

JOEL KENNEDY

The Recapitulation of Israel

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe*
257

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

Herausgeber / Editor

Jörg Frey (München)

Mitherausgeber / Associate Editors

Friedrich Avemarie (Marburg)

Judith Gundry-Volf (New Haven, CT)

Hans-Josef Klauck (Chicago, IL)

257



Joel Kennedy

The Recapitulation of Israel

Use of Israel's History in Matthew 1:1–4:11

Mohr Siebeck

JOEL KENNEDY, born 1970; 2008 PhD at the University of Aberdeen; presently involved with independent research and teaching.

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-16-151600-9

ISBN 978-3-16-149825-1

ISSN 0340-9570 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data is available in the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

© 2008 by Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, Germany.

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was printed by Laupp & Göbel in Nehren on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Nädele in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

Acknowledgements

This book is a revised version of my doctoral thesis submitted to the University of Aberdeen in February 2008. The research and composition of the thesis could only have been possible through the support of many kind persons. Moving to Aberdeen was a tremendous undertaking, and yet a remarkable amount of details all providentially came together to make it a reality. Many family members as well as numerous friends helped in a diversity of thoughtful ways. A generous financial scholarship from the Saint Andrews Society of North Carolina assisted with expenses. The loving congregation at Gilcomston South Church of Scotland warmly embraced and helped my family immensely throughout our time in Aberdeen. I am especially grateful to my supervisor, Professor Francis Watson, for his excellent oversight and generous patience throughout the entire process of this thesis. The examiners of my thesis, Tomas Bokedal and Michael Bird, made numerous valuable suggestions that I utilized. Many thanks to several critical readers who offered various helpful comments: Dale Allison, Stanley Porter, Jason Hood, Robyn Kennedy, Elaine Wainwright, and Eugene Boring. I very much appreciate Jörg Frey's recommendation of this work for publication, as well as the help of Henning Ziebritzki and the staff at Mohr Siebeck. The interest, patience, and loyal support of my children, Elisabeth, Victoria, and Benjamin, I gladly acknowledge. While much of my time was dominated with this work, there were those valued moments that I happily left it to hang out with them. Finally, with the utmost gratitude and recognition, my wife Robyn is to be enormously thanked for the myriad of ways she lovingly supported, accommodated, and encouraged me. Therefore, to her this work is affectionately and appreciatively dedicated. *Avise La Fin.*

November 2008

Joel Kennedy

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	V
Table of Contents.....	VII
Chapter 1. Introduction.....	1
1.1 Approaching the Gospel of Matthew	1
1.2 Christology in Matthew	4
1.3 Use of the Old Testament in Matthew	15
1.4 Summary of Methodology	22
1.5 Scope of the Present Work.....	23
Chapter 2. Israel’s History Recapitulated.....	25
2.1 Introduction	25
2.2 Classification of Old Testament Genealogies.....	26
2.2.1 Multilinear Genealogies	28
2.2.2 Unilinear Genealogies.....	30
2.2.3 Teleological Genealogies	32
2.3 Genealogy as Narrative	35
2.3.1 Genealogy as Narrative in Genesis	37
Use of Genealogies to Connect Narratives.....	38
Integration of Genealogy and Narrative.....	39
Genealogy as Story	41
Genealogy and Narrative in Tension	42
2.3.2 Genealogy as Narrative in Ruth.....	43
Genealogy Integrated with Narrative.....	44
Genre of Ruth: Similarities to Patriarchal Narratives	44
Purpose of a Teleological Genealogy in Ruth	45
2.3.3 Genealogy as Narrative in Chronicles	47
Brief Narratives within the Genealogy	48
Literary Structure of the Genealogy	49
Theological Interpretation of History	50
2.3.4 Conclusion	51
2.4 Use of Old Testament Sources in Matthew’s Genealogy.....	52

2.4.1	The Use of Genesis	55
2.4.2	The Use of Ruth	59
2.4.3	The Use of Chronicles	65
2.5	Matthew's Genealogy as Teleological	72
2.5.1	Form	73
2.5.2	Content	74
2.5.3	Purpose	75
2.6	Matthew's Genealogy as Narrative	76
2.6.1	Identifying Narratival Aspects in the Genealogy	76
2.6.2	The Genealogy as Compressed Narrative	77
2.7	Theological Interpretation of Matthew's Genealogy	81
2.7.1	Teleological-Narratological Genealogy	81
2.7.2	Israel's History Retold through Names	83
From Abraham to David	84	
From David to Exile	93	
From Exile to Christ	97	
2.8	Chapter Conclusions	100
Chapter 3. Passive Recapitulation of Israel's History		103
3.1	Introduction	103
3.2	Use of the Exodus Motif in Matthew 2:1–23	103
3.2.1	Past Scholarship on Matthew 2:1–23	105
3.2.2	Israel's History in Matthew 2:1–23	108
3.2.3	Understanding the Narrative of Matthew 2:1–23	108
3.2.4	Identifying the Exodus Motif in Matthew 2:1–23	110
3.3	Prophetic Warning	111
3.3.1	Comparison with Jewish Sources	113
3.3.2	The Magi and the Star	121
3.4	Flight to Safety	125
3.5	Judea under Herod = Israel under Pharaoh	128
3.5.1	A Misplaced Quotation?	128
3.5.2	Overview of Common Explanations	130
3.5.3	Why These Explanations are Unsatisfactory	131
3.5.4	A Subtle Reversal	135
3.5.5	Judea as a Metaphorical Egypt	138
3.5.6	Jesus as Son of God	140
3.5.7	Jesus' Fulfillment of Hosea 11:1	143
3.6	Rachel's Lament	147
3.7	Return to the Land of Israel	150
3.8	Chapter Conclusions	152

