Dissertations (1934 -)                  Dissertations, Theses, and Professional
                                                                    Projects

# The New Day of Atonement: A Matthean Typology

Hans Moscicke
*Marquette University*

THE NEW DAY OF ATONEMENT: A MATTHEAN TYPOLOGY

by

Hans M. Moscicke, B.A., M.A.

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School,
Marquette University,
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Milwaukee, Wisconsin

May 2019

ABSTRACT

THE NEW DAY OF ATONEMENT: A MATTHEAN TYPOLOGY

Hans M. Moscicke, B.A., M.A.

Marquette University, 2019

Ancient Christians often interpreted the death of Jesus through the lens of Leviticus 16, conceiving Jesus as both the immolated "goat for Yahweh," whose blood the high priest brought into the Holy of Holies once a year to purge Israel's sins, and the "goat for Azazel," which bore Israel's iniquity into the wilderness far away from God's presence. Such an understanding of Jesus's death did not strike theologians such as the author of the Epistle of Barnabas, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Hippolytus, Origen, Jerome, Cyril of Alexandria, and the earliest Markan commentator as strange. What is strange is how seldom modern critics have scrutinized the potential impact of early Judaism's most significant occasion of atonement on the First Evangelist's conception of the death of Jesus, whose blood is explicitly poured out "for the forgiveness of sins" only in his Gospel (Matt 26:28)

Building upon the insights of John Dominic Crossan, Helmut Koester, Adela Yarbro Collins, Richard DeMaris, Albert Wratislaw, Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, and Jeniffer Maclean, this dissertation investigates the influence of the Day of Atonement on the First Evangelist's passion narrative by employing redaction, literary, and intertextual criticism. The Barabbas episode (Matt 27:15–26), the Roman-abuse scene (Matt 27:27–31), the crucifixion, death, and burial narratives (Matt 27:32–66), and Leviticus 16 are the primary texts in this study, though I draw upon a wide range of Second Temple Jewish literature, including the Book of Zechariah, the Book of Watchers, the Book of Jubilees, 11QMelchizedek, and the Apocalypse of Abraham.

I conclude that Matthew crafts a sustained Yom Kippur typology in the twenty seventh chapter of his Gospel. He remodels the Barabbas episode as a Yom Kippur lottery between two "goats," thereby merging the themes of new Passover and forgiveness of sins. In this dark ritual parody, Pilate acts as high priest, designating Jesus as the sacrificial goat for Yahweh and Barabbas as the goat for Azazel. The governor transfers the iniquity of bloodguilt from his hands onto the crowd, which corresponds to sin-bearing Azazel. Since the crowd is only a provisional sin-bearer in his view, Matthew also casts Jesus as a scapegoat. The evangelist depicts Jesus as receiving the sins of the world in the curse-transmission ritual of the Roman-abuse scene. In his death and burial narrative, Matthew portrays Jesus as offering his πνεῦμα/lifeforce to God as the goat for Yahweh and as descending to the realm of the dead as the goat for Azazel.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Ancient Christians commonly interpreted the death of Jesus through the lens of the Day of Atonement and Leviticus 16, conceiving Jesus as both the immolated goat for Yahweh, whose blood the high priest brought into the Holy of Holies once a year to purge Israel's sins, and the goat for Azazel, which bore Israel's iniquity into the wilderness far away from God's presence. Such an understanding of Jesus's death did not strike these ancient authors as strange. What is strange, however, is how seldom modern critics of Matthew have considered Jesus's death in light of Leviticus 16 and Yom Kippur traditions. Surely by now scholars have thoroughly scrutinized the potential impact of early Judaism's most significant occasion of atonement on the First Evangelist's conception of the death of Jesus, whose blood is poured out "for the forgiveness of sins" only in his Gospel (Matt 26:28). Surprisingly, this would be an incorrect assumption. In fact, Matthean scholars have very rarely reflected on Yom Kippur as a possible background to the gospel writer's understanding of Jesus's death.

This dissertation is not a comprehensive study of atonement in the Gospel of Matthew. The evangelist, I am convinced, tends to be a maximalist with regards to scriptural allusions. Richard Hays is correct to state that, "For Matthew, Israel's Scripture constitutes the symbolic world in which both his characters and his readers live and move."[1] Thus, I cannot chase every echo or typology that possibly concerns the meaning of Jesus's death in the Gospel. My aim is more modest. It is to examine Matthew's appropriation of Leviticus 16 and Day of Atonement traditions in his passion narrative (PN) and to consider the influence of Yom Kippur on his theology of

---

1. Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels* (Waco: Baylor University Press), 186.

atonement. This investigation will hopefully yield a more complete portrait of the death of Jesus in the First Gospel.

Method

In this study, I assume the two-source hypothesis and employ redaction criticism as my primary tool of analysis.[2] Given that the *Tendenz* of redaction critics has been to generate relatively myopic readings of Matthew's Gospel and its message, I adopt Graham Stanton's methodologically prudent directive, that "the results of redaction criticism are more compelling when they are complemented by other methods."[3] I therefore utilize literary and intertextual methods of analysis as well. As the purpose of this dissertation is not to debate issues of hermeneutics or metaphysics, I find it adequate to commandeer Dale Allison's sensible deduction, that "literary texts, as the products of human beings, creatures whose public and private lives are pervaded by intentions, have the intentions of their authors encoded in them; and if we can often comprehend intentions while conversing with living human beings, we can do the same while reading the sentences on a page."[4] Therefore, while I readily acknowledge the (sometime severe) limitations of historical knowledge, I will speak of the

---

2. Burnett Hillman Streeter's hypothesis with regards to Markan priority and the existence of "Q" is, in its essence, still defensible today and remains the consensus position (*The Four Gospels: A Study in Origins* [Edinburgh: R. & R. Clark, 1924], 150–332). For a recent defense of the Q hypothesis, see John S. Kloppenborg, *Q: The Earliest Gospel: An Introduction to the Original Stories and Sayings of Jesus* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2008), 1–40. Graham Stanton's apology for redaction criticism remains relevant and valid (*A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew* [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992], 23–53). See the seminal redaction-critical investigation of Matthew's Gospel by Günther Bornkamm, "Die Sturmstillung im Matthäusevangelium," *WD*, Jahrbuch der Theologischen Schule Bethel 1 (1948): 49–54.

3. Stanton, *Gospel for a New People*, 23.

4. Dale C. Allison, *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 2.

historical gospel author, his community, and his authorial intentions.[5]

I employ Richard Hays's criteria for discerning scriptural allusions,

---

5. Post-war Matthean scholarship through the 1980s typically located the evangelist's community outside the walls (*extra muros*) of the synagogue and Judaism. For a bibliography on *extra muros* positions, see Anders Runesson, "Rethinking Early Jewish-Christian Relations: Matthean Community History as Pharisaic Intragroup Conflict," *JBL* 127 (2008): 95–132, at 97 n. 3 and 97 n. 4. Typical of this position is Douglas R. A. Hare: "Matthew's description of the synagogue as an alien institution indicates that, whatever the cause, Christians are no longer members" (*The Theme of Persecution of Christians in the Gospel According to St. Matthew*, SNTSMS 6 [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967], 125). Donald A. Hagner represents a more recent defense of the *extra muros* stance: "Matthew reflects a new community with a new focus of a revolutionary kind that puts it in strong contrast with all other contemporary Jewish communities. An eschatological turning point has been reached and this requires a radical reorientation of previous perspectives" ("Matthew: Apostate, Reformer, Revolutionary?" *NTS* 49 [2003]: 193–209, at 208; see also idem, "Matthew: Christian Judaism or Jewish Christianity?" in *The Face of New Testament Studies: A Survey of Recent Research*, ed. S. McKnight and G. Osborne [Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004], 263–82). The last thirty years have witnessed a strong emergence of scholars who situate the Matthean community within the bounds of emerging rabbinic (or "formative") Judaism, suggesting that the Mattheans still viewed themselves as "Jewish." In his seminal study, J. Andrew Overman argues that conflict and competition with emerging rabbinic Judaism in the years following 70 CE had the most influential impact on the formation of Matthew's community (*Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism: The Social World of the Matthean Community* [Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1990]). So-called formative Judaism and "Matthean Judaism" were "fraternal twins... [that] developed and defined themselves in light of one another," the latter conceiving its identity not as "Christian," but as a Jewish sect and "true Israel" (ibid., 160, 5). Alan F. Segal understands the Matthean community to be also at odds with Pauline "antinomianism" ("Matthew's Jewish Voice," in *Social History of the Matthean Community*, ed. David L. Balch [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991], 3–37). L. Michael White suggests that the tension between the Matthean community and the Pharisees "was born of proximity rather than distance, of similarity rather than difference" ("Crisis Management and Boundary Maintenance: The Social Location of the Matthean Community," in Balch, *Social History*, 211–47, at 241). Graham Stanton compares the communities of Qumran and Matthew, arguing that both groups evince typical sectarian characteristic traits, such as vitriol toward the "parent body" of Pharisaism in the case of Matthew (*A Gospel for a New People*, 85–107). However, Stanton concludes that the evangelist's community had already parted company with Judaism. On the contrary, Anthony J. Saldarini argues that the Mattheans were a "reform group" within the Jewish community, which fundamentally understood Jesus as an authoritative interpreter of Torah, but which ultimately "lost the battle for Judaism" ("The Gospel of Matthew and Jewish-Christian Conflict," in Balch, *Social History*, 38–61; idem, *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994], 60). While the Gentile mission played a minimal role in Matthew's group, they were on a trajectory that would soon lead to it. David C. Sim views the Mattheans as anti-Gentile, situating the community within Judaism but outside the synagogue and at variance with Paul's "law-free" Gospel (*The Gospel of Matthew and Christian Judaism* [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998]). Boris Repschinski suggests that Matthew's community viewed itself as within Judaism, yet at odds with its leaders, advancing the position of Overman (*The Controversy Stories in the Gospel of Matthew: Their Redaction, Form and Relevance for the Relationship Between the Matthean Community and Formative Judaism*, FRLANT 189 [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000]). Runesson argues more specifically that the Mattheans belonged to a Pharisaic voluntary association, which had judicial power over the Mattheans, but that by the time of the Gospel's final redaction, a schism between Matthew's social group and the Pharisaic associations had occurred ("Early Jewish-Christian Relations," 95–132). For an incisive critique of the positions of Overman, Saldarini, Sim, and Repschinski, see Paul Foster, *Community, Law and Mission in Matthew's Gospel*, WUNT 2:177 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 22–79. For a more recent review of the intra-Jewish dynamics of the Matthean community, see Joshua Ezra Burns, *The Christian Schism in Jewish History and Jewish Memory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 136–45.

supplementing these with conditions set forth by other scholars.[6] Particularly

insightful for this investigation is Leroy Huizenga's suggestion, that "Hays's criteria

can help us listen for echoes not only to biblical texts but also to postbiblical

traditions of interpretation attached to those texts."[7] The criteria I adopt are (1)

whether the proposed source of the allusion was *available* to the author of the text and

its original readers,[8] (2) the *volume* of distinctive verbal, syntactical, conceptual,

formal, or structural correspondences between texts or traditions, especially if such

parallels exist in unusual combinations or as a unique cluster,[9] (3) the *recurrence* or

prominence of the evoked scriptural passage, figure, or tradition elsewhere in the

author and contemporary literature,[10] (4) the *thematic coherence* of the purported echo

in the author's argument or narrative,[11] (5) the *historical plausibility* that the author

---

6. Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 29–32; idem, *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 34–45.

7. Leroy A. Huizenga, *The New Isaac: Tradition and Intertextuality in the Gospel of Matthew*, NovTSup 131 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 63. So also Christopher A. Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul to the Corinthians*, BibInt 96 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 33.

8. Hays, *Echoes in Paul*, 29; idem, *Conversion*, 34. For Robert L. Brawley, the criteria of availability and volume are paramount (*Text to Text Pours Forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts* [Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1995], 13). For Beetham, the most important criteria are "availability," "word agreement or rare concept similarity," and "essential interpretive link" (*Echoes*, 28–34).

9. Hays, *Conversion*, 35–36; cf. idem, *Echoes in Paul*, 30. So also Douglas J. Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives* (Sheffield: Almond, 1983), 21–22; Allison, *New Moses*, 19–20, 23; Beetham, *Echoes*, 29. Michael B. Thompson adds that the greater the rarity of the shared words, syntactical patterns, or a combination of words "the higher the probability that there exists some kind of shared tradition" (*Clothed with Christ: The Example and Teaching of Jesus in Romans 12:1–15:13* [Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1991], 31). Brawley points out that "allusions may also replicate the form, genre, setting, and plot of their precursor" (*Text to Text*, 13).

