

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1947

Matthew's Method of Quoting the Old Testament

Lorenz Otto Nieting

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_nietingl@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Nieting, Lorenz Otto, "Matthew's Method of Quoting the Old Testament" (1947). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 211.
<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/211>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

**MATTHEW'S METHOD OF QUOTING
THE OLD TESTAMENT**

**A Thesis Presented to
The Faculty of Concordia Seminary
Department of New Testament Theology**

**In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Bachelor of Divinity**

**by
Lorenz Otto Nieting
May 1947**

Approved by:

George C. Schick
Alex. H. Schubert

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. The Problem Stated 1

II. The Quotations Borrowed from the Gospel of Mark . . . 4

III. The Quotations Original with Matthew with no Special
Formula 30

IV. The Quotations with a Special Introductory Formula . . 36

V. Conclusions as to Matthew's Method of Quoting . . . 50

Bibliography 53

There was a time in the past of the world when men were not acquainted with the
 matter with themselves. Matthew used the use of the other copies.
 Matthew, the author of the first gospel, was acquainted with the
 Old Testament in several forms. The Septuagint was in evidence and
 the Hebrew text. There probably was a third version other than the
 Septuagint. The Hebrew original was being used by the Jewish Jews and
 in the Synagogue in connection with translations. The language of the
 people of the time was Hebrew so that these translations in Hebrew
 were in evidence. It seems to me of the part of the world Jewish
 version. Our problem then, briefly stated, is to determine whether
 Matthew used one of these versions exclusively, and if so, which one.
 It is seen as single copies consistently as well as otherwise and

MATTHEW'S METHOD OF QUOTING

THE OLD TESTAMENT

I. The Problem Stated

In examining Matthew's use of the Old Testament, we are immediately confronted by the problem of the language that he uses in quoting the Old Testament. The problem simply stated is to find out whether Matthew used the Hebrew, the Septuagint, an Aramaic version, or extant Greek version of the Old Testament; or if he used a number of these versions. In the case of the latter we shall try to determine under what circumstances Matthew used the one or the other version.

Matthew, the author of the First Gospel, was acquainted with the Old Testament in several forms. The Septuagint was in existence and circulated freely. There probably was a Greek version other than the Septuagint. The Hebrew original was being used by the learned Jews and in the synagogues in conjunction with translations. The language of the people at the time was Aramaic so that these translations in Palestine were in Aramaic. We cannot be sure of the text of the oral Aramaic version. Our problem then, briefly stated, is to determine whether Matthew used one of these versions consistently, and if so, which one. If he uses no single version consistently we must determine what

principle he seems to follow in deciding which version to use. This problem of determining how much consistency is present in his use of the different translations will involve a certain amount of study of the actual content of the quotations and the hermeneutical principles that Matthew follows in using these quotations.

In connection with the form of the quotations definite charges have been brought up to discredit the author of the First Gospel. Johnson lists the charges brought up against the New Testament authors in general, of which we have selected those that deal primarily with our subject:

The principal difficulties which have been found with the quotations of the New Testament from the Old may be stated as follows:

1. The writers of the New Testament, instead of translating their quotations directly from the Hebrew, and thus presenting us with exact transcriptions of the original text, have taken them generally from the LXX version which is not free from faults.
2. Their quotations from the LXX are often verbally inexact, and their variations from this version are seldom of the nature of corrections, since they seem usually to have quoted from memory.
3. They sometimes alter the language of the Old Testament with the obvious design of aiding their argument.¹

Toy who is extremely critical of the Evangelists says:

The Church father was at one, in this respect, with the Talmudical tanna, or traditional teacher: their method was a part of the intellectual culture of the times. . . . The basis on which this exegesis rested was twofold. . . . profound reverence for the Scripture, and an unhistorical, unscientific mode of studying it.²

1. Franklin Johnson, The Quotations of the New Testament from the Old, p. x.
 2. Crawford Howell Toy, Quotations in the New Testament, p. xxiii.

We shall take up the individual quotations first then and analyze them. It seems advisable to divide them into sections for more convenient studies. Several divisions are possible. Turpie for example makes five major divisions and some forty sub-divisions. His major divisions are these: 1) Those in which Matthew agrees with both the Hebrew and the Septuagint which themselves agree. 2) Those in which Matthew does not follow the Hebrew or Septuagint which are in agreement. When the Septuagint and the Hebrew both disagree, we have three more possibilities. 3) Those in which Matthew follows the Septuagint and disagrees with the Hebrew. 4) Those in which Matthew follows the Hebrew and disagrees with the Septuagint. 5) Those in which Matthew follows neither the Septuagint nor the Hebrew, which themselves are in disagreement.

This is logically a good division; however, it is not fruitful of any results. The division we have adopted is one which our conclusions will warrant. We have chosen three divisions: 1) Those quotations in which Matthew is parallel to Mark and has borrowed from Mark. 2) Those quotations which are original in Matthew quoted from the Septuagint. 3) Those quotations which are introduced by a special formula.

There is an initial problem in determining just when a given statement is an attempt at a quotation or is merely a free citation or allusion. Twenty nine quotations are introduced by a formula which quite clearly designates them as direct quotations. We have omitted 22:44 which is introduced by the formula "Moses said", but is evidently a summary statement rather than a strict quotation. To these we have

followed Turpie in adding fourteen more, omitting two of Turpie's list; and have followed Buhl and Scott in adding a fifteenth one. Of these forty-four quotations, thirteen are introduced by a very clear formula which marks them as prophetic quotations, twenty-six are introduced by formulas such as "it is written" and other variations, five occur in the midst of a discourse, are not marked as quotations, but prove to be quotations when compared to the original.

One quotation we have omitted because the textual evidence is against its being included in the text. (37:35)³

3. ΔΘ λ φ α λ it *mg*^{al} has the quotations. Other Mss. omit it.

II. The Quotations Borrowed from the Gospel of Mark.

In this first section then, we have those quotations which are also found in Mark and which give indications that they were taken from either Mark's account as we have it or an earlier version of Mark's gospel which was used by both Mark and Matthew. Mark's language is very close to the Septuagint but not always completely true to it.

We shall analyze these quotations first: 3:3; 5:43; 11:10; 15:4; 15:8; 19:4; 19:18; 21:9-15; 31:13; 21:42; 22:32; 22:37; 22:39; 22:44; 24:15; 26:64; 24:30; 26:31; 27:46.

3:3. φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. ἑτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ
24:40:3 φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. ἑτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν.

וְהָיָה קוֹל בּוֹכֵה בְּעֵמֶק יַרְדֵּן וְהָיָה עֲבָרָה לְעַמְּךָ
וְהָיָה עֲבָרָה לְעַמְּךָ וְהָיָה עֲבָרָה לְעַמְּךָ

It appears from the parallelism of this verse, that the phrase "in the wilderness" in the Hebrew does not belong to "crying" but to "prepare". However this is by no means conclusive. The fact that Matthew has the same structure in this case might indicate that he has adopted a LXX alteration, if this be a genuine alteration. Broadus

passages in the Old Testament,² we cannot speak of it as coming from the Septuagint. Most likely it again was an Aramaic saying. The first half of the quotation is too brief to warrant any conclusions as to the language, but is apparently from the Septuagint. Allen states: "the second is an inference from the distinction drawn in the Old Testament between conduct towards Israelites and conduct towards the Gentiles."³

11:10 ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐξαποπέλλω τὸν ἀγγελόν μου, πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὅς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου ἔμπροσθέν σου.

Mal. 3:1 ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐξαποπέλλω τὸν ἀγγελόν μου, καὶ ἐπιβλέψεται ὁδὸν πρὸ προσώπου μου.

□ אַנְשׁוֹי יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׁלַח אֱלֹהֵינוּ מַלְאָכָא בְּרִישׁוֹתָא
וְיִבְרָא הַדָּרָגָה לְפָנֵינוּ וְיִשְׁלַח אֱלֹהֵינוּ מַלְאָכָא בְּרִישׁוֹתָא

Ex. 23:20 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποπέλλω τὸν ἀγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ἵνα φυλάξη σε ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ.

אֲנִי אֶשְׁלַח אֶת־אַנְשִׁי בְּרִישׁוֹתָא וְיִבְרָא הַדָּרָגָה לְפָנֵינוּ וְיִשְׁלַח אֱלֹהֵינוּ מַלְאָכָא בְּרִישׁוֹתָא

Allen notes these alterations from the Septuagint which also agree with the Hebrew:

"Mt. 10:11, Mk. 1:2, and Lk. 7:37, agree against the Septuagint - (a) in ἀποπέλλω for ἐξαποπέλλω; (b) in πρὸ προσώπου σου after "my messenger"; (c) in ὅς for καὶ; (d) in κατασκευάσει for ἐπιβλέψεται; and Mt. and Lk. agree: (e) in ἔμπροσθέν σου for πρὸ προσώπου σου after "way". Both Mt. and Lk. omit in their parallels to Mk. 1:2 πρὸ προσώπου σου after "my messenger". It may be due to assimilation to Ex. 23:20."⁴

Most of the commentators agree that this is not a Septuagint quo-

2. Dt. 7:2, 15:3, 23:21, I Sam. 15, Dt. 25:17 - 19.
3. Allen, Willoughby C.: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew. p. 55.
4. Willoughby C. Allen, op. cit., p. 115.

tation. What it is they all state according to their individual attitude as to what Bible was in circulation. Perhaps the best summary is that of Allen who says: "It seems clear that the quotation was current in Christian circles in a form slightly different from the Septuagint."⁵

Part of the alteration is due to the change in reference to the speaker. In Malachi the Godhead speaks. In Mt. the Father God speaks to His Son. Johnson calls these exegetical changes:

"The writers of the New Testament held that Jehovah really came in Christ, and that the prediction of the advent of Jehovah was fulfilled in the advent of Christ, and they introduced such verbal changes in the passages as served to bring out its real meaning, saying "thy face" instead of "my face", and "thy way" instead of "a way before me." The changes are strictly exegetical."⁶

15:4 τίμα τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα, καὶ ὁ καταλογῶν πατέρα ἢ μητέρα θανάτῳ τελευτάτῳ.

