

H. Daniel Zacharias, *Matthew's Presentation of the Son of David: Davidic Tradition and Typology in the Gospel of Matthew* (T&T Clark Biblical Studies; London – New York: Clark 2017). Pp. xi + 224. \$ 108. Hardback. ISBN 978-0-56767-077-9

JACEK PIETRZAK

Sekcja Nauk Biblijnych, Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski Jana Pawła II
 ORCID: 0000-0003-3747-5256
 e-mail: jacek.pietrzak@dominikanie.pl

H. Daniel Zacharias is an Assistant Professor of the New Testament and Biblical Languages at the Canadian Acadia Divinity College. The book *Matthew's Presentation of the Son of David* is his PhD dissertation that he defended at the University of Aberdeen in Scotland. It is worth mentioning that he was a student of Craig A. Evans. One of his supervisors was John Nolland. Both Craig and Nolland are well known Bible scholars.

In his book Zacharias examines the portrait of Jesus as the “Son of David” and shows that Matthew guides the reader through a process of in-depth understanding of this title. Starting from genealogy, the author of the Gospel indicates that the Messiah comes from the Davidic dynasty. Then he corrects the Jewish expectations of Davidic Messiah, pointing to his healing rather than military activities. Finally, using Ps 110, the Evangelist states that Jesus is more than just the human “Son of David” because David himself calls Him “Lord” (Mat 22:45).

Although the name “David” appears in Matthew’s work more often than in the other gospels (Matthew 17 times, Luke - 13, Mark - 7, John - 2), and the title “Son of David” is used in the very first verse of his writing, this thread of Matthew’s Christology had not been fully developed by biblical scholars. Zacharias admits that his work is based on previous studies which analyze Matthew’s presentation of the Son of David in selected fragments of the Gospel. However, Zacharias is the first who deals with Davidic tradition and the use of Davidic typology in the Matthew’s Gospel as a whole. The same typology has been already examined in other synoptic gospels. In 2007, Yuzuru Miura wrote a book entitled *David in Luke-Act*, and in 2019 Max Botner published his *Jesus Christ as the Son of David in the Gospel of Mark*.

Zacharias uses the intertextual method and pays special attention to typology. In order to avoid terminological disputes, he introduces the division into “first type of typology” and “second-order typology”. The first category refers to the

presentation of persons or events in the Gospel as the antitypes of specific individuals or situations that have occurred in the past. The second category, also called “typological fulfillment”, refers to the Old Testament prophecies. Their literal meaning together with their fulfillment becomes a type for the event described by the Evangelist (p. 12-13). The author notes that the Davidic typology is emphasized more strongly at the beginning of the Gospel, in order to make the reader more attentive to the allusions and echoes of the Davidic tradition hidden in the Gospel narrative. At the same time, he admits that there are no such references in the story of the funeral and in the part presenting the revelation of the Risen Jesus.

In Chapter 2 Zacharias analyzes the use of the name “David” in the first 17 verses of the Gospel. He notes that it appears in the very first verse, and then it is the most frequently used name in Jesus’ genealogy (4 times). Zacharias concludes that in this way Matthew achieves the “primacy effect” which is the interpretative key for the whole Gospel (p. 37). The genealogy itself serves to show the Jesus’ origin from the Davidic dynasty and his royal dignity. Zacharias recognizes that Matthew uses names from the 1Chr 2:3-16; 3:1-10 (p. 38). It is worth adding, however, that some of these names coincide with those presented in the genealogy of King David in Ruth 4:18-22. Matthew divides the genealogy into three parts and according to verse 1:17 each consists of 14 generations. However, Zacharias observes that since the Babylonian resettlement up to Jesus, Matthew mentions only 13 names. According to him, this inaccuracy disappears when the name “David” is counted twice (p. 41).

In the next chapter Zacharias examines the application of the Davidic tradition in the infancy narrative (Mat 1:18–2:23). Big part of this analysis he devotes to formula quotations which are the second-order typology. He tries to prove that Matthew’s narrative of the birth of Jesus is not, in the first place, the presentation of Jesus as the Son of God, but rather the presentation of how Jesus, the Son of David, fulfills the messianic announcements of the Prophets (p. 77).