10. Hays, *Echoes in Paul*, 30; idem, *Conversion*, 37–38. So also Moo, *Gospel Passion Narrative*, 20; Thompson, *Clothed with Christ*, 35; Beetham, *Echoes*, 33–34. Allison notes, "Probability will be enhanced if it can be shown (on other grounds) that a passage's proposed subtext belongs to a book or tradition which held some significance for its authors" and if a typology's "constituent elements have been used for typological construction in more than one writing" (*New Moses*, 21–22). According to Huizenga, the distinctiveness, prominence, or familiarity of the traditions associated with the evoked text or figure ought to be considered (*New Issac*, 63).

11. Hays, *Echoes in Paul*, 30; idem, *Conversion*, 38–41. So also Moo, *Gospel Passion*

intended the effect of the allusion's meaning and that the readers could comprehend this meaning,[12] (6) whether subsequent readers of the text in the *history of interpretation* have heard the allusion,[13] and (7) whether the proposed allusion results in reader *satisfaction*, in that the author's meaning as a whole is better illumined with, not without, the allusion for the contemporary reader.[14]

I appropriate these admittedly-imperfect criteria as guidelines for my interpretation implicitly throughout this study. In the Conclusion I consider my research in light of these criteria explicitly, since only after having seen the entire argument and all the data is one able judiciously to employ the criteria of volume, recurrence, thematic coherence, and satisfaction. One must keep in mind that these criteria "will often yield only greater or lesser degrees of probability about any

---

*Narratives*, 20; Beetham, *Echoes*, 34.

12. Hays, *Echoes in Paul*, 30; idem, *Conversion*, 38–41. Similarly, Moo, *Gospel Passion Narratives*, 20; Allison, *New Moses*, 22; Beetham, *Echoes*, 34. According to Huizenga, this criterion "recognizes the particular historical location in which the New Testament texts were produced and read, and thus necessitates the inclusion of traditions of interpretation attached to the biblical texts" (*New Isaac*, 64).

13. Hays, *Echoes in Paul*, 31; idem, *Conversion*, 43–44. So also Beetham, *New Isaac*, 32–33. Hays remarks that "this criterion should rarely be used as a negative test to exclude proposed echoes that commend themselves on other grounds" (*Echoes*, 31). According to G. K. Beale, "this is one of the least reliable criteria in recognizing allusions" (*Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* [Grand Rapids: BakerAcademic, 2012], 33).

14. Hays, *Conversion*, 44; cf. idem, *Echoes in Paul*, 31–32. Scholars have most severely criticized this criterion, since it purportedly "embraces the relativistic agenda of those literary theorists who first developed 'intertextuality,' tarnishing the other six criteria in the process" (David A. Shaw, "Converted Imaginations? The Reception of Richard Hays's Intertextual Method," *CurBR* 11 [2013]: 234–45, at 240). I do not take Hays's criterion of satisfaction as assuming a poststructuralist agenda. In fact, William Scott Green criticizes Hays for *not* adopting the radical deconstructionist presuppositions that gave rise to the modern discipline of intertextual analysis ("Doing the Text's Work for It: Richard Hays on Paul's Use of Scripture," in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, JSNTSup 83 [Sheffield: JSOT, 1993], 58–63, at 63). On the controversy concerning Hays's appropriation of the term "intertextuality," which arose out of a postmodern assumption about the absolute fluidity of textual meaning, see María Jesús Martínez Alfaro, "Intertextuality: Origins and Development of the Concept," *Atlantis* 18 (1996): 268–85; Thomas R. Hatina, "Intertextuality and Historical Criticism in New Testament Studies: Is there a Relationship?" *BibInt* 7 (1999): 28–43; David I. Yoon, "The Ideological Inception of Intertextuality and its Dissonance in Current Biblical Studies," *CurBR* 12 (2012): 58–76; Samuel Emadi, "Intertextuality in New Testament Scholarship: Significance, Criteria, and the Art of Intertextual Reading," *CurBR* (2015): 8–23.

particular reading."[15]

<div style="text-align:center">Procedure</div>

To say anything new about the purported Day of Atonement typology in Matthew's PN, it will be imperative first to review and evaluate what scholars have already said about the impact of Yom Kippur on the gospel PNs. It will also be important to survey and assess the current state of the question with regards to the concept of atonement in the First Gospel. This is what Chapter One accomplishes. Chapter Two will overview the biblical Yom Kippur ritual and the robust traditions developed around the Day of Atonement in Second Temple Judaism. It will additionally survey the christological Yom Kippur typologies in early Christianity, in order to situate historically Matthew's typology. In Chapters Three and Four, I conduct an in-depth exegesis of Matthew's Barabbas (Matt 27:15–26) and Roman-mockery (Matt 27:27–31) narratives, where the purported Day of Atonement typology is clearest and strongest. In Chapter Three, I examine whether Matthew constructs a set of Yom Kippur "cast members" in the Barabbas episode: Pilate as the high priest, Jesus as the goat for Yahweh, Barabbas as the goat for Azazel, the crowd as Azazel, and Jerusalem as a new wilderness. In Chapter Four, I consider whether the gospel writer also designates Jesus as the scapegoat in the Roman-abuse scene, exploring a possible high priest typology in this passage as well. Finally, I pursue whether Matthew sustains this alleged christological

---

15. Hays, *Conversion*, 34. So also Thompson, who relays a helpful taxonomy pertaining to the weighing of an echo on the scale of probability; an echo may be virtually certain, highly probable, probable, possible, doubtful, or incredible (*Clothed with Christ*, 36) (the scale is adapted from E. P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985], 321).

goat typology into his crucifixion, death, and burial narratives (Matt 27:32–66) in Chapter Five. I probe the possibility that the evangelist portrays Jesus as fulfilling the destiny of the goat for Yahweh, when Jesus releases his life-force (πνεῦμα) and the temple curtain is torn in two (Matt 27:50–51a), and the destiny of the goat for Azazel, when Jesus presumably descends into the underworld (Matt 27:51b–53).

CHAPTER ONE:

*STATUS QUAESTIONIS* ON YOM KIPPUR IN THE PASSION NARRATIVE

AND ATONEMENT IN THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

Scholars have long debated which scriptural texts and traditions exercised the greatest influence on Matthew's PN and most significantly shaped the evangelist's conception of Jesus's death.[1] But seldom have commentators considered the influence of Leviticus 16 and the Day of Atonement on the Gospel. This lacuna may come as a surprise, given the cultural prominence of Yom Kippur among Jews in the first century CE. Philo of Alexandria writes, "On the tenth day is the fast [Yom Kippur], which is carefully observed not only by the zealous for piety and holiness but also by those who never act religiously in the rest of their life. For all stand in awe, overcome by the sanctity of the day, and for the moment the worse vie with the better in self-denial and virtue."[2] A leading scholar on Yom Kippur traditions in antiquity, Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra remarks that "this [ancient] holiday, unlike other holidays, is celebrated by the greatest number of Jews, even by those that never show up in the

---

1. In his classic work, Martin Dibelius argued that scriptural citations functioned apologetically to furnish details to an already-existent PN (*From Tradition to Gospel*, trans. Bertram Lee Woolf [New York: Scribner, 1965 (1919)], 178–217). For recent discussion on this topic, see Mark Goodacre, who remarks, "The fact that the earliest Christians were immersed in the Old Testament simply means that history interacted with biblical reflection. The conviction that Jesus's crucifixion was 'according to the Scriptures' was both generated by and subsequently retold in terms of the Scriptures that the earliest Christians saw as fulfilled in their midst" ("Prophecy Historicized or Tradition Scripturalized? Reflections on the Origins of the Passion Narrative," in *The New Testament and the Church: Essays in Honour of John Muddiman*, ed. John Barton and Peter Groves, LNTS 532 [London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016], 37–51).

2. Philo, *Spec.* 1.186 (Colson). See also Philo, *Mos.* 2.18, 20, 23: "Throughout the world of Greek and barbarians, there is practically no state which honours the institutions of any other … It is not so with ours. They attract and win the attention of all, of barbarians, of Greeks, of dwellers on the mainland and islands, of nations of the east and the west, of Europe and Asia, of the whole inhabited world from end to end … Again, who does not every year shew awe and reverence for the fast, as it is called [τὴν λεγομένην νηστείαν], which is kept more strictly and solemnly than the 'holy month' of the Greeks?" (Colson). See also Josephus (*J.W.* 5.236), who refers to Yom Kippur as "the day on which it was the universal custom to keep fast to God" (Thackeray).

prayer assemblies during the rest of the year. In a sense, this reminds of modern Christmas."[3]

Many church fathers perceived a typological correspondence between the passion of Christ and the two goats of Leviticus 16: the "goat for Yahweh" (the immolated goat) and the "goat for Azazel" (the scapegoat). For example, christological goat typologies appear in the Epistle of Barnabas, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Hippolytus, Origen, Jerome, Cyril of Alexandria, and the earliest commentary on the Gospel of Mark.[4] Yet only recently has modern scholarship considered whether the Day of Atonement has impacted Matthew's understanding of Jesus's death.

The question of whether Matthew portrays Jesus as one or both the goats of Yom Kippur has no consensus in biblical scholarship. There are currently four views on the issue: (1) Jesus as the scapegoat of Leviticus 16, (2) Jesus as *pharmakos*-like scapegoat, (3) Barabbas as scapegoat and Jesus as immolated goat, and (4) alternative approaches to atonement with no reference to Yom Kippur. This last category includes the following: (A) Jesus as the Suffering Servant, (B) Jesus's death in light of Matthew's metaphors for sin, (C) Jesus's death as the new exodus and Paschal defeat of dark powers, (D) Jesus's death as a matter of innocent blood, and (E) other views on atonement in the Gospel. The aim of this chapter is to gauge how further analysis of the influence of Yom Kippur on Matthew's PN could advance our understanding of

---

3. Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, "Fasting with Jews, Thinking with Scapegoats: Some Remarks on Yom Kippur in Early Judaism and Christianity, in Particular, 4Q541, *Barnabas* 7, Matthew 27 and Acts 27," in *The Day of Atonement: Its Interpretation in Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*, ed. Thomas Hieke and Tobias Nicklas (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 165–88, at 167. See also Stökl Ben Ezra, *The Impact of Yom Kippur on Early Christianity: The Day of Atonement from Second Temple Judaism to the Fifth Century*, WUNT 163 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 13–141.

4. See Chapter Two.

the meaning of Jesus's death in the First Gospel.

## 1. Jesus as the Scapegoat of Leviticus 16

The scapegoat typology of Jesus as both goats of Yom Kippur is an ancient interpretation of Christ's passion.[5] Although the nuance of each Christian author's typology differs, the maltreatment and mockery of Jesus (Mark 15:16–20 parr.) is usually interpreted as corresponding to the abuses of the scapegoat. In recent years, John Dominic Crossan and Helmut Koester have posited the influence of Leviticus 16 and scapegoat traditions on the earliest Gospels and their sources.

### John Dominic Crossan

Crossan argues that the early passion tradition was the progenitor of the typological trajectory of Jesus as the two goats of Yom Kippur. In *The Cross that Spoke*, Crossan suggests that the Yom Kippur typology of Jesus as scapegoat was transmitted to all of the canonical PNs by means of the "Cross Gospel" and its underlying traditions.[6] His

---

5. Barn*. 7.3-11; Justin, *Dial*. 40.4-5; 111.1; Tert., *Marc*. 3.7.7-8; *Adv. Jud*. 14.9-10; Hipp., *Frag*. 75; Origen, *Hom. Lev*. 9.5.2. See Chapter Two.

6. John Dominic Crossan, *The Cross that Spoke: The Origins of the Passion Narrative* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988), 16–30, 114–59. Our sole textual witness to the "Gospel of Peter" is contained within a small parchment codex that was discovered in 1886–1887 CE at Akhmîm, Egypt (Hellenistic Panopolis). The codex has been designated P.Cair. 10759, and the portion that contains the "Gospel of Peter" is generally dated between the late 6th century and the beginning of the 9th century CE (Paul Foster, *The Gospel of Peter: Introduction, Critical Edition, and Commentary*, TENTS 4 [Leiden: Brill, 2010], 1–3). Discovery of a small fragment from Oxyrhynchus (P.Oxy. 2949), dated to the third (or possibly late-second) century CE and containing what may be a variant version of Gos. Pet. 2:3–5a, caused some scholars to date the "Gospel of Peter" to the second or third century CE (Foster, *Gospel of Peter*, 58–68). Crossan assumes that the "Cross Gospel" predates the Gospel of Mark, basing his supposition chiefly on his historical reconstruction of the PN, although he thinks the evidence of P.Oxy. 2949 already points in the direction of a very early date (*Cross that Spoke*, 6–9). This "Cross Gospel" was supposedly composed of the following three units: crucifixion and deposition

theory should be examined in view of his hypothesis regarding the development of the PN.