Chapter 4. Active Recapitulation of Israel's History	153
4.1 Introduction	153
4.2 The Narrativial and Theological Unity of 1:1–4:11	156
4.3 The Importance of the Unity of 3:1–4:11	162
4.4 The Baptism Narrative	166
4.4.1 Narrowing Down to Jesus Alone	167
4.4.2 The Baptism of Jesus	172
4.4.3 Divine Approval	174
4.4.4 Jesus as Israel in the Baptism Narrative	175
4.4.5 Summary	184
4.5 The Testing Narrative	184
4.5.1 The Genre of the Testing Narrative	185
4.5.2 Interpretations of the Testing Narrative	186
4.5.3 Importance of the Quotations from Deuteronomy	186
4.5.4 The Role of Deuteronomy 8	189
4.5.5 Testing the Son of God	192
4.5.6 The Setting of the Testing Narrative	194
4.5.7 The First Test	196
Jesus' Scriptural Response to the Temptation	196
Deuteronomy 8:3 and the Context	197
Exodus 16	198
Does Jesus' Test Differ from Israel's?	199
A Messianic Temptation?	200
4.5.8 The Second Test	201
Psalm 91	202
The Context of Deuteronomy 6	203
Exodus 17	205
A Messianic Temptation?	206
4.5.9 The Third Test	207
Scriptural Background to the Third Test	208
Jesus' Scriptural Response	209
Deuteronomy 6:13 (10:20) and the Context	210
Exodus 32	211
A Messianic Temptation?	212
4.5.10 Divine Approval	213
4.5.11 Summary	214
4.6 Chapter Conclusions	215
Chapter 5. Conclusions	216
5.1 Summary	216
5.2 Main Conclusions	225
5.3 Suggestions for Future Research	228

Bibliography	231
Index of Ancient Sources	245
Index of Modern Authors	257
Index of Subjects and Key Terms	262

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Approaching the Gospel of Matthew

In his work on the early church, Ernest Renan encapsulated the conviction of many throughout church history regarding the Gospel of Matthew when he wrote,

Cela était plus important que l'exactitude biographique, et l'Évangile de Matthieu, tout bien pesé, est le livre le plus important du christianisme, le livre le plus important qui ait jamais été écrit. Ce n'est pas sans raison que, dans la classification des écrits de la nouvelle Bible, on lui a donné la première place. La biographie d'un grand homme est une partie de son œuvre.¹

For almost two millennia, the Gospel of Matthew has functioned within the Christian community as an authoritative and dominant canonical writing, as well as being a respected and influential text among numerous individuals and groups outside of Christianity. The Gospel of Matthew has served a pervasive and substantial role in the growth and expansion of Christianity throughout history. In the patristic period,² Matthew was the most dominant Gospel, being most frequently utilized in the ancient church.³ Matthew's dominance continued during the medieval era, throughout the Reformation period and the subsequent Enlightenment age, and on into the modern period.⁴ While approaches to the text and teaching of Matthew have changed and developed over the centuries, it has nevertheless maintained a prominent and influential position throughout these centuries. Scholarly study of the Gospel of Matthew has been practiced throughout the centuries, and each successive generation of scholars is indebted to

¹ Renan, *Les Évangiles et la seconde génération Chrétienne*, 212–213.

² Well exhibited in the volumes by Simonetti, *Matthew 1–13* and *Matthew 14–28*. Full documentation can be found in E. Massaux, *Influence de l'évangile de saint Matthieu sur la littérature chrétienne avant saint Irénée*.

³ van der Horst, *Jews and Christians in Their Graeco-Roman Context*, 208.

⁴ For overview of the history of the interpretation of Matthew, see Luz's *Wirkungsgeschichte* in his commentaries on Matthew and *Matthew in History*; Kealy, *Matthew's Gospel and the History of Biblical Interpretation*; and Clarke, *The Gospel of Matthew and Its Readers*.

those previous for furthering the knowledge and understanding of this gospel. Current scholarly study of Matthew certainly shows no sign of abating, as witnessed by the explosion of commentaries on this gospel in the last twenty years. Proliferation in scholarly methods of research has contributed greatly toward this increase of writing about Matthew as varying perspectives are brought to the text.

While the text and teaching of Matthew has been subjected to much scholarly attention throughout the centuries, beginning in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries scholars who were greatly influenced by the surrounding philosophical environment of the Enlightenment pursued study of the biblical texts utilizing a more vigorous historical criticism than had generally been practiced in the past. This led to an expansion of critical methods for ascertaining the history of early Christianity. Following a period in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries of closer attention to the earliest Christian sources, particularly Mark and Q, which was especially spurred on by a critical examination of the historical origins of Christianity, Matthew then began to be studied with renewed vigor. This renewal of interest in Matthew principally resulted from its being positioned as a work dependent upon Mark, Q, and other possible sources, which has been the dominant view in biblical scholarship.⁵ The Gospel of Matthew has continued to be the subject of intense study by a wide variety of scholars that have sought to further advance scholarly study of the text.

Matthew has been studied utilizing various types of critical approaches that have especially dominated the twentieth century: source, form, tradition, redaction, literary, and social-scientific criticism. All of these approaches have contributed insights that have greatly expanded knowledge and understanding of Matthew's Gospel. Utilizing these approaches, numerous subjects and themes have been assessed in Matthew from different perspectives: historical, social, cultural, literary, and theological. The questions, work, and knowledge to be gleaned from Matthew appear to be almost endless given the variety of critical approaches that scholars can now utilize, and further evolution of critical approaches will no doubt continue to expand into the future.

⁵ This has certainly been the prevailing scholarly viewpoint, with a variety of perspectives within the two-source theory. Beyond the standard critical commentaries, see Streeter, *The Four Gospels*; Kilpatrick, *The Origins of the Gospel according to Matthew*; Stein, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*; France, *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher*; Stanton, *A Gospel for a New People*. However, it deserves mention that many scholars have dissented, providing other viewpoints that, although they command less support, nevertheless offer an array of helpful insights. See Goodacre, *The Synoptic Problem: A Way through the Maze* and *The Case Against Q*; Farmer, *The Synoptic Problem*; Dungan, *A History of the Synoptic Problem*; Cope, *Matthew: A Scribe Trained for the Kingdom of Heaven*.

One thematic area within Matthean studies that has long deserved further attention, utilizing a variety of critical approaches, is the christological use of Israel's history in Matthew 1:1–4:11, which is the subject of this book. Due to the substantial amount of data that can be gleaned from Matthew and the word-limitations of a thesis, the present work has necessarily confined itself to these early chapters of Matthew. The primary area of focus for this work is to examine and describe the christological use of Israel's history in Matthew 1:1–4:11 with rigorous attention to every element that demonstrates this usage. The prevailing theme or concept that adequately encapsulates the use of Israel's history maintained in Matthew is that of recapitulation.

Due acknowledgement of Irenaeus' initial contribution of the concept of recapitulation in Jesus' life to the seed-thoughts of this work should be noted. However, his conception of recapitulation is used in connection with Jesus' recapitulation of Adam and humanity rather than Israel.⁶ Also beneficial was the work of N. T. Wright, where for example he notes that the evangelists tell "the form of the story of Israel, now reworked in terms of a single human life." Jesus is the climax of Israel's history and thus the gospels give "the story of Jesus told as the history of Israel in miniature."⁷ Elsewhere, Wright identifies Jesus as the recapitulation of Israel in his reading of the parable of the sower, which is a programmatic explanation of Jesus' own ministry.⁸ In addition, the general use of the concept recapitulation by various scholars to describe parts of Matthew also provided a further impulse. However, the need became clear that this concept in Matthew should be further studied in much greater detail because to date there has been no substantial study of this theme in Matthew.