Ex. 21:16 ὁ καταλογῶν πατέρα αὐτοῦ ἢ μητέρα αὐτοῦ τελευτάσει θανάτῳ.

· תָּרַחַתְּ תַחַת יְדֵי אֲבִיךָ וְאִמְךָ

The first half of the statement is too brief to draw a conclusive argument as to the language. Mt.'s omission of ^{σοῦ} is not unusual, the article standing here for the pronoun as is common in this type of construction.

In the second part of the quotation, the Septuagint either read Kal ^{σοῦ} instead of the Hophal ^{תָּרַחַתְּ} which latter is supported by the versions, or rendered freely the passive into an active. Turpie feels

5. Ibid., p. 115
6. Johnson, op. cit., p. 76.

that Matthew is closer to the Hebrew and quotes Gesenius:

"Says Gesenius in Heb. Gr. par. 125. 3. c. The future "is also used for the imperative when the third person is required"; and thus Matthew is right in rendering יָגִיד by ἐλεούσάτω . The form יָגִיד standing before the finite form adds, in general, an expression of intensity: "let him certainly die."

This was most likely a current saying among the people, so common that it was a household phrase, indicating the influence of the Septuagint on the people's language in general but not necessarily indicating Matthew's use of the Septuagint.

15: 8.9. ὁ λαὸς οὗτος τοῖς χείλεσιν ἐν μέσσοις
ἡ δὲ καρδιά αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ' ἐμοῦ
μάτην δὲ εἰβόντάι με,
διδάσκοντες διδασκαλίαις ἐντάλλματα ἀνθρώπων

Is. 29:13 Ἐγγίζετε με ὁ λαὸς οὗτος τοῖς χείλεσιν αὐτῶν
τιμωθῆναι με, ἡ δὲ καρδιά αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ' ἐμοῦ,
μάτην δὲ εἰβόντάι με, διδάσκοντες ἐν-
τάλλματα ἀνθρώπων καὶ διδασκαλίαις.
וְיָבֹאוּ וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ לְפָנַי וְלֹא יִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ לְפָנַי
וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ לְפָנַי וְלֹא יִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ לְפָנַי
וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ לְפָנַי וְלֹא יִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ לְפָנַי

Matthew follows the Septuagint with the exception of these changes noted by Toy:

He omits the clause "draw near to me with their mouths", as superfluous; and he transposes the noun "teachings" (perhaps so as to bring it near the cognate verb), and reads: "teaching teachings, ordinances of men." Perhaps this second change is after the oral Aramaic version, which would give

7. Turpie, Davin McCalman: The Old Testament in the New. p. 47

the words in the Hebrew order; or the whole quotation may be after the Aramaic, this latter following the Septuagint closely."8

Toy further explains the "in vain" as an addition in the Septuagint and Matthew by a difference in the Hebrew consonants: $\text{לֵבָב} \text{לֵב}$ for לֵבָב . So also the "they worship" instead of "their fear" (or worship) comes about by לָבַד for לָבַד . More likely it is just an idiomatic change to what Matthew and the Septuagint considered to be better Greek but still preserving the essential meaning. So Turpie rightly states in regard to the last phrase that there is no change in the thought:

"Now, this may mean, either a precept of men, which they are made to learn - which is inculcated on them, or a precept of men, which is made to be learned - which they inculcate: so that it would, in the latter case, be said of them, inculcating a precept of men. And this the Septuagint appears to have chosen in its "teaching the injunctions of men as doctrines," of things to be taught. By this we see that there is no need to supply any word to correspond with didaskontes of the Septuagint and Matthew."9

19:4.5. ἄρουν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτοῦς, καὶ εἶπεν ἔνσκα τούτου καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα καὶ κολληθήσεται τῇ θυγατρὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς ἓνα κῆρμα μίαν.

Gen. 1:27 ἄρουν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτοῦς.
 $\text{אָדָם וְאִשָּׁה בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים$

Gen. 5:2 ἄρουν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτοῦς.
 $\text{אָדָם וְאִשָּׁה בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים$

Gen. 2:24 ἔνσκεν τούτου καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ

8. Toy, op. cit., p. 43.

ΠΡΟΣΚΟΛΛΗΘΗΣΑΙ ΠΡΟΣ ΤΗΝ ΧΥΝΑΪΚΗΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ,
ΚΑΙ ΞΕΘΝΤΑΙ ΟΙ ΔΥΟ ΣΙΣ ΕΑΡΚΑ ΜΙΑΝ.

תָּמַן - תָּמַן תָּמַן - תָּמַן שִׁנְיָ - בְּצֵעַ : כֶּן - לָע
תָּמַן תָּמַן לְבָרָה יָמַן יָמַן בְּמַשְׁכָּל

Matthew differs from the Septuagint in the omission of the first two sets of pronouns the *αὐτοῦ*'s, and differs but only from a few of the Septuagint texts by the addition of *οἱ δύο*.⁹ None of these changes are conclusive since in the Koine it was common to omit a personal pronoun like *αὐτοῦ* and simply use the article. If the quotation is from memory such a change would easily come about. This is probably a quotation from memory from the Septuagint.

19:18-19 τὸ οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, οὐ
ψευδομαρτυρήσεις, τίμα τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα,
καὶ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτὸν.

Ex. 20:13-16 οὐ μοιχεύσεις. - οὐ κλέψεις. - οὐ
φονεύσεις. - οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις.

בְּצֵעַ תָּמַן : תָּמַן תָּמַן : תָּמַן תָּמַן תָּמַן
תָּמַן תָּמַן תָּמַן תָּמַן תָּמַן תָּמַן

Lev. 19:18h καὶ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτὸν.

תָּמַן תָּמַן תָּמַן תָּמַן תָּמַן

Ex. 20:12 τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα

תָּמַן - תָּמַן תָּמַן - תָּמַן תָּמַן תָּמַן

Although this is a quotation it has little or no meaning for our inquiry. This must have been a very common saying, and probably cir-

9. Rahlfs' edition of the Septuagint includes the words as part of the text.

culated in a number of different forms and word orders. Toy remarks:

"For the explanation of these differences of order, and citations outside of the Decalogue, it seems unnecessary to call in a different version from the Greek, or a difference in the rabbinical order of citation; there being no logical rule or order, variations in quotation might arise from various sources."¹⁰

This is a case of a general agreement with the Septuagint but no conclusive argument for Jesus' use of the Septuagint.

21:9.15 ὡσαννὰ τῷ υἱῷ Δαυὶδ. εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου 15. ὡσαννὰ τῷ υἱῷ Δαυὶδ.

Ps. 118:25.26 Ὡ κύριε, ἠλώων δὴ, Ὡ κύριε, εὐδωκων δὴ εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου εὐλογηθήκαμεν ὑμᾶς ἐξ οἴκου κυρίου.

נְיַן פִּתְיָא נְיַן פִּתְיָא נְיַן פִּתְיָא נְיַן פִּתְיָא נְיַן פִּתְיָא נְיַן פִּתְיָא
נְיַן פִּתְיָא נְיַן פִּתְיָא נְיַן פִּתְיָא נְיַן פִּתְיָא נְיַן פִּתְיָא נְיַן פִּתְיָא

The second clause is in agreement with the Septuagint as well as with the Hebrew. The difficulty involved is in the first and third clauses, which are not really intended for quotations. "Hosanna according to Toy is נְיַן פִּתְיָא and is the proper emphatic formation from the shorter imperative."¹¹ Lange points out that "the expression seems gradually to have become a Messianic prediction of good wish."¹² So also the last phrase according to Allen "can only mean, "let these in the heights of heaven say, Hosanna,".¹³

21:13 ὁ οἶκός μου οἶκος προεσυχῆς κληθήσεται.

10. Toy, op. cit., p. 48.

11. ibid., p. 51.

12. Lange, John Peter: The Gospel according to Matthew. p. 373.

13. Allen, op. cit., p. 231.

ὑμῖς δὲ αὐτὸν ποιεῖτε ἐπήλαιον λιθῶν.

Is. 56:7 Ὁ γὰρ οἶκος μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθήσεται
καὶ πᾶν τὸ εὐθύνειν. וְהָיָה בְּיָמַי וְהָיָה בְּיָמַי וְהָיָה בְּיָמַי

Jer. 7:11 μὴ ἐπήλαιον λιθῶν. ὁ οἶκος μου, οὐ ἐπι-
κέκληται τὸ ὄνομα μου ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἕκτι, ἐνώπιον ὑμῶν,

וְהָיָה בְּיָמַי וְהָיָה בְּיָמַי וְהָיָה בְּיָמַי וְהָיָה בְּיָמַי

וְהָיָה בְּיָמַי וְהָיָה בְּיָמַי וְהָיָה בְּיָמַי וְהָיָה בְּיָמַי

This passage is a free combination of Is. 56:7 and Jer. 7:11, taken from the Septuagint with slight alterations in the second clause. The first clause is exactly the same as in the Septuagint. In the second clause the only words that are strictly quoted, and again according to the Septuagint, are ἐπήλαιον λιθῶν. No indication is made if the Lord actually meant to quote the passage or if He intended only to allude to it. Toy says:

"The change of construction of Jeremiah's words is due, probably, not to a different rendering in a Greek or Aramaic version, but to the demand of the occasion: Jesus desired to say distinctly that the Jews were then guilty of this offense against the temple."¹⁴

21:42 λίθον ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες,
οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας
παρὰ κυρίου ἐγένετο αὕτη,
καὶ ἔστιν θυμαστὴ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν,

Ps. 118 (117):22,23 λίθον ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκο-
δομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας
παρὰ κυρίου ἐγένετο αὕτη καὶ ἔστιν θου-

14. Toy, op. cit., p. 54.

ματῆς, ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν
 מִבֶּן קָמָסוֹת הַכּוֹנִים הַיּוֹקֵה לֵרֵאשִׁיפָה
 סִמָּת יְהוֹת הַיּוֹקֵה לִמָּת דִּי מִלְּפָנֵי בְּטִיבִיבִי

Matthew follows the Septuagint exactly which also agrees with the Hebrew except for the omission of the N^{I} and the addition of a copula - καὶ . This is purely an idiomatic difference. Yet the structure and exactly same vocabulary is large enough here to lead us to classify this as a use of the Septuagint.