Crossan argues that the passion tradition evolved through three primary stages: (P1) the historical passion, (P2) the prophetic passion, and (P3) the narrative passion.[7] During P1, Jesus was crucified, but his earliest followers knew none of the details of his execution.[8] In P2, Jesus's disciples interpreted the meaning of his death in light of the Old Testament, but they did so without reference to the particular details of the passion events. During P3, Jesus's followers organized this complex array of scriptural proof-texts into a coherent and sequential narrative, refining and augmenting the story with verisimilar historical detail.

According to Crossan, certain texts became crucial in the interpretation of Jesus's death during P2. He seems to divide this stage into two parts: what I shall call "P2A" and "P2B." In P2A, Christians principally utilized the Old Testament prophets to interpret Jesus's death. This stage is detected in the tradition of Barn. 7.8–9, which, according to Crossan, interprets Christ's passion in light of (1) Isa 50:6, which predicts that the Servant will be "spat" upon, (2) Zech 12:10, which prophesies that the inhabitants of Jerusalem will "pierce" and "look upon" a certain (messianic) figure, and (3) Zech 3:1–5, which describes the "robing" and "crowning" of Joshua

---

(Gos. Pet. 1:1–2; 2:5b–6:22), tomb and guards (7:25; 8:28–9:34), and resurrection and confession (9:35–10:42; 11:45–49) (Crossan, *Cross that Spoke*, 16).

7. Crossan, *Cross that Spoke*, 156–57; idem, *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991), 375–76. Crossan argued earlier that the Gospel of Peter contains traditions that predate the canonical gospels (*Four Other Gospels: Shadows on the Contours of the Canon* [Minneapolis: Winston, 1985], 125–81). The four stages that lead to the "Cross Gospel's" composition in Crossan's taxonomy are equivalent to (1) P1, (2) P2A, (3) P2B, and (4) P3A and P3B in the taxonomy I have adopted (*Cross that Spoke*, 142, 157; cf. Crossan, *Historical Jesus*, 375–76).

8. According to Crossan, during this stage all that the disciples could assume about the death of Jesus was that torture and scourging accompanied his crucifixion (*Cross that Spoke*, 117).

the high priest.[9]

During P2B, Christian tradents interpreted this complex of Old Testament prophetic texts through the lens of a Day of Atonement typology, as perceived in the final form of Barn. 7.3–11:

> Pay attention to what he commands: "Take two fine goats who are alike and offer them as a sacrifice; and let the priest take one of them as a whole burnt offering for sins." But what will they do with the other? "The other," he says, "is cursed." Pay attention to how the type of Jesus is revealed. "And all of you shall spit on it and pierce it and wrap a piece of scarlet wool around its head, and so let it be cast into the wilderness."[10]

According to Crossan, the spitting of Isa 50:6,[11] the piercing of Zech 12:10,[12] and the robing and crowning of Zech 3:1–5 are here reinterpreted in light of a christological goat typology.[13] The convergence of Isa 50:6 and Zech 12:10 with the tradition of the

---

9. Ibid., 120–39.

10. Barn. 7.6–8 (Ehrman).

11. Isa 50:6 uses ἔμπτυσμα with regards to the Servant (Joseph Ziegler, ed., *Isaias*, 3rd ed., Septuaginta, VTG 14 [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983], 311). Barn. 7.8–9 uses ἐμπτύω with regards to the scapegoat (Ehrman).

12. Zech 12:10: "And they shall look to me [ἐπιβλέψονται πρός με] because they have mocked me [κατωρχήσαντο]" (Joseph Ziegler, ed., *Duodecim prophetae*, 2nd ed., Septuaginta, VTG 13 [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967], 319). Barn. 7.8–9: "And all of you… shall [κατακεντήσατε] pierce it... Since they will see him [ὄψονται αὐτὸν]… And they will say: Is this not the one whom we once crucified… piercing [κατακεντήσαντες] him?" (Ehrman). Crossan posits that in Zech 12:10 the Septuagint seems to have misread the Hebrew דקר ("to pierce") for the verb רקד ("to dance," as in, "to insult") and thus translated the verb as κατορχέομαι ("to mock"), whereas other Greek translations have the verb ἐκκεντέω ("to pierce"); for example, Aquila (ἐξεκέντησαν), Symmachus (ἐπεξεκέντησαν), and Theodotian (ἐξεκέντησαν), in addition to John 19:37 (ἐξεκέντησαν) and Rev 1:7 (ἐξεκέντησαν), which both make reference to Zech 12:10 (Ziegler, *Duodecim prophetae*, 319). According to Crossan, this was the translation with which Barnabas was familiar (*Cross that Spoke*, 125–27).

13. Joshua is crowned and clothed in a ποδήρης in Zech 3:4–5 (Ziegler, *Duodecim prophetae*, 296). The scapegoat is said to be crowned, and Jesus is described as wearing a ποδήρης in Barn. 7.8–9 (Ehrman). See Crossan, *Cross that Spoke*, 120–39.

scapegoat being spat upon and pierced rendered a typology of Jesus as the abused scapegoat (Barn. 7.8a). The convergence of Zech 3:3–5 with the tradition about the scarlet ribbon tied around the scapegoat's head rendered a typology of Jesus as the crowned and cursed scapegoat (Barn. 7.8b–9a), gloriously robed at the *parousia* (Barn. 7.9b–10).

The passion tradition evolved further when the "Cross Gospel," the purported source of the Gospel of Peter, introduced the motif of the mocked king into this commixture of prophetic texts and the christological goat typology.[14] I shall refer to this stage as "P3A." Thus, in Gos. Pet. 3.6–9, the elements of a mock judgment (3.7) and royal acclaim (3.9b) are included.[15] Jesus's scarlet robe, in its likeness to the scapegoat's scarlet headband (Barn. 7.8-9), becomes a royal *purple* robe (Gos. Pet. 3.7), and the scapegoat's crown *on* thorns (Barn. 7.8b-11a) becomes Jesus's crown *of* thorns (Gos. Pet. 3.8).

During the final stage of the development of the PN (what I shall call "P3B") the goat typology is no longer explicit, although remnants of it remain in the accounts of Jesus's abuse during the Jewish Trial (Mark 14:65; Matt 26:67–68; Luke 22:63–65), his mockery and maltreatment by the Roman soldiers (Mark 15:16b–20a; Matt 27:26b–31), and the structure of the Synoptic PNs in general.[16] The motifs of striking, scourging, and spitting that originally derived from Isa 50:6 and then were interpreted

---

14. Ibid., 139–44.

15. Gos. Pet. 3.6–9: "'⁶So those taking the Lord were pushing him while running along, and they were saying, 'Let us drag the son of God having authority over him.' ⁷And they were clothing him in purple and they sat him on the seat of judgment saying, 'Judge justly King of Israel.' ⁸And one of them brought a thorn crown and placed it on the head of the Lord. ⁹And others who stood by were spitting in his face, and others struck his cheeks, others were piercing him with a reed and some were scourging him saying, 'With this honour let us honour the son of God'" (Foster, *Gospel of Peter*, 199). The scouring, striking, and spitting of Isa 50:6 are incorporated here, as is the piercing of Zech 12:10.

16. Crossan, *Cross that Spoke*, 145–56.

through the scapegoat typology are present in Mark 14:65; 15:15, 19; Matt 26:67–68;

27:26, 30. The motifs of crowning and robing, initially taken from Zech 3:3–5 and

recast in light of the scapegoat typology, are present in Mark 15:17, Matt 27:28–29,

and Luke 23:11. The element of the reed (cf. Gos. Pet. 3.9; Sib. Or. 8.296), which

Crossan conjectures was used to goad the scapegoat into the desert, was retained in

Mark 15:19 and Matt 27:30.[17]

## Helmut Koester

In *Ancient Christian Gospels*, Koester elaborates upon Crossan's thesis.[18] He affirms

that the canonical Gospels presuppose the prior historical development of (A) passion

prophecy, (B) the integration of the Yom Kippur typology, and (C) the incorporation

of the "royal mocking" motif.[19] The Jewish tradition of spitting upon the scapegoat

(Barn. 7.8) established a bridge to Isa 50:6 in the pre-canonical stage of the PN, and

the alleged Jewish tradition of piercing (κατακεντέω) the scapegoat (Barn. 7.8)

created a link to Zech 12:10.[20] Here, one sees the transition from Crossan's P2A to

P2B.

Once the scapegoat typology was firmly established, Koester suggests that the

passion tradition evolved to integrate the theme of royal mockery by means of the

---

17. Ibid., 157–59.

18. Helmut Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* (London: SCM, 1990), 220–30. Prior to Crossan, Koester had argued that the Gospel of Peter contains a PN that is earlier than and independent from the canonical gospels ("Apocryphal and Canonical Gospels," *HTR* 73 [1980]: 105–30, at 126–30).

19. Koester, *Gospels*, 224–25.

20. Ibid., 224–25.

following motifs: (A) tying a piece of scarlet wool around the scapegoat's head (Barn. 7.8); (B) placing the scarlet band among thorns (Barn. 7.11); and (C) (possibly) piercing the scapegoat (Barn. 7.8).[21] Christian tradents blended these motifs with the theme of royal mocking, and they became: (A´) the purple/scarlet robe placed upon Jesus (Mark 15:17; Matt 27:28); (B´) the crown woven from thorns (Mark 15:17; Matt 27:29); and (C´) the reed placed in Jesus's right hand as a mock scepter (Mt. 27:29; cf. Mark 15:19). The Synoptic Gospels finally incorporated this combined tradition into their PNs.[22]

Lastly, Koester suggests that Matthew utilized an older christological goat typology independently from Mark.[23] Thus, Matt 27:28 changes the purple (πορφύρα) garment of Mark 15:17 to a scarlet (κόκκινος) garment to correspond to the scapegoat's scarlet attire, conforming to the tradition contained in Barn. 7.8. Similarly, Matt 27:34 and 27:48 preserve the elements of vinegar (ὄξος) *and* gall (χολή) that were used in the older typology of Jesus as immolated goat retained in Barn. 7.4–5. This passage in Barnabas draws a correspondence between (A) a Jewish custom in which the priests are to eat the intestines of the immolated goat unwashed with vinegar, and (A´) the sacrificial death of Jesus, who refused to drink the gall mixed with vinegar offered to him at his crucifixion, and the consumption of his body in the Eucharist. While Mark 15:36 and Luke 23:36 only transmit the tradition concerning vinegar (ὄξος), Matt 27:34 includes the tradition involving gall (χολή; cf. Mark 15:23) to conform to an earlier tradition that allegedly interpreted Ps 69:21 (Ps

---

21. Ibid.

22. Ibid., 225.

23. Ibid.

68:22 LXX) in light of the immolated goat typology (see Barn. 7.5; Gos. Pet. 5.16).[24]

Evaluation

Scholars have on the whole rejected Crossan's thesis, that the Gospel of Peter contains an earlier textual stratum reflecting a primitive passion tradition upon which the canonical Gospels were dependent.[25] While this negative evaluation weakens Crossan's particular argument that the christological goat typology played a crucial role in the early development of the PN, they do not discredit *per se* the claim that the Synoptic Gospels utilized such a typological schema or drew upon earlier Yom Kippur traditions.