While appropriation of the concept recapitulation has often been used to characterize portions of Jesus' experience in the early chapters of Matthew, especially on 2:15, recapitulation has not been closely analyzed by scholars. This study has sought to fill this lacuna with meticulous consideration of the utilization within Matthew's Gospel of recapitulation. In Matthew, Israel's history is recapitulated, and the manner in which this recapitulation is communicated is the overarching argument of this work. In brief, the concept of recapitulation that is utilized in this study, which seeks to describe Matthew 1:1–4:11, is primarily focused on the element of repetition. This especially involves how Israel's history is repeated and re-enacted in the presentation of Jesus in Matthew 1–4. Also included in the concept of recapitulation that is discussed within this study: the summing

⁶ See Irenaeus, "Against Heresies," in Roberts and Donaldson (eds.), *The Ante-Nicene Fathers* vol. 1, 454–455, 547–548; cf. Torrance, *Divine Meaning: Studies in Patristic Hermeneutics*, 68–69, 121–122.

⁷ Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God*, 401–402.

⁸ Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 235–237.

up of Israel's history in Jesus' early life; Jesus as the corporate representative of his people Israel; and Jesus as the embodiment of Israel in his recapitulation. All of these are aspects and components in the discussion of Jesus as the recapitulation of Israel.

1.2 Christology in Matthew

To fully situate the standpoint and argument of the present work, it is considerably important and would prove beneficial to briefly survey two major areas of scholarly focus in Matthean studies: christology and the use of the Old Testament. As mentioned above, there have been multitudes of themes studied in Matthew, some of which intersect with these two key areas.⁹ Many of these themes and topics underlie this work to some degree and are discussed at various points; however, for the purpose of adequately introducing this work, christology and the use of the Old Testament are the two most relevant components in situating a proper focus upon investigating the recapitulation of Israel in Matthew 1:1–4:11. The following section will briefly survey Matthean research on these two topics, the range of scholarly views, the extensive ways that these two topics have been further sub-divided in scholarly research, as well as providing comments upon how the present work fits these viewpoints.¹⁰

A brief foray into the various critical approaches in light of their interaction, influence, and help with understanding christology in Matthew is important in properly orienting the present work in terms of that ongoing discussion. Study of the christology of Matthew has occupied the attention of scholars from the very beginning¹¹ due to the obvious orientation of the Gospel itself upon presenting and proclaiming the life and teaching of Jesus Christ. The text and teaching of Matthew has dominated the church's understanding of christology throughout the history of the church. Much of

⁹ Beyond the standard critical commentaries, there are numerous works on Matthew generally that indicate many of these themes. See Stanton, *The Interpretation of Matthew and Gospel for a New People*; France, *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher*; McKnight, 'Matthew', 527–541; Riches, *Matthew*; Luz, *The Theology of the Gospel of Matthew*; Senior, *What Are They Saying About Matthew?*; Bauer and Powell, *Treasures New and Old*; Carter, *Matthew: Storyteller, Interpreter, Evangelist*; Aune, *Gospel of Matthew in Current Study*; Gurtner and Nolland, *Built Upon the Rock*.

¹⁰ While most of the following survey by necessity must give prominence to works within the last hundred years, this is by no means out of any disrespect for scholars' work in earlier centuries. Indeed, no current scholarly work could be done without their prior work, where all should rightfully acknowledge that we stand on the shoulders of giants. Cf. Allison, *Studies in Matthew*, 117–131.

¹¹ See Simonetti, *Matthew 1–13* and *Matthew 14–28*.

this understanding in the patristic and medieval periods was dominated by various kinds of historical and dogmatic questions that faced the church. During and following the period of the Enlightenment, further types of historical questions were pursued, and this led toward the expansion of critical approaches that now underlie modern scholarly biblical research. Each of these approaches has been utilized in ascertaining the christological teaching of Matthew and will be further dealt with below. While additional research on the history of the church's interpretation of Matthew in regard to its christology is valuable and worthwhile,¹² the work of this thesis must primarily remain centered upon the text.

The dominant focus for the discussion of Matthew's christology has especially centered on the use of various titles/descriptions: Messiah/Christ,¹³ Son of God/divine sonship,¹⁴ Son of Man,¹⁵ Kyrios, Son of David,¹⁶ Son of Abraham, Teacher/Preacher, Healer,¹⁷ Prophet,¹⁸ the Coming One, Servant, Emmanuel,¹⁹ Shepherd,²⁰ and Wisdom.²¹ Many scholars have undertaken efforts to outline the use and meaning of these titles in Matthew through general surveys. Others have offered more specialized studies that have focused exclusively upon one title in Matthew, utilizing various critical approaches. Nevertheless, efforts to understand and define the christology of Matthew with sole attention to the titles in Matthew has met ample disapproval by various scholars of late, which is further dealt with below.

Within the work on titles in Matthew, further attempts have been undertaken by some scholars to determine the most important title for this Gos-

¹² Well exhibited in the commentaries on Matthew by Luz.

¹³ Verseput, *The Rejection of the Humble Messianic King: A Study of the Composition of Matthew 11–12*.

¹⁴ Head, *Christology and the Synoptic Problem*, 200–214.

¹⁵ Luz, "The Son of Man in Matthew: Heavenly Judge or Human Christ," 3–21.

¹⁶ Gibbs, "Purpose and Pattern in Matthew's Use of the Title 'Son of David,'" 446–464; Suhl, "Der Davidssohn im Matthäusevangelium," 67–81; Burger, *Jesus als Davidssohn*, 72–106; Kingsbury, "The Title 'Son of David' in Matthew's Gospel," 591–602; Head, *Christology and the Synoptic Problem*, 180–186; van Aarde, "ΙΗΣΟΥΣ, The Davidic Messiah, As Political Saviour in Matthew's History," 7–31. Arguing for a royal, davidic christology in Matthew, see Nolan, *The Royal Son of God: The Christology of Matthew 1–2 in the Setting of the Gospel*.

¹⁷ Duling, "The Therapeutic Son of David: An Element in Matthew's Christology," 392–410.