22:32 Ἐγὼ εἶμι ὁ Θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς Ἰακώβ;

Ex. 3:6 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἐγὼ εἶμι ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ πατρὸς σου, Θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Θεὸς Ἰακώβ. [Lxx > B, in O sub - ὁ Θεὸς πατὸρ]

לִּי אֵלֹהִים אֲבֹרָה וְלִי אֵלֹהִים אֲבֹרָה וְלִי אֵלֹהִים אֲבֹרָה
 לִּי אֵלֹהִים אֲבֹרָה וְלִי אֵלֹהִים אֲבֹרָה וְלִי אֵלֹהִים אֲבֹרָה

Matthew omits $\text{ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ πατρὸς σου}$, and adds the articles where the Septuagint omits them. Neither of these changes are important and do not necessarily prove that Matthew has intentionally left the Septuagint and corrected it to the Hebrew. The use of the article follows its own laws in the Greek of the New Testament and it is more likely that this is the reason for the addition of the article. Turpie merely points out that he is not departing from the original.¹⁵ Also the first omission is due to either quotation from memory, or omission of a clause which is not considered necessary, as is typical of quoting in literature in general.

15. Turpie, op. cit., p. 42.

22:37 ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ δυνάμει σου.

De. 6:4.5. καὶ ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς δυνάμεώς σου.
[καρδίας] δυνάμεις B'

קבץ לבבך ליהוה אלהיך וליהוה לבבך
: יהוה לבבך וליהוה לבבך וליהוה לבבך

The various differences between the texts are these: the Hebrew has three terms which are also found in the Septuagint - "heart", "soul", and "strength".¹⁶ In the parallel account, Mark lists four - the three of the Septuagint and an additional one, "mind", *δυναμία*. Matthew in terms of Mark's quotation drops *ἰσχύος* and uses *δυναμία*.¹⁷ This again was a very common saying among the Jews. The Pharisees in asking Jesus the question: "What is the greatest commandment in the Law?" were not expressing their ignorance. Jesus answered in the form of the quotation as it was current. Nor is this a misquotation, then, from the Old Testament, for the statement is not definitely worded as a quotation. Formally, we might say that this is an example of the influence on the language of the Jews in general by the Septuagint, but not a literal quotation.

16. The variant reading of the Rescription of the Vaticanus does not solve the problem. This is most likely a later correction to Matthew.

17. Turpie's and Davidson's attempt to reconcile *ἰσχύος* to *δυναμία* is unsuccessful and unnecessary. Cf. Turpie, op. cit., p. 167.

the Septuagint. The phrase is used several times in Daniel, in the singular as in 12:11, and in the plural as here. We cite the quotation as being from Dn. 9:27 because of the rest of the phrase.

In the Hebrew the phrase is a word-play. Montgomery gives this explanation:

"In Phoenician Baal was known as 𐤁𐤍𐤔𐤁𐤏, Lord of Heaven. Baal was replaced by 𐤅𐤓𐤏 - abomination, altering 𐤁𐤍𐤔 to 𐤁𐤍𐤓, as in 8:13, the "Apalling sin".¹⁹

The other words, ἐν τόπῳ ἀγίῳ, cause the commentators some trouble. Again, Montgomery²⁰ has a traditional but good explanation, that the Septuagint in referring this to "temple" understood the sense of the Hebrew correctly. This does not necessitate a change in the consonants as Toy²¹ wrongly imagines, but implies that "wing" is a word properly applied to an extremity of the temple.

24:30 & 26:64 24:30 καὶ ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τὸν ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς.
26:64 πλὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἅπ' ἄρτι ὄψεσθε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καθήμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.
Dn. 7:13 καὶ ἰδοὺ μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενος καὶ ἕως τοῦ παλαιοῦ τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐφ' ἔθρονον καὶ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ προσήνεχθη.

19. Montgomery, James A.: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel. p. 388

20. Ibid.

21. Toy, op. cit., p. 65.

וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁמַע אֶת-קוֹל הַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ

There are two difficulties in this passage: the citation is not definitely referred to as a quotation; and the text of the Septuagint cannot be known as surely as in the other books of the Old Testament.²²

In general however, all the words in Matthew are found in the Old Testament Greek text, and most of the phrases and constructions are the same. One interesting change which Matthew makes in favor of the Septuagint is the change of Mark's ἐν νεφέλαις to ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν.

26:31 πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα, καὶ διασκορπισθήσονται τὰ πρόβατα τῆς ποιμνῆς.

Zech. 13:7 Πατάξατε τοὺς ποιμένας καὶ ἐκεπάτατε τὰ πρόβατα.

וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁמַע אֶת-קוֹל הַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ

This is one of the unusual quotations where Mark does not quote the Septuagint, but where Matthew takes over Mark's quotation with only a slight stylistic change, even adding "of the shepherd" which is not found in the original, but is an additional clarification. Toy says of the alteration of the verb:

"This alteration, it is probable, was not found in the Aramaic translation (which had not a motive for the change), but was made by Jesus himself, in order to render into plain language the poetical expression of the prophet, and refer immediately to God what the latter assigns to the avenging sword. Matthew's "sheep of the flock" is merely an expansion of the original expression."²³

27:46 ἡλι ἡλι λεμὰ βαβα χθάνι; τουτ' εἶ-

22. The Septuagint Ms. of the IX Century, the only one we have, has while Theoditon, the text used in the church, has .

23. Toy, op. cit., p. 67.

ΤΙΝ ΘΕΙ ΜΟΥ ΘΕΙ ΜΟΥ, ΙΝΑ ΤΙ ΜΕ ΞΥΚΑΤΕΛΙΠΕΣ,
 Ps. 22:2 ὁ θεὸς ὁ θεὸς μου, πρόσχες μοι, ἵνα τί
 ἔγκυτε λιπὲς με. : יְיָ יְיָ יְיָ יְיָ יְיָ יְיָ יְיָ יְיָ יְיָ

Evidently, there is no connection here whatsoever between the Septuagint and Matthew.

"It is the words of an Aramaic version (Targum) that Jesus here uses; they are nearly identical with the rendering in an existing Targum on the Psalms which however is a late manuscript of the XVII Century."²⁴

It is quite evident upon a survey of these quotations that they are all either exact quotations of the Septuagint version or that they adhere very closely to the Septuagint language, with the exception of 11:10 which is derived from some other Greek version but not the Septuagint, and 27:46 which is an independent rendering of the Aramaic.

Allen makes this statement: "For in the quotations borrowed from Mark, the editor shows a tendency to assimilate the language more closely to the Septuagint."²⁵ We find upon investigation that this is not necessarily the case. There are several quotations which do show a correction in favor of the Septuagint:

15:8 where Matthew reverses word order of three words.

19:4 where Matthew adds a phrase of the Septuagint, but omits two pronouns.

19:8.9. where Matthew uses *μή* of the Septuagint for *οὐ* of Mark, but uses word order of Mark and not that of the Septuagint.

22:32 where Matthew adds *ἰησὺ* of the Septuagint, but omits the articles of the Septuagint and Mark.

24. Toy, op. cit., p. 73.

25. Allen, op. cit., p. lxi.

26:31 where Matthew changes the position of one word to the Septuagint (and Hebrew), but rejects the mistranslation of the Septuagint and uses Mark's translation.

26:64 where Matthew changes ξv of Mark to $\xi \pi \acute{\iota}$ of Septuagint. Yet, see the footnote to 26:64 on difficulty of determining text.

27:46 where $\epsilon \bar{\iota} \varsigma \tau \acute{\iota}$ may be a correction to the Septuagint from the $\iota \nu \alpha \tau \acute{\iota}$ of Mark; yet $\theta \epsilon \acute{\iota} \varsigma$ for $\acute{\omicron} \theta \epsilon \acute{\omicron} \varsigma$ of Septuagint.

On the other hand there are several quotations that show an opposite tendency:

15:4 where Matthew omits the $\epsilon \nu \nu$'s of the Septuagint and Mark.

23:37 where the Septuagint and Mark have four nouns, Matthew uses three as in the Hebrew, although they are not the same three terms. However, this is not evidence of the use of the Hebrew.

24:15 where Matthew fails to correct Mark who uses a singular for the plural of the Septuagint and the Hebrew.

Rather than the influence of the Septuagint or the Hebrew, or even any conscious effort at all toward correcting the text of Mark, to fit better to either of these texts, we find that these alterations are better considered as only stylistic or editorial changes; and that there are as many arguments for a tendency toward the Hebrew as toward the Septuagint, if there is any tendency at all. In order for the argument to be decisive other quotations must be referred to. If there it is found that there is a tendency to assimilate to the Septuagint version, then there is also evidence here to show that in several cases in quotations borrowed from Mark assimilation to the Septuagint is present.

Again the Septuagint follows the Hebrew closely; but the use of the exact words and order by Matthew of the Septuagint indicates that he had the Septuagint in some form before him in quoting the words of Satan.

4:7 ΟΥΚ ἔκπαιράεις κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου,

Dt. 6:16 ΟΥΚ ἔκπαιράεις κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου.

וְלֹא יִתְּנוּ אֶת יְדֵיהֶם לְעֹלֵל אֱלֹהֵיהֶם

Matthew follows the Septuagint ἔκπαιράεις for יִתְּנוּ:

"very possibly a difference of Hebrew manuscript reading" accounts for the difference.²⁶

4:10 κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου προσκυνήσεις καὶ αὐτῷ

Dt. 6:13 κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου φοβηθήσῃ μόνω λατρεύσεις.

