך טלטה), mighty man (גבר). He will seize firm hold on you (Isa 22:17).

Behold, the Lord of hosts casts out (εκβαλει) and destroys a man, and will take away your crown (Isa 22:17 LXX).

Behold, the Lord casts you out (מטלטל לך), a mighty man is cast out (טלטול דגיבר), and shame will cover you (Isa Tg 22:17).

In warning of looming exile, the Isaiah Targum uses טלטל and the LXX uses ἐκβάλλω.

Moreover, each version of Isa 22:17 is part of a wider warning of imminent exile:

Isa 22:17-18 MT (NRSV)	Isa 22:17-18 LXX	Isa 22:17-18 Tg
<p>The Lord is surely going to cast you out (טלטה מטלטלך), mighty man. He will seize firm hold on you, whirl you round and round, and throw you (יזנפך) like a ball into a wide land; there you shall die, and your splendid chariots shall lie, O you disgrace to your master's house!</p>	<p>Behold, the Lord of hosts casts out (ἐκβαλει) and destroys a man, and will take away your apparel and your crown of glory and will throw you (ρίψει σε) into a large and wide land; and there you will die. And he will bring your good chariot to shame and the house of your ruler will be destroyed.</p>	<p>Behold, the Lord casts you out (מטלטל לך), a mighty man is cast out (טלטול), and shame will cover you. He will take away from you the turban and encircle you with enemies as an encircling wall and he will exile you (ויגלינך) to a wide land; there you shall die, and there shall your glorious chariots return in shame, because you did not guard the glory of your master's house.</p>

In this passage, not only does the LXX translate the Hebrew טלטל with ἐκβάλλω, but also, whether in its Hebrew, Greek or Aramaic contexts, “cast out” is employed to talk about Israel’s exile to Babylon. Furthermore, whereas the Hebrew and Greek texts state that

God will “throw” (יִצְנַפֵּךְ/πιψει) the Israelites from their land in v. 18, the Targum concretizes the language by explicitly stating that the people will be “exiled” (ויגלינך). Thus, whereas in the LXX being “cast out” *describes* “exile,” for the Targum the two concepts had essentially become synonymous; to be “cast out” *is* to be “exiled.”

Similar instances of ἐκβάλλω and טלטל in the context of exile also appear in the Greek and Aramaic translations of Jeremiah:

Jer 12:14-15 MT	Jer 12:14-15 LXX	Jer 12:14-15 Tg
<p>Thus says the Lord, concerning all my wicked neighbors, who touch the inheritance that I have caused my people Israel to inherit, “Behold, I will pluck them up (נָתַשׁ) from upon their land, and I will pluck up (אָחַשׁ) the house of Judah from among them. And it will be, after I have plucked them up (אָחַשׁ נָתַשׁ), that I will return and have mercy on them, and I will make them return, each to his inheritance and each to his land.”</p>	<p>For thus says the Lord, concerning all of the wicked neighbors who touch my inheritance, which I have divided to my people Israel, “Behold, I will draw them away (ἀποσπῶ) from their land and I will cast out (ἐκβαλῶ) Judah from among them. And it shall be, after I have cast them out (ἐκβαλεῖν με αὐτούς), that I will return and have mercy on them and will cause them to dwell, everyone in his inheritance and everyone in his land.”</p>	<p>Thus says the Lord concerning all wicked neighbors who damage the inheritance that I have made my people Israel inherit, “Behold, I will cast them out (נִטְלֵיהוֹן) from upon their land and I will cast out (אִטְלֵיהוֹן) the people of the house of Judah from among them. And it will be, after I have cast them out (דִּאִטְלֵיהוֹן יתהוֹן), that I will return in my Memra and have mercy on them and make them return, each to his inheritance and each to his land.”</p>

In foregoing direct translation of the Hebrew, the LXX twice opts for ἐκβάλλω while the Tg inserts טלטל three times, probably following the MT in its threefold repetition of “to pluck up” (נָתַשׁ).

A final text that reflects the conceptual relationship between טלטל and ἐκβάλλω is Jer 22:28 Tg/LXX. Although here the terms do not translate the same Hebrew words, they appear within the same verse and convey the same exilic idea:

Jer 22:28 MT	Jer 22:28 LXX	Jer 22:28 Tg
Is [this] a despised, broken pot, this man Coniah; or a vessel in which there is no pleasure? Why is he cast out (הוטל), he and his seed, and sent (והשלכו) into a land that they do not know?	Jechonias [Coniah] is dishonored like a useless vessel, for he is hurled (ἐξερρίφη) and cast out (ἐξβλήθη) into a land that he does not know.	Despised, weak, unstable (נטלטל) is this man Coniah; like a vessel in which there is no use. Why is he cast out (איטל), he and his sons, and are exiled (ואתגליאו) into a land that they do not know?

The Targum translates the first Hebrew verb, טיל, with טלטל, which is congruent with the targumic rendering of Isa 22:17 cited above. The LXX uses ἐκβάλλω to translate the second Hebrew verb, שלך (to send or cast). As was the case with Deut 29:27, ἐκβάλλω and טלטל do not occupy the same position in their translation of the Hebrew.

Nonetheless, once again the LXX uses ἐκβάλλω where the Targum uses גלי (to be exiled), which we have already seen is a semantic parallel to טלטל.

ἐκβάλλω is used in the LXX in the same way that טלטל is used in the Targums: both describe the fate of the Judeans who were cast out of their land by Babylon. However, while the LXX only rarely assigns an exilic connotation to ἐκβάλλω, the Targums frequently use טלטל as an exilic descriptor. Whereas the preceding analysis lists each of the four times Isa/Jer LXX use ἐκβάλλω to describe Israel's exile (as well as the remaining three times the word is used in this context elsewhere in the LXX), the Aramaic writers refer to טלטל in an exilic context over thirty times in the Isaiah and Jeremiah Targums.⁸⁶ This shows that the Jewish textual tradition of the "casting out" according to Isaiah and Jeremiah's accounts of the Babylonian exile had developed

⁸⁶ See Isa Tg 5:6; 16:2, 8; 22:3, 17-18; 23:16; 27:13; 37:13; 49:7; 51:21; 57:17; 58:7; Jer Tg 2:31; 4:1, 25; 9:9; 12:14-17; 14:9-10; 16:13; 22:26, 28; 23:2-3; 24:5-6; 27:10, 15; 31:9, 17-18; 50:3, 6, 17; 51:34.

considerably since the 2nd – 3rd centuries BCE. Therefore, the prevalence of טלטל in the Targums supports the possibility that Jewish readers in the first few centuries CE could have heard echoes of Israel’s exile in Matthew’s references to being cast out.

Moreover, the Septuagint offers a linguistic precedent to the Gospels that the Targums do not and, thus, it provides the conceptual foundation for a Jewish tradition that became more widespread. Based on the compound testimony of the Septuagint and the Targums, the idea of “cast out” carrying a meaning that pertained directly to Israel’s exile was certainly available to Matthew. The First Evangelist then incorporated it into his presentation of Jesus’ death in order to connect his Messiah with the history of Israel.

CHAPTER VI

“CAST OUT” IN MATTHEW AND THE ISAIAH TARGUM

Matthew’s Use of ἐκβάλλω as Exile in 8:12

The Gospels use the term ἐκβάλλω most often to describe the casting out of demons or unclean spirits. Of the twenty-four occurrences of the word in Matthew’s Gospel, nearly half refer to exorcism.⁸⁷ Matthew also uses ἐκβάλλω to describe a punishment for human beings. Matthew mentions the punishment of being “cast out” four times, each within the context of Jesus’ stories about the kingdom of heaven (Mt 8:12; 21:39; 22:13; 25:30 cf. Lk 13:28). Matthew’s first use of ἐκβάλλω as a punishment (8:12) appears within the context of exile, showing that Matthew, like the Targums, equates being “cast out” with being “exiled.”