Analyzing Matthew’s use of the quote from Isa 7:14 (Mat 1:23), Zacharias omits the discussion among Catholic scholars about the word “παρθένος” and about Mary’s virginity, but links the promise of Emmanuel with the line of David. According to his typological criteria, Zacharias recognizes a prophecy as typological only when it is already fulfilled (cf. p. 14). In the prophecy given to Ahaz, God assured that the dynasty of David would be saved and another descendant would appear. When Zacharias follows rabbinic interpretation he does it to claim that Emmanuel is actually Ahaz’s son, Hezekiah, the next king of Judah (p. 61). Similarly, in the Gospel of Matthew, an angel reminds Joseph that he is “the Son of David” and his wife will give birth to a son. Typological fulfillment here is not based only on thematic relevance, but also develops the Old Testament motif. The anonymous young woman becomes a virgin named Mary; instead of Ahaz,

who did not want to ask God for a sign, there is Joseph obeying God's will; and the child who was to be a sign of God's presence is now the real Emmanuel named "Jesus", who "will save his people from their sins" (p. 63).

In the second quotation, from Mic 5:1 (LXX 5:2; Mt 2:6), Zacharias notes that Matthew changes "Bethlehem Ephrata" into "Bethlehem, in the land of Judah" to make it clear that it is the Bethlehem where King David grew up. He underlines that also here Matthew is faithful to the typological principle according to which prophecy had to be fulfilled in the past so that it could serve as the basis for establishing any typological relationship. That is why the Evangelist modifies the quote from Mic 5:1, which is a prophecy for an indefinite period, by adding a prophecy from 2Sm 5:2, which was fulfilled in David's life (p. 66).

In the citation from Jer 31:15 (Mat 2:16) Zacharias recognizes geographical mention of Ramah as an echo of the story of David, who found refuge in Ramah when he was fleeing from Saul (1Sa 19:18 and 20:1) (p. 66). The same pattern he tends to see also in the quote from Hos 11:1 (Mat 2:15), where the call of the savior from Egypt may be regarded as a possible reference to David's stay in Egypt (1Sa 27:8) (p. 70). A separate subsection is devoted to the statement "will be called a Nazarene" (Mat 2:23). After presenting possible interpretations, Zacharias favors the reading of the Greek Ναζωραῖος as a play on Hebrew *nēšer* and obvious reference to Jesse's branch from Isa 11:1 (pp. 74-76).

When Zacharias applies the hermeneutical Davidic key to the infancy narrative, we have the impression of typological consistency. However, in some places this typology is only an echo heard by the most eloquent listeners. At least in the case of Hos 11:1 the Mosaic typology presented by Dale Allison is much more convincing. Although Zacharias underlines that he does not reject the typology of Moses, he is sure that Davidic motif "has dominated the first two chapters of Matthew" (p. 77). In terms of one typological theme for the whole infancy narrative we must give him his due credit.

In chapter 4 Zechariah examines the phenomenon of calling Jesus the title "Son of David" in the contexts of healing. The author rejects the views based on Josephus and Qumran writings which combine Jesus' healing activities with exorcisms carried out by king David (Ant. 6.166-69; 11QPsa 27:2-10; cf. 1Sa1 6:17-23) or by king Solomon (Ant. 8.42-49). Zacharias argues that in several places Matthew consciously exchanges Mark's verbs "to expel" or "to teach" for the verb "to heal" (θεραπεύω) and avoids giving details of the possessions which are present in Mark's descriptions (e.g. Mat 17:18 and Mar 9:25-27) (p. 91). Zacharias also disagrees with Lidja Novakovic, who claims that therapeutic activity of the Son of David is based on the Isaiah songs of the Yahweh servant. Zacharias finds her explanation based on Mat 11:3-6 insufficient because it is not confirmed elsewhere in Matthew's narrative and the name David is missing in these Isaiah passages (p. 94).

Zacharias argues that the best ground for referring to Jesus by the title “Son of David” during his healing activity is presented by the context of Eze 34. In this chapter Ezekiel associates the name “David” with healing and also with the motive of a shepherd and a servant. The same themes can be observed at the beginning and at the end of the healing section (Mat 9:27-38; 15:21-28). In these places Jesus is addressed as the “Son of David” during the healing activity, and the motif of shepherding is also strongly emphasized (Mat 9:36; 15:24). In these verses healing process is strongly associated with the search for lost sheep and the function of shepherd. Zacharias also brings to the discussion the research of Young S. Chae and Wayne Baxter to show parallels between the motifs present in Matthew’s Gospel and in Eze 34 (pp. 95-100).