καὶ αὐτῷ λατρεύσεις, καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν κολληθήσῃ, καὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ὀμῆ.

וְלֹא יִתְּנוּ אֶת יְדֵיהֶם לְעֹלֵל אֱלֹהֵיהֶם וְלֹא יִתְּנוּ אֶת יְדֵיהֶם לְעֹלֵל אֱלֹהֵיהֶם

Here Matthew disagrees with both the Septuagint and the Hebrew in the first verb and the addition of μόνω after αὐτῷ.

There are three possible explanations. Either the alteration was purely intentional with no basis to it for the purpose of making a more specific application to the situation. More likely this was one of those common sayings which circulated freely in the conversation of the people and had developed in this form in the Greek.

More hypothetical is the explanation of Allen:

"B has there φοβηθήσῃ, and omits μόνω. But A has προσκυνήσεις and μόνω. . . The editor (or his

26. Toy, op. cit., p. 22.

source) either had *περικυνησεις* (rather than *ἀντιβησεις* - Heb. *נִתְּבָה*) in his copy of the Septuagint, or has substituted it for *ἀντιβησεις* to emphasize the anti-thesis with *περικυνησεις* of v.9.²⁷

5:21 οὐ φονεύσεις
Ex. 20:13 (15) οὐ φονεύσεις
לֹא תִּזְכֹּךְ אֱלֹהִים

The identical words used does not necessarily demand that this be a quotation from the Septuagint. It could be pure coincidence. That this was a common saying

"partly, accounts for *ἡκούεαι* rather than *ἀνιγνωται* and for *ἔρεθισθαι* rather than *ἔρετληται*. Further, "it was said", is the most frequent form of biblical citation in the Rabbinical writings; cf. Bacher, 1.6.²⁸

5:27 οὐ μοιχεύσεις
Ex. 20:14(13) οὐ μοιχεύσεις
לֹא תִּזְנֶה

This quotation again is too brief and too general a saying to give conclusive evidence of Matthew using the Septuagint.

5:38 Ἠκούετε ὅτι ἔρεθισθαι ὀφθαλμὸν ἀντὶ ὀφθαλμοῦ καὶ ὀδόντα ἀντὶ ὀδόντος.
Mt. 19:21 ὀφθαλμῶν ἀντὶ ὀφθαλμοῦ, ὀδόντα ἀντὶ ὀδόντος.
Lv. 24:19. ὀφθαλμὸν ἀντὶ ὀφθαλμοῦ, ὀδόντα ἀντὶ ὀδόντος
Ex. 21:24 ὀφθαλμὸν ἀντὶ ...
... תַּחַת תַּחַת

27. Allen, *op. cit.*, p. 32 and footnote p. 32.
28. *ibid.* p. 47.

very similar. Toy says:

"The Hebrew קָוָה , commonly "strength", is used also of expressions of praise of the glory of God as in Ps.29:1, and is rendered in the Septuagint by ἐξουία there and Ps.68:35; Is. 12:2; but in our passage the context (Yahwe manifests his power in employing feeble things, such as young children, and to quell his enemies) requires the meaning strength."³¹

There is a similar relation between the Septuagint and Matthew in the verb κατατίθημι . The Hebrew verb תָּבַח really means to "found", "establish", but this has been generalized in the Septuagint to mean "prepare". If Matthew had been unacquainted with the Septuagint, he might have used a different Greek verb.

23:39

See discussion under 21:9.

All of these quotations indicate that they are from the Septuagint. Some of them are very brief, mere phrases, but others are long enough to indicate their Septuagint origin.

There is only one exception which bears special study - 9:13 and 13:7 where נָסַח of the Hebrew is adopted where the Septuagint has η , in Mss. B L P which also seems to be the best reading. Yet Rahlfs adopts the reading καὶ οὐ . The problem cannot be settled until we know the Septuagint text. If η were the right reading of the Septuagint, this would be the one case where Matthew did not follow his usual custom in these passages of following the Septuagint, but deserted it for the Hebrew.

31. Toy, op. cit., p. 55

IV. The Quotations Introduced by a Special Formula

The last group of quotations is that group which are peculiar to Matthew and which seem to belong together in a group by reason of their special introductions which are not exactly alike but have a striking resemblance: 1:23; 2:6; 2:18; 2:15; 2:23; 4:15.16; 8:17 12:18 - 21; 13:14.15.; 13:35; 21:5; 27:9.10.

1:23 ἰσοῦ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχει καὶ τέξεται
 υἱόν, καὶ καλέουσιν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουήλ,
 ὃ ἔστιν μεθερμηνεύμενον μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ θεός.

12:18 ἰσοῦ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἀήμφεται καὶ τέξεται
 υἱόν, καὶ καλέεισιν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουήλ.

קָרָא וְיָדַע וְיָדַע וְיָדַע וְיָדַע וְיָדַע
 וְיָדַע וְיָדַע וְיָדַע וְיָדַע וְיָדַע

Matthew has adopted the Septuagint with two changes: $\epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota$ for $\lambda\eta\mu\phi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$; $\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu$ for $\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma$. In the former case:

"Die Uebersetzung ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχει ist dem participium entsprechender als das λημφεται der Septuagint da jene beiden Ausdruecke die augenblickliche Schwangerschaft besagen."³²

According to the Masoretic vowel-pointing, the word for "call" is either third singular feminine perfect or feminine participle, or second singular feminine perfect. The rendering as second singular feminine perfect is favored by the similar passage, Gen. 15:11 and is

32. Bñhl, Eduard: Die Alttestamentlichen Citate im Neuen Testament.
 p. 5.

adopted by all the Greek versions; but the connection seems to favor rather the participial translation which Matthew accepts but renders as a third person plural.

The use of $\tau\eta\sigma\ \theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ for $\tau\eta\ \rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta$ is almost conclusive that the quotation is from the Septuagint and that Matthew adopted the Septuagint and currently accepted interpretation of this passage.

There has been much discussion about this passage, the point being that Matthew wrongly uses an Old Testament quotation. It is said that Isaiah had nothing like a virgin birth in mind, but that Matthew here takes the passage referring to a married daughter of Ahaz and applies it to Mary. Toy notes the use of the term in the Old Testament:

$\tau\eta\ \rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta$ is, properly, "a young marriageable woman," who may or may not be married. Such is the sense in Aramaic and Arabic, and the Old Testament usage (though not decisive one way or the other) permits this signification. The word occurs, outside of our passage, in Gen. 24:43 (Rebekah, unmarried), Ex. 2:8 (Miriam, unmarried), Ps. 68:26(25) (damsels with tabrets, in a festival procession), Song of Songs, 1:3, 6:8 ("way of a man with an alms"), and Ps. 16:1 (in the title), and I Chron. 15:20 (musical term "soprano"). The masculine $\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta$, "young man," is found in I Sam. 17:56; 20:22. In Exodus, Psalms, and Song of Songs, the Septuagint renders $\tau\eta\ \rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta$ by $\nu\eta\upsilon\sigma\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha$, "young woman"; which word is used in our passage also by the other Greek versions. The Septuagint rendering by $\tau\eta\ \rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta$ in two places (here and in Gen. 24:43) is probably an interpretation, it being assumed that the young women in question were virgins."³³

Allen is even more outspoken in his commentary as to the justification of the traditional interpretation:

"There are signs that the view that Isaiah was using current mythological terms, and intended his $\tau\eta\ \rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta$ to carry with it the sense of supernatural birth is rightly gaining ground. Cf. Jeremias, Babylonisches im Neuen Testament, p. 47; and Geismann, Der Ur-

33. Toy, op. cit., p. 4.

surung der Israelitische-jüdischen Eschatologie.
 p.270 ff. In any case the Septuagint translators
 already interpreted the passage in this sense; the
 fact that the later Greek translators substituted
 $\nu\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$ for $\mu\epsilon\theta\iota\upsilon\sigma\iota$, and that there are no
 traces of the supernatural birth of the Messiah
 in the later Jewish literature, is due to anti-
 Christian polemic. Cf. Just. Mart. Trypho, xlii.,
 It is probable that the editor is here, as else-
 where adopting words of the Old Testament to a
 tradition which he had before him."34

In view of the strict commandments that a bride found not to
 be a virgin should suffer the death penalty, it is easy to under-
 stand that the word for unmarried young woman should pass over into
 the stricter meaning of spotless virgin:

216 και εὐβηθλίεμ, γῆ Ἰούδα, οὐδαμῶς ἐλ-
 αχίετη εἰ ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν Ἰουδα: ἐκ σοῦ
 γὰρ ἐξελεύεσται ἡγρούμενος ὅστις ποιμανεῖ
 τὸν λαόν μου τὸν Ἰεραήλ.

Mc. 5:1-3. και εὐβηθλίεμ οἶκος Ἐφράθα, ὀλιγοετός
 εἰ τοῦ εἶναι ἐν χιλιάσιν Ἰουδα: ἐκ σοῦ μοι ἐξελεύεσται
 τοῦ εἶναι εἰς ἄρχοντα τοῦ Ἰεραήλ. και εὐβηθλίεμ
 και ὄψεται, και ποιμανεῖ τὸ ποίμνιον αὐτοῦ ἐν ἰεχὺ
 κύριος.

וְיִשְׁמַע בְּיָמָיו לְהַיְבִיחַ אֶת-בְּתוּלָתָא
 אֲשֶׁר בְּיָמָיו לְהַיְבִיחַ אֶת-בְּתוּלָתָא
 אֲשֶׁר בְּיָמָיו לְהַיְבִיחַ אֶת-בְּתוּלָתָא

II Sam. 5:26 ὁ ποιμανεῖς τὸν λαόν μου τὸν Ἰεραήλ.