Mt 8:5-13 depicts a meeting between Jesus and a centurion whose servant lies paralyzed in his home (cf. Lk 7:1-10). When Jesus agrees to heal the servant, the centurion states, “Lord, I am not worthy to have you come under my roof, but only say the word and my servant will be healed” (8:8). Jesus, amazed at the centurion’s faith (a Matthean motif), declares,

Truly I tell you, in no one in Israel have I found such faith. I tell you, many will come from east and west and will eat with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven, while the children of the kingdom will be cast out (ἐκβλήθησονται) into the outer darkness, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth. (Mt 8:10-12 cf. Lk 13:28)

By mentioning that “many will come from the east and west” (8:11), Matthew’s Jesus speaks of an ingathering in the same terms that his Scriptures speak about Israel

⁸⁷ Mt 7:22; 8:16, 31; 9:33f; 10:1, 8; 12:24, 26ff; 17:19.

being gathered from the east and west after their exile (e.g., Ps 107:2-3; Isa 43:5; Zec 8:7-8).⁸⁸ It would have been clear to any scripturally literate reader that Matthew was evoking return-from-exile language. So, if “many will come from the east and west” conveys an ingathering from exile, then those who are “cast out” are, by comparison, subjected to exile. Some will come in and others will be cast out; some will be gathered and others will be exiled.⁸⁹

The Isaiah Targum envisions the ingathering from exile in terms similar to those in Matthew. According to the Targum, God resolves “to gather exiles from the east (לכשנא גלותא ממדנחא), to bring openly as a swift bird from a far land the sons of Abraham (בני אברהם)” (46:11a). Matthew makes a similar claim that many will be gathered from the east and west to recline with Abraham, but then claims that the “sons of the kingdom” (υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας) – whom the Targum calls the “sons of Abraham” – will be exiled, rather than ingathered. The reader who approaches Matthew’s use of ἐκβάλλω in light of the targumic טלטל will find its appearance in the context of exilic imagery is especially appropriate. In Mt 8:12, ἐκβάλλω appears in a way that is analogous to how the Targums use טלטל – as a metaphor for exile.

⁸⁸ Several scholars have noted this. See, for example, E. P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1985), 220; Keener, *Matthew*, 269-270; Allison, “Who Will Come from East and West? Observations on Matt. 8.11-12–Luke 13.28-29,” *Irish Biblical Studies* 11 (1989): 158-170; Maureen W. Yeung, *Faith in Jesus and Paul* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 277.

⁸⁹ There is debate over whether Jesus speaks of an ingathering of Gentiles (since he is addressing a Gentile centurion), Jews, or both. I agree with John Nolland, who writes, “It is sometimes said that Matthew reapplies texts about the eschatological gathering of the dispersed of Israel to the gathering in of the Gentiles, but this is to claim too much. By locating the text where he does, Matthew does no more than allow for the inclusion of Gentiles in the gathering of Israel.” John Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005), 357. This view of Gentiles being included in an eschatological ingathering is in keeping with prophetic texts such as Isaiah 2:2-3, which states, “It will be in the latter days [that] the mountain of the house of the Lord will be first among the mountains and highly exalted, and all the nations will flow to it. Many people will come and say, ‘Come, let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob, that he may teach us his ways and we may walk in his paths.’” To be sure, the Gentiles were never exiled according to the Bible, so their inclusion in this ingathering does not mean that they come to Zion as returning exiles. Rather, Gentiles choose to accompany the Jews to Zion (see Zec 8:20-23).

The Parable of the Tenants (Mt 21:33-46) and Isaiah 5:1-7 MT

Having prepared readers to understand ἐκβάλλω in terms of exile in 8:10-12, Matthew reinforces this allusion in the Parable of the Tenants (21:33-41). This parable, a version of which appears in all three synoptic Gospels as well as the *Gospel of Thomas* (cf. Mk 12:1-12; Lk 20:9-19; *GThom* 65-66), describes a vineyard owner who prepares his property and then leases it to his tenants (21:33). Having departed for a distant country, he sends his servants to the vineyard to collect the produce. The tenants beat and kill them (21:34-36). Finally, the owner sends his son in the conviction that the tenants will treat the son more respectfully than they had the servants (22:37). Instead, in a bid to get the son's inheritance, the tenants "seized him, and cast him out (ἐξέβαλον) of the vineyard" (Mt 21:39). This parable presents Matthew's allegorical retelling of Israel's history, with the vineyard owner being God, the persecuted servants being Israel's prophets, the tenants being Israel's current leadership – as the chief priests and Pharisees themselves recognize at the conclusion of the parable (cf. Mt 21:45) – and the son symbolizing Jesus.⁹⁰ When the son is cast out of the vineyard, Matthew offers an allegorical picture of Jesus being handed over to his death.

The Parable of the Tenants recalls Isa 5:1-7. In Matthew, the owner plants a vineyard, builds a fence around it, and constructs a winepress and tower within it (21:33).

In the Isaian allegory, God does the very same thing (Isa 5:2). A comparison of the

⁹⁰ Cf. Ivor H. Jones, *The Matthean Parables: A Literary and Historical Commentary* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 376; Wright, *Jesus*, 178; Arland J. Hultgren, *The Parables of Jesus: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), 361-62; Allan W. Martens, "'Produce Fruit Worthy of Repentance': Parables of Judgment against the Jewish Religious Leaders and the Nation" in Richard N. Longenecker, ed., *The Challenge of Jesus' Parables* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), 158; Klyne Snodgrass, *The Parable of the Wicked Tenants: An Inquiry into Parable Interpretation* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983), 73-95; Idem., *Stories with Intent: A Comprehensive Guide to the Parables of Jesus* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008), 284-86.

opening verse of both narratives shows that Matthew (along with the other Synoptics) draws directly on language from Isa 5:1a-2 LXX.⁹¹

Isa 5:1a-2 LXX My beloved had a vineyard (ἀμπελών)... and I made a fence around [it] (φραγμὸν περιέθηκα), and dug a trench, and planted a choice vine, and built a tower (ὠκοδόμησα πύργον) in the midst of it, and dug a place for the wine vat (προλήνιον ὄρυξα ἐν αὐτῷ) in it.

Mt 21:33 There was an owner of a house who planted a vineyard (ἀμπελώνα) and made a fence around it (φραγμὸν αὐτῷ περιέθηκεν) and dug a winepress in it (ὄρυξεν ἐν αὐτῷ ληνὸν) and built a tower (ὠκοδόμησεν πύργον).

However, the parables also diverge at key points. The vineyard of Isaiah represents both the land of Israel, which will be laid waste and neglected when its inhabitants are removed (Isa 5:6), as well as “the house of Israel” (οἶκος τοῦ Ἰσραηλ) and “the people of Judah” (ἄνθρωπος τοῦ Ἰουδα), more specifically (Isa 5:7 LXX).⁹² For Matthew, the vineyard does not represent people (the tenants, servants, and son fulfill this function), but only place. The Matthean vineyard begins as a symbol for Israel – or, perhaps, specifically Judea – and it may also narrow into a symbol for Jerusalem, since the place at which Jesus is crucified may have been located outside the Jerusalem city limits (Mt 27:32-33 cf. Heb 13:12).⁹³ Moreover, in his explanation of the parable, Matthew’s Jesus identifies the vineyard as the “kingdom of God” (21:43).⁹⁴ Thus, Matthew draws the basic imagery from Isaiah 5 and also nuances the vineyard to serve

⁹¹ Davies and Allison call the similarity between the Matthean and Isaian vineyards “a fact recognized throughout exegetical history.” W.D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, Jr., *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, Vol. 3 (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988), 178.

⁹² Cf. Otto Kaiser, *Isaiah 1-12*. 2nd Ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1983), 93.

⁹³ Matthew does not specify the exact location of Golgotha, so we do not know whether the “Place of the Skull” was located inside or outside Jerusalem. After Jesus is scourged, Mt 27:32 notes that he and the Romans “went out” (ἐξερχόμενοι) but this seems to refer to going out from the “praetorian” (πραιτώριον) where Jesus is mocked and scourged (27:27), rather than going out from Jerusalem.

⁹⁴ Cf. Warren Carter, *Matthew on the Margins: A Sociopolitical and Religious Reading* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 426.

his exegetical purposes by adding the allegory of the “kingdom of God” to the base allegory of the vineyard as Israel, Judah, and/or Jerusalem.

Furthermore, Matthew re-purposes the imagery of Isaiah 5 as a critique not of the people of Judah as a whole but rather of the Temple authorities (as well as the Pharisaic leadership). The context of Mt 21 concerns the Temple and its administrators. Mt 21:12-17 details Jesus’ cleansing of the Temple and the indignation it produces among the chief priests and scribes (21:15). Immediately thereafter Jesus curses a fig tree by saying, “May no fruit ever come from you again” (21:19). Based on this incident’s proximity to Jesus’ Temple cleansing and the symbol of the withered fig tree as a critique of Israel’s leaders in the Jewish Scriptures (Jer 8:4-12), the cursing comports with Jesus’ denouncement of the Temple leadership.⁹⁵ Finally, Jesus enters the Temple a second time, where the chief priests question his authority (21:23) and where he answers with the Parable of the Tenants.

