CHAPTER FOUR
THE PROBLEM OF LEGITIMACY
MATTHAEAN HERMENEUTICS AND
THE MESSIANIC HOPE

In Qumran and rabbinical literature and in Mt, the mechanics of treating the OT text are targumically oriented.¹ A certain similarity exists between Qumran and NT interpretation of the OT in the common themes of eschatological fulfilment and of illumination of the full meaning of the OT text through that fulfilment.² This similarity lends a fervency to the NT and Qumran which stands in contrast to the arid academicism of the rabbis.³ Qumran, however, stands in the midst of the fulfilment-process, whereas the dominant NT perspective is that prophecies have already reached fulfilment.⁴ Also, in the NT the person of Jesus Christ looms much larger than the Teacher of Righteousness.⁵ Jesus' role is pre-eminently redemptive, but that of the Teacher of Righteousness is not.⁶

Both Qumran hermeneutics and rabbinical hermeneutics are supremely oblivious to contextual exegesis whenever they wish.⁷ The major question which now confronts us is whether the hermeneutical principles upon which Mt worked display the same atomization of the OT text.

C. H. Dodd's study, According to the Scriptures, constitutes an initial consideration against an affirmative answer to the question.

---

¹ See above, pp. 172ff.
² F. F. Bruce, Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts, 7-10, 66f.
³ Elliger, op. cit., 156-164; J. C. G. Greig, in Studia Evangelica, 595.
⁴ I. Rabinowitz, JBL, 73 (1954), 11-35; B. Gärtner, Studia Theologica, 8 (1954), 61f.; et al.
⁵ F. F. Bruce, Biblical Exegesis, 67f.
⁶ Greig, op. cit., 597.
⁷ On atomizing exegesis in Qumran literature, see Elliger, op. cit., 139ff.; F. F. Bruce, Biblical Exegesis, 11ff.; Milik, Ten Years of Discovery, 40; and in rabbinical literature, see F. Weber, Jüdische Theologie⁸ (Leipzig, 1897), 86f.; F. Johnson, op. cit., 376f.; B. J. Roberts, BJRL, 36 (1953/54), 78f. This similarity led W. H. Brownlee to see no essential difference between rabbinical exegesis and Qumran exegesis (BA, 14 [1951], 71-75). On reflections of atomization in the LXX, see Seeligmann, op. cit., 41; and in the Targum, see P. Seidelin, ZNW, 35 (1936), 195.
Dodd shows that the mainstream of quotation material which relates to Jesus and the Church tends to concentrate in certain areas of the OT. From this discovery Dodd concludes that the NT authors were not engaged in searching through the OT for isolated proof-texts, but that they exploited "whole contexts selected as the varying expression of certain fundamental and permanent elements in the biblical revelation."

All OT quotations in Mt which show the fulfilment-motif fall into Dodd's text-plots, except these which will now be considered. The quotations from Mic 5:1 (Mt 2:6) and 7:6 (Mt 10:21, 35 f. and synoptic parallels) do not fall in a text-plot. However, Mic 5 is a prominent Messianic passage, also alluded to in Jn 7:42. Lk 1:32, 33 quotes Mic 4:7, and Rev 12:3 quotes Mic 4:10. Mic 7:6 is quoted in an unparallel passage, Mk 13:12. Lk 1:55 quotes Mic 7:20. This number of references from such varying NT sources warrants the establishment of another supplementary text-plot, Mic 4-5, 7.

Num 23-24, alluded to in Mt 2:1, 2, is another prominent Messianic section, so interpreted in Judaism. Interestingly, Heb 8:2 quotes Num 24:6 LXX in an entirely different connection.

Mt 2:11 alludes to Is 60:6. But allusions to the last chapters of Is (outside the boundaries of Dodd's text-plots) are very numerous throughout the NT. The other half of the allusion in Mt 2:11 refers to Ps 72:10. In the Lucan nativity narrative Ps 72:18 is quoted (Lk 1:68).

Mt 2:13, 20 f. plays on the experiences of Moses in Ex 2 and 4. The Moses–Jesus typology rests (in part, at least) on Dt 18:15, which does fall in one of Dodd's text-plots. However, Ex 1-4 seems itself to be another text-plot, for Stephen alludes to these chapters about fourteen times in Acts 7, and further quotations occur in Mt 22:32;

1 Failure to recognize this qualification underlies the adverse criticisms of Sundberg, op. cit., 271ff.
3 Ibid., 132f.