וְיִשְׁמַע בְּיָמָיו לְהַיְבִיחַ אֶת-בְּתוּלָתָא

We note first the changes or substitutions: γῆ Ἰούδα for
 Ἐφράθα for אֲשֶׁר בְּיָמָיו . Matthew here clarifies the Hebrew term.

34. Alien. op. cit. . p. 10

left unexplained in the Septuagint. It cannot mean simply the land of Ephraim, since that was the northern kingdom. οὐδὲ μὲν ἐλάχιον, ἢ is substituted for ἀλγαιὸς ἢ τὸ εἶναι of the Septuagint and the םִיָּׁן םִיָּׁן of the Hebrew. Turpie with Davidson reads the opening phrase in Hebrew interrogatively, following the Syriac version, punctuating likewise. "The question proposed by the prophet is answered by the Evangelist (the scribes) in the negative."³⁵ Böhl finds other manuscripts that took the first sentence interrogatively as did the Aramaic oral version, he surmises: "was auch in nicht wenigen Codices der Septuagint und bei Theodoret, ja auch in einem von E. Ranke edirten Itala-fragment ("numquid minima es?") geschehen ist."³⁶ ἡγεμόειν stands for χιλιάρειν of the Septuagint and םִיָּׁן of the Hebrew. This is most likely just a change in style rather than the result of a different reading of a different manuscript, reading םִיָּׁןׁ for םִיָּׁן. "In point of fact, the Evangelist here refers to a central town or thousand, only personifying it by the term "prince".³⁷ םִיָּׁן is omitted. It is omitted either because it was considered unnecessary or "actually did not occur in the text, as it is absent in Nathan Concordance and is wanting in the Syriac versions."³⁸ The last clause is probably an expansion of Micah's words by assimilation of II Sam. 5:2.

The readiness with which the scribes were able to answer the question of Herod shows that this prophecy was a well-known one.

35. Turpie, op. cit., p. 191.

36. Böhl, op. cit., p. 7.

37. Lange, op. cit., p. 38.

38. Ely, op. cit., p. 8.

often repeated, so that it acquired a form of its own, the one used by Matthew, and not derived or related to the Septuagint.

2:15 ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐκάλεσα τὸν υἱὸν μου.

Ex. 11:1 ἐξ Αἰγύπτου μετεκάλεσα τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ.
יְבִרָהוּ? יְהִי נִתְּרָהּ מִיִּתְּרָהּ

This is a very clear example of interpretation in the translation of the Septuagint. Matthew rejects the change and follows the original. Toy mentions that some of the Targums also translate as did the Septuagint but there is no reason for the change. In fact, the typical character of the statement is lost in the Septuagint, but regained by Matthew's correct translation.

Lange has a fine analysis of the content of this quotation in his explanation of its typical fulfillment:

"Israel of old was called out of Egypt as the Son of God, inasmuch as Israel was identified with the Son of God. But now the Son of God Himself was called out of Egypt, who came out of Israel as Israel came out of Egypt and the kernel comes from the husk. When the Lord called Israel out of Egypt, it was with special reference to His Son; that is, in view of the high spiritual place which Israel was destined to occupy." ³⁹

2:18-21 φωνὴ ἐν Ῥαμὰ ἠκούεθην, κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὄδυρμὸς πολὺς. Ῥαχὴλ κλαίουσα τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς καὶ οὐκ ἠθέληεν παρακληθῆναι ὅτι οὐκ εἶν.

Jer. 31:15 (38:15) φωνὴ ἐν Ῥαμὰ ἠκούεθην θρήνου καὶ κλαυθμοῦ καὶ ὄδυρμου Ῥαχὴλ ἀποκλαίουμένη οὐκ ἠθέληεν παύεσθαι ἐπὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐτῆς ὅτι οὐκ εἶν.

39. Lange, op. cit., p. 63

כִּי אָמַר יְהוָה קוֹל בְּרָקָה זָשָׁמַע זְהָ יְבָכִי
 תִּסְרֹוּרִים קָחַל מִבְּכָה עַל-בְּנֵי יָהּ מֵאֲזַר
 לְהַנְחֵם עַל-בְּנֵי יָהּ כִּי אֵינִי

In the first clause Matthew, the Septuagint, and the Hebrew are in complete agreement. In the second clause, the Septuagint takes the first two nouns and changes the descriptive adjective of the second noun of the Hebrew into a third noun so that it has three descriptive nouns. Matthew takes the last two nouns of the Septuagint and adds an adjective so that $\pi\omicron\lambda\upsilon\varsigma$ seems to stand for $\tau\omicron\sigma\rho\rho\upsilon\tau\iota\mu$. This would seem to indicate a correction to the Hebrew. Matthew might have translated the three nouns in this way without any reference to the Septuagint at all.

In the third phrase, the Septuagint in some versions and in others not, dropped the "for her children". Also to be noted, Matthew and the Septuagint use two different words for "weeping", $\kappa\lambda\upsilon\iota\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\alpha$ and $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\kappa\lambda\upsilon\iota\omicron\mu\iota\upsilon\tau\eta$. In the fourth clause, Matthew drops the phrase "for her children" which is found both in the Hebrew and the Septuagint; and is closer to the Hebrew with his use of "did not wish to be comforted" - $\omicron\upsilon\kappa \eta\theta\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\nu \mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\kappa\lambda\eta\theta\iota\upsilon\mu\iota$ than the $\omicron\upsilon\kappa \eta\theta\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\nu \mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\kappa\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\iota$ of the Septuagint.

The last clause is identical in all three. Lenski calls this a translation by Matthew from the Hebrew.⁴⁰ Charles calls it a translation by memory from the Septuagint.⁴¹ Most of the commentators

40. Lenski, R. C. H. : The Interpretation of St. Matthew's Gospel. p. 82

41. Allen, op. cit., p. 17.

make no attempt to make a definite statement. It seems to us to be more likely a memory quotation more closely related to the Hebrew than the Septuagint.

2:23 τὸ ἐπιθῆναι δὲ τῶν προφητῶν ὅτι Ναζω-
ραῖος κληθήσεται.

There is no distinct place in the Old Testament to which this quotation can refer. That is already indicated in the introduction, "by the prophets," that is, that there is no one prophet who is being quoted. Rather this is a fragmentary reference to a number of expressions in the Old Testament.

Zahn . . . points out three peculiarities of the introduction formula— a) ὅπως instead of ἵνα ; b) τῶν προφητῶν instead of the singular; c) the absence of λέγοντων . ὅτι is therefore equivalent not to "that," and does not introduce the contents of the prophecies referred to, but "because," and introduces an exegetical remark of the Evangelist. Christ lived at Nazara and so fulfilled prophecies that He should be despised and rejected of men, because He was to be known as the Nazarene.⁴²

Three attempts have been made to explain this quotation. The first revolves around the word נָזִיר for נָזִיר . Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, and others take it to mean Ναζωραῖος from נָזִיר , a Nazarite.⁴³

More sensible is the supposition that the writer is playing on the Hebrew words נָזִיר and נָזִיר . In Is. 11:1 the נָזִיר , branch, from the root of Jesse, is interpreted as the Messiah in the Targum. In Jer. 23:5; 33:15 a branch, נָזִיר , is to be raised

42. Allen, op. cit., p. 17.

43. Meyer, op. cit., p. 99,100.

This is perhaps one of the most difficult passages of all to determine from which source it is being quoted. Allen claims that it comes from a Greek version. He argues from the use of $\gamma\tilde{\eta}$ and $\acute{o}\delta\acute{o}\nu$.

The editor seems to be quoting a Greek version, otherwise he would hardly have rendered $\gamma\tilde{\eta}$ by the accusative $\acute{o}\delta\acute{o}\nu$. In the original it is the object of a verb: but Matthew, who wrests the words from the context and omits the verbs, would, if translating from the Hebrew, have rendered $\gamma\tilde{\eta}$ just as he has given us $\gamma\tilde{\eta}$, not $\gamma\tilde{\eta}\nu$. $\acute{o}\delta\acute{o}\nu$ can only be due to careless copying from a version before him.⁴⁷

Meyer on the other hand states that it is "quoted from memory but adhering to the Septuagint."⁴⁸ He defends the use of $\acute{o}\delta\acute{o}\nu$ as a Hebraism and found in the versions.

These words ($\acute{o}\delta\acute{o}\nu$ $\beta\alpha\lambda\acute{\iota}\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\varsigma$), namely, determine the situation of $\gamma\tilde{\eta}$ Zebulun and $\delta\tilde{\eta}$ Naphthali, and are to be translated "seaward". The absolute accusative $\acute{o}\delta\acute{o}\nu$ is quite Hebraistic, like $\gamma\tilde{\eta}$ in the sense of versus (Ezek. 8:5; 40:20; 41:11ff; 42:11ff; 1 Kings 8:48; 2 Chron. 6:38; Deut. 1:2,19)--a usage which is partly retained in the Septuagint. 1 Kings 8:48, $\acute{o}\delta\acute{o}\nu$ $\gamma\tilde{\eta}$ $\delta\tilde{\eta}$ $\acute{o}\delta\acute{o}\nu$ in the direction of their land; exactly so in 2 Chron. 6:38, and most probably also in Deut. 1:19. In this sense had the evangelist also understood $\gamma\tilde{\eta}$ $\delta\tilde{\eta}$ in the original text of the passage before us; so also Aquilla and Theodotion, not the Septuagint, according to B (in A, by an interpolation). No completely corresponding and purely Greek usage is found, as the accusatives of direction, in Bernhardt, p. 144 f.; cf. Kühner II,1, p. 268 f.; do not stand independent of a verb.⁴⁹

In the next two phrases there is no particular grammatical difficulty.