In Chapter 5, entitled “The Son of David’s Humility and Authority in Matthew”, Zacharias analyzes three moments in which the name “David” appears: Sabbath controversy (Mat 12:1-8), solemn entry (Mat 21:6-17) and discussion about Psa 110 (Mat 22:41-46). In the first pericope, the Jesus’ behavior is juxtaposed with that of David from 1Sa 21:2-7. Zacharias shows that Matthew modified Mark’s text in such a way that Jesus is undoubtedly an anti-type of David. The typology is used here to emphasize Jesus’ authority (p. 109). The next text, about Jesus’ solemn entry to Jerusalem (Mat 21:6-17) is the climax of the whole narrative about Son of David (p. 112). The research of Davies and Allison helps Zacharias to prove the terminological connections of this pericope with the description of the healing of the two blind people in Mat 20:29-30. Being still presented as a healer, Jesus is also being introduced as a king (p. 114). Zacharias points to a typological echo of the story from 2Sa 15–16, where David receives a pair of donkeys to carry the royal family (2Sa 16:1). The formula that introduces the quotation from Zec 9,9 about the royal dignity of the Messiah (Mat 21:4) corresponds to the formula preceding the first quote in the Gospel (Mat 1:22). In this way, the story of the king’s birth in Jerusalem is being continued. Once again the king turns out to be a humble shepherd (p. 116).

In Jesus’ last encounter with the Pharisees, Matthew invokes the Scriptures to complete the definition of the Son of David (22:41-46). Earlier in the Gospel the Messiah was presented not as a soldier but rather as a healer, and not as a king with political power but as a humble shepherd. And now Jesus says that the Messiah is someone even more than a descendant of David because David himself calls Jesus “Lord” (Psa 110) (p. 148). Although it is the last time when the title “Son of David” appears in the Gospel of Matthew, Zacharias shows in the next chapters that references to the Davidic tradition and the use of David’s typology were applied also in the farther narrative.

In chapter 6, Zacharias examines the motive of Judas’ betrayal and shows that Jesus was betrayed by him just like David, who was betrayed by his closest adviser Ahithophel. According to Zacharias, numerous echoes of Psa 109 “betrayal

psalm” can be heard in the Matthew narrative (p. 155). The similarities between Ahithophel and Judas, are also emphasized in Psalms 41 and 55, and the fact that Ahithophel is the only person in the Old Testament to commit suicide by hanging, makes it possible to speak of first order typology in this case (p. 160).

The last reference to David’s tradition are Jesus’ words spoken from the cross which come from the beginning of Psa 22 (LXX Psa 21). Zacharias devotes Chapter 7 to analyzing them. He notes also that terminological elements and narrative motifs of this Davidic psalm are woven into the whole narrative of Jesus’ passion. For example, Matthew adds to the Mark’s text (Mar 14:1) the phrase “He trusts in God. Let God rescue him now” (Mat 27:43), which corresponds to the words from Psa 22:9 (p. 178). Similarly, the motive of casting of lots for clothing (Mat 27:35) comes from Psa 22:19 (p. 181).

Zacharias’ work is a very interesting and rich study of Matthew’s Gospel. The author shows that the Messianic title “Son of David” is not a side thread but an important motive to understand Matthew’s Christology. In his work, he shows that the title “Son of David” carries a deeper meaning than just the origin of the Davidic dynasty. This is evident in the prophet’s tradition, widely used by the Evangelist, where the title “Son of David” is associated with the name “Emmanuel” and motifs of shepherding, healing and being a humble king. In this way the title “Son of David” indicates that Jesus’ messianism is a fulfillment of the Old Testament prophecies. Zacharias’s book undoubtedly opens up the field for farther studies. The author’s suggestion to examine in the future how Matthew finally combines all three similar titles: Son of David, Son of Man and Son of God is in every way right. As he himself admits, Davidic typology is not present in the last chapters. Therefore, to have a complete picture of Matthew messianism we have to remember that Jesus is not only “Son of David”, but is “truly the Son of God” (Mat 14:33; 27:54) and true Emmanuel, that is “God with us” (Mat 28:20).

