

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

Scripture, Confession, Justification

CARL S. MEYER

History and Dogma in Christology

WALTER R. BOUMAN

Existence and Process: A Study of the Theology
of Schubert Ogden

ROBERT W. PAUL

First Faith, Then Reason
JOHN PHILIPP KOEHLER

Brief Study

Homiletics

Book Review

Volume XLII

April 1971

Number 4

NOTE

The following note is an addition to the article by Frederick W. Danker, "Fresh Perspectives on Matthean Theology," CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY, XLI (September 1970), 478—490.

In his support of the view that Matt. 13:14-15 is a later editorial interpolation Kingsbury follows much of the argument summarized by J. Gnilka, *Die Verstockung Israels: Isaias 6, 9-10 in der Theologie der Synoptiker* (Munich, 1961), pp. 103—105. The principal objections are: (1) Matt. 13:14 is especially for Matthew an unusual mode of fulfillment-citation and includes two Matthean hapaxlegomena, ἀναπληροῦν and προφητεία. (2) The citation parallels Acts 28:26-27 in an unusually long and LXX-conformed text. (3) Verses 14-15 interrupt the balanced thoughts of vv. 13 and 16. The first objection contains ingredients of irrelevance, for it is a common methodological fallacy to include as part of the statement of proof a restatement of the problem. In view of a well-documented text one must reckon with the possibility that the very departure from normal patterns of fulfillment-citation may signal special intention. This is all the more probable in the light of Matthew's alteration of Mark's purpose clause into a causal statement in the verse that immediately precedes (v. 13). Only it remains to be demonstrated that the alteration sets the stage for the peculiar wording of v. 14a.

Often overlooked in discussions of vv. 14-15 is the commercial connotation of ἀναπληροῦν, "pay in full" (see Moulton-Milligan, *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*, 1952, p. 37; add Papyrus Par. 62, 5, 3 [2d c. B. C.], cited by Liddell-Scott, s.v., I, 4; cf. related usage in 1 Cor. 16:17; Gal. 6:2; Phil. 2:30; and perhaps 1 Thess. 2:16). That the earliest readers would have made such association is very probable in view of the preceding context, which speaks of quantity of grain production (v. 8) and introduces in v. 12 the element of profit. The verb περισσεύειν (v. 12) is patently commercial, "show a surplus" (cf. Moulton-Milligan, p. 508). Matthew's use of ἀναπληροῦν in v. 14 ties in well with these other commercial metaphors. The prophecy of Isaiah is "paid in full" in the case of first-century Israel. Sight they have, but even what they have is taken away (v. 12). But the act of deprivation is ironically described as a *payment*.

The fact that Matt. 13:14-15 is matched by the Septuagintal text-form in Acts 28:26-27 cannot be used to outweigh the philological observations in favor of genuineness expressed above, and appeal to the datum is in fact self-defeating. It is true that the term ἡ προφητεία in a formula of introduction to Old Testament prophecy is unprecedented in Matthew. But it is no more unusual in such a context than the verb προφητεύειν in 15:7, borrowed from Mark 7:6. Of special interest, however, is the fact that in both these pairs (Matt. 13:14-15/Acts 28:26-27; Matt. 15:7/Mark 7:6), where Matthew has what is for him an unusual introductory formulation, in addition to similarity in Septuagintal text-form one finds common departures (omission of the first αὐτῶν from Is. 6:10; alteration of διδάσκοντες ἐντάματα ἀνθρώπων καὶ διδασκαλίας, Is. 29:13).

The most data-satisfying conclusion is that the introductory words in Matt. 13:14 are derived from an unknown source that had Is. 6:9-10 in the same verbal pattern known to the author of Acts 28 (cf. L. Cerfaux, "La connaissance des secrets du royaume d'après Matt. xiii. 11 et parallèles," *New Testament Studies*, II [1955/56], 248—49). Whether Matthew read πληροῦν in his source and altered this verb in favor of the compound is difficult to determine. In favor of redaction by Matthew himself (as in the case of ἀκμήν, 15:16, which more precisely conveys Matthew's meaning than would Mark's οὕτως, 7:18) is the fact that this

verb is never used elsewhere in the New Testament of prophecy that finds fulfillment. The variants in the manuscript tradition, on the other hand, reveal the direction conformity-minded editors might take. If the original expression was *πληροῦν*, a term even more frequently used for its commercial connotations, Matthew may well have altered it to the compound, which in contrast to his specialized use of the un-compounded form (cf. 1:22; 2:15, 17 et passim) has the unmistakable smell of the commercial atmosphere of the context.

Finally, the literary function of the citation is not negligible. V. 13 parallels the thought of Deut. 29:3 and echoes the appeal to Jesus' deeds and words, Matt. 11:5. Noteworthy in this earlier pericope is the fact that John's disciples are to relate ἃ ἀκούετε καὶ βλέπετε (v. 4), and after their departure Jesus at 11:15 warns the assemblage in terms that are repeated in 13:9; ὁ ἔχων ὄρα ἀκουέτω. 13:13 then affirms that despite their seeing and hearing the people fail to grasp God's action in connection with Jesus. Thus this verse, with its contrast of what one has and does not have, offers partial explanation to the words ὅστις δὲ οὐκ ἔχει καὶ δὲ ἔχει ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. There remains the vital thought expressed in the verb ἀρθήσεται. The citation in vv. 14-15 completes the explanation of the proverb in v. 12: He who has ears but refuses to hear will have the hearing taken away. Vv. 16-17, in turn, contrast with the circumstances described in vv. 13-15 and expatiate on the positive portion of the proverb recited in v. 12.

FREDERICK W. DANKER