Meyer places them in this way:

$\eta\iota\epsilon\alpha\nu$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\text{I}\sigma\alpha\delta\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\nu$ is not, like $\acute{o}\delta\acute{o}\nu$ $\beta\alpha\lambda\acute{\iota}\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\varsigma$, a determination of the position of $\gamma\tilde{\eta}$ $\text{Z}\epsilon\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu$ $\gamma\tilde{\eta}$ $\text{N}\eta\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\iota\mu$, as these tribes were situated on this side the Jordan, while $\eta\iota\epsilon\alpha\nu$. . . can never signify on this side; but it designates, after these two lands, a new land as the theatre of the working of Jesus, viz., Perea, whose customary designation was

47 47. Op. cit., p. 34.
48. Op. cit., p. 144.
49. Ibid., p. 145.

that is, the land east of Jordan. . . . Γαλιλαία τῶν
 ? θινῶν □ ? ? ? ? (district of the
 heathen), that is, in keeping with the originally appel-
 lative term Γαλιλαία, which had become a proper name,
 Upper Galilee, in the neighborhood of Phoenicia, inhabited
 by a mixed population of heathen and Jews. 50

Of this section of the quotation we note that Matthew deals rather freely with it since his intention is only to identify the place of the people mentioned in the second section. The verbs descriptive of these tribes in the verse quoted did not prophecy anything that was here fulfilled, and so are not quoted. This fact that he is dealing freely with the section makes it difficult to determine its origin. It seems to be clearly not close to the Septuagint. Most likely it is from the Aramaic version with traces or actual use of the other Greek versions.

This last section we shall divide into four phrases and discuss them individually: "the people who sat in darkness." Matthew here alters the "walk" of the Hebrew and the Septuagint. Luke has the same alteration; and it is probably an assimilation to the following καθ' ἡμῶν. "Have seen a great light!" Matthew here differs from the Septuagint as he does through the entire quotation by rendering as a narrative as does the Hebrew what the Septuagint renders as vocative. The vocabulary however is the same. "And for those who sat in the region and the shadow of death." Matthew uses the word "sit" while the Septuagint uses κατοικοῦντες "dwell," although not much of a change in meaning since καθ' ἡμῶν has a very

50. Meyer, Op. cit., p. 145.

generalized meaning, yet a difference in vocabulary which is close to the Hebrew 'ג'ש'. Matthew adds an "and" between region and shadow which in the original are tied together as "the land of the shadow of death," תִּיִן־וְצֵל־מָוֶת; and in the Septuagint are left in apposition. "Light has dawned to them." There is a difference in vocabulary but little difference in meaning. The Septuagint λαμπρῶς is probably a little closer to the Hebrew אֲרָזָה than the ἀντίστιλιν of Matthew.

This last section necessitates about the same conclusions as the first. There is no trace of the Septuagint. The alterations are not necessarily translations from the Hebrew. Most likely it is again the use of an Aramaic version with influence of the other Greek versions.

8:17 αὐτὸς τὰς ἀθευσίας ἡμῶν ἔλαβεν
καὶ τὰς νόμους ἐβάετο εἶναι.

Is. 53:4 οὗτος τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν φέρει καὶ
περὶ ἡμῶν ὀδυνᾶται, καὶ ἡμῶν ἐλογισά-
μεθα αὐτὸν εἶναι, ἐν πόνῳ καὶ ἐν πληγῇ
καὶ ἐν κακώεσι.

וְהוּא יָסַב עֲוֹנוֹתֵינוּ וְעָרַב עֲוֹנוֹתֵינוּ
וְעָרַב עֲוֹנוֹתֵינוּ וְעָרַב עֲוֹנוֹתֵינוּ
וְעָרַב עֲוֹנוֹתֵינוּ : וְהוּא יָסַב עֲוֹנוֹתֵינוּ

This is very clearly an independent rendering of the Hebrew or of some translation that gave the original in pretty near the same form. This is an admirable example of a place where the Septuagint

mistranslated and lost the original meaning of the text, which mistranslation of the original is rejected by Matthew. Johnson notes:

We see at once why the New Testament writer abandons the Septuagint and recurs to the Hebrew: he is speaking of miracles of healing, to which the Hebrew words directly refer, while the Septuagint version does not preserve the reference of the prophecy to sickness.⁵¹

12:17-21 ἰδοὺ ὁ παῖς μου ὃν ἤρέτιβα
 ὁ ἀγαπητός μου ὃν εὐδόκησεν ἡ ψυχή μου
 Θῆσω τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ' αὐτόν,
 καὶ κρίειν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀπαρχελεῖ.
 οὐκ ἐρίβει οὐδὲ κραυγάσει,
 οὐδὲ ἀκούσει τις ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις
 τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ.
 κάλαμον συντετριμμένον οὐ κατεάξει
 καὶ λίνον τυφόμενον οὐ βρέξει.
 ἕως ἄν ἐκβάλῃ εἰς νίκος τὴν κρίειν.
 καὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιδῶσιν
Is 42: 1-4 Ἰακώβ ὁ παῖς μου, ἀντιλήψομαι αὐτοῦ.
 Ἰσραὴλ ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου προεδείξατο αὐτόν
 ἡ ψυχή μου.
 ἔδωκα τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ' αὐτόν,
 κρίειν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐξοίσει,
 οὐ κεκραγεται οὐδὲ ἀνήσει,
 οὐδὲ ἀκουσθήσεται ἔγω ἡ φωνὴ αὐτοῦ.
 κάλαμον τεθλασμένον οὐ συντρίψει,

51. Johnson, Op. cit., p. 26.

καὶ λίνον καπνιζόμενον οὐ βέβει
ἀλλὰ εἰς ἀλήθειαν ἐφοίβει κρίειν.

ἀναλάμψει καὶ οὐ θραυθήσεται
ἕως ἂν θῆ ἔπι τῆς γῆς κρίειν.

καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἔλπιουσιν.

יְהוָה עֲבָדֵי מַתְמַקְדָּבּוּ בְּחִירֵי הַצִּדְקָה הַנִּשְׁפָּטִים
| צְדָקָתֵי רִוּחֵי עֲלֵיו מִשְׁפָּט לְגוֹיִם יוֹצֵא
לֵא יִצְעַק וְלֵא שָׁמַע וְלֵא יִשְׁמָע בְּתוֹךְ
קוֹלָיו: קִצְתָּ הַצִּדְקָה לֵא שְׁבוּר וּמִשְׁתַּדָּד
כִּדְשָׁתָה לֵא כִבְדָתָה לְנַאֲמֹת יוֹצֵא מִשְׁפָּט
לֵא כִדְשָׁתָה וְלֵא רִוּחַ עַד-שִׁמְשֵׁם בְּאֶרֶץ
מִשְׁפָּט וְלִתְהַרְתֵּנוּ אֵיִם: יִחַלְנוּ:

This quotation cannot have come from the Septuagint. There are eighteen distinct differences between the text of Matthew and that of the Septuagint. There is only one case which we shall discuss later, where an influence of the Septuagint might be pointed out.

In comparison to the Hebrew, besides the mistaken exegesis at the beginning of the citation in the Septuagint, there are no important changes except the two that Matthew makes and which we shall discuss. Despite the fact that Matthew and the Septuagint are so completely different they both render the Hebrew fairly accurately. In fact, the Greek of Matthew is a little more idiomatic and seems to have caught the spirit of the original better than the Septuagint. For example, ἐφοίβει is better than the ἄν ἡβει of the Septuagint. Θῆτω is also to be preferred over the ἔσωκα of the Hebrew, which though literally

closer to the Hebrew does not as well catch the spirit.

About the only point that the commentators agree on is that the quotation is not from the Septuagint. Even here Allen finds the influence of the Septuagint in the last clause "or more probably from a current Greek version, which is already implied in Mark 1:11."⁵² Toy thinks that it comes from an Aramaic version.⁵³

The texts may not be said to differ till the last clause of verse three where the Hebrew has "to truth shall he bring forth judgment" while Matthew has "until he have thrown out judgment to victory." It is really a substitution by Matthew of "victory" for "truth." Toy says:

How the Aramaic got the rendering "send forth judgment unto victory" instead of "unto truth," is not clear - perhaps it had a different Hebrew word from ours in its text, but more probably "victory" is a free translation or interpretation of the idea of "certainty," which is contained in the Hebrew word for "truth".⁵⁴

Turpie quotes Davidson as reconciling the two:

"But", says Dr. Davidson, "between emeth truth, and nikos victory, there is no disagreement. The progress of truth is a continued victor over error." Yet I prefer the meaning of emeth, firmness stability and hence perpetuity, expressed by eis nikos, which in LXX Thren. (Lament. Jerem.) v. 20, Job XXXVI. 7, and other places for the Hebrew lanet-sach means: "for ever", to everlasting."⁵⁵

The best explanation seems to be that of Toy that here we have a change in the Aramaic which was adopted by Matthew.

The second disagreement is where Matthew and the Septuagint

52. Allen, Op. cit., p. 131.

53. Toy, Op. cit., p. 35

54. Ibid.

55. Turpie, Op. cit., p. 230

have ὄνοματι for the Hebrew יְהוָה .

It is not likely that here Matthew adopted a Septuagint reading when he seems to have ignored the Septuagint altogether in the rest of the citation. Much more likely is the statement by Meyer: "Matthew and the Septuagint had a different reading before them."⁵⁶

Also the word "isle" of the Hebrew is translated by both Matthew and the Septuagint as ἴθνη . It is most likely that both correctly interpreted the Hebrew word and adopted a more literal Greek word, than that Matthew took the Septuagint.

13:14, 15. ἀκοῇ ἀκούετε καὶ οὐ μὴ συνῆτε
καὶ βλέποντες βλέψετε καὶ οὐ μὴ ἴδητε
ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδιά τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου
καὶ τοῖς ὠσίν βαρέως ἤκουσαν,
καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν ἐκάμμυσαν.
μὴ ποτε ἴδετε τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς
καὶ τοῖς ὠσίν ἀκούωσιν
καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνῶσιν καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσιν,
καὶ ἴασομαι αὐτούς.