¹⁸ Knowles, *Jeremiah in Matthew's Gospel: The Rejected Prophetic Motif in Matthean Redaction*.

¹⁹ Kupp, *Matthew's Emmanuel: Divine Presence and God's People in the First Gospel*.

²⁰ Garbe, *Der Hirte Israels*; Willetts, *Matthew's Messianic Shepherd-King*.

²¹ Suggs, *Wisdom, Christology, and Law in Matthew's Gospel*; Johnson, "Reflections on a Wisdom Approach to Matthew's Christology," 44–64; Deutsch, *Lady Wisdom, Jesus, and the Sages: Metaphor and Social Context in Matthew's Gospel*.

pel. One of the most common positions in this regard has been especially led by Jack Dean Kingsbury, who strongly argues that Son of God is the preeminent title for Matthew's story.²² Understanding the use of Son of God in Matthew is an important component of this work because it plays a significant role in the early chapters and closely relates to the recapitulation theme. The attention given by Kingsbury to the Son of God title in Matthew has proven valuable in describing and understanding Matthew's christology, and this study has sought to build on his insights in many ways. Also important for this work is a correction of some overemphasis in Kingsbury on Son of God as "the unique filial relationship that exists between God and Jesus"²³ which overshadows other significant elements of what is textually communicated about Son of God in the early pericopes of Matthew. The other aspects of what Son of God means in Matthew, while they are occasionally dealt with cursorily by Kingsbury, are often relegated to minor subsidiary aspects, therefore obscuring the overall presentation of Jesus as Son of God in Matthew. When closely studied, Jesus as the Son of God in Matthew reveals further varied meanings beyond his filial relation to God.²⁴ Israel was called God's son (Exod 4:22–23; Hos 11:1), as was Israel's king (2 Sam 7:14; Ps 89:26–27). Matthew appropriates these elements in his overall christology, and these further christological elements are a large part of the focus of this study on Jesus and the recapitulation of Israel.

James Dunn concurs that Son of God is the "most important christological affirmation for Matthew." However, he rightly recognizes that Jesus' identification with Israel is an important component in Matthew's Son of God christology. Dunn summarizes that "Matthew thinks of Jesus' sonship in terms of a mission that fulfilled the destiny of Israel."²⁵ Denying the filial viewpoint on Matthew's use of Son of God is obviously unwarranted, as it becomes even more apparent later in the Gospel (cf. 11:25–27). However, this study argues that Matthew's employment of Son of God in these early chapters most directly relates to its prior use in the Old Testament in

²² Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story*, 57, 76, 93, 161–163; cf. *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom*, 162.

²³ Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story*, 51.

²⁴ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1.720, state that Son of God in Matthew "is to some extent multivalent ... varies according to context." Luz, *Studies in Matthew*, 93–96, argues that Son of God in Matthew is both a confessional title (vertical dimension) and ethical title (horizontal dimension).

²⁵ Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, 48–49, 59. Cf. Gibbs, "The Son of God as Torah Incarnate in Matthew," 38–39: "In his unique filial relationship to God, Jesus embodies Israel's calling in the covenant to be the Son of God ... Jesus' sonship is Israel's sonship"; and Dodd, *The Founder of Christianity*, 105–108. The present work has sought to examine the validity of such christological statements by a closer investigation of Matthew's text to a degree not undertaken in these works.

relation to corporate Israel as son of God and to the king as a representative. The use of the Son of God title in the early chapters of Matthew is vitally connected to Matthew's use of Israel's history and the important fulfillment theme that Matthew accentuates, which is where recapitulation is especially prominent.²⁶ Attention to the wider narrative context and characterization adds vital information for correctly understanding the meaning of Son of God in Matthew 1:1–4:11. In addition, a significant argument of this study is that the use of Son of God is cumulative, in that more and more information is set forth to the hearer and reader, which is true not only in the reading of chapters 1–4 but throughout the rest of the Gospel.²⁷

While many have disagreed with Kingsbury on his standpoint that Son of God serves as the key title for Matthew,²⁸ for the more closely defined purposes of this thesis that discussion must be set aside other than a few brief remarks here. In regard to titles in Matthew, several scholars have argued strongly that this effort to discover the one dominant title is seriously at fault and misrepresents the variegated orientation of the Gospel upon Jesus Christ,²⁹ with all of the titles serving a role in the theological presentation of Jesus Christ. Those scholars that have argued against picking one title over the others, most notably Davies and Allison,³⁰ have persuaded many and are most certainly right in their detailed case for properly appropriating all of the titles to apprehend christology in Matthew.³¹ The relations between the titles is also an area for further exploration toward determining a fuller understanding of Matthew's christology.³² As Luz observes, "Each of the titles encompasses particular aspects vis-à-vis the others; each denotes only aspects of Matthean christology."³³

²⁶ Kingsbury, *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom*, 15, 51, does very briefly mention Jesus recapitulating Israel.

²⁷ Nolland, *Matthew*, 42: "As Matthew's story unfolds, the sense of what it might mean to identify Jesus as the Son also unfolds in all its richness and variety."

²⁸ Cf. Hill, "The Figure of Jesus in Matthew's Story: A Response to Professor Kingsbury's Literary-Critical Probe," 37–52; cf. Allison, "The Son of God as Israel: A Note on Matthean Christology," 74–81; Head, *Christology and the Synoptic Problem*, 186, 201.

²⁹ Tuckett, *Christology and the New Testament*, 10, 119, 130, aptly describes the christology of Matthew as "a rather variegated picture," and he also emphasizes the importance of discerning the narrative christology of Matthew.

³⁰ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3.721, aptly note that "christology is more – much more – than titles."

³¹ Cf. McKnight, "Matthew," 533, synthesizes and summarizes Matthew's christology: "Jesus is God's Messiah who fulfills OT promise, reveals God's will and inaugurates the kingdom of heaven through his public ministry, passion, and resurrection, and consequently, reigns over the new people of God."

³² Cf. Head, *Christology and the Synoptic Problem*, 201.

³³ Luz, *Studies in Matthew*, 96.