Isaiah 5:1-7 in Early Jewish and Christian Interpretation

The interpretation of Isa 5:1-7 as a critique of the Temple and its authorities is not confined to the Gospels. The equation of Isaiah’s vineyard with the Temple is also found in Jewish tradition before and after the first century as well as in patristic sources. The Dead Sea Scrolls contain what may be our earliest attestation of Isaiah’s vineyard being equated with the Jerusalem Temple. The fragmentary 4Q500, usually dated to the first half of the first century BCE,⁹⁶ notes that the winepress of Isa 5:2 was “built of stones,”

⁹⁵ Cf. Harrington, *Matthew*, 296-98.

⁹⁶ See George J. Brooke, “4Q500 1 and the Use of Scripture in the Parable of the Vineyard,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* Vol. 2, No. 3 (Nov., 1995): 268-294; John S. Kloppenborg, *The Tenants in the Vineyard: Ideology, Economics, and Agrarian Conflict in Jewish Palestine* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 90-91.

which could refer to the “altar of stones” in Deut 27:5.⁹⁷ If this is the case, then according to this Scroll, the winepress in Isaiah’s vineyard represents a sacrificial altar, so that the vineyard itself would be the Temple in which the altar resides.

Rabbinic interpretation also makes these equations, and it does so more explicitly. In its commentary on Isaiah’s vineyard, the Tosefta states, “*And he built a tower in the midst of it— this is the sanctuary; and hewed out a wine vat in it – this is the altar*” (*t. Sukk.* 3:15 cf. *t. Me’il* 1.16).⁹⁸ While the Tosefta was finalized two to three centuries after Matthew’s Gospel, its interpretation is attributed to Rabbi Yosé b. Halafta, who lived in the mid-second century CE. Thus, we have a text that predates Matthew’s Gospel and a text that postdates it, showing that the idea of Isaiah’s vineyard parable being equated with the Temple was in circulation in the first century. While Matthew does not equate the vineyard with the Temple, the Parable of the Tenants, beginning with Mark’s version and continuing in Matthew, suggests some relationship between the Temple (or a critique thereof) and Isa 5:1-7.

Origen’s *Commentary on Matthew* (c. 246) provides an allegorical reading of the NT parable that parallels early Jewish interpretations of Isaiah. Origen’s assertion that “the tower is the sanctuary, the press is the place of offerings” (*Comm. in Matt.* 17.6) may point to his contact with rabbis (or at least the rabbinic exegesis of Isa 5:1-2) after his move to Caesarea in 231.⁹⁹ This reading of Mt 21:33, which retains a distinctly Jewish flavor, is unique among early Christian commentators. Despite this slant, Origen’s commentary also shares the more traditional Christian opinion reflected in Irenaeus and

⁹⁷ See Kloppenborg, *Tenants*, 90-91.

⁹⁸ For more on the Tosefta’s reading of Isa 5 and how it relates to the NT parable, see Craig A. Evans, *Noncanonical Writings and New Testament Interpretation* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992), 183; Kloppenborg, *Tenants*, 91-92.

⁹⁹ Cf. Kloppenborg, *Tenants*, 98.

later writers that the “kingdom was taken from the Jews and ‘given to a nation bringing forth the fruit thereof’ ... [i.e.] the Gentiles” (*Comm. in Matt.* 10:23).¹⁰⁰ Nonetheless, Origen’s incorporation of a traditionally Jewish interpretation of Isaiah into his interpretation of Matthew’s parable shows that a Temple-centric reading of both texts was known in both Jewish and Christian circles in Late Antiquity.

The Parable of the Tenants and Isa Tg 5:1-7

The Isaiah Targum not only couches its presentation of Isa 5:1-7 in Temple imagery (as does Qumran, Tosefta, and Origen), but it also directs its critique against the Temple leadership (as does Matthew). In place of the Hebrew words for “tower” (מגדל) and “wine vat” (יקב), the Targum inserts the cultic structures to which the Dead Sea Scrolls and Tosefta also refer: “I built my sanctuary (מקדשי) in their midst, and even gave

¹⁰⁰ Commentary on the Parable of the Tenants is surprisingly scarce within early Christian history. The earliest known treatment is found in Irenaeus’ *Adversus Haereses* (4.36.1-2), ca. 180. Irenaeus equates the vineyard with God’s creation for the whole human race, which is ultimately populated by Israel – an allegory for what he calls the “Mosaic dispensation.” Irenaeus allegorizes the tower as Jerusalem, and the vineyard owner’s servants represent the pre- and post-exilic prophets. Finally, Jesus, the vineyard owner’s son, is killed and rejected by “those who do not receive the Spirit” (i.e. the Jews), whom God rejects in favor of the Gentiles. Commenting on Mt 21:39 and parallels, Irenaeus contends, “For inasmuch as [those who do not receive the Spirit] have rejected the Son of God, and cast him out of the vineyard when they slew him, God has justly rejected them, and given to the Gentiles outside the vineyard the fruits of its cultivation. This is in accordance with what Jeremiah says, ‘The Lord has rejected and forsaken the nation which does these things; for the children of Judah have done evil in my sight, says the Lord’” (4.36.2). In his *Commentaries on Isaiah* (1.33) written ca. 324, Eusebius conflates the parable of the vineyard in Isa 5 with the NT parable. Like Irenaeus, Eusebius also notes the rejection of the Jews, which, in turn, provides the means by which the Gentile church has grown. For Eusebius, the parables in Isa 5 and Mt 21 prove that those who oppose God’s purposes will be rebuffed and that God is providentially endorsing the Gentile Christian Church. Jerome and Chrysostom follow Irenaeus and Eusebius’s lead in interpreting the parable as the divine discarding of the Jews and the shift of God’s blessings to Gentile Christians. See Kloppenborg, *Tenants*, 22-24; David Stern, “Jesus’ Parables from the Perspective of Rabbinic Literature: The Example of the Wicked Husbandmen,” in Clemens Thoma and Michael Wyschogrod, eds., *Parable and Story in Judaism and Christianity* (New York: Paulist Press, 1989). With regard to this Gentile Christian interpretation, Brad Young writes, “Certainly the historical context and situation of the Jewish people in the first century was largely forgotten by Christian interpreters, who allegorized the parable and often viewed it as a symbolic portrayal of Israel’s rejection.” Brad H. Young, *Jesus and His Jewish Parables: Rediscovering the Roots of Jesus’ Teaching* (New York: Paulist Press, 1989), 283. Despite this decidedly anti-Jewish understanding, the Parable of the Tenants is not cited in any of the materials that scholars categorize as *Adversus Judaeos* literature. See Luz, *Matthew 21-28*, 39.

them my altar (מִדְבַּחַי) to atone for their sins” (Isa Tg 5:2). Chilton adduces the Targum’s cultic language and the Temple setting of the Parable of the Tenants to claim that the NT parable, “contexted in Temple controversy and directed against the Temple leadership, reflects the specifically cultic context of Isaiah 5:1-7 in the Targum.”¹⁰¹ Both Matthew and the Targum build on this foundation of allusions to the Temple in interpretations of Isa 5 at Qumran and in Rabbinic sources by developing it into a critique of the Temple and its leadership.

Chilton also argues that Jesus, in originally telling this parable, drew on the specifically targumic (i.e. cultic) understanding of Isaiah’s vineyard to ensure that the Temple priests would understand that his critique was directed against them (cf. Mt 21:45). He concludes,

In the present case, we have posited a conscious awareness on the part of Jesus’ opponents that he appealed to the application of the vineyard imagery of Isaiah 5 to the Temple in the Targumic tradition.... Jesus is able to point the parable of the vineyard against the Temple authorities precisely because he plays on their conscious familiarity with Jewish (in this case Targumic) tradition.... Jesus consciously shaped a saying so that only those familiar with the Isaiah Targum of the time could fully and readily understand it.¹⁰²

Chilton’s argument for Jesus’ use of the Isaiah Targum and the Temple authorities’ cognizance of this use in determining their interpretation of the parable is difficult to substantiate. Again, to assert that the Temple authorities adduced specifically and solely “Targumic tradition” in order to understand Jesus’ parable is unduly narrow and possibly anachronistic. The Isaiah Targum as we now have it did not exist in Jesus’ day. At most, Jesus and his opponents may have had interpretive traditions that were not exclusively associated with the Aramaic translation of Isaiah. However, while Chilton

¹⁰¹ Bruce Chilton, *A Galilean Rabbi and His Bible: Jesus’ Use of the Interpreted Scripture of His Time* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1984), 113.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 115-16.

may be overstating with regard to how targumic tradition functioned for Jesus and his contemporaries, his stress on the cultic language in the Targum and the context of the Temple in the NT parable does mark some general, contextual similarities between them.