Certain criticisms of Crossan's thesis should be revisited in light of more

---

24. Ibid., 225–27.

25. One of Crossan's chief critics was Raymond E. Brown, who made the following critiques ("The Gospel of Peter and Canonical Gospel Priority," *NTS* [1987]: 321–43; idem, *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave*, 2 vols. [New York: Doubleday, 1994], 2:1317–49, esp. 2:1332–36). First, none of the canonical Gospels follow the wording of the Gospel of Peter for more than three words. If all the biblical Gospels utilized the "Cross Gospel" as a source, then why do Matthew and Luke not reproduce the wording of the "Cross Gospel" nearly to the extent that they reproduce their Markan source? (so also C. Clifton Black, review of *Cross that Spoke*, by Crossan, *JR* 69 [1989]: 398–99; Reginald H. Fuller, review of idem, *Int* 45 [1991]: 71–72). Second, when the canonical Gospels do purportedly reproduce the "Cross Gospel," they seem arbitrarily to leave out significant details from the "Cross Gospel," even when those details are in the same lines from which the evangelists copied. For example, if Mark purportedly derives κεντυρίων (15:39, 44–45) from Gos. Pet. 8.31–32, then why does he not include the name Petronius (8.31)? Similarly, why would Matthew (27:66) omit the detail that the sepulcher was sealed with seven seals (Gos. Pet. 8.33) (so also Walter Wink, review of *Cross that Spoke*, *ChrCent* 105 [1988]: 1159–60). Third, it is difficult to imagine why Matthew, Luke, and John never agree against Mark when all three allegedly borrowed material from the same "Cross Gospel." In contrast, when Matthew and Luke appropriate material from Q, most of what they produce is in agreement. How could their use of the "Cross Gospel" differ so drastically (so also Frank J. Matera, review of *Cross that Spoke*, *Worsh* 63 [1989]: 269–70)? D. R. Wright offers several other substantial criticisms ("*Four Other Gospels*: Review Article," *Them* 12 [1987]: 56–60). See also F. Neirynck, "The Apocryphal Gospels and the Gospel of Mark," in *The New Testament in Early Christianity: La réception des écrits néotestamentaires dans le christianisme primitif*, ed. J.-M. Sevrin, BETL 86 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989), 123–75, esp. 140–57; John P. Meier, review of *Cross that Spoke*, *Hor* 16 (1989): 378–79; Erik M. Heen, review of idem, *HDB* 20 (1990): 16; Joel B. Green, review of idem, *JBL* 109 (1990): 356–58.

recent scholarly research. For instance, Green critiques Crossan on the basis that the earliest known goat typology dates to the last half of the second century CE and that an evolution toward a greater developed passion prophecy is more probable than the trajectory Crossan proposes.[26] Green's criticisms were well founded nearly thirty years ago, and I would agree that Crossan's complex tradition history does not hold the most explanatory power for the material. Yet Crossan's use of later sources is not wholly unjustified, in light of the following. First, there is some (albeit sparse) evidence for an early scapegoat typology in the writings of Paul, especially Gal. 3:13.[27] Second, the Epistle of Barnabas is dated between 70–135 CE, and scholars agree that Barnabas made use of an earlier christological goat typology, which situates the traditions of Barnabas near the time of the composition of the Gospels.[28] Third, since the primary basis for Barnabas's typology is not Leviticus 16 but earlier Jewish traditions that he quotes at some length, the possibility that the Gospel writers were acquainted with these traditions should not be excluded, as some of them date to the Second Temple period.[29] So while it is true that Crossan occasionally makes questionable use of later material in reconstructing earlier strata of tradition, this should not prevent scholars from responsibly utilizing these same materials.

Some of Crossan's critics find his analysis of Old Testament typologies in the PNs compelling,[30] and some affirm his suggestion that Mark 15:16–20 blends the

---

26. Green, review of *Cross that Spoke*, 358. See Green's critique of Koester's theory concerning the early and independent nature of the Gospel of Peter's PN ("The Gospel of Peter: Source for a Pre-canonical Passion Narrative?" *ZNW* 78 [1987]: 293–301).

27. Most of the literature on this topic was published after Green's review. See Chapter Two.

28. See Chapter Two.

29. See Chapter Two.

30. Fuller, review of *Cross that Spoke*, 72; George W. E. Nickelsburg, review of idem, 160.

mocked king motif with the typology of the abused scapegoat.[31] Additionally, some scholars have endorsed Koester's proposal that Matthew changes Jesus's purple garment (Mark 15:17) to a scarlet robe (Matt 27:28) in order to allude to the scarlet ribbon wrapped around the scapegoat.[32]

The poor reception of Crossan's PN thesis seems to have dissuaded scholars from exploring the possibility of a christological goat typology in the NT Gospels. Yet Crossan and Koester raise several questions awaiting further analysis. First, were the evangelists and/or their sources aware of extra-biblical Yom Kippur traditions, and did these traditions have an impact on the Synoptic PNs? Scholars have focused on the Gospel writers' use of Old Testament *texts* but have studied far less their use of Second Temple *traditions*. Second, did the evangelists employ the goat typology as an organizing principle or interpretive lens for their appropriation of other scriptural allusions? And third, did the gospel writers perceive a connection between the Jewish scapegoat ritual and parallel Greco-Roman rites, conflating these traditions or privileging one over the other?

## 2. Jesus as *Pharmakos*-Scapegoat

Crossan and Koester posit a direct influence of Yom Kippur traditions on the early

---

31. Koester, *Gospels*, 224; Richard E. DeMaris, "Jesus Jettisoned," in *The New Testament in its Ritual World* (London: Routledge, 2008), 91–111, at 96–97; Jennifer K. Berenson Maclean, "Barabbas, the Scapegoat Ritual, and the Development of the Passion Narrative," *HTR* 100 (2007): 309–34, at 332–33.

32. Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 170–71; idem, "Fasting with Jews," 183; Andrei A. Orlov, *The Atoning Dyad: The Two Goats of Yom Kippur in the Apocalypse of Abraham*, Studia Judaeoslavica (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 63–64; Christian A. Eberhart, "To Atone or Not to Atone: Remarks on the Day of Atonement Rituals According to Leviticus 16 and the Meaning of Atonement," in *Sacrifice, Cult, and Atonement in Early Judaism and Christianity*, ed. Henrietta L. Wiley and Christian A. Eberhart (Atlanta: SBL, 2017), 197–231, at 230–31.

stages of the PN, resulting in the absorption of this typology into the the Synoptic Gospels. Taking a different approach, Adela Yarbro Collins and Richard DeMaris argue that the Markan PN portrays Jesus as a Greek *pharmakos* or designee of a curative exit rite, especially in the Roman-abuse scene (Mark 15:16–20; Matt 27:27–31). Though Yarbro Collins and DeMaris are principally concerned with the Gospel of Mark, their thesis is nearly equally applicable to Matthew and forms the backbone of my argument in Chapter Four, so I include it here.

## Adela Yarbro Collins

In her article, "Finding Meaning in the Death of Jesus," Yarbro Collins argues that the author of Mark drew upon motifs from ancient Mediterranean "scapegoat" rituals to interpret Jesus's humiliating death.[33] According to Yarbro Collins, a striking parallel to the abuse scene is the Greek *pharmakos*, an ancient ritual practiced in Ionia and Athens during a festival to Apollo called the Thargelia, wherein two individuals at the margins of society functioned as a means of purification for their community through the ritual action of being treated as kings, led in procession while being physically abused, and exiled from the city.[34]

---

33. Adela Yarbro Collins, "Finding Meaning in the Death of Jesus," *JR* 78 (1998): 175–96. Yarbro Collins also argues that the biographical story-arch of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark has been significantly shaped by the Greek leitmotif of the tragic life of the poet, who is divinely inspired at the beginning of his life to produce great works of art and later rejected among his or her community— sometimes even murdered—but who is eventually vindicated by his or her patron deity ("Finding Meaning," 187–93).

34. Yarbro Collins relies chiefly upon the work of Jan N. Bremmer ("Scapegoat Rituals in Ancient Greece," *HSCP* 87 [1983]: 299–320) and Dennis D. Hughes ("The Pharmakos and Related Rites," in *Human Sacrifice in Ancient Greece*, Dennis D. Hughes, repr. [London: Routledge, 2010], 97–114). Bremmer's article has been reprinted and updated with an addenda in "Scapegoat Rituals in Ancient Greece," in *Oxford Readings in Greek Religion*, ed. Richard Buxton (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 271–93.

Following Bremmer, Yarbro Collins studies the details of both the historical *pharmakos* ritual and its Greek mythic-literary configuration, finding traces of these currents in Mark 15:16–20.[35] As the *pharmakos* was often an individual of low societal status, so the evangelist portrays Jesus as a criminal worthy of execution (15:15).[36] As the *pharmakos* was treated as a high member of society before his expulsion, and the Greek myths describe the voluntary death of a *king* as averting disaster, so the soldiers transform Jesus into a king with royal attire (15:17–19).[37] As the *pharmakos* was sometimes punished with wild plants,[38] so Jesus was adorned with a thorny crown and beaten with a reed (15:17, 19).[39] According to the Greek ritual logic, the death of a valued member of society can propitiate a deity.[40] Thus, "the scene in which the soldiers mock Jesus seems to be a literary reconfiguration of the ritual in which the *pharmakos* takes on himself all the impurity, disease, and sin of the community."[41]

Yarbro Collins also suggests that Jesus's death "for many" (ὑπὲρ πολλῶν, Mark 14:24) derives, in part, from the concept of the scapegoat bearing the sin of the people, although this notion is transmitted to Mark by means of Isa 53:12.[42]

---

35. Bremmer, "Scapegoat Rituals," 275–85; Yarbro Collins, "Finding Meaning," 186–87.

36. Bremmer, "Scapegoat Rituals," 275; Yarbro Collins, "Finding Meaning," 186.

37. Bremmer, "Scapegoat Rituals," 274, 277; Yarbro Collins, "Finding Meaning," 186.

38. E.g., see fragments 5–10 of Hipponax in Tzetzes's *Chiliads*. Frag. 6 reads: "…winter striking and flogging him with fig branches and squills as though a scapegoat [φαρμακόν]" (Gerber). See further in Chapter Four.

39. Bremmer, "Scapegoat Rituals," 280–85; Yarbro Collins, "Finding Meaning," 186–87.

40. As Bremmer explains, since in reality a king was likely not willing to die for his people, a low member of society was chosen and then exalted to a high position as a symbolic substitute ("Scapegoat Rituals," 278). In the mythical tales, this stage could be eliminated, and thus one finds handsome or valuable people willing to die for their community in such stories.

41. Yarbro Collins, "Finding Meaning," 196.

42. Ibid., 176–78.

According to Yarbro Collins, Isa 53:12 lies behind Jesus's saying over the cup (Mark 14:24) and contains an allusion to the sin-bearing scapegoat of Leviticus 16. She understands the clause, "he poured out his soul to death" (Isa 53:12a) as evoking the sacrificial imagery of Leviticus,[43] and the clause, "he bore [נשא] the sin of many" (53:12b), as alluding to the scapegoat of Lev 16:22: "the go-away goat shall bear [נשא] on itself all their iniquities."[44] Thus, the Isaianic poem provides "two related but distinct images for the suffering of the servant: he is the sacrificial offering for sin, and he is the scapegoat. The tradition preserved in Mark 14:24 combines the two images."[45]

## Richard E. DeMaris

In *The New Testament in the Ritual World*, DeMaris argues that Mark narrates Jesus's passion as a "curative exit rite" patterned after two types of ancient rituals: the Greek *pharmakos* and the Roman *devotio*.[46]

---

43. Yarbro Collins remarks, "The conclusion that the phrase 'he poured out his life to death' in Isa 53:12 is sacrificial is supported by a clear allusion to sacrifice in verse 10. Here the Servant is called אשם ('a guilt-offering' or 'a trespass-offering'). This term is the name for a type of sacrifice discussed in Leviticus 5–6. The type of sacrifice spoken of in Leviticus 4, where the phrase 'to pour out blood' is used, is called a חטאת ('a sin-offering'), but Lev. 5:6 shows that the two terms are synonymous" (ibid., 177).

44. Yarbro Collins may suggests an allusion to Lev 16:21–22 in Isa 53:6 and possibly 53:11 (ibid., 177 n. 8).

45. Ibid., 177–78.

46. DeMaris, "Jesus Jettisoned," 91–111. DeMaris builds upon ritual theorists such as Ronald L. Grimes and Jonathan Z. Smith, assuming the primacy of ritual over phenomena such as text, belief, and experience, and eschewing an interpretive framework that seeks to discern any type of referential value or symbolic meaning behind ritual (*Ritual World*, 1–9). Agreeing with Frank H. Gorman in his programmatic essay, "Ritual Studies and Biblical Studies: Assessment of the Past, Prospects for the Future" (*Semeia* 67 [1994]: 13–36), DeMaris nevertheless recognizes the interplay between ritual and narrative. According to Gorman, "Ritual structures and ritual process may serve as a basis for story and narrative. Ritual may serve as the background for narrative construction and development. Indeed, ritual may generate narrative and story in such a way that ritual dynamics will be reflected within

According to DeMaris, the ancient world understood *pharmakos* and *devotio* both as "curative exit rites."[47] These rites display the pattern of (A) a group crisis, (B) a ritual response, and (C) a positive result. The *pharmakos* ritual manifests this pattern in (A) an internal threat to the community, (B) the localizing and driving out of a pollution through a designee who undergoes status transformation, and (C) resultant purification or expulsion of the threat. The *devotio* ritual manifests this pattern in (A) an external threat to the community, (B) the marshalling of supernatural power and the devotion of a designee to destruction, and (C) resultant safety or appeasement of the external threat.[48]

DeMaris suggests that the Levitical scapegoat ritual possesses a *pharmakos* component: the community was threatened by the yearly accumulation of sins, and the high priest ritually transferred these sins unto the designee (the scapegoat) that was banished into the wilderness, thereby removing the community's internal threat.[49] The scapegoat ritual also possesses a *devotio* component in one strand of the tradition, where the scapegoat placates an external threat: the desert demon "Azazel" (Lev 16:8,

---

narrative" ("Ritual Studies," 23).