Further attention beyond the titles is also crucial as other christological actions, attributes, characterization, and themes can be recognized when the whole of Matthew is utilized. As Mogens Müller has recently complained, “little attention has been paid to the so-called indirect christology, the constructing of the theological impact of Jesus in the way of telling his story.”³⁴ This type of approach is well exhibited in a monograph by D. Kupp and a commentary by Ben Witherington. Kupp offers a narratival, christological reading of Matthew 1–4, particularly within his thesis on Emmanuel in arguing for a story of divine presence in Matthew.³⁵ Witherington provides a sapiential reading of Matthew, highlighting Matthew’s wisdom christology, with attention to narratival and biographical elements as well.³⁶ Also crucial toward understanding Matthean christology is the interweaving of Jesus’ teaching and person.³⁷

Tending to the other means of communicating christology in Matthew beyond titles is an important argument of this thesis. Narrative insights, thematic portrayals, structural details, use of the Old Testament and other literature and traditions, parallels and correspondence (also called typology), and sociological insights have all contributed to understanding the christology of Matthew.³⁸ Charting the historical development of christology in comparison with the rest of the New Testament and other early Christian literature is also an important enterprise that brings Matthew’s christology into focus.

While understanding the titles in Matthew is obviously an important area of focus, the discussion of titles in reality should serve as a subsidiary area of christology in Matthew and not be the predominant focus of attention. This insight has been convincingly argued, notably by Leander Keck,³⁹ and thus a fuller pursuit of other aspects in Matthew’s christology has been undertaken by some scholars. One little known but immensely helpful study that covers the whole of Matthew is the work by William Kynes, *A Christology of Solidarity*. In this monograph, Kynes highlighted

³⁴ Müller, “The Theological Interpretation of the Figure of Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew: Some Principle Features in Matthean Christology,” 157; cf. Luz, *Matthew 21–28*, 637–642.

³⁵ Kupp, *Matthew’s Emmanuel*, 52–66.

³⁶ Witherington, *Matthew*, 16–21.

³⁷ Thiselton, *New Horizons in Hermeneutics*, 286–288.

³⁸ France, *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher*, 279–317, provides a helpful “portrait of Jesus” that includes a more extensive, multifaceted grasp of christology in Matthew that moves beyond titles alone”; cf. Blair, *Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew*; McKnight, “Matthew,” 532–535; Luz, “Eine thetische Skizze der matthäischen Christologie,” 221–236; de Jonge, *Christology in Context*, 91–96; Schnackenburg, *Jesus in the Gospels: A Biblical Christology*, 74–130; Matera, *New Testament Christology*, 26–47; Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*, 316–340.

³⁹ Keck, “Toward the Renewal of New Testament Christology,” 362–377.

a significant aspect of Matthew's christology "by focusing on Jesus' representative role ... an appreciation of Jesus' solidarity with his people as their representative before God."⁴⁰ The insights and general methodology of Kynes' work proved helpful for the work of this thesis. Beyond his commentary in collaboration with W. D. Davies, Dale Allison has also contributed an excellent study in *The New Moses* that not only surveys much of the background literature, but also deeply delves into Matthew's text for ascertaining the presentation of Jesus as the new Moses.⁴¹ Many of his insights, as well as his methodology, aided the research for this thesis.

While closer examination to the christological details of Matthew's text remain to be done, the refinement of approaches to christology in Matthew will definitely correct some of the deficiencies of the past, and it is a hope that the present work will enhance a greater understanding of christology in Matthew. This study seeks to penetrate further into Matthew's christology, in as detailed a manner as possible, by especially seeking to understand the story of Jesus in Matthew's early chapters as a recapitulation of Israel's history, something that to date has not been undertaken to this degree.

Form criticism and tradition criticism have offered various useful insights toward understanding christology in Matthew, led obviously by the pioneering work of Bultmann,⁴² Dibelius,⁴³ and Schmidt.⁴⁴ While the practice of form criticism was objected to by some, and then later overshadowed by other subsequent approaches, it led to many constructive avenues of thinking that has undergirded all subsequent scholarly work, whether acknowledged or not. Distinguishing the historical Jesus' life and teaching from subsequent developments in the early church was an important conception. Acknowledging the changes and developments that took place over the era that ranged from Jesus' ministry to the final composition of the Gospels is now commonplace. Certainly varying disagreements have been expressed as to how it developed, why, and how expansive the developments really were. While these issues continue to occupy scholarly research, the debt to form criticism is nevertheless acknowledged. Seeking to define the varying episodes that the Gospels utilize in their presentation of Jesus was also a significant development in christological understanding. While the ways these episodes and scenes were defined and categorized have often been disagreed with, the practice of seeking to understand these smaller units of the Gospels rightfully continues to be examined and discussed.

⁴⁰ Kynes, *A Christology of Solidarity*, 7.

⁴¹ Allison, *The New Moses*.

⁴² Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*.

⁴³ Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel*.

⁴⁴ Schmidt, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*.

The research work of this thesis has benefited from form critical insights and it has been utilized at various points. It underlies the discussion of Matthew's christology in relation to recapitulation, although it remains for the most part a critical tool utilized in the research and is not directly discussed as such. The present work does not delve into the tradition history of Matthew 1–4, other than to note some of the discussion of that endeavor and highlight components that directly affect interpretation of some of the pericopes. The chapter on the genealogy also was aided by Old Testament scholars that practiced form criticism on the various kinds of literature, especially in regard to classifying genealogies.

Another area of critical focus that directly resulted from both source⁴⁵ and form criticism is the work of redaction criticism, which has especially been useful for the work of this thesis in discovering and describing Matthew's christology.⁴⁶ Based on the most common synoptic theory that Matthew used and adapted Mark, Q, and probably other traditions, whether written or oral, redaction critics have interpreted Matthew's Gospel on this basis to determine Matthew's own theological perspective. By comparing and contrasting Matthew's use of Mark and Q, scholars have determined key aspects of Matthew's christology that have highlighted many aspects overlooked when the Synoptic Gospels are merely harmonized or when the Gospels are only interpreted with exclusive attention to one Gospel alone.⁴⁷ In addition, comparison and contrast with Luke's Gospel has also brought further insights into understanding Matthew's christology. Redaction criticism underlies much of the work of many commentaries, monographs, and articles on Matthew in the last fifty years and therefore has resulted in a profound influence on the discussion of the christological orientation of Matthew.

Unlike form and tradition criticism, which is less utilized in contemporary biblical scholarship,⁴⁸ redaction criticism remains a key interpretive viewpoint that underlies most scholars' work in describing Matthew's christology. The use of redaction criticism for understanding Matthew's christology informs and undergirds much of the present work. However, because Matthew 1–2 is unique to Matthew, except where there are some

⁴⁵ Allen, *Matthew* was an important early work in Matthew on source criticism.

⁴⁶ Key works in this regard are Bornkamm, Barth, and Held, *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*; Strecker, *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit*; Rohde, *Rediscovering the Teaching of the Evangelists*; Gundry, *Matthew*; Gnilka, *Das Matthäusevangelium*; and Goppelt, *Theology of the New Testament*, 2.211–235.