Other scholars have noted further similarities between the Parable of the Tenants and Isa Tg 5:1-7.¹⁰³ Johnnes de Moor, who offers the most extensive treatment of the parable in light of the Targums, argues with regard to Mark's version, "all tenors of the metaphors used in the allegorical interpretation [of the Parable of the Tenants] may have had a Targumic background."¹⁰⁴ For example, de Moor proposes that NT reference to the "time" or "season" (καιρός) at which the fruit of the vineyard (καρπός) will be given to the owner (Mk 12:2; cf. Mt 21:34; Lk 20:10) denotes the act of tithing, specifically. As the vineyard owner is God, de Moor alludes to the possibility that the targumic parable has a lack of tithing in mind as its specific critique of the Temple leadership. He notes that Isa Tg 5:10 cites "the sin of not giving tithes," which "may refer to the same offense" we find in the NT parable.¹⁰⁵ De Moor highlights the reference to "inheritance" (אחזקה) as another name for the vineyard in Isa Tg 5:1 in order to draw a possible parallel between the Aramaic term and the reference in the Gospels to the vineyard as the son's "inheritance" (κληρονομία cf. Mt 21:38; Mk 12:7; Lk 20:14).¹⁰⁶ Although the Targum associates the vineyard to God's people as a whole (5:1), de Moor notes that the chapter later "indicates that it held the leadership in Jerusalem responsible for the downfall of the

¹⁰³ Michel Hubaut, *La parabole des vigneron* (Paris: Gabalda, 1976), 22-23; Donald Juel, *Messiah and Temple* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977), 136-37; Hans-Josef Klauck, *Allegorie und Allegorese: in synopischen Gleichnistexten* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1978), 306; Evans, *Noncanonical Writings*, 111, 182-83; Craig Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables*, 2nd Edition (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2012), 330.

¹⁰⁴ Johnnes C. de Moor, "The Targumic Background of Mark 12:1-12: The Parable of the Wicked Tenants," *JSJ* 29 (1998), 66.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 71.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 77.

people” (see Isa Tg 5:8-15, 20-24). The Targum does not mention the Temple administration explicitly, but its focus on Jerusalem’s leaders parallels Matthew’s tenants, “the chief priests and the Pharisees” (Mt 21:45).

This final insight is important for our purposes in that it highlights the tradition of reworking Isaiah’s parable into a critique of Israel’s leaders. However, because the identity of this leadership is not explicated in the Targum, we cannot know whether the targumist wished to implicate the priests, teachers comparable to the Pharisees, or some other group, which weakens the connection to Matthew. Moreover, de Moor’s comparisons are sometimes based on speculation that lacks textual evidence connecting the two parables. For example, because there is no mention of tithing in the Parable of the Tenants, de Moor must posit a possible allusion to it in *καίρός*.

For all of the potential similarities in imagery and context that scholars have observed between Isa Tg 5 and Mt 21:33-46, they have missed a clear and striking linguistic parallel. Whereas the Hebrew at Isa 5:6a announces the fate of the vineyard, the Targum proclaims the fate of the people by saying that they will be cast out:

	ואשיתהו בתה לא יזמר ולא יעדד
Isa 5:6a MT	And I will lay it [the vineyard] waste; it shall not be pruned or nor hoed.
	ואשויונון רשישין לא יסתעדון ולא יסתמוכון ויהון משלטלון ושביקין
Isa 5:6a Tg	And I will <i>make them [to be] banished</i> ; they will not be helped and they will not be supported, and <i>they will be cast out</i> and forsaken.

The targumic description of the people being cast out of the vineyard parallels the fate of Matthew’s parabolic son who is also cast out (*ἐξέβαλον*) of the vineyard (Mt 21:39). Once again, Matthew and the Targum share language that, in Jewish tradition, described the exile of God’s people. However, while the inhabitants of the vineyard (i.e. the people) are

exiled in the Targum, Jesus is exiled in Matthew. Thus, Matthew reworks a Jewish interpretation of Isaiah 5:1-7 to equate Jesus' impending death with the tradition of Israel's exile.

Viewing the parable in light of the Targum also explains why Matthew's Jesus has God, the vineyard owner, going into a distant country (21:33). This detail recalls God's departure from the Temple after Israel's exile according to Ezekiel, who states, "And the glory of the Lord departed from upon the threshold of the house [i.e. the Temple]" (ויצא כשור יהוה מעל מפתן הבית) (Ezek 10:18). In this case, God leaves his Temple after the people leave their land. The Isaiah Targum picks up this scenario in its paraphrase of Isa 57:17b MT, in which God states, "I hid myself and was angry" (ואקצף). The Targum renders this verse, "I took up my Shekinah [i.e. presence] from them and cast them out; I scattered their exiles" (סליקית שכינתי מנהון וטלשילתינון בדריית גלוחהון). Matthew's Jesus begins his parable with God's departure, and has the vineyard owner return only after his son has been cast out of the vineyard (Mt 21:39-40). In this way, Matthew conveys that God will return to Zion once his Son, Jesus, is exiled in his death – "cast out of the vineyard and killed" (21:40). This aspect of the parable reinforces the parallel thought between Matthew and the Targum, both of which anticipate the return of God's kingdom once the debt of exile is paid.

According to Mt 21:40, "when the owner of the vineyard comes" (ὅταν... ἔλθῃ ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος), he will destroy those tenants who beat and killed his servants and son (21:41). The Jeremiah Targum agrees that God's visitation will end in catastrophe for the wicked leaders of the people:

לכן כה אמר יהוה אלהי ישראל על הרעים הרעים את עמי אתם הפצתם את צאני ותדחום ולא פקדתם אתם הנני פקד עליכם את רעמעלליכם ונס יהוה

Jer 23:2 MT Therefore, thus says the Lord, the God of Israel, concerning the shepherds who shepherd my people: ‘You have scattered my flock and have driven them away, and you have not sought them. Behold, I will visit upon you the evil of your deeds,’ says the Lord.

בדין כדנן אמר יי אלהא דישראל על פרנסיא דמפרנלין ית עמי אתון בדרתון ית עמי ושלטילתונון ולא תבעתון האמא מסער עליכון ית בישות עובדיכון אמר יי
 Jer 23:2 Tg Therefore, thus says the Lord, the God of Israel, concerning the *community leaders* who support my people: ‘You have scattered my people and *cast them out* and you have not sought them. Behold, I will visit upon you the evil of your deeds,’ says the Lord.

The scenario in the Targum mirrors the events of Matthew’s parable, in which the “community leaders,” (the chief priests and Pharisees) “cast out” the son/Son, and God then visits punishment upon the offending leaders.

While Matthew and the Isaiah Targum share the addition of people being cast out of the vineyard, differences exist as well. For example, the Hebrew and Aramaic versions of Isaiah 5 speak of the destruction of the vineyard and its structures. The Hebrew reads, “And now I tell you what I will do to my vineyard: I will remove its hedge and it shall be devoured. I will break down its wall and it will be trampled down” (Isa 5:5). Speaking of the inhabitants of the vineyard, the same verse in the Targum inserts, “I will break down the house of their sanctuaries (איתרע בית מקדושיהון).” Matthew’s parable, however, says nothing about the destruction of the vineyard itself. Rather, Jesus states that the kingdom of God will be taken away from the current tenants (i.e., the leaders who reject him by casting him out) and given to another “people” (ἔθνει), namely those who choose to follow him as Messiah (Mt 21:43).¹⁰⁷ This difference shows that, according to Matthew,

¹⁰⁷ The idea that ἔθνος here refers to Gentiles, as opposed to Jews who follow Jesus, makes little sense in the context of the parable. The allegory is predicated upon Israel’s sacred history and God’s reaction to Jewish disobedience, in particular. The parable recounts this history leading up to the death of Jesus, who is himself a Jew, and its conclusion hinges on the fact that the current Jewish leaders understand

the object of God's judgment, in the case of this parable, is neither the land of Israel nor its population as a whole, but only its leadership (cf. Mt 21:45).¹⁰⁸

It is at this point that the *difference* between the analogous “cast out” motif in Matthew and the Targum delivers its most striking theological conclusion: according to Matthew, Jesus – not the people – is cast out of the vineyard. Where the Targum has the *people* cast out, Matthew claims that *Jesus* will receive this punishment instead. That Jesus stands in for his people in his death aligns with Matthew's Jesus giving his life as a “ransom” (Mt 20:28)— not to replace his people, but rather to save them from the sins that cause separation or, more specifically, exile from God.¹⁰⁹ As N. T. Wright notes, Jesus' crucifixion marked the point at which he would “take upon himself the exile of the nation as a whole... bear[ing] the weight of Israel's exile, dying as her Messiah outside the walls of Jerusalem.”¹¹⁰ Matthew's presentation of the son (Jesus) being cast out in the Parable of the Tenants, when read in light of the Isaiah Targum, offers evidence that Matthew's view of Jesus accords with Wright's assertion, in that Matthew directly connects Jesus' death with Israel's exile.