47. DeMaris, "Jesus Jettisoned," 97–107. According to DeMaris, the ancient world understood the *pharmakos* and *devotio* rites as similar and sometimes even interchangeable concepts (ibid., 107). While he is aware of the historical origins of both traditions, DeMaris uses the terms *pharmakos* and *devotio* in a somewhat fluid manner, as broader categories that can be applied to other ancient rituals, such as the Jewish scapegoat rite, which was referred to neither as *pharmakos* nor *devotio* in antiquity.

48. Ibid., 98. For example, an account of the *pharmakos* ritual performed in Abdera of northern Greece relays that the city purchased a slave, who was sumptuously feasted, led outside the city and paraded around, and then pelted with stones until driven from the city's boundaries (Callimachus, *Aetia* 90). A clear example of *devotio* is the legendary account of a member of the famous Decii family who sacrificed (i.e., "devoted") himself in battle to propitiate the anger of the gods and save the Roman people (Livy, *History of Rome*, 8.9). In Greek literature, what Yarbro Collins refers to as the mythic configuration of the *pharmakos*, DeMaris classifies as a literary form of *devotio*. One example is the story of how the last Athenian king, Codrus, supposedly clothed himself as a beggar, went outside of the besieged city, and delivered his life into the hands of his enemies to save Athens from defeat (Lycurgus, *Against Leocrates*, 83–87). See further examples of the *pharmakos* and *devotio* in Chapter Four.

49. DeMaris, "Jesus Jettisoned," 99–100.

10, 26) later associated with the fallen angel "Asael" (e.g., 1 En. 8–10; Apoc. Ab. 13–14).[50] According to DeMaris, while the Jewish scapegoat ritual contains elements of both *pharmakos* and *devotio*, and while the rite may implicitly lie underneath the structure of Mark's PN, the evangelist did not directly borrow from Leviticus 16 but constructed his narrative to conform to the broader template of curative exit rites.[51]

For DeMaris, Mark portrays Jesus as becoming both a *pharmakos* and a *devotio* in the Gospel narrative, as the concept of "curative exit rite" would have provided a fitting solution to the problem of how Jesus's dishonorable death could be conceived as "good news."[52] Jesus becomes a *pharmakos* by undergoing a drastic status transformation and expulsion, thereby restoring order and wholeness to the demon-possessed land ruled by the corrupt temple establishment. Beginning with his triumphal entry and acclamation as Davidic King of Israel (Mark 11:1–10), Jesus is hailed as an authoritative prophet in the capital city of his people (11:15–19; 13:1–37), garnering such esteem from the crowds that his antagonists cannot speak a word against him (11:18; 12:12). On one occasion, even his opponents come to accept his teaching (12:32–34). After his apotheosis, however, Jesus suffers great status degradation during his passion by means of the humiliating expulsion rites that the Jewish (14:53–65) and Roman (15:1–15, 16–20) authorities perform upon him. Jesus therefore becomes a *pharmakos*.[53]

DeMaris's main contribution is his argument that Jesus's death *also* functions

---

50. Ibid., 100. On Azazel traditions, see Chapter Two.

51. Ibid., 97.

52. Ibid., 94–95, 107–10.

53. Ibid.,107–8.

as an act of *devotio*.[54] As early Christians encountered increasing conflict with Jews who rejected their claims, they began to view Jewish resistance to the Gospel message as an external threat facing the fledgling Christian community. Members of the Jesus movement interpreted the life of Jesus as a ritual response to this perceived threat: Jesus, through his suffering, diverts danger from his followers and channels it toward the Jewish temple establishment. Mark's Gospel utilizes anti-temple rhetoric and themes throughout the narrative (e.g., chs. 7, 11, 13, and 15:38) to portray Jesus's voluntary death as a *devotio* that protected the Christian community against the perceived threat of the opposing Jewish majority.

## Evaluation

Yarbro Collins's interpretation of Jesus's maltreatment as an ancient *pharmakos* sharpens Crossan and Koester's suggestion that Mark 15:16–20 and Matt 27:27–31 draw upon the "mocked king" motif. Whereas Crossan and Koester provide only one proof text for their claim (i.e., Philo, *Flacc.* 36–40),[55] Yarbro Collins appeals to a wider cultural trope. Unlike in the Karabas episode, the *pharmakos* was ritually maltreated in addition to being mocked as a king. Thus, the *pharmakos* may be a more comprehensive background for the Roman mockery episode.

What is perplexing about Yarbro Collins's analysis is that, while she conceives the scapegoat ritual of Leviticus 16 as a substitution rite analogous to the Greek *pharmakos*, she does not comment on the Levitical ritual as potential background to

---

54. Ibid., 109–10.

55. Crossan, *Cross that Spoke*, 139–40; Koester, *Gospels*, 225.

the Roman-abuse scene.[56] This would not be puzzling if Yarbro Collins had not argued that the saying over the cup retains cultic imagery pertaining to the scapegoat, namely, bearing the sins of many. It is interesting that in her 1998 article, Yarbro Collins makes no reference to Koester's work on the PN. Again, this may be due to the association between his reading and Crossan's failed gospel hypothesis. In a more recent article, Yarbro Collins affirms the cultic background to the cup-saying in Mark, although she does not pursue further analysis of Yom Kippur's influence in the Jesus tradition: "The death of Jesus is interpreted, on the one hand, as a sacrifice that renews the covenant established on Mount Sinai. On the other, it is a sin offering, a metaphorical sacrifice that expiates the sin of man."[57] Granted these cultic metaphors, the question arises whether the evangelists have chosen to incorporate these themes in their PNs. It would be a remarkable (yet possible) situation if the cultic metaphors of Mark 14:24 // Matt 26:28—one of the rare passages in both Gospels that attributes explicit meaning to Jesus's death—were abandoned in the PNs in favor of Hellenistic tropes.

The strength and weakness of DeMaris's approach is his grouping the *pharmakos*, *devotio*, and scapegoat rituals into the larger category of "curative exit rite." Classifying these phenomena together allows DeMaris to identify their common ritual logic. This grants him the ability to discern parallels in the Gospel with a variety of ancient rituals. He adduces a wide range of support from the ancient world to anchor his interpretation. Scholars have been generally favorable toward his reading

---

56. Yarbro Collins, "Finding Meaning," 182.

57. Adela Yarbro Collins, "Mark's Interpretation of the Death of Jesus," *JBL* 128 (2009): 545–54, at 550.

of Mark's PN as curative exit rite.[58]

Yet DeMaris's sweeping approach does not lend itself to identifying more precise parallels between the gospel accounts and ancient exit rites. Is one able to discern which particular rites are echoed in the PN and which ones are not? As DeMaris deftly recognizes, each ritual possesses different associations: a militarist connotation in forms of *devotio* and a demonic connotation in the scapegoat tradition, for example.[59] These factors should be taken into account. DeMaris cursorily mentions Crossan's work on the PN and does not engage Yarbro Collins's (1998) article or Stökl Ben Ezra's (2003) book.[60] Yet these studies would enhance his argument. DeMaris's aversion to finding theological meaning in rituals seems to deter him from considering whether Yom Kippur has had a more pointed impact on the PN.[61] Finally, neither Yarbro Collins nor DeMaris incorporate substantial discussion of christological exegesis in their analyses of Jesus's death in the PN.[62] How do these exit-rite motifs intersect with the evangelists' theological appropriation of Scripture?

---

58. DeMaris's book has received positive reviews on the whole. Critics mainly aver that DeMaris (1) overemphasizes ritual aspects of a text at the expense of other elements (Tomas Bokedal, review of *Ritual World*, by DeMaris, *BibInt* 19 [2011]: 511–16, 515), (2) proffers thin interpretations of certain texts (Paul F. Bradshaw, review of *Ritual World*, *BTB* 39 [2009]: 167–68; Ithamar Gruenwald, review of idem, *CBQ* 71 [2009]: 399–401), or (3) omits discussion of certain prominent NT rituals (Nicholas H. Taylor, review of idem, *JSNT* 31 [2009]: 21–22; John S. Kloppenborg, review of idem, *SR* 39 [2010]: 306–7). See also Teresa L. Reeve, review of idem, *AUSS* 48 (2010): 126–28; Louise J. Lawrence, review of idem, *Theo* 113 (2010): 58–59.

59. DeMaris, "Jesus Jettisoned," 100–103.

60. DeMaris mentions Crossan's shorter summary in *Historical Jesus* but does not interact with *Cross that Spoke* ("Jesus Jettisoned," 97).

61. DeMaris, *Ritual World*, 8, 95–96. Gruenwald similarly states: "Here, general discussions of a theoretical nature, which seek to establish overarching kinds of meaning, take the place of in-depth analysis of individual rituals in their practiced modes" (review of *Ritual World*, 400).

62. Though the theme of scriptural fulfillment is more prominent in Matthew, recent studies demonstrate its importance in Mark (see Mark 1:2–3; 4:12; 7:6–7; 11:9–10, 17; 12:10–11, 36; 13:26; 14:27, 62; 15:34). See Joel Marcus, *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox), 1–11; Rikki E. Watts, *Isaiah's New Exodus and Mark*, WUNT 2:88 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck), 47–52; Hays, *Scripture in the Gospels*, 15–104.

### 3. Jesus and Barabbas, the Two Goats of Leviticus 16

Albert Wratislaw, Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, and Jennifer Maclean have argued that Matthew and Mark portray a typological correspondence between Jesus and Barabbas and the two goats of Yom Kippur in the Barabbas episode of Mark 15:6–15 and Matt 27:15–26. This interpretation dates to Origen of Alexandria, Jerome, and the earliest commentary on Mark.[63] A number of scholars have adopted this ancient interpretation in recent years.[64]

Albert Wratislaw

In his 1863 *Notes and Dissertations*, Wratislaw relayed six points of correspondence between Leviticus 16 and the Barabbas account. He writes:

(1) The two prisoners before Pilate correspond to the two goats in number.

(2) One of the goats and one of the prisoners were selected for death, the other for release.

(3) The death and release were actually carried into execution.

(4) As the two goats, so also were the two prisoners exact counterparts of each other. Jesus was the Messiah, Barabbas was the representative of the kind of Messiah, which the Jews expected and desired.

(5) Even if Origen's statement (on Matt 27:16–18) that some MSS. of St Matthew in his day read "Jesus Barabbas" as opposed to "Jesus called Christ,"

---

63. See Chapter Two.

64. See Chapter Three.

be not relied on, here yet remains a very singular coincidence of name between the two. Barabbas, son of the Father, stands in a remarkable antithesis to the Son of man, who claimed God as his Father.

(6) The next point is not altogether one of resemblance, but also in some degree of contrast, yet comes equally under the laws of association … The Jewish nation did not confess its sins by the mouth of the priest over the head of the scapegoat, but, at the instigation of the priest, deliberately took its greatest sin upon itself. "His blood be upon us and upon our children!"[65]

In truth, Wratislaw presents only five correspondences, since point (2) and (3) belong together. The correspondences can be summarized as follows:

(A) There are two subjects (the two goats and the two prisoners, Matt 27:17, 21)

(B) One subject is released and the other is put to death (Matt 27:26)

(C) The two subjects are exact counterparts of each other (Matt 27:16, 19)

(D) Both subjects are similar in appearance (Matt 27:16–17)

(E) Both rituals includes a confession and transference of sin (Matt 27:24–25)

Though he appears to be unaware of the extra-biblical tradition requiring the two goats to be similar in appearance (m. Yoma. 6:1; Barn. 7.6, 10; Justin, *Dial.* 40), Wratislaw perceives a correspondence between the duality of the two goats in Lev 16:7–10 and the duality of the two figures in the Barabbas scene.[66] He notes that a textual variant in Matt 27:16–17 attributes the name "Jesus" to Barabbas, drawing the

---

65. Albert Henry Wratislaw, *Notes and Dissertations: Principally on Difficulties in the Scriptures of the New Covenant* (London: Bell and Daldy, 1863), 12–23, at 18–19; reprinted in "The Scapegoat-Barabbas," *ExpTim* 3 (1891): 400–403. Wratislaw analyzes the Barabbas account in all four Gospels as whole, not distinguishing between the various reports.