⁴⁷ A helpful overview of synoptic research in relation to christology can be found in Head, *Christology and the Synoptic Problem*.

⁴⁸ Bauckham's, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospel as Eyewitness Testimony*, is a recent work that could possibly reinvigorate further discussion and development.

general common aspects that intersect with the early chapters of Luke,⁴⁹ use of redaction criticism in this regard is less useful for these chapters. For Matthew 1–2, the massive and erudite study by Raymond Brown on the infancy narrative in Matthew is a major resource of information, and throughout the discussion of Matthew 1–2 it was utilized.⁵⁰ With Matthew 3:1–4:11, this work does utilize many of the helpful insights that redaction criticism can bring to light for further understanding Matthew’s christology. While primary attention is given to Matthew’s text, comparison with the other Evangelists proves helpful in further understanding Matthew’s work, particularly in reference to the christology that is communicated.

The last thirty years has seen an explosion of work by scholars utilizing literary and narrative criticism with considerable attention to Matthew as a unified coherent narrative. Many of the insights that scholars have highlighted using this method have coincided with and corroborated some of the conclusions drawn from redaction criticism. However, many scholars utilizing literary criticism have usually given exclusive focus to Matthew with less or no regard to other comparative historical and literary sources.⁵¹ Kingsbury led the way in the literary approach to Matthew.⁵² His earlier work primarily utilized redaction criticism,⁵³ but it has no doubt influenced his literary critical work on Matthew, which has exclusively focused upon the text of Matthew. Other scholars have furthered the use of literary criticism on Matthew with many helpful insights, such as David Bauer,⁵⁴ David Howell,⁵⁵ D. J. Weaver,⁵⁶ Janice Capel Anderson,⁵⁷ Margaret Davies,⁵⁸ Warren Carter,⁵⁹ Mark Allen Powell,⁶⁰ and John A. Barnet.⁶¹ Focus on Jesus as the main character has been especially important. Common to literary criticism on Matthew is attention to plot, characterization, settings, structure, and discourse.

⁴⁹ There are some commonalities; however, this is not substantial enough to warrant an argument that Matthew used Luke or vice versa.

⁵⁰ Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*.

⁵¹ See Meier, “Gospel of Matthew,” 4.623, for a particularly negative view of narrative criticism.

⁵² Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story*.

⁵³ Kingsbury, *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom*.

⁵⁴ Bauer, *The Structure of Matthew’s Gospel*.

⁵⁵ Howell, *Matthew’s Inclusive Story*.

⁵⁶ Weaver, *Matthew’s Missionary Discourse: A Literary Critical Analysis*.

⁵⁷ Anderson, *Matthew’s Narrative Web*.

⁵⁸ Davies, *Matthew: Readings, A New Biblical Commentary*.

⁵⁹ Carter, *Matthew: Storyteller, Interpreter, Evangelist*.

⁶⁰ Powell, “The Plot and Subplots of Matthew’s Gospel,” 187–204; and “Matthew,” 868–900.

⁶¹ Barnet, *Not the Righteous but Sinners: M. M. Bakhtin’s Theory of Aesthetics and the Problem of Reader-Character Interaction in Matthew’s Gospel*.

Further christological insights have been gleaned utilizing other types of literary approaches such as reader-response,⁶² deconstruction, feminist, and social criticism.⁶³ While these approaches frequently illuminate important details in Matthew, they are only dealt with cursorily in this thesis. However, one critical approach that proved instructive for this thesis is feminist criticism, which bridges literary and social-scientific criticism. The specific area in this thesis that this is generally utilized is in regard to the discussion of the five women in Matthew's genealogy.

The most helpful insight from literary critics is the appreciation of the whole of Matthew as story, a coherent narrative in and of itself that should be read and interpreted as a narrative. Eugene Boring duly assesses narrative in Matthew and the relation it has to christology when he writes that Matthew is "fashioned to express in narrative form the christological convictions of early Christianity."⁶⁴ Attention to the narrational coherence of Matthew underlies various areas in this work and is crucial to the argument at several points in the thesis, especially in regard to structure and literary unity. Narrative portrayal also plays a part in understanding Matthew's presentation of Jesus, and this is utilized at various points in this work as well.

Another burgeoning industry in Matthean studies is social-scientific criticism. Various scholars have sought to appropriate insights from the field of social-science in understanding Matthew's Gospel, some of which overlap in various ways with literary criticism.⁶⁵ At various points in this work, some of the helpful insights from social-scientific criticism are utilized in a general manner. Although much more could have been used, necessities of space demanded that it remain only a small part. In terms of direct implication for christology in Matthew in relation to the recapitulation of Israel, while there are certainly further avenues to be explored, it could not be adequately developed here.

Situating Matthew in the broader environmental milieu of Judaism, early Christianity, and the Greco-Roman world has been an essential area of research.⁶⁶ Exclusive focus upon the text of Matthew without compari-

⁶² Mayordomo-Marín, *Den Anfang hören: Leserorientierte Evangelienexegese am Beispiel von Matthäus 1–2*.

⁶³ Moore, *Literary Criticism and the Gospels*.

⁶⁴ Boring, "Matthew," 109.

⁶⁵ Balch, *Social History of the Matthean Community*; Malina and Neyrey, *Calling Jesus Names*; Malina and Rohrbaugh, *Social-Science Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels*; Carter, *Matthew and the Margins*.

⁶⁶ Note the plea in this regard by Hengel, "Tasks of New Testament Scholarship," 67–86, which is a slightly abbreviated translation of "Aufgaben der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft," 321–357. Well exhibited in regard to the Gospels is Carlidge and Dungan, *Documents for the Study of the Gospels*.

son to other texts and approaches contemporary to it has been one of the dangers with exclusive utilization of literary criticism. The work of scholars in understanding the broader background of the time and environment is indispensable for understanding Matthew and his christology. Expansive growth in specialties of scholarly focus has been both a blessing and a curse in that only a small minority scholars can adequately command even a few of these specialties. However, the insights to be gleaned from this expansion in knowledge cannot be overlooked by scholars. Relying upon the results of others' work has therefore become a requisite in this regard, and collaborative studies that synthesize the knowledge from this wide field should prove increasingly necessary.