themselves as the brunt of Jesus' critique. It is, therefore, difficult to imagine that Matthew would suddenly introduce an ἔθνος other than Jews in Jesus' post-parable comments without explicitly glossing the term with reference to Gentiles (who appear nowhere in the body of the parable itself). While Matthew does use ἔθνος to mean Gentiles elsewhere in his Gospel (e.g., 4:15; 6:32; 10:5; 12:18; 20:19), and certainly makes reference to Gentile inclusion in the Matthean community (e.g., 28:19), there is no immediate reason to assume that Gentiles are in view here. Cf. Harrington, *Matthew*, 303-04. Even if ἔθνος is to be translated “nation” rather than “group of people,” it still would not preclude a reference to a Jewish “nation.” Keener, who reads ἔθνος as “nation,” states, “‘nation’ probably recalls Ex. 19:6 [i.e., a holy nation (ἔθνος ἅγιον)] and strict Jewish groups that characterized themselves as “righteous remnants” within Israel (e.g., Qumran) could also view themselves as heirs of the biblical covenant community.... Matthew implies not rejection of Israel but of dependence on any specific group membership.” See *Matthew*, 515-16 n. 171.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Snodgrass, *The Parable of the Wicked Tenants*, 90-91; Hultgren, *The Parables of Jesus*, 359.

¹⁰⁹ The Torah includes commands for the individual to pay “a ransom for his life to the Lord” (Exod 30:12 cf. 21:30). In Matthew's case, Jesus pays the ransom with his own life.

¹¹⁰ Wright, *Jesus*, 608, 603.

CHAPTER VII

EXILE IN THE MATTHEAN PASSION NARRATIVE

While the Parable of the Tenants depicts Jesus' death as a recapitulation of Israel's exile, Matthew also makes frequent reference to the exile in the passion narrative itself (Mt 26-27). For example, Matthew includes the term παραδίδωμι (to hand over) throughout Jesus' judgment and crucifixion, which echoes the Judeans being handed over to the Babylonians. While all the Gospel writers use the term with reference to Jesus, Matthew greatly increases its prominence, employing παραδίδωμι 19 times to describe Jesus being handed over to death, as compared to Mark's 13 uses.¹¹¹ As Donald Senior notes, παραδίδωμι "becomes almost a technical term in the Gospels for Jesus' arrest and deliverance to his opponents."¹¹² Scholars have proposed various reasons for the frequency of the term: as a reminder of God's providence in Jesus' crucifixion,¹¹³ to show that multiple parties (e.g., Judas, the Jewish leadership, and the Romans) were responsible for Jesus' death,¹¹⁴ or as an allusion to scriptural passages, most notably Isaiah 53 LXX.¹¹⁵ Frederick Dale Bruner has suggested that the word connotes "a judgment of God. It was what God did to Israel when she sinned—God 'handed her over'

¹¹¹ See Mt 10:4; 17:22; 20:18-19; 26:2, 15-16, 21, 23-25, 45-46, 48; 27:2-4, 18, 26. Cf. Mk 3:19; 9:31; 10:33; 14:10-11, 18, 21, 41-42, 44; 15:1, 10, 15. Apart from references solely to Jesus' passion, Matthew uses the term a total of 31 times in his Gospel, compared to Mark's total of 19.

¹¹² Donald Senior, *The Passion of Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1985), 42.

¹¹³ See Luz, *Matthew 21-28*, 331; Hare, *Matthew*, 204.

¹¹⁴ See Craig S. Keener, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999), 673.

¹¹⁵ See Joel Marcus, "The Old Testament and the Death of Jesus: The Role of Scripture in the Gospel Passion Narratives" in John T. Carroll and Joel B. Green, eds., *The Death of Jesus in Early Christianity* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995), 214; Nolland, *Gospel of Matthew*, 719.

to her enemies.... Therefore, when God ‘handed over’ Jesus to ‘men,’ it means that God intends his Son to be judged with the judgment that ‘men’ deserve.”¹¹⁶ A detailed analysis of “to hand over” in the Greek and Aramaic versions of Jeremiah not only shows, per Bruner, that Matthew views Jesus’ passion as God’s judgment, but also that Jesus’ judgment and crucifixion convey the same divine judgment that God’s people experienced at the hands of the Babylonians. In this way, as with ἐκβάλλω, Matthew uses παραδίδωμι to link Jesus’ death with Israel’s exile.

In the Hebrew Scriptures, God repeatedly states that his people will be “given” (נתן) into the hands of the Babylonians and taken from their homeland. For example, God states, “I will give (אתן) Zedekiah king of Judah and his servants and the people in this city [Jerusalem]... into the hand (בִּיד) of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon and into the hand (בִּיד) of their enemies, into the hand (בִּיד) of those who seek their lives” (Jer 21:7a). Most often, the LXX follows the Hebrew closely, as in the case of the verse above: “I will give (δώσω) Zedekiah king of Judah and his servants and the people left in this city... into the hands (εἰς χεῖρας) of their enemies who seek their lives” (Jer 21:7a LXX).

On occasion, however, the LXX diverges from a strict translation of נתן by replacing the basic verb δίδωμι (to give) with the compound παραδίδωμι (to hand over). This shift, which occurs twelve times in Jeremiah LXX, can be seen in the following examples:¹¹⁷

Jer 32:43 MT Fields shall be bought in this land of which you are saying, “It is a desolation, without human or beast; it is given into the hand (בִּיד נתנה) of the Chaldeans.”

¹¹⁶ Frederick Dale Bruner, *Matthew: A Commentary (Volume 2: The Churchbook, Matthew 13-28)* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1990), 200-201.

¹¹⁷ Cf. Jer LXX 15:4; 21:10; 22:25; 24:8; 33:24; 39:4, 28, 36; 41:2; 45:3.

- Jer 39:43 LXX And fields shall be bought in the land, of which you are saying, “It will be desolation, without human or beast; and they are handed over into the hands (παρεδόθησαν εἰς χεῖρας) of the Chaldeans.”
- Jer 37:17 MT King Zedekiah sent and received him. And the king asked him secretly in his house and said, “Is there any word from the Lord?” Jeremiah said, “There is.” Then [Jeremiah] said, “You shall be given (תנתן) into the hand (בִּיד) of the king of Babylon.”
- Jer 44:17 LXX Then Zedekiah sent and called him. And the king asked him secretly, saying, “Is there a word from the Lord?” And [Jeremiah] said, “There is: you shall be handed over (παραδοθήση) into the hands (εἰς χεῖρας) of the king of Babylon.”

In light of these passages, when Matthew’s Jesus predicts his death by telling his disciples, “The Son of Man is about to be handed over into the hands (παραδίδοσθαι εἰς χεῖρας) of human beings” (Mt 17:22 cf. 26:45), he is echoing specifically Septuagintal language that was used to describe the Babylonian exile.

One might ask why Matthew chooses to feature this exilic terminology so prominently in his passion narrative when it occurs relatively infrequently in the Septuagint. The Targum helps to answer this question. Whereas Jeremiah LXX only occasionally uses παραδίδωμι to translate the נתן as it relates to exile, the Jeremiah Targum translates every such instance of נתן with מסר, “to hand over.” In comparison to the twelve times “to hand over” is used in Jeremiah LXX to describe the exile, the equivalent Aramaic verb appears forty times in the Jeremiah Targum.¹¹⁸ For example, in the following passage both the Hebrew and Greek versions feature their respective verbs “to give,” while the Aramaic rendering substitutes “to hand over.” Speaking to King Zedekiah, Jeremiah states,

¹¹⁸ Cf. Jer Tg 2:14; 12:7; 13:20; 15:9, 13; 17:3; 20:4f; 21:7, 10; 22:25; 25:31; 26:14, 24; 27:8; 29:21; 30:16; 32:3f, 24f, 28, 36, 43; 34:2f, 20f; 37:4, 17; 38:3, 5, 16, 18ff, 23; 39:17; 43:3; 44:30. The term is also used with reference to the eventual punishment of Egypt and Babylon; cf. 46:24, 26; 48:15; 50:15, 27; 51:40.