Is. 6:9, 10. ἀκοῇ ἀκούετε καὶ οὐ μὴ συνῆτε
καὶ βλέποντες βλέψετε καὶ οὐ μὴ ἴδητε
ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδιά τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου
καὶ τοῖς ὠσίν αὐτῶν βαρέως ἤκουσαν
καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν ἐκάμμυσαν.
μὴ ποτε ἴδετε τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς

56. Meyer, Op. cit., p. 336.

και τοις ωειν ακουσωειν
 και τη καρδια ευνωειν και επιστρεψουειν,
 και ιαβομαι αυτους.
 שְׁמַעוּ וְיִשְׁמְעוּ וְיִשְׁמְעוּ וְיִשְׁמְעוּ
 וְיִשְׁמְעוּ וְיִשְׁמְעוּ וְיִשְׁמְעוּ
 וְיִשְׁמְעוּ וְיִשְׁמְעוּ וְיִשְׁמְעוּ
 וְיִשְׁמְעוּ וְיִשְׁמְעוּ וְיִשְׁמְעוּ
 וְיִשְׁמְעוּ וְיִשְׁמְעוּ וְיִשְׁמְעוּ

The Septuagint and Matthew are here in perfect agreement. There is some difference between them and the original which is accounted for by Turpie:

Between Matthew and the original, the variations lie in this, that what is expressed in the latter in the imperative, is in the former changed into the future in the first verse, and the aorist in the next. ...The Imperative "is employed especially in strong assurances (comp. thou shalt have it, which expresses both a command and a promise.) and hence in prophetic declarations as Is. 6:10 thou shalt make the heart of this people hard, for, thou wilt make... In all these cases the use of the imperative approaches very near to that of the Future, which may either precede or follow it in the same signification." ...Now, the command being issued by God renders the accomplishment certain, so that it may be aptly expressed, as in the former instances by the future, since yet, but surely to happen and as in the latter by the present (properly the aorist), the effect having already, as it were, taken place, and, as a preparatory to the end in view, and accounting for what is said before, being suitably introduced by gar, for.⁵⁷

This is one of the few prophetic quotations that definitely agrees with the Septuagint. Allen notes the introductory formula in this connection and remarks:

57. Turpie, Op. cit., p. 89 .

We might expect the editor to use the formula ὅπως (ἰνα) πληρωθῆ τὸ (ἡθῆν). But that formula seems to have been characteristic of a special group of quotations which the editor had before him in a Greek form. In this case he himself has recourse to the LXX.... He therefore uses an introductory phrase of his own, which was suggested, no doubt, by the πληρωθῆ of the recurring formula.⁵⁸

13:35 ἀνοίξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὸ στόμα μου, ἐρεύξομαι κεκρυμμένα ἀπὸ καταβολῆς.

Ps. 78 (77:2) ἀνοίξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὸ στόμα μου, φθέγγομαι προβλήματα ἀπ' ἀρχῆς.
 שִׁיר־לְמִנְחָה לְדָוִד בְּיָמֵי אֶלְיָשִׁב בֶּן־אֶחֱיָהוּ
 פִּתְחֵנָּה בְּפָרָבֹלִים מִן־הַבְּרִיָּה

The first clause of the quotation is from the Septuagint. The second appears to be an independent rendering from the Hebrew. It is especially evident that the first clause is from the Septuagint. Matthew "is employing παραβολαῖς in a special sense and one foreign to original Hebrew."⁵⁹ Allen remarks:

In the original Hebrew it is expressly said שִׁיר־לְמִנְחָה, not in parables but in a song of proverbs, the contents of which, however, "though historical from beginning to end," latentes rerum Messiae figuras continebat (Grotius),... In Christ he finds realized what the prophet says with reference to himself.⁶⁰

The difference in the expression of the age, "from of old" is not important, does not change in its essential meaning, but involves only a difference in formal expression.

This quotation we can classify as part from the Septuagint and part from some other version, or independent translation.

58. Allen, Op. cit., p. 146.

59. Meyer, Op. cit., p. 366.

60. Allen, Op. cit., p. 152.

Zech 9:9

εἶπατε τῇ θυγατρὶ Σιών.
Ἴδοὺ ὁ βασιλεὺς σου ἔρχεται σοι
πραῦς καὶ ἐπιβεβηκῶς ἐπὶ ὄνον
καὶ ἐπὶ πῶλον υἱὸν ὑποζυγίου

Zech 9:9

χαῖρε εφόδρα, Θύγατῆρ Σιών. κήρυξε
εἰς, Θύγατῆρ Ἱερουσαλήμ. Ἴδοὺ ὁ βασιλεὺς
σου ἔρχεται σοι, δίκαιος καὶ εὐφρων αὐτός,
πραῦς καὶ ἐπιβεβηκῶς ἐπὶ ὑπόζυγιον καὶ
πῶλον υἱόν.

אָז יִבְרַח בְּתֵינָן דְּרַיָּעֵי בַת יְרוּשָׁלַם
וְהָיָה רִכְבָּהּ יָבֹא לָהּ: צְדִיק וְנֹשֵׁעַ
וְנִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה לָהּ עַל עֲלֵי חֲמֹר וְעַל עֲלֵי בֶן אֲתוֹנָה

Is. 62:11

Εἶπατε τῇ θυγατρὶ Σιών ἴδου σοι ὁ σωτήρ.
... בְּתֵינָן דְּרַיָּעֵי בַת יְרוּשָׁלַם

This quotation seems to have come from the Septuagint originally but became a current well-known saying which was slightly altered then in its form. The opening phrase is an assimilation to Is. 62:11. "The appellatives that follow king are omitted by Matthew" as an abridgement.⁶¹ Turpie also notes that the influence of the Septuagint is especially predominant in that Matthew mentions "the act, mounted" for "riding."⁶² The last clause is again a correction to the Hebrew or some Aramaic version that Matthew knew. It differs from the Septuagint.

61. Turpie, Op. cit., p. 222.
62. Ibid.

27:9.10. καὶ ἔλαβον τὰ τριάκοντα ἄργύρια,
τὴν τιμὴν τοῦ τετιμημένου ὃν ἐτιμή-
σαντο, ἀπὸ υἱῶν Ἰερουθὴλ, καὶ ἔδωκαν
αὐτὰ εἰς τὸν ἄγρον τοῦ κτραμῆως, κα-
θὰ συνέταξέν μοι κύριος.

Zech. 11:13 καὶ εἶπεν κύριος πρὸς μέ, κέθεις
αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ χωνευτήριον, καὶ ἐκίψομαι
εἰ δοκιμὸν ἔβτιν, ὃν τρόπον ἐδοκιμάθη
ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν. καὶ ἔλαβον τοὺς τριάκοντα
ἄργυροὺς καὶ ἐνέβαλον αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν οἶ-
κον κυρίου εἰς τὸ χωνευτήριον.

וְיָרֵד בְּיָמֵי יְרֵמְיָהוּ
וְיָרֵד בְּיָמֵי זְכַרְיָהוּ
וְיָרֵד בְּיָמֵי יְרֵמְיָהוּ
וְיָרֵד בְּיָמֵי זְכַרְיָהוּ
וְיָרֵד בְּיָמֵי יְרֵמְיָהוּ
וְיָרֵד בְּיָמֵי זְכַרְיָהוּ

The initial problem is the problem of the introduction in which
the quotation is given as being derived from Jeremiah. Investigation
shows that there is a passage similar to this in Jeremiah, but the
quotation being used is found in Zechariah. Toy lists the possible
solutions to the difficulty.

It has been suggested that the latter prophet stood
first in the evangelist's manuscript and that his name
here stands for the whole body of prophetic writings;
but such a mode of citation is unexampled. Or, it is
said that Zechariah writes in the spirit of Jeremiah; or,
that this scene actually occurred in Jeremiah's life
(see Jer. 18:2; 19:1;) and was repeated by Zechariah,
and that this fact was preserved by tradition, and here
recorded by Matthew; this explanation, being on its
face perfectly arbitrary and improbable, needs no refu-
tation. . . It is more likely that it is a clerical
error (though it must have got into the text early.

since the present reading is supported by the mass of manuscripts and versions, but not the Peshitto): instead of the abbreviation zriou, a scribe may have written iriou, and so the latter may have been perpetrated.⁶³

The quotation itself is much closer to the Hebrew than to the Septuagint. In fact it is difficult to find any trace at all of the Septuagint.

The original can be separated into phrases in this way:

Cast it unto the potter;

a goodly price that I was prized at of them.

And I took the thirty pieces of silver,

and cast them to the potter in the house of the Lord.

The first difference in Matthew that we note is that he rearranges the elements in the sentence in this way:

And I took the thirty pieces of silver,

a goodly price that I was prized at of them,

and cast them to the potter in the house of the Lord.

The first phrase has been omitted; the third has been shifted so that it is the first.

The chief change in the words themselves is the alteration of person from the first person singular to the third person plural in Matthew, pointing directly at the agency of the priests in the transaction. It is hardly necessary, as does Toy, to argue that this is from the Septuagint, because its Greek forms admit of such an interpretation.⁶⁴ Rather it is a free adaptation of Matthew to fit the situation.

63. Toy, *op. cit.*, p. 71.

64. *ibid.*, p. 70.