66. Ibid., 18.

two figures together (most scholars now accept this reading as original).[67] Pilate's question to the crowd becomes: "Whom do you want me to release to you, *Jesus* Barabbas or *Jesus* who is called Messiah?" (Matt 27:17). Further, the name Βαραββᾶς, which Wratislaw takes to mean "son of the father," parallels Jesus's claim that God was his Father.[68]

Just as the two goats are juxtaposed by being designated "for" opposing divine powers (Lev 16:8), so both Jesus and Barabbas represent opposing messianic ideals. Wratislaw draws a comparison between Aaron's confession of Israel's sin (Lev 16:21), which was placed upon the head of the scapegoat (Lev 16.21–22), and the crowd's response to Pilate in Matt 27:25: "His blood on us and on our children."[69] Whereas in Lev 16:21–22 the priest makes the confession and the scapegoat bears the people's sin, in Matthew the crowd ironically both confesses and bears its own sin.[70] Wratislaw's interpretation is drawn primarily from the redactional elements of Matthew's account.

## Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra

In his work, *The Impact of Yom Kippur on Early Christianity*, Stökl Ben Ezra advances Wratislaw's thesis, arguing that Matthew's Barabbas account (27:15–26) evinces the goat typology, especially when viewed in light of the evangelist's

---

67. See Chapter Three.

68. Ibid., 18.

69. Ibid., 19.

70. Ibid.

redactions.[71] He posits that five prescriptions of Yom Kippur influenced Matthew's typology: "(a) The lottery of the two goats; (b) The similarity of these goats; (c) Their opposing destinations; (d) The confession over the scapegoat; (e) The washing of the hands at the end of the ritual."[72] I will relay these points in the order of (b), (a), (c), (d), and (e).

(b): Stökl Ben Ezra argues that the redactions of Matthew betray an agenda to make Jesus and Barabbas appear similar, just as the two goats of Yom Kippur were required to be indistinguishable in Jewish tradition (m. Yoma. 6:1; Barn. 7.6, 10; Justin, *Dial.* 40).[73] Matthew introduces Barabbas's first name Ἰησοῦς into the story (27:16–17) to create a similarity between him and Jesus: Ἰησοῦν τὸν Βαραββᾶν and Ἰησοῦν τὸν λεγόμενον χριστόν (27:17). Matthew's addition of the adjective ἐπίσημος ("notable," "famous," 27:16) in describing Barabbas and his omission of Mark's potentially incriminating statement regarding Barabbas (Mark 15:7; cf. Matt 27:17) mitigates Barabbas's identity as a wrongdoer, thus advancing the similarity between him and Jesus.

(a): Three Matthean redactions portray Pilate's presentation of the two prisoners to the crowd as a "lottery" between the two "goats" (see Lev 16:7–8).[74] First, Pilate presents the two prisoners in a side-by-side manner: "Whom do you want me to release to you: *Jesus Barabbas* or *Jesus who is called Christ*?" (Matt 27:17; cf. Mark 15:9). Second, whereas in Mark 15:11 the chief priests motivate the crowd to choose

---

71. Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 165–71; see also idem, "Fasting with Jews," 179–84.

72. Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 169.

73. Ibid., 167–68; idem, "Fasting with Jews," 181.

74. Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 168–69; idem, "Fasting with Jews," 182.

Barabbas without mention of Jesus, Matthew introduces the duality again: "But the chief priests and the elders persuaded the crowds so that they might *ask for Barabbas but destroy Jesus*" (Matt 27:20). Third, unlike Mark, Matthew has Pilate repeat his presentation of the two prisoners to the crowd: "And the governor answered and said to them, '*Which of the two* do you want me to release to you?'" (Matt 27:21).

(c): While Matthew makes Barabbas and Jesus similar in appearance, they also remain juxtaposed like the two goats of Yom Kippur. Two men are brought before the people—one is killed and the other is released—and "of the goats/men, one will be considered as having an atoning function."[75] Unlike in Mark, Matthew indicates that Jesus's blood will be poured out "for the forgiveness of sins" (Matt 26:28; cf. Mark 14:24). Stökl Ben Ezra does not posit a sacerdotal function for Barabbas.

(d) and (e): Scholars often interpret the additional scene of Pilate's hand-washing and statement of innocence (Matt 27:24) in light of Deut 21:1–9, which describes the ritual procedure for when a dead body is found and the murderer is unknown.[76] The elders of the city nearest the body are to slaughter a heifer and wash their hands over it, confessing their innocence. Stökl Ben Ezra finds this reading problematic, since the situation in Matthew is different from that in Deuteronomy: in Matt 27:24 no one has been slain, and the would-be murderer is known. He suggests that the symbolic actions of Matt 27:24–25 *additionally* evoke Lev 16:21–24, where the high priest confesses Israel's sins, transfers them onto the scapegoat, and then bathes his body.[77] Stökl Ben Ezra notes that Yom Kippur is the only Old Testament

---

75. Ibid., 179.

76. See Chapter Three.

77. Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 169; idem, "Fasting with Jews," 183.

temple ritual that includes a washing *after* the procedures.[78]

Finally, Stökl Ben Ezra postulates Matthew's purpose in utilizing the Yom Kippur typology: "The labels Jesus of Nazareth and Jesus Barabbas symbolize two aspects of the historical Jesus. Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah, as God wants him to be, while Jesus Barabbas is the Messiah as the people want him to be... Matthew mocks the temple ritual, and the people disregard the atonement in Jesus."[79] He understands the immolated goat typology as embellishing the expiatory nature of Jesus' death (Matt 26:28): "Passover does not really have connotations of atonement. By applying scapegoat imagery to Jesus who is killed on Passover Matthew merges the historical and chronological background of Passover with the ritual of Yom Kippur and its theological ramifications."[80]

## Jennifer K. Berenson Maclean

In her article published in *Harvard Theological Review*, Maclean argues that both Matthew *and Mark* depict the events of the Barabbas episode as a curative exit rite, wherein Barabbas functions as the scapegoat, and Jesus the immolated goat.[81] Notably, Maclean conceived this article without prior knowledge of Stökl Ben Ezra's work on the subject.[82]

---

78. Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 169.

79. Ibid., 170.

80. Stökl Ben Ezra, "Fasting with Jews," 182. He observes that Aquila's translation of Leviticus employs the same term that Matthew uses for the "release" of Barabbas, ἀπολύω (Matt 17:15, 17, 21, 26) (ibid., 183). This term also occurs in Mark 15:6, 9, 11, 15.

81. Maclean, "Barabbas," 309–34.

82. Stökl Ben Ezra, "Fasting with Jews," 179.

Contrary to Mary Douglas, Maclean categorizes the Day of Atonement goat ritual as an ancient exit rite, thus affirming the position of DeMaris.[83] Maclean contests that even if the scapegoat was not originally understood as a *pharmakos*, "by the time the Gospels were composed, the Jewish scapegoat ritual had been deeply influenced by the pattern of curative exit rites, in particular the φαρμακός," and thus "study of Christian appropriation of the scapegoat should likewise be informed by that broader context."[84]

According to Maclean, Mark 15:6–15 conforms to the three-fold schema of exit rites relayed by DeMaris.[85] First, a recent "insurrection" (ἡ στάσις, Mark 15:7) constitutes the crisis. Second, the scapegoat designee is a character of marginal status, namely, Barabbas who had "been bound with the rebels who committed murder during the insurrection" (15:7). Third—this is one of Maclean's major innovations—Pilate's release of Barabbas to the crowd (ἀπολύειν + αὐτοῖς/ὑμῖν, Mark 15:9, 15) ominously implies that he was released as a *pharmakos* to be ritually abused by the community.[86]

Maclean therefore reads Mark's Barabbas account in the following way: the crowd asks Pilate to release to them a scapegoat/*pharmakos* (Mark 15:6, 8), and Pilate

---

83. Maclean, "Barabbas," 315; DeMaris, "Jesus Jettisoned," 99–100. Reflecting on the likeness of the Leviticus 16 scapegoat ritual to analogous Greek exit rites, Mary Douglas claims that "there are fewer similarities between the two so-called scapegoat rites than differences" ("The Go-Away Goat," in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception*, ed. Rolf Rendtorff and Robert A. Kugler [Leiden: Brill, 2003], 121–41, at 123).

84. Maclean, "Barabbas," 316. Maclean argues that the Levitical scapegoat ritual parallels other curative exit rites in the following features: (a) the threat of sin (Lev 16:1; 10:1–2), (b) the designation of a purgative agent (the scapegoat), (c) the goat's status-transformation through the casting of lots (16:9–10), (d) the concentration of divine power through the priest's laying-on of hands and confession of sin (16:21), (e) the exit of the scapegoat from the community (16:21b–22), and (f) the efficacy of the rite (16:30) (ibid., 315).

85. Ibid., 321–24; DeMaris, "Jesus Jettisoned," 98.

86. Maclean, "Barabbas," 322.

responds by presenting to them Jesus (15:9). The crowd rejects this offer and is persuaded by the priests to ask for Barabbas instead (15:11), a fitting candidate for a scapegoat (15:7). Pilate then asks the crowd what he should do with Jesus, to which they reply, "Crucify him!" (15:13–14), thus allowing Jesus to be designated as the immolated goat and Barabbas as the scapegoat (15:15).[87]

For Maclean, the following factors support this interpretation.[88] First, this reading explains why the Barabbas story was purportedly fabricated in the first place, as no evidence for a paschal pardon exists. Second, it better coheres with what is known about the character of Pilate, as it is historically improbable that he would have returned a criminal to society. Third, it explains why the priests and the crowd desired Barabbas in the first place. Fourth, it accounts for the unanimity of the crowd (15:13), as the abuse of the *pharmakos*/scapegoat was usually communal. Fifth, it explains why the narrative is structured to guarantee the release of one prisoner and the death of the other. Sixth, it accounts for the odd phrase τῷ ὄχλῳ τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιῆσαι (15:15), which may be interpreted as "to indulge one's passion," allegedly indicating the crowd's hunger for a scapegoat.

According to Maclean, Matt 27:15–26 accentuates the goat typology in Mark 15:6–15.[89] She affirms many of the suggestions made by Stökl Ben Ezra.[90] For example, Matthew's addition of Barabbas's name "Jesus" (27:16–17) evokes the requirement that the two goats be indistinguishable, as does his description of Barabbas as a "notable prisoner" (δέσμιος ἐπίσημος, 27:16), a term that could well

---

87. Ibid., 324.

88. Ibid., 321–24.

89. Ibid., 324–30.

90. Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 165–71.

apply to Jesus (cf. Luke 23:19, 25; Acts 3:4; and John 18:40). Moreover, Matthew's additional statement that the crowd was on the verge of rioting (27:24a) meets a key criterion of *devotio*: the aversion of an external threat by means of a ritual designee.

Maclean's major contribution is the suggestion that Pilate's disavowal of bloodguilt (Matt 27:24) is with reference to Barabbas, not Jesus.[91] In turn, the blood for which the crowd claims responsibility (Matt 27:25) is not that of Jesus, but Barabbas. This reading purportedly takes Pilate's symbolic gesture at face value, since the governor is still responsible for Jesus's execution. She claims that Pilate's phrase, "take care of the matter yourself" (ὑμεῖς ὄψεσθε, Matt 27:24), is more intelligible if the crowd is understood as receiving Barabbas as scapegoat. Otherwise, Pilate tasks the crowd with crucifying Jesus—something they clearly could not accomplish. Maclean concludes: "the Day of Atonement rituals were central to the earliest reflections on the significance of Jesus's death and the development of the Passion Narrative."[92]

## Evaluation

The Yom Kippur reading of the Barabbas episode has found favor with a growing number of scholars.[93] Stökl Ben Ezra remarks correctly, "Only [a] few reviewers of

---

91. Maclean, "Barabbas," 326–29. Maclean argues that the christological immolated-goat typology is more primitive than the christological scapegoat typology, a theory based on the supposition that Barnabas, Justin, and Tertullian all make recourse to the immolated-goat typology despite their failure to adduce a compelling exegesis for it (ibid., 317–21). She suggests that the scapegoat's demonological association diverted earliest Christians from applying the scapegoat typology to Jesus.