“But if you do not surrender to the officials of the king of Babylon, then this city shall be given (נתנה/δοθήσεται) into the hand of the Chaldeans, and they shall burn it with fire, and you shall not escape from their hand. King Zedekiah said to Jeremiah, “I am afraid of the Jews who have deserted to the Chaldeans, lest I be given (יתני/δώσειν) into their hands and they mock me.” (Jer 38:18-19 MT/45:18-19 LXX)

“But if you do not go out to princes of the king of Babylon, then this city will be handed over (תחמסר) into the hand of the Chaldeans and they will burn it with fire, and you will not be rescued from their hands.” And King Zedekiah said to Jeremiah, “I am afraid of the Jews who deserted to the Chaldeans, lest they hand me over (ימסרין) to their authority, and they mock me.” (Jer Tg 38:18-19)

Unlike the MT or LXX, the Targum never simply states that people are “given” into the hands of their oppressors. Rather, the people are always “handed over” to their enemies. In fact, the Targum adds מסר to verses in which neither the MT nor the LXX shows any trace of the verbs “to give” or “to hand over.”¹¹⁹

Jer 2:14 MT/LXX Is Israel a servant, a slave by birth? Why then has he become plunder ((לבו/προνομην ἐγένετο)?

Jer 2:14 Tg Was Israel like a slave? Is he the son of a slave? Why is he handed over (אתמסר) to plunderers?

Finally, the Targum also tends to bypass the use of metaphor when it comes to recalling Israel’s captivity at the hands of the Babylonians. Whereas the Hebrew and Greek texts often use various poetic metaphors to describe the exile, the Targum simply inserts, “exile” (גלי) to ensure that its readers do not miss the connection between being handed over and going into exile.¹²⁰

Jer 15:9 MT/LXX “She who bore seven has grown feeble; she has fainted away; her sun went down while it was still day; she has been shamed and disgraced. And the rest of them I will give (אתן/δώσω) to the sword before their enemies,” says the Lord.

¹¹⁹ Cf. Jer Tg 26:14; 38:5; 48:15; 50:15, 27; 51:40.

¹²⁰ Cf. Jer Tg 26:23f; 29:21f; 32:36f; 43:3. Indeed, as we have seen, the same is true in the tandem references to “exile” and “cast out” in the Targums.

Jer 15:9 Tg

“Their land is desolate, without her people; they have given up their life; their honor has gone into exile (גלא) with their life, and as long as they exist they are ashamed and disgraced. And I will hand over (אמסר) their remnant to the sword before their enemies,” says the Lord.

Thus, following Senior’s suggestion that παραδίδωμι is a “technical term in the Gospels for Jesus’ arrest and deliverance to his opponents,” we can similarly conclude that מסר is the technical term in the Jeremiah Targum for the Jews’ deliverance to the Babylonians. As with the notion of being “cast out” in exile, we see here in both Matthew and the Jeremiah Targum a similar tradition that Israel was “handed over” to exile. Moreover, in the above example, the people are handed over specifically to be killed – they go “into exile with their life” (גלא ... בחייהון), insofar as in exile they “give up their life” (למפחת נפש) and are ultimately “handed over... to the sword” (לחרבא אמסר). In this way, we see a direct association with death in the targumic presentation of the exile. Matthew similarly has Jesus giving up his life in exile when he is handed over to death by crucifixion.

Moreover, Matthew joins παραδίδωμι with other LXX references throughout Jesus’ final hours, which connect his suffering to that of the exiles. For example, Matthew 27:2 states, “And they bound (δήσαντες) [Jesus] and carried him away (ἀπήγαγον) and handed him over (παρέδωκαν) to Pilate the governor.” Each of the verbs applied to Jesus in Mt 27:2—“bound,” “carried away,” and “handed over”—is also used in the Septuagint to describe the capture of Zedekiah and the destruction of the Temple at the hands of the Babylonians:

And [Jeremiah] said [to king Zedekiah]... “You shall be handed over (παραδοθήση) into the hands (εἰς χεῖρας) of the king of Babylon”.... And [the king of Babylon] put out the eyes of Zedekiah, and bound (ἔδησεν) him in chains, and the king of Babylon brought him to Babylon.... And the bronze pillars that were in the house of the Lord, and the stands,

and the bronze sea, the [Babylonians] broke into pieces, and they took the bronze from there and carried it away (ἀπήνεγκαν) to Babylon. (Jer 44:17; 52:11a, 17 LXX)

Matthew condenses these events of Israel's exile and applies them to Jesus in 27:2. In so doing, Matthew echoes language from the LXX that was used to describe the suffering and exile of a previous Jewish king and his people. In this way, Matthew's description of Jesus in 27:2 directly points to Jesus' judgment and crucifixion as an individual reenactment of the corporate exile to Babylon.

Even before describing how Jesus is handed over to the Jewish authorities and, subsequently, to the Roman leadership, Matthew includes terms that were earlier used in the Jewish Scriptures to speak about the Babylonian exile. Among the most prominent scriptural motifs in Matthew's passion narrative is the description of God's wrath as a cup from which his people had been forced to drink when they went into exile.¹²¹ Isaiah proclaims,

Awake, awake, stand up, O Jerusalem, who has drunk at the hand of the Lord the cup (ποτήριον) of his fury. For you have drunk and drained the cup (ποτήριον) of calamity.... Thus says the Lord God who judges his people: Behold, I have taken out of your hand the cup (ποτήριον) of calamity... and you will not drink it anymore. (Isa 51:17, 22 LXX)

Similarly, mourning the destruction of Jerusalem and the exile of its people, Lamentations asks, "What shall I witness to you, or to what shall I compare you, O daughter of Jerusalem? Who shall save and comfort you, O virgin daughter of Zion? For the cup (ποτήριον) of your destruction is enlarged. Who shall heal you?" (Lam 2:13 LXX). To drink from God's cup, in these contexts, is a euphemism for undergoing exile.

When Matthew's Jesus petitions God in Gethsemane regarding his impending death: "My Father, if it be possible, let this cup (ποτήριον) pass from me" (Mt 26:39), the exilic cup becomes an allusion to Jesus' internal struggle (cf. Mt 20:22-23; 26:42). When

¹²¹ Cf. Harrington, *Matthew*, 288.

Jesus realizes that this cup would not pass, he tells his disciples, “See, the hour has drawn near (ἤγγικεν ἡ ὥρα), and the Son of Man is handed over into the hands (παραδίδοται εἰς χειρας) of sinners” (Mt 26:45). In this statement, we hear a faint echo of the declaration of the Jerusalemites just before the king of Babylon invades their city: “Our time has drawn near (ἤγγικεν ὁ καιρὸς), our days are fulfilled, our time is come” (Lam 4:18b LXX). Thus, with this echo of Lamentations coupled once again with the exilic παραδίδομι, Matthew’s Jesus equates his own captivity by those whom he deems “sinners” with his ancestors’ captivity at the hands of the Babylonians.

Matthew then confirms that the “hour has come” for his persecuted protagonist by stating that the arresting party “laid hands on Jesus (ἐπέβαλον τὰς χειρας ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰησοῦν) and seized him” (Mt 26:50b). This particular wording for Jesus’ arrest serves to tie his experience to that of the exiles. Isaiah declares, “Therefore the Lord of hosts was greatly angered against his people, and he reached out his hand upon them (ἐπέβαλεν τὴν χειρα αὐτοῦ ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς), and struck them” (Isa 5:25a LXX). Here Matthew compares Jesus’ captivity to Israel’s exile and also suggests that while it is ostensibly the arresting party that seizes Jesus on behalf of the Jewish leadership, it is actually God who reaches out a hand upon Jesus, thereby actively sending him to his death in order to accomplish a salvific purpose.

Matthew continues to parallel Jesus and Israel’s exile as the passion narrative develops. After being arrested, Jesus is taken to the house of Caiaphas the high priest where he is questioned before the Sanhedrin (Mt 26:57-68). Peter, sitting in the courtyard, is also questioned as to whether he is one of Jesus’ followers. Three times Peter is questioned, and each time he denies any affiliation with Jesus. After the third

denial, “Peter remembered the saying of Jesus, ‘Before the rooster crows, you will deny me three times.’ And he went out and wept bitterly (ἔκλαυσεν πικρῶς)” (Mt 26:75).

Peter’s reaction to his failure to maintain allegiance to Jesus parallels Isaiah’s reaction to the sacking of Jerusalem. Having seen his people captured and killed in the Babylonian raid, the prophet laments, “Therefore, I said: ‘Leave me alone, I will weep bitterly (πικρῶς κλάσομαι); labor not to comfort me for the breach of the daughter of my people”” (Isa 22:4 LXX). Once again, the events surrounding Jesus in his final hours recollect the Babylonian exile as it is presented in the Scriptures.