One key writer of this period is Josephus, and his works are of prime importance for understanding the history and traditions of the first century. Discussion of Josephus is especially important in chapter two of this thesis as it helps to highlight Matthew's recapitulation of Israel's exodus history in the early life of Jesus. Philo is another important writer for understanding the wider background of the Jewish world, and he is referenced at a several points in this work. Greco-Roman works are an important resource for language, historical, sociological, and cultural issues.⁶⁷ Furthermore, there is now some agreement that this Gospel is to be generally classified as a type of ancient biography.⁶⁸ The Greco-Roman background to Matthew is difficult to quantify in that specifics about Matthew's audience are not known. Although assumptions about the community of Matthew often proceed upon a Syrian background, this hypothesis, while certainly possible, is not an established fact.⁶⁹ Therefore, it appears reasonable based on the Gospel itself to assume for the present work that Matthew's hearers and readers were Jewish and Gentile believers and non-believers.⁷⁰ Nevertheless, the influence of the Greco-Roman environment upon Matthew's audience⁷¹ is a complicated endeavor, and it appears best to proceed cau-

⁶⁷ Well exhibited in Danker, "Matthew: A Patriot's Gospel," 94–115. Also see Riches and Sim, *The Gospel of Matthew in its Roman Imperial Context*.

⁶⁸ Aune, *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment*, 46; Cf. Aune, *Greco-Roman Literature and the New Testament*, 107–126; Stanton, *Jesus of Nazareth in New Testament Preaching*, 117–136. Further discussion on the genre of Matthew see Talbert, *What is a Gospel? The Genre of the Canonical Gospels*; Shuler, *A Genre for the Gospels*; and Burridge, *What are the Gospels? A Comparison with Greco-Roman Biography*.

⁶⁹ Stanton, *Gospel for A New People*, xii, admits, after much work based on Antioch as Matthew's audience, that he was finally unpersuaded by it. Cf. Bauckham, *The Gospel for All Christians*.

⁷⁰ For recent work on Matthew's Gospel in relation to the Gentile mission see Wilk, *Jesus und die Völker in der Sicht der Synoptiker*, 83–153, 240–242; and Lee, *Mission to the Jews and the Gentiles in the Gospel of Matthew*.

⁷¹ France, *Matthew* (NICNT), 26, offers an important reminder that one should take into account the illiteracy rate at that time.

tiously with the assumption that there are undoubtedly some influences in the background,⁷² in conjunction with the more evident Jewish background.⁷³ As an educated, literate person, the Evangelist's own influences from Greco-Roman literature and history would probably be much higher than most of his audience. Again, a cautious assumption that there are elements from that background in the Evangelist's body of knowledge is probable. Frederick W. Danker well summarizes the presentation of christology in Matthew: "to present a book that speaks to Judean and at the same time assists Greco-Romans to use their cultural experience as a stepping stone to appreciate the uniqueness of Jesus Christ, the messiah, the Great Patriot, who includes them in his people."⁷⁴ Therefore, there are several places in the present work where Greco-Roman literature and history are discussed as helpful elements, for both comparison and contrast, toward understanding Matthew's text.

Other scriptural texts, especially the Old Testament scriptures, which is dealt with further below, are an indispensable part of determining Matthew's christology in this work. Other translations, such as the Septuagint and the Targums have been invaluable assets, and these prove very important at various points for discussion of Matthew's christology.⁷⁵ Discovery of texts such as the Dead Sea Scrolls has led toward a greater understanding of Matthew, the exegetical methodology as a whole as well as its christology.⁷⁶ Discussion of the Dead Sea Scrolls takes place at various points in this thesis, especially where applicable to christology. The vast amount of Rabbinic literature is an important resource as well,⁷⁷ although this is made considerably problematic with the utilization of literary works that were compiled long after Matthew was written. Obviously, Rabbinic literature like the Mishnah and Talmud were the result of developing oral tradi-

⁷² The infancy narrative of Matthew is especially rich with motifs (dreams, portents, etc.) that can be connected with a Greco-Roman background, particularly in the biographies of famous individuals. Cf. Bailey and Vanderbroek, *Literary Forms in the New Testament*, 150. Comparative parallels are helpfully listed in Boring, Berger, and Colpe, *Hellenistic Commentary to the New Testament*.

⁷³ Obviously, the Jewish background and Greco-Roman background are not completely separate worlds, as abundantly demonstrated by Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period*. In addition, the antiquity of the Jewish background would certainly appeal to many Gentile readers that respected ancient religions and history.

⁷⁴ Danker, "Matthew: A Patriot's Gospel," 115, cites many valuable comparisons toward understanding the background he proposes.

⁷⁵ Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel*.

⁷⁶ Stendahl, *The School of Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament*.

⁷⁷ Keener, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, provides an extensive amount of references in the footnotes from various Rabbinic sources; however, careless, injudicious, anachronistic use of these references is a potential consequence.

tion, some of which undoubtedly existed in the first century. However, distinguishing and carefully defining this is no small task.⁷⁸ While it is a worthwhile endeavor needing much further work and clear methodological precision, due to the constraints of this study, use of Rabbinic material in the following chapters can only be general and limited.

A considerable amount of current scholarly work has rightly sought to appropriate all of the critical approaches: historical, sociological, literary, and theological. Exclusive use of one approach is rightly disapproved, and while increasing specialization limits in many ways the capabilities and competence of scholars, pursuit from as many angles as possible is the only way forward.⁷⁹ The encyclopedic commentary of Davies and Allison⁸⁰ in appropriating the various critical tools has proven very influential in Matthean studies.⁸¹ Their commentary was a valuable resource in the work of this thesis, and the debt to their efforts is immense, even where there is disagreement. The multifaceted approach that they utilize was also an influence upon the approach of this work, and therefore, the argument of this thesis highlighting Matthew's christology in relation to the recapitulation of Israel is set forth using a variety of critical tools.

1.3 The Use of the Old Testament in Matthew

A second prominent area of focus in Matthean studies has been the use of the Old Testament in Matthew. This subject has received a tremendous amount of concentration, and it is rightly recognized as a key factor in understanding the communicative intention of the text. There are many important areas of research that encompass Matthew's use of the Old Testament.⁸² Many have sought to broadly outline Matthew's use of the Old

⁷⁸ See Neusner, *Rabbinic Literature and the New Testament: What We Cannot Show, We Do Not Know*, for a vehement critique of many scholars' faulty, anachronistic use of Rabbinic literature in this regard.

⁷⁹ Cf. Senior, "Directions," in Aune, *Gospel of Matthew in Current Study*, 15, on need for bridges between literary criticism and the classical approach.

⁸⁰ Through personal correspondence, Allison affirms that he indeed wrote the whole commentary (cf. 3.ix), with Davies' collaboration diminishing with each successive volume. He also notes that he benefited from many helpful comments by the editor, C. E. B. Cranfield.