92. Ibid., 330.

93. E.g., Nicole Wilkinson Duran, *The Power of Disorder: Ritual Elements in Mark's Passion Narrative*, LNTS 378 (London: T&T Clark, 2008), 87; Helen K. Bond, "Barabbas Remembered," in *Jesus and Paul: Global Perspectives in Honor of James D. G. Dunn for his 70th Birthday*, ed. B. J.

my book have expressed reservations against my understanding of this passage."[94]

Particularly striking are the five points of correspondence between the goat ritual and

Matt 27:15–26 that Stökl Ben Ezra puts forward.[95] Wratislaw, Stökl Ben Ezra, and

Maclean all concur that Matthew's Barabbas account contains a Yom Kippur

typology. The key disparity between Stökl Ben Ezra and Maclean is whether Mark's

Barabbas account also evinces the typology.[96]

In terms of Matthew's account, I have three main critiques of the proposed

Yom Kippur reading of Matt 27:15–26. First, it is unclear from the exegesis of Stökl

Ben Ezra and Maclean how Matthew's goat typology relates to his larger innocent-

blood discourse, which runs through Matt 23:29–39, 27:3–10, and arrives at its climax

in the proclamation, "His blood on us and on our children" (Matt 27:25). Second, how

can Barabbas function as a sin-bearing scapegoat in any meaningful way? He does not

bear the people's iniquity, nor is he abused and sent into the Judaean wilderness.

---

Oropeza, C. K. Robertson, and Douglas C. Mohrmann, LNTS 414 (London: T&T Clark International, 2009), 59–71, at 66; Mary Ann Beavis, *Mark*, PCNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011), 226; André LaCocque, *Jesus the Central Jew: His Time and his People* (Atlanta: SBL, 2015), 246 n. 30; Orlov, *Atoning Dyad*, 58–64; Eberhart, "To Atone or Not to Atone," 230–31; Justin Buol, *Martyred for the Church: Memorializations of the Effective Death of Bishop Martyrs in the Second Century CE*, WUNT 471 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018), 79–80; Hannah S. An, "Reading Matthew's Account of the Baptism and Temptation of Jesus (Matt 3:5–4:1) with the Scapegoat Rite on the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:20–22)," *Canon & Culture* 12 (2018): 5–31, at 22–23 n. 27.

94. Stökl Ben Ezra, "Fasting with Jews," 179. The following reviewers make no passing criticism of Stökl Ben Ezra's exegesis of the Barabbas account: Christian Grappe, review of *The Impact of Yom Kippur on Early Christianity*, by Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, *RHPR* 84 (2004): 230–32; Göran Larsson, review of idem, *STK* 80 (2004): 134–35; Étienne Nodet, review of idem, *RB* 112 (2005): 280–85; Thomas Knöppler, review of idem, *TLZ* 131 (2006): 1288–90; Eileen Schuller, review of idem, *CBQ* 68 (2006): 782–84; Petra von Gemünden, review of idem, *Numen* 33 (2006): 223–77. On the contrary, Simon C. Mimouni remarks: "L'hypothèse que les premiers chrétiens, ceux qui étaient d'origine juive, aient été marqués par le rite du Yom Kippur n'est pas établie" (review of idem, *REJ* 165 [2006]: 299–300, at 300).

95. Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 169.

96. According to Stökl Ben Ezra, in Mark "there are no truly striking allusions in the vocabulary or in the details of the narrative beyond the general observation that the narrative is 'constructed to ensure that one prisoner is released and the other slain'" ("Fasting with Jews," 179).

Third, it is unclear whether the evangelist's Yom Kippur typology extends into Matt 27:24–25. Maclean posits that "his blood" (Matt 27:25) refers to the blood of Jesus Barabbas, not Jesus the messiah. But this reading is questionable for several reasons, namely, Jesus predicts that "all righteous [δίκαιον] blood" will come "upon this generation" (Matt 23:35–36), a passage with close verbal affinities to the redactional verses of Matt 27:19, 24–25, where *Jesus the messiah* is called "righteous" (δίκαιος, Matt 27:19).[97] Stökl Ben Ezra suggests that both Deuteronomy 21 and Leviticus 16 have influenced Matt 27:24–25, but an appeal to a combined allusion may be unnecessary if the Day of Atonement background can explain the oddities of the scene.[98] Is it possible that "all the people" who bear Jesus's bloodguilt fulfill the sacerdotal function of the sin-bearer, as Wratislaw already suggested, and that the confession and hand-washing rite of Pilate should be read as an adaptation of the

---

97. There are four additional points of critique: (1) Maclean claims that the construction ἀπολύειν + αὐτοῖς/ὑμῖν/ὄχλῳ (Mark 15:9, 15; Matt 27:15, 17, 21, 26) should be taken as a dative of indirect object (as opposed to dative of advantage) and thus carries an ominous connotation (i.e., Barabbas released to the crowd to be ritually abused) ("Barabbas," 321–22). But ἀπολύειν + αὐτοῖς/ὑμῖν as dative of indirect object could also indicate that the prisoner, once released, simply went to be with the crowd that chose him. (2) Maclean argues that Mark's phrase τῷ ὄχλῳ τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιῆσαι (Mark 15:15) means "to indulge one's passions," suggesting the crowd's desire for a scapegoat (ibid., 323–24). But this phrase, granted Maclean's definition, could alternatively indicate the crowd's fondness for Barabbas or their desire for Jesus's death (Mark 15:11). (3) Maclean interprets the phrase ὑμεῖς ὄψεσθε (Matt 27:24) as Pilate telling the crowd "to take care of the matter" of abusing the scapegoat Barabbas (ibid., 327–28). However, Pilate's command ὑμεῖς ὄψεσθε should be read in light of the evangelist's use of the same expression in Matt 27:4, where the chief priests and elders tell Judas, σὺ ὄψῃ. Since the issue in the case of Judas is bloodguilt, as it is in Matt 27:24–25, it seems appropriate to interpret Pilate's command in Matt 27:24 as in Matt 27:4, as a deflection of bloodguilt. Even granting Maclean's reading of ὑμεῖς ὄψεσθε, one could understand Pilate as telling the crowd to take care of the matter of bloodguilt, in the sense of taking ownership of the bloodguilt themselves. (4) Maclean suggests that her interpretation "takes all statements of guilt and innocence at face value rather than as deceptions" (ibid., 329). Yet her own reading does not take Pilate's offer to the crowd to chose between Jesus and Barabbas at face value (Mark 15:9, 12; Matt 27:17, 21), but, rather, as a deception that masks a predetermined trial. But both Mark and Matthew depict the crowd as being given a genuine choice between Barabbas and Jesus. If Pilate's offer to the crowd to choose between Jesus and Barabbas (Matt 27:17, 21) is taken at face value, then Pilate's statement of innocence (Matt 27:24) and the crowd's acceptance of guilt (Matt 27:25) need no further explanation.

98. Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 169; idem, "Fasting with Jews," 183. See Chapter Three.

confession and hand-leaning rite of the high priest?[99] These possibilities have not been considered.

Since both Stökl Ben Ezra and Maclean perceive the scapegoat typology as operative in Matthew's Roman-abuse scene, the question arises: how could the evangelist first identify Jesus Barabbas and then Jesus the messiah as a scapegoat?[100] How can there be two scapegoats in Matthew's PN and theology?

To their credit, Stökl Ben Ezra and Maclean attempt to connect the evangelists' goat typology to other themes in Mark and Matthew. Stökl Ben Ezra submits that the saying over the cup (Matt 26:28) pertains to Jesus's death as the sacrificial goat, and Maclean posits that the rending of the temple veil at Jesus's death evokes the immolated goat typology, proving Jesus's success in purifying the sanctuary.[101] These intriguing suggestions warrant a more thorough consideration of whether Matthew's PN contains a sustained Yom Kippur typology.

### 4. Alternative Approaches to Atonement in the Gospel of Matthew

Outside of the Yom Kippur proposals, scholars have taken numerous approaches to the question of atonement in the Gospel. Here, I survey five of these: (A) Jesus as the Suffering Servant, (B) Jesus's death in light of Matthew's metaphors for sin, (C) Jesus's death as the new exodus and Paschal defeat of dark powers, (D) Jesus's death as a matter of innocent blood, and (E) other views on atonement in Matthew.

---

99. Wratislaw, *Notes and Dissertations*, 19.

100. Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 170–71; Maclean, "Barabbas," 332–33.

101. Stökl Ben Ezra, "Fasting with Jews," 184; Maclean, "Barabbas," 331.

## A. Jesus as the Suffering Servant in Matthew

The impact of the Suffering Servant on the earliest Jesus traditions has become a controversial issue, though many still grant its formative influence.[102] At first glance, it seems that the Servant figure has had some significant impact on Matthew's Christology, since he quotes the Servant Songs more than any other evangelist (Matt 8:17, citing Isa 53:4; Matt 12:18–21, citing Isa 42:1–4).[103] However, commentators disagree as to whether Matthew's citation of these texts foreshadows or implies the notion that Jesus's passion fulfills the vicarious suffering prophesied in Isaiah 53.[104] Indeed, scholars now debate whether Isaiah 53 has influenced the gospel writer's conception of Jesus's death at all.

Douglas Moo, Raymond Brown, and W. D. Davies and Dale Allison defend

---

102. In his classic article on the topic, Joachim Jeremias's argues that the Synoptic Gospels present Jesus as identifying himself with Isaiah's Servant ("παῖς θεοῦ," *TDNT* 5:654–717). This has long been the consensus view (Moo, *Gospel Passion Narratives*, 164 n. 1). However, Morna Hooker has challenged this consensus, arguing that (1) the alleged allusions to the Servant Songs in the Gospels are very weak, especially when compared to other scriptural allusions in the New Testament, (2) there is scarce evidence that Jews in the Second Temple era were expecting such a vicariously Suffering Servant, and (3) other scriptural figures more obviously influenced the earliest interpretations of Jesus's death, such as the Son of Man from Daniel 7 or the Righteous Sufferer from the Psalms (*Jesus and the Servant: Influence of the Servant Concept of Deutero-Isaiah in the New Testament* [London: SPCK, 1959], esp. 1–102; eadem, "Did the Use of Isaiah 53 to Interpret his Mission Begin with Jesus?" in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins*, ed. W. H. Bellinger and William R. Farmer [Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, [1998], 88–103; eadem, "Response to Mikael Parsons," in ibid., 120–24). Cf. Moo, *Gospel Passion Narratives*, 165–67; Otto Betz, "Jesus and Isaiah 53," in Bellinger and Farmer, *Suffering Servant*, 70–87; Rikki E. Watts, "Jesus' Death, Isaiah 53, and Mark 10:45," in ibid., 125–51; Adrian M. Leske, "Isaiah and Matthew," in ibid., 152–69.

103. The only other quotations from the Servant Songs are in Luke 22:37; Acts 8:32; 13:47; John 12:38.

104. For example, Otto Betz remarks, "Matthew certainly knew the spiritual meaning of Isaiah 53:4: Bearing and taking away our sicknesses actually refers to the vicarious suffering of the Servant because of our sins. For Jesus, healing the diseases and forgiveness the sins actually belong together. This becomes clear from the story of the healing of the paralytic (Matt 9:1–9) in which the Son of Man is acting in the place of God, 'who forgives all your iniquity and heals all your diseases' (Ps 103:3)" ("Jesus and Isaiah 53," 81). So also, e.g., Donald A. Carson, "Matthew," in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, ed. F. E. Gaebelein, vol. 8 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984), 205–7; Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew*, 2 vols., WBC 33A–B (Dallas: Thomas Nelson, 1995), 1:210–11; Donald Senior, *Matthew*, ANTC (Nashville: Abingdon, 1998), 100. For the usual alternative viewpoint, see below.

the position classically articulated by Joachim Jeremias, that Isaiah 53 and the Servant

figure have significantly influenced the Synoptic passion predictions and narratives.[105]

According to Moo, the clearest allusion is Mark 10:33–34 (Matt 20:18–19; Luke

18:31–33), where the verbs used to narrate Jesus's abuse, ἐμπτύω and μαστιγόω, echo

Isa 50:6 LXX (ἔμπτυσμα, μάστιξ), and where the dual occurrence of παραδίδωμι

(only once in Luke 18:32) echoes Isa 53:6 and 53:12 LXX.[106] However, Matthew fails

to reproduce ἐμπτύω from his Markan *Vorlage* (Matt 20:19), which weakens the link

to Isa 50:6 in the First Gospel. Scholars often posit a Servant allusion in the episode

of Jesus's abuse by the Sanhedrin (Mark 14:65; Matt 26:67; cf. Luke 22:63–65),

where Mark and Matthew employ three words (ἐμπτύω, πρόσωπον, ῥάπισμα/ῥαπίζω)

that echo Isa 50:6 LXX.[107] Since the evangelist's redaction seems to highlight the

allusion,[108] this may be the strongest case for an allusion to the Servant Songs in

Matthew's PN.[109] Additionally, Davies and Allison submit that Jesus's silence during

this trial (Matt 26:63) evokes the Servant's silence (Isa 53:7),[110] but Brown warns that

the vocabulary is not the same, and Jesus's silence could be explained by other

means.[111] Davies and Allison also propose that Matthew's ubiquitous use of

---

105. Jeremias points to Mark 9:12, 31; 10:33–34; 14:8, 24, 61; 14:24 parr.; 15:5; Matt 26:2; Luke 24:7 (*TDNT* 5:705–6).

106. Moo, *Gospel Passion Narratives*, 88–89.

107. Isaiah 50:6: "I gave my back to scourges and my cheeks to blows [ῥαπίσματα]; I did not turn my face [πρόσωπόν] away from the shame of a spitting [ἐμπτυσμάτων]" (Ziegler, *Isaias*, 311). E.g., Moo, *Gospel Passion Narratives*, 139–44; Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 1:578; W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *The Gospel According to Matthew*, ICC, 3 vols. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988–1997), 3:527; Hubert Frankemölle, *Matthäus*, 2 vols. (Düsseldorf: Patmos. 1994, 1997), 2:488–89.

108. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:536.

109. Hays, *Scripture in the Gospels*, 161. Matt 27:30 might also allude to Isa 50:6 by means of the word ἐμπτύω, but this link is more tenuous.

110. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:527.

111. Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 1:772–73.

παραδίδωμι evokes "not only the passion predictions... but also the fate of the Suffering Servant of Isaiah (Isa 53:6, 12 LXX)."[112] But the reader's ability to recognize such subtle echoes would depend on the predominance of the Servant typology in the Gospel as a whole, which is the very issue at hand.

Scholars commonly suggest an allusion to Isaiah 53 MT in Jesus's ransom logion and saying over the cup. In regards to the former (Matt 20:28 = Mark 10:45), it is argued that (1) ἀντὶ πολλῶν echoes לרבים (Isa 53:11) and/or רבים (Isa 52:14, 15; 53:12 MT; LXX has πολλοί), (2) δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον echoes אם־תשים אשם נפשו (Isa 53:10), (3) διακονῆσαι accurately describes the vocation of the עבד in Isaiah, (4) the substitutionary notion implied with ἀντὶ πολλῶν matches the function of the Servant, and (5) Jesus's saying over the cup in the Synoptics probably alludes to Isa 53:12.[113] In regards to the cup-saying (Matt 26:28 = Mark 14:24), it is contended that (1) ὑπὲρ πολλῶν echoes לרבים (Isa 53:11 MT; LXX does not use ὑπέρ) and/or רבים (Isa 52:14, 15; 53:12 MT; LXX has πολλοί), (2) ἐκχυννόμενον is a literal translation of הערה (Isa 53:12 MT; LXX does not use ἐκχύννω), (3) Matthew's switch to περί echoes Isa 53:4 (περὶ ἡμῶν) and 53:10 LXX (περὶ ἁμαρτίας), and (4) the notion of vicarious suffering is common to both traditions.[114] However, these arguments have failed to persuade some scholars.[115] For example, Morna Hooker remarks,

---

112. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:555. Matthew writes παραδίδωμι 15 times, Mark writes the verb 10 times. While Matthew writes the verb six more times than Mark, lending support to this thesis, it is uncertain whether the reader is given clear enough signals elsewhere in the Gospel for παραδίδωμι to trigger an association with the Servant.

113. Moo, *Gospel Passion Narrative*, 122–27; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:95–96.

114. Joachim Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 3rd ed., trans. Norman Perrin (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1966), 227–29; Moo, *Gospel Passion Narrative*, 122–27; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:474; Yarbro Collins, "Finding Meaning," 176–78. For further discussion of the saying over the cup in Matthew, see Chapter Five.

115. E.g., C. K. Barrett, "The Background of Mark 10:45," in *New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson*, ed. A. J. B. Higgins (Manchester: University Press, 1959), 1–18;

The verb διακονέω is never used in the LXX to translate עבד, and

λύτρον, which is often traced to אשם in Isaiah 53:10, is never used for

that word, and has a quite different meaning. The LXX text of Isaiah

53:10 is in fact very different from both Mark 10:45 and from the

Hebrew, for it reads "if you [presumably the listeners] offer a sin-

offering" — i.e., περὶ ἁμαρτίας. Of the three words traced to Isaiah 53,

only πολλῶν (used there three times) is relevant, and that is a term

which is used frequently elsewhere. I do not find the evidence

persuasive.[116]

With respect to Matt 20:28, Richard Hays notes that Matthew "neither expands nor

elaborates on the Markan formulation. As we note above, it is at best doubtful

whether the saying echoes Isaiah 53:10–12."[117]

Regarding Matthew's citation of Isa 53:4 (Matt 8:17),[118] Leroy Huizenga

affirms the conclusion of Davies and Allison, arguing that Matthew's writing "ἔλαβεν

for נשא eliminates the possibility of vicarious suffering: Jesus takes away sicknesses;

he does not take them into his person."[119] But this is a dubious claim, since the notion

---

Hooker, *Jesus and the Servant*, 74–83; eadem, "Use of Isaiah 53," 94–95; Ulrich Luz, *Matthew: A Commentary*, trans. James E. Crouch, 3 vols., Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001–2007), 3:381; Leroy A. Huizenga, *The New Isaac: Tradition and Intertextuality in the Gospel of Matthew*, NovTSup 131 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 204–6; Hays, *Scripture in the Gospels*, 86–87, 160.

116. Hooker, "Use of Isaiah 53," 94–95.

117. Hays, *Scripture in the Gospels*, 160.

118. "This was to fulfill what had been spoken through the prophet Isaiah, 'He took [ἔλαβεν] our infirmities and bore [ἐβάστασεν] our diseases'" (Matt 8:17). Matthew himself probably renders the text of Isa 53:4 from the Hebrew (Richard Beaton, *Isaiah's Christ in Matthew's Gospel*, SNTSMS 123 [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004], 110–14). Notably, Matthew does not utilize the Septuagint, which says the Servant bears "our sins" (τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν, Isa 53:4). The citation comes at the conclusion of Jesus's first series of healings (Matt 8:1–4, 5–13, 14–16), thereby framing his ministry of healing.

119. Huizenga, *New Isaac*, 200. Davies and Allison write, "In Isaiah the servant suffers vicariously, carrying infirmities in himself; in the Gospel he heals the sick by taking away their diseases... So a text about vicarious suffering has become a text about healing, and two different

could be removal by means of bearing, as in Leviticus 16, which also employs the verb λαμβάνω to describe the scapegoat's receiving the burden of sins (Lev 16:22 LXX). A more straightforward way to read Matthew's application of Isa 53:4 is to imagine Jesus as bearing the infirmities upon himself and thereby removing them from others, just as Isa 53:4 MT portrays the Servant doing.[120] In addition to (1) the use of λαμβάνω in Lev 16:22 to indicate removal by means of bearing (vis-à-vis the scapegoat), this reading is supported by the fact that (2) the verb סבל (Isa 53:4), which Matthew translates as βαστάζω, means "bear" (not "remove") in the MT,[121] (3) βαστάζω only means "bear" elsewhere in the Gospel (Matt 3:11; 20:12),[122] and (4) the following verse may suggest that Jesus suffers from his borne ailments: "Now when Jesus saw a great crowd around him, he gave orders to go to the other side" (Matt 8:18).[123] The question is whether this portrait foreshadows the notion of Jesus

---

pictures are involved" (*Matthew*, 2:38). Huizenga follows Luz (*Matthew*, 2:14) in stating, "It is most likely that the function of the quotation here is atomistic, that the empirical author provided precisely the part of Isaiah he wanted in the particular form he wanted, and thus that his hearers would likely not have perceived a reference to any Servant figure" (*New Isaac*, 200).

120. Interestingly, Baruch Schwartz cites Isa 53:4–12 as an exception to the rule that "the sinner whose burden someone else bears has not transfered its weight to another; the bearer is not weighted down by the sin as the sinner formerly was" ("The Bearing of Sin in the Priestly Literature," in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom*, ed. David P. Wright, David Noel Freedman, and Avi Hurvitz [Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1995], 3–22, at 10). In other words, the "burden" concept in Isa 53:4–12 is analogous to the notion of the transference and bearing of sin in the scapegoat ritual (though the scapegoat does not "vicariously suffer," and it carries sins, not infirmities [see ibid., 17–19]). For a summary of views on the notion of place-taking in Isa 52:13–53:12, see Daniel P. Bailey, "Concepts of Stellvertretung in the Interpretation of Isaiah 53," in Bellinger and Farmer, *Suffering Servant*, 223–59.

121. Beaton, *Isaiah's Christ*, 117.

122. Ibid., 116.

123. Why does Jesus suddenly desire to flee the crowd? Since Matthew offers no explanation, the reader may assume that Jesus has become exhausted from bearing the affirmatives of the "many" (πολύς), whom he has just cured (Matt 8:16; cf. Isa 52:14, 15; 53:11, 12), and therefore he seeks relief. Interestingly, on the basis of Isa 53:4, one tradition held that the Servant would be a leper (Jeremias, *TDNT* 5:690, 697).

vicariously bearing *sins*.[124]

Matthew's lengthy quotation of Isa 42:1–4 is notable, since the evangelist thereby identifies Jesus as ὁ παῖς, who will bring hope to the Gentiles (Matt 12:18–21). While this citation is sandwiched between two instances of healing (Matt 12:15, 22), which links it to the evangelist's former Isaianic quotation (Matt 8:17; Isa 53:4), here Jesus's identity as the Servant has no obvious connection to his death.

To conclude, while he clearly has a Servant typology, Matthew is surprisingly conservative in drawing from Isaiah 53 in his PN. Even Moo acknowledges that "the Servant conception seems to play so small a role" in the Synoptic PNs.[125] Huizenga contends that "finding allusions to Isa 53 or other Servant material in these and other passages rests on the most tenuous connection. Further, even if the Gospel of Matthew does contain allusions to Servant material, one must be careful not to overinterpret such allusions."[126] Hays similarly remarks, "A few submerged echoes of the Suffering Servant of Isaiah may lie below the surface of Matthew's narrative, but it is difficult to be sure about this."[127] It seems likely that the Servant is just one of several scriptural figures to whom the evangelist makes occasional reference in his PN.

### B. Jesus's Death in Light of Matthew's Metaphors for Sin

In his influential work, *Sin: A History*, Gary Anderson argues that the prevailing Hebrew metaphor of sin as a burden was replaced by the metaphor of sin as a debt in

---

124. Beaton suggests this possibility (*Isaiah's Christ*, 116).

125. Moo, *Gospel Passion Narratives*, 170.

126. Huizenga, *New Isaac*, 206.

127. Hays, *Scripture in the Gospels*, 160–61.

the post-Exilic era due to the influence of Aramaic.[128] In turn, the remedy for sin was no longer conceived as the removal of a burden but as the remission of a debt.[129] In his revised doctoral dissertation, Nathan Eubank expounds Matthew's grammar of sin vis-à-vis Anderson's thesis, contending that the evangelist envisions sin as a debt to be repaid.[130] According to Eubank, Matthew's use of ὀφείλημα in the Lord's Prayer (Matt 6:12) and his Parable of the Unforgiving Debtor (Matt 18:23–35) demonstrates this cognitive framework: "For Matthew, sin is debt. Those who sin against God or against another person are in danger of being thrown into debtor's prisoner (i.e., Gehenna) where they will remain until they pay back all they owe."[131] Thankfully, believers can store up "wages" (μισθός) in heaven to pay down their debt and that of others.[132] God is not a coldly calculating creditor, but one who delights in remitting debts and repaying righteous deeds far more than they are worth.[133] Jesus's exceptionally virtuous life "fulfills all righteousness," earning an overabundance of heavenly wages (Matt 3:15), which God uses to "ransom the many" from their bondage of debt (Matt 20:28), granted they take up their crosses and follow him (Matt

---

128. Gary A. Anderson, *Sin: A History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), esp. 15–39. Anderson's theoretical foundation are the studies of metaphor by Paul Ricoeur, *The Symbolism of Evil*, trans. Emerson Buchanan (Boston: Beacon, 1969) and George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980). Anderson posits a totalizing claim: "Stories like the scapegoat in Leviticus 16 or the injunction that Ezekiel lie on his side while God loads upon him the sins