At the end of the passion narrative, Matthew records Jesus’ death: “And Jesus cried out again with a loud voice and yielded up his spirit. And behold, the curtain of the Temple was torn in two, from top to bottom. And the earth shook (ἡ γῆ ἐσεισθη), and the rocks were split (πέτραι ἐσχίσθησαν)” (27:50-51). In the LXX, the shaking of the earth is associated with the punishment of Babylon for having taken God’s people into exile.¹²² Isaiah states that this punishment will constitute an outpouring of divine wrath so severe that creation itself will feel the repercussions: “For the heavens shall be enraged, and the earth shall be shaken (ἡ γῆ σεισθήσεται) from her foundation because of the fierce anger of the Lord of hosts, in the day in which his wrath shall come” (Isa 13:13 LXX cf. Isa 24:20). Jeremiah similarly states, “For at the sound of the taking of Babylon the earth shall shake (σεισθήσεται ἡ γῆ), and a cry shall be heard among the nations” (Jer 27:46 LXX). The shaking of the earth in Matthew, then, signifies that just as God defeated the Babylonians after the Jewish return from exile, God has once again defeated the imprisoning forces of sin through Jesus’ death. Moreover, because God’s wrath is poured

¹²² Allison also reads the cataclysmic events surrounding the death of Jesus in Matthew vis-à-vis earlier passages that refer to exile (Amos 8:9-10) and its ultimate end (Ezek 37:12). However, he does not describe Jesus’ death as being a parallel event to Israel’s exile. See *New Moses*, 262.

out on Babylon only after the exile ends, Matthew uses this allusion to argue that, in Jesus' death, the exile has finally come to an end.

The splitting of the rocks after Jesus' death also resonates with the post-exilic situation as it is described in Scripture. Speaking of the Jewish people, Isaiah states, "And if they shall thirst, [God] shall lead them through the desert; he shall bring forth water to them out of the rock: the rock shall be split (σχισθήσεται πέτρα) and the water shall flow forth, and my people shall drink" (Isa 48:21 LXX). Moreover, the words leading up to Isa 48:21 LXX establish the context of the exodus from Babylon, which marks the decisive end of the exile:

Go out from Babylon, you who flee from the Chaldeans! Utter aloud a voice of joy, proclaim it to the end of the earth. Say, "The Lord has redeemed his servant Jacob!" And if they thirst, he shall lead them through the desert; he shall bring forth water to them out of the rock: the rock shall be split and the water shall flow forth and my people shall drink. (Isa 48:20-21 LXX)

Assuming that the wider context in Isaiah is present in Matthew's allusions, that the rocks split at Jesus' death signifies neither a random tribulation nor even God's anger at the death of his son; rather, it signifies the end of the exile into which Jesus entered when he was handed over to crucifixion. As Richard Hays notes, "we will miss important intertextual echoes if we ignore the loci from which the quotations originate."¹²³ In this case, close attention to the scriptural background from which Matthew draws reveals that just as Jesus' judgment and crucifixion echoed the exile to Babylon, his death marks the end of his own exile from the "land of the living" (cf. Isa 53:8).

For Matthew, Jesus' exile provides evidence for his messianic legitimacy insofar as his own suffering is patterned on the suffering of the Jewish exiles. Moreover, the

¹²³ Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 71.

Matthean focus on exile throughout Jesus' passion is an implicit argument for the prominence of suffering in the Jewish Scriptures, which, according to Matthew, should rightly be a major component of an authentic messianic mission. Finally, based on the intertext of Isaiah 48:20-21, Jesus' death marks the end of exile and points to the ultimate reconciliation between God and his people, which not only anticipates Jesus' own resurrection, but also confirms that he has finally saved his people from the sin that causes exile (cf. Mt 1:21).

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

The First Gospel depends on the Jewish Scriptures and their interpretive traditions for its account of the life and death of Jesus of Nazareth. Matthew draws on traditions associated with Israel's exile to Babylon to present Jesus as a Messiah who enters exile and in accepting this punishment for the people's sin, atones for them. The Targums' use of טלטל to describe Israel's exile finds an equivalent in Matthew's Parable of the Tenants, where ἐκβάλλω describes the death of the son/Son. Whereas Matthew's allusions to the Babylonian exile are also seen in the LXX, the Targums expand the tradition of Israel being "cast out" in exile: in rewriting Isaiah's vineyard parable, the Targum contains a reference to casting out the people of Israel that closely parallels Matthew's language of the son being cast out. Thus, Matthew views Jesus' crucifixion as reconstituting Israel's exile as it appears Jewish tradition preserved in the Targum.

Matthew's shift of the identity of the exilic sufferer from the people of Israel to Jesus helps to explain the view of Jesus as a "ransom" (20:28) who substitutes his own life for the sake of his people. The connection between crucifixion and exile is confirmed by Matthew's frequent references to Israel's exile in the Passion Narrative. Finally, Jesus' death marks the end of Israel's exile for those who follow him and looks forward to God's ultimate return to Zion, so that in Jesus' death the ransom is complete and Jesus' people are saved from their sins in accordance with the messianic mission established at the outset of the Gospel (Mt 1:21).

REFERENCES

- Allen, Danielle S. *The World of Prometheus: The Politics of Punishing in Democratic Athens*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Allison, Dale C., Jr., ed. *Matthew: A Shorter Commentary*. London: T&T Clark International, 2004.
- _____. *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.
- _____. "Who Will Come from East and West? Observations on Matt. 8.11-12–Luke 13.28-29." *Irish Biblical Studies* 11 (1989): 158-170.
- Anderson, Gary A. *Sin: A History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.
- Basser, Herbert. *The Mind Behind the Gospels: A Commentary to Matthew 1-14*. Brighton, MA: Academic Studies Press, 2009.
- Blomberg, Craig. *Interpreting the Parables*. 2nd Edition. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2012.
- Brooke, George J. "4Q500 1 and the Use of Scripture in the Parable of the Vineyard," *Dead Sea Discoveries* Vol. 2, No. 3 (Nov., 1995): 268-294.
- Bruner, Frederick Dale. *Matthew: A Commentary (Volume 2: The Churchbook, Matthew 13-28)*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1990.
- Buchanan, George Wesley. *Typology and the Gospel*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1987.
- Bauer, David R. "The Literary and Theological Function of the Genealogy in Matthew's Gospel." In *Treasures Old and New: Recent Contributions to Matthean Studies*, edited by David R. Bauer and Mark Alan Powell, 129-59. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- Brown, F., S. Driver, and C. Briggs, eds. *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon: with an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic: Coded with the Numbering System from Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible*. 13th Edition. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2010.
- Carter, Warren. *Matthew and the Margins: a Sociopolitical and Religious Reading*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- _____ and Amy-Jill Levine. *The New Testament: Methods and Meaning*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2013.

- Chilton, Bruce. "Four Types of Comparison between the Targumim and the New Testament." *Journal for the Aramaic Bible* 2 (2000): 163-188.
- _____. "From Aramaic Paraphrase to Greek Testament." In *From Prophecy to Testament*, edited by Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans, 23-43. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2004.
- _____. *A Galilean Rabbi and His Bible: Jesus' Use of the Interpreted Scripture of His Time*. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier Inc., 1984.
- _____. *The Glory of Israel: the Theology and Provenience of the Isaiah Targum*. Sheffield: JSOT, 1983.
- _____. *The Isaiah Targum*. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier Inc., 1987.
- _____. "Reference to the Targumim in the Exegesis of the New Testament." In *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 34, edited by Eugene H. Lovering, 77-81. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- _____. *Targumic Approaches to the Gospels: Essays in the Mutual Definition of Judaism and Christianity*. Lanham, MD: University of America. 1987.
- _____, Darrell Bock, Daniel M. Gurtner, Jacob Neusner, Lawrence H. Schiffman and Daniel Oden, eds. *A Comparative Handbook to the Gospel of Mark: Comparisons with Pseudepigrapha, the Qumran Scrolls, and Rabbinic Literature*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Clines, David J.A., ed. *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew, Vol. III ט-ז*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Cook, Michael J. "Interpreting 'Pro-Jewish' Passages in Matthew." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 54 (1983): 135-46.
- Dalman, Gustaf H. *Aramäisch-Neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud und Midrasch*. Hildesheim, Germany: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1967.
- Davies, William D. and Dale C. Allison, Jr. *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew, Volume 3*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988.
- 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.
- Donaldson, Terence L. "Parallels: Use, Misuse, and Limitations." *Evangelical Quarterly* 55 (1983): 193-210.

Eloff, Mervyn. “'Από... ἕως and Salvation History in Matthew’s Gospel.” In *Built Upon the Rock: Studies in the Gospel of Matthew*, edited by Daniel M. Gurtner and John Nolland, 85-107. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008.

_____. “Exile, Restoration, and Matthew’s Genealogy of Jesus ‘Ο ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ.” *Neotestamentica* 38 (2004): 75-87.

Eubank, Nathan. *Wages of Cross-bearing and Debt of Sin: The Economy of Heaven in Matthew’s Gospel*. Germany: De Gruyter, 2013.