⁸¹ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1.1–7, lay out their "principled eclecticism." Mention should also be made of Garland, *Reading Matthew: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the First Gospel*, though a much smaller work for a wider audience also exhibits an excellent utilization of many different critical approaches.

⁸² While they are never directly quoted, noncanonical works also play a role in Matthew and they are discussed at numerous points throughout this study.

Testament,⁸³ which France rightly characterizes as “multi-dimensional.”⁸⁴ Scores of others have closely analyzed a verse, pericope or larger section toward delineating Matthew’s use of the Old Testament. Several key works, beyond the standard critical commentaries, on the early chapters of Matthew were important for the research and writing of this work, many of which cover both the use of the Old Testament and christology.⁸⁵ Scholarly attention has also been given to the various textual traditions utilized by Matthew in his use, adaptation, or non-use of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek texts.⁸⁶ In addition, comparison with texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls has also highlighted Matthew’s use of the Old Testament.⁸⁷ Matthew’s exegetical methodology has occupied some attention, situating it within the broader Jewish and Christian exegetical background of the first century.⁸⁸ Attention has been given to Matthew’s purposes for utilizing the Old Testament,⁸⁹ and there has been a great deal of discussion concerning the important fulfillment quotations and the perspective he has on prophecy being fulfilled in Jesus Christ.⁹⁰ Research on the use of typology in Matthew

⁸³ Beyond the standard critical commentaries, see Johnson, “The Biblical Quotations in Matthew,” 135–153; Hummel, *Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kirche and Judentum im Matthäusevangelium*, 128–135; Stanton, *A Gospel for a New People*, 346–363; France, *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher*, 166–205; Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament*; Cope, *Matthew: A Scribe Trained for the Kingdom of Heaven*; Prabhu, *The Formula Quotations in the Infancy Narrative of Matthew*; Hartman, “Scriptural Exegesis in the Gospel of St. Matthew”; McConnell, *Law and Prophecy in Matthew’s Gospel*; Smith, “The Use of the Old Testament in the New”; Stendahl, *School of Matthew*; Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*, 124–135; Blomberg, “Matthew,” *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*.

⁸⁴ France, *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher*, 188.

⁸⁵ Brown, *Birth of the Messiah*; Allison, *The New Moses*; Donaldson, *Jesus on the Mountain: A Study in Matthean Theology*; Kynes, *Christology of Solidarity*; Johnson, *The Purpose of Biblical Genealogies*; Nolan, *The Royal Son of God*.

⁸⁶ Stendahl, *School of Matthew*; Gundry, *Use of the Old Testament*.

⁸⁷ Stendahl, *School of Matthew*, 183–206, led the way in this regard. For critique see Gärtner, “The Habakkuk Commentary (DSH) and the Gospel of Mt.,” 1–24; and Gundry, *Use of the Old Testament*, 155–159.

⁸⁸ Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine*; Juel, *Messianic Exegesis*, 31–57; Cope, *Matthew: A Scribe Trained for the Kingdom of Heaven*; Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*.

⁸⁹ Gundry, *Use of the Old Testament*; Holmgren, *The Old Testament and the Significance of Jesus*.

⁹⁰ Strecker, *Der Weg*, 49–85; Pesch, “Der Gottessohn im matthäischen Evangelienprolog (Mt 1–2). Beobachtungen zu den Zitationsformeln der Reflexionszitate,” 395–420; Rothfuchs, *Die Erfüllungszitate des Matthäus-Evangelium*; Prabhu, *The Formula Quotations in the Infancy Narrative of Matthew*; Stendahl, *School of St. Matthew*; Moule, “Fulfillment-Words in the New Testament: Use and Abuse,” 293–320; Van Segbroeck, “Les citations d’accomplissement dans l’Évangile selon saint Matthieu d’après trois ouvrages récents,” 107–130; Beaton, *Isaiah’s Christ in Matthew’s Gospel*.

has also been undertaken, which is given further attention below. Scholars have also focused research upon the varying kinds of use, such as quotation, allusion, echo, and sought to describe and define these uses.⁹¹ There has been important research on the role these scriptural texts had in the early church as determined by their use in Matthew.⁹² Within source and redaction criticism, scholars have compared and contrasted the various uses of the Old Testament in the synoptic gospels,⁹³ as well as in other early Christian texts.⁹⁴

While many of these areas of research informed much of the work on this thesis and are dealt with at various points, they have remained subservient to a more closely defined area of Matthew's use of the Old Testament. This particular area of study involves a detailed examination of the use of Israel's history in Matthew, especially in regard to how it is recapitulated in Matthew 1:1–4:11. For the most part, scholars have only generally dealt with recapitulation in Matthew through cursory statements that note how Jesus repeats and relives Israel's history.⁹⁵ Greater attention to how this is accomplished in Matthew is an area that has deserved more focus. This study has sought to delve much more deeply into explicating the recapitulation of Israel in these early chapters of Matthew.

The primary focus of the present work is examining Israel's history and the recapitulation of it in Matthew. This involves consideration of the use of the Old Testament in regard to Matthew's utilization of Israel's history in his story of Jesus Christ, in addition to other means utilized by Matthew to recapitulate Israel's history. Furthermore, at numerous points this study discusses these various uses of Israel's scriptures because it remains an important area for discussion in refinement of various over-generalized conclusions about Matthew's use of the Old Testament that have proven unsatisfactory. One of the arguments that is subsidiary to the overall argument of this study is that Matthew's appropriation of the Old Testament is more complex, subtle, and variegated than some scholars have maintained.⁹⁶ Over-generalizing and too sharply categorizing Matthew's ap-

⁹¹ Ellis, *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity*. From a broader standpoint beyond Matthew, see Porter, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament," 94–96.

⁹² Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*; Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*.

⁹³ Powery, *Jesus Reads Scripture: The Function of Jesus' Use of Scripture in the Synoptic Gospels*.

⁹⁴ Ellis, *The Old Testament Canon in Early Christianity*.

⁹⁵ Allison, "Son of God as Israel," 74–81, devotes a short insightful article to the topic.

⁹⁶ Cf. Sanders, "The Gospels and the Canonical Process," in W. O. Walker (ed.), *The Relationships Among the Gospels*, 223, who duly criticizes the inadequate understanding of McCasland, "Matthew Twists the Scriptures," 143–148, when Sanders states, "Matthew did not twist the Scriptures when he so often reshaped his citations of the Old Tes-