In the first clause of Matthew's statement there is no deviation from the original but a difference in case from the Septuagint.⁶⁵

In the original the tone of the second clause is satirical and highly ironical. Matthew's important alteration is the expansion of "of them" into "by the children of Israel", which may be regarded as a legitimate exegetical paraphrase to clarify the saying. As to the rest of the clause, it has been rendered into more idiomatic Greek than that of the Septuagint. Toy states that the slightly altered structure of this clause is due to the Aramaic version:

The remainder of the Gospel passage is after an Aramaic version of the prophet's exclamation: "The goodness of the price of the honored one whom they valued from them;" whence the evangelist: "the price of the priced whom they priced from (on the part of) the children of Israel."⁶⁶

In the last clause there is difficulty with two words: *κεραμειω* *αγρου*, the potter and the field. The objections to the use of the word "potter" rise from the fact that the critics cannot understand how a potter could be in the house of the Lord. It is a criticism of the Hebrew word in our present text. Turpie has the fullest discussion:

The noun *קֶרַם* is supposed by some to mean here, not "potter" but "pottery", or a place where the potters dwell, and where was a court into which were thrown all the broken vessels of the temple, (Cf. Jer. 19: 2. 10. 11.) and where it may be supposed other filth was cast out. . . . But the words *קֶרַם אֲדָמָה* seem not to be reconcilable with this interpretation. Hence, says Gesenius whom I am quoting (see Heb. Lex. s.v.) "the other and earlier explanation is preferable, which here regards *קֶרַם* as i. q. *קֶרַם* treasurer, from *קֶרַם*; so Chald. and

65. This hardly warrants Allen's "influence of the Septuagint" p. 218
66. Toy, op. cit., p. 70

Syr. vers....Now, as with the money the potter's field was bought, would not the money be given to Him? And as Matthew adduces the quotation with reference to said field, it does not seem to be necessary to depart from the literal rendering of by "potter".⁶⁷

Better is Johnson's simple explanation that the potter could very easily have been in the temple, not with his workshop for the purpose of manufacturing, but with some of his wares for selling.⁶⁸

Matthew then notes that since the field was bought with this money, indirectly it was given to the potter.

The second difficulty is the origin of the word "field" for "house of the Lord". Toy finds the solution in the Aramaic.

But whence does the evangelist get "the potter's field"? It is not to be supposed that he inserted it in his quotation without some authority. Five Hebrew manuscripts here read, "the potter's house" (perhaps after Jer. 18:2;), and so, possibly, the oral Aramaic version may have read; and, as the Hebrew and Aramaic term for "house" is used in a wide sense of any "place", the Aramaic expression may have been here interpreted by Matthew to mean the "field", as the place where the potter worked, this interpretation having been suggested by the transaction of Judas.⁶⁹

The addition of the last phrase is simply "a free rendering of the last opening words of the prophet, "the Lord said to me". Matthew may thus have followed it to bring the words into more obvious connection with the priest's purchase of the field."⁷⁰

It was noted above that this last group of quotations seems to form a special group because of the striking formulas with which they

67. Turpie, op. cit., p. 235.

68. Johnson, op. cit., p. 313

69. Toy, op. cit., p. 70.

70. Ibid.

are introduced.

These are the formulas:

1:23 All this took place to fulfill what the Lord had spoken
by the prophet.

2:6 They told him, ... for so it is written by the prophet.

2:15 This was to fulfill what the Lord had spoken by the prophet.

2:17 Then was fulfilled what was spoken by the prophet Jeremiah.

2:23 That what was spoken by the prophets might be fulfilled.

4:14 That what was spoken by the prophet Isaiah might be fulfilled.

8:17 This was to fulfill what was spoken by the prophet Isaiah.

12:17 This was to fulfill what was spoken by the prophet Isaiah.

13:14 With this indeed is fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah which
says.

13:35 This was to fulfill what was spoken by the prophet.

21:4 This took place to fulfill what was spoken by the prophet,
saying.

27:9 Then was fulfilled what had been spoken by the prophet
Jeremiah, saying.

In all these formulas the concept of a single act fulfilling a specific prophecy is prominent. The word "fulfill" occurs in all but one of them. This same formula never occurs in any other of the quotations in Matthew. With them the formula "it is written" or a certain prophet "writes", or "says", or "prophesies", or other variations, are used.

An analysis of the language of these quotations does not show the same consistency as the formulas or as the other quotations so far discussed, which were almost all invariably close to the Septuagint.

1:23 is largely from the Septuagint.

2:6 is an independent rendering from the Hebrew.

2:15 is an independent rendering from the Hebrew.

2:18 seems related to the Septuagint but corrected to the Hebrew.

2:23 has no direct source.

4:15.16 is not from the Septuagint and may be from a Greek version, or from the Hebrew, although there is no direct evidence.

8:17 is an independent rendering of the Hebrew.

13:18-21 is an independent rendering of the Hebrew, or a Greek version.

13:14.15. is in agreement with the Septuagint.

13:35 is from the Septuagint in the first clause and from the Hebrew in the second.

21:5 is from the Septuagint in greatly altered form.

27:9.10. is an independent rendering from the Hebrew with slight alterations; a trace of the Septuagint is probably coincidental.

It is noted that there is hardly any consistency whatsoever between these quotations in respect to their language. In the next section we shall make an analysis of the various explanations and methods that have been advanced to explain this inconsistency.

V. Conclusions as to Matthew's Method of Quoting.

It is not difficult to explain the reason for Matthew's departing at times from the Septuagint or from the Hebrew text which we have today. It is very likely that Matthew was unacquainted with the Hebrew text. Johnson remarks:

The writers of the New Testament quoted from the Septuagint because it was the only written version of their time. The Jews in general had long ceased, not merely to speak and write, but also to read Hebrew; even to the majority of those who lived in Palestine it was a dead language and it was necessary for them to "search the Scriptures", if at all, in some translation with which they were acquainted.⁷¹

In speaking of those quotations which show an influence of the Hebrew, Toy says:

They cannot be supposed to come from the Hebrew, for two reasons: first, the number and character of the cases in which the New Testament writers depart from the Hebrew make it difficult to believe that they had this text before them; and, further, it is unlikely that Hebrew, which was a dead language in their time was known to any of them except Paul, and his citations are almost uniformly from the Greek. Where, then freedom of quotation will not explain the New Testament deviations from the Septuagint, it is more natural to refer the citations, not to the Hebrew, but to the only popular existing version of the Old Testament, - the Aramaic.⁷²

That then would explain those alterations from the Hebrew where Matthew is apparently quoting from the Hebrew rather than the Septuagint. Throughout this thesis, we have used the term "Hebrew", because it is the only text we have with which we can make a comparison; in reality, it was the oral Aramaic version that was used.

71. Johnson, op. cit., p. 19

72. Toy, op. cit., p. ix

However, that does not explain why Matthew in one quotation should follow the Septuagint and in another the Aramaic. Böhrl, for example never answers that question.⁷³ In his discussion of a given passage he indicates at times, that we have a reference to the oral Aramaic version, but he does not indicate whether Matthew had any set rule as to which text he would use. The discussions of Turpie and Toy are similar.⁷⁴

Part of the failure to find a consistent pattern that Matthew follows in quoting the Old Testament lies in the attempt to take the first Gospel as an individual unit by itself. As soon as the Gospel of Matthew is compared with that of Mark, a definite relationship can be noted in the quotations.

The problem of an Aramaic original for Matthew would not solve the problem. It would show how there could be a divergence from both the Septuagint and the Hebrew, but would give no indication of a definite pattern in these divergences.

All of the commentators note that there are certain passages found only in Matthew which have an unusual introductory formula. Most of the commentators in discussing them, try only to find the doctrinal implications.

Allen notes more about these passages when he says:

It seems therefore, probably that the eleven quotations introduced by a formula, and also 11:10 were already current when the editor compiled his work in a Greek form. They may come from a collection of Old Testament passages regarded as prophecies of events in the life of the Messiah.⁷⁵

73. Böhrl, op. cit., passim

74. Turpie, op. cit., & Toy, op. cit., passim

75. Allen, op. cit., p. lxi

Allen excludes from his list one quotation with a striking formula that we have included - 13:14.15 which is in agreement with the Septuagint. Böhl notes of this passage that its introductory formula is not of the same type as the other passages.⁷⁶ A comparison with the gospel of Mark also indicates that Mark may be quoting the first and last phrase of this quotation. Probably this quotation then was not in the list of prophecies used by Matthew. On the one hand, the presence of a formula which somewhat resembles the others indicates that it should be included. On the other hand, its language which is that of the Septuagint, and the slight peculiarities of its formula lead one to omit it. Allen also includes 11:10 in his list of prophecies.⁷⁷ This quotation is obviously very similar to Mark although different from the Septuagint. Likely it was so common a saying that it developed its own Greek form which was adopted by Mark and by Matthew. We have therefore omitted it from this list of special prophecies.

This then would explain the inconsistencies in Matthew. Matthew is greatly influenced by the Septuagint. He is well at home in the language of the Septuagint. When he writes he writes in terms of the Septuagint language, as did Mark. However, he had one document, oral or written, the list of twelve prophecies which were already in a definite Greek form. In incorporating these into his text, because they were already known, and familiar in that state, he left them in that form and did not alter them to conform to the Septuagint.

76. Böhl, op. cit., p. 45.

77. Allen, op. cit., p. 55

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, Willoughby C.: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew. International Critical Commentary, v. 26, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907.
- Böhl, Eduard: Die Alttestamentlichen Citate im Neuen Testamente. Wien, Wilhelm Braumüller, 1878.
- Dittmar, Wilhelm: Vetus Testamentum in Novo. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 1903.
- Ruehn, Eugen: Die Alttestamentliche Citate und Reminiscenzen im Neuen Testamente. Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr. (Paul Siebeck), 1900.
- Lange, John Peter: The Gospel according to Matthew. Translated by Philipp Schaff, fifth edition. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1866.
- Meyer, Heinrich A. W.: Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew. Translated by Rev. Peter Christie, translation revised and edited by Frederick Crombie and William Steward. New York, Funk and Wagnalls, 1887.
- Montgomery, James A.: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel. International Critical Commentary, v. 19. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1927.
- Nestle, Eberhard: Greek New Testament. Revised by Erwin Nestle, sixteenth edition. New York, American Bible Society, n.d.
- Rahlfs, Alfred: Septuagint. Stuttgart, Privilegiertes Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935.
- Swete, Henry Barclay: Septuagint. Second edition. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1896.
- Treyer, Joseph Henry: A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. New York, American Book Company, 1889.
- Toy, Crawford Howell: Quotations in the New Testament. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1884.
- Turpie, Davin McCalman: The Old Testament in the New. London, Williams and Morgate, 1863.