Evans, Craig A. *Ancient Texts for New Testament Studies: A Guide to the Background Literature*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2005.

_____. “Aspects of Exile and Restoration in the Proclamation of Jesus and the Gospels.” In *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish and Christian Conceptions*, edited by James M. Scott, 299-328. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

_____. “Jesus and the Continuing Exile of Israel.” In *Jesus and the Restoration of Israel: A Critical Assessment of N.T. Wright’s Jesus and the Victory of God*, edited by Carey C. Newman, 77-100. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1999.

_____. *Noncanonical Writings and New Testament Interpretation*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992.

Fishbane, Michael. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. “The Targum of Jeremiah: Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes” [Peer Review]. *Theological Studies*. 49 no. 4 (1988): 735-739.

Flesher, Paul V. M. and Bruce Chilton. *The Targums: A Critical Introduction*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2011.

France, R. T. *The Gospel of Matthew*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007.

_____. *Jesus and the Old Testament: His Application of Old Testament Passages to Himself and His Mission*. London: Tyndale Press, 1971.

Frey, Jörg and Jens Schröter, eds. *Deutungen des Todes Jesu im Neuen Testament*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

Goppelt, Leonhard. *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New*. Translated by Donald H. Madding. Grand Rapids, MI: Erdmann, 1982.

- Goulder, Michael D. *Midrash and Lection in Matthew*. London: SPCK, 1974.
- _____. *Type and History in Acts*. London: SPCK, 1964.
- Gundry, Robert H. *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel with Special Reference to the Messianic Hope*. Leiden: Brill, 1967.
- Hare, Douglas. *Matthew*. Interpretation. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1993.
- Harrington, Daniel J. *The Gospel of Matthew*. Sacra Pagina. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2007.
- Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- _____. "The Gospel of Matthew: Reconfigured Torah" *HTS Teologiese/Theological Studies* 61 (2005): 165-90.
- Hayward, Robert. "Some Notes on Scribes and Priests in the Targum of the Prophets." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 36.2 (1985): 210-21.
- _____. *The Targum of Jeremiah: Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes*. Wilmington, DE: M. Glazier, 1987.
- Hubaut, Michel. *La parabole des vigneronniers homicides*. Paris: Gabalda, 1976.
- Hultgren, Arland J. *The Parables of Jesus: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2000.
- Huizenga, Leroy A. *The New Isaac: Tradition and Intertextuality in the Gospel of Matthew*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Jastrow, Marcus. *Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi and the Midrashic Literature*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2005.
- Jones, Ivor H. *The Matthean Parables: A Literary and Historical Commentary*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Juel, Donald. *Messiah and Temple: The Trial of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark*. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press for the Society of Biblical Literature, 1977.
- Kaiser, Otto. *Isaiah 1-12*. 2nd Edition. Translated by John Bowden. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1983.

- Keener, Craig S. *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999.
- _____. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary, Volume I*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003.
- Kennedy, Joel. *The Recapitulation of Israel: Use of Israel's History in Matthew 1:1-4:11*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Klauck, Hans-Josef. *Allegorie und Allegorese: in synoptischen Gleichnistexten*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1978.
- Kloppenborg, John S. *The Tenants in the Vineyard: Ideology, Economics, and Agrarian Conflict in Jewish Palestine*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- Knowles, Michael. *Jeremiah in Matthew's Gospel: The Rejected-Prophet Motif in Matthaean Redaction*. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- Koehler, Ludwig and Walter Baumgartner. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament: Study Edition, Vol. I*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Lampe, G. W. H. and K. J. Woollcombe. *Essays on Typology*. London: W. and J. Mackay, 1957.
- Le Donne, Anthony. *The Historiographical Jesus: Memory, Typology, and the Son of David*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009.
- Levey, Samson H. *The Targum of Ezekiel: Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes*. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1987.
- Levine, Amy-Jill. "Matthew's Portrayal of the Synagogue and its Leaders." In *The Gospel of Matthew at the Crossroads of Early Christianity*, edited by Donald Senior, 177-93. Leuven: Peeters, 2011.
- _____. *The Misunderstood Jew: the Church and the Scandal of the Jewish Jesus*. New York: HarperCollins, 2006.
- Luz, Ulrich. *Matthew 8-20: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.
- _____. *Matthew 21-28: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.
- Marcus, Joel. "The Old Testament and the Death of Jesus: The Role of Scripture in the Gospel Passion Narratives." In *The Death of Jesus in Early Christianity*, edited by John T. Carroll and Joel B. Green, 205-33. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995.

- Martens, Allan W. “‘Produce Fruit Worthy of Repentance’: Parables of Judgment against the Jewish Religious Leaders and the Nation.” In *The Challenge of Jesus’ Parables*, edited by Richard N. Longenecker, 151-76. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000.
- McNamara, Martin. “Targum and the New Testament: A Revisit.” In *The New Testament and Rabbinic Literature*, edited by Reimund Bieringer, Florentino Garcia Martinez, Didier Pollefeyt and Peter J. Tomson, 387-427. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- _____. “Targums and New Testament, A Way Forward? Targums, Tel-like Character, a Continuum.” In *Targum and New Testament: Collected Essays*, by Martin McNamara, 518-32. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Neusner, Jacob. “Contexts of Comparison: Reciprocally Reading Gospels’ and Rabbis’ Parallels.” In *The Missing Jesus: Rabbinic Judaism and the New Testament*, edited by Bruce Chilton, Craig A. Evans, and Jacob Neusner, 45-68. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Nolland, John. *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Provan, Iaian W. *1 & 2 Kings*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995.
- Reid, Daniel G. “Jesus: New Exodus, New Conquest.” In *God Is a Warrior*, edited by Tremper Longman III and Daniel G. Reid, 91-118. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1995.
- Runesson, Anders. “Rethinking Early Jewish-Christian Relations: Matthean Community History as Pharisaic Intragroup Conflict,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 127 (2008): 95-132.
- Sanders, E. P. *Jesus and Judaism*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1985.
- Sandmel, Samuel. “Parallelomania.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 81.1 (1962): 1-13.
- Segal, Alan F. “Matthew’s Jewish Voice.” In *Social History of the Matthean Community: Cross-Disciplinary Approaches*, edited by David L. Balch, 3-37. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.
- Senior, Donald. *Matthew*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1998.
- _____. *The Passion of Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1985.
- Smith, Jonathan Z. *Drudgery Divine: On the Comparison of Early Christianities and the Religions of Late Antiquity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.

- _____. *To Take Place: Toward Theory in Ritual*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1992.
- Snodgrass, Klyne. *The Parable of the Wicked Tenants: An Inquiry into Parable Interpretation*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983.
- _____. *Stories with Intent: A Comprehensive Guide to the Parables of Jesus*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Sokoloff, Michael. *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period*, 2nd ed. Ramat-Gan, Israel and Baltimore, MD: Bar Ilan University Press and The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002.
- Stec, David M. *The Targum of Psalms: Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2004.
- Stern, David. "Jesus' Parables from the Perspective of Rabbinic Literature: The Example of the Wicked Husbandmen." In *Parable and Story in Judaism and Christianity*, edited by Clemens Thoma and Michael Wyschogrod, 42-80. New York: Paulist Press, 1989.
- Stenning, J.F. *The Targum of Isaiah*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1949.
- Strack, Hermann L. and Paul Billerbeck. *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*. Munich: Beck, 1922-1928.
- Tuckett, Christopher. "Matthew: The Social and Historical Context – Jewish Christian and/or Gentile?" In *The Gospel of Matthew at the Crossroads of Early Christianity*, edited by Donald Senior, 99-130. Leuven: Peeters, 2011.
- VanderKam, James and Peter Flint. *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity*. New York: HarperCollins, 2002.
- Vermes, Geza. "Bible and Midrash: Early Old Testament Exegesis," in *Cambridge History of the Bible Volume 1*, edited by P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans, 199-232. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- _____. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. London: Penguin, 1997.
- _____. *Jesus in His Jewish Context*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.
- Watts, Rikki E. *Isaiah's New Exodus and Mark*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.
- Wise, Michael Martin Abegg Jr., and Edward Cook. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New*

Translation. New York: HarperOne, 2005.

Wright, N. T. *Jesus and the Victory of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997.

_____. *The New Testament and the People of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

Yeung, Maureen W. *Faith in Jesus and Paul*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002.

Young, Brad H. *Jesus and His Jewish Parables: Rediscovering the Roots of Jesus' Teaching*. New York: Paulist Press, 1989.

Young, Frances. "Typology." In *Crossing the Boundaries: Essays in Biblical Interpretation in Honour of Michael D. Goulder*, edited by Stanley E. Porter, Paul Joyce, and David E. Orton, 29-50. Leiden: Brill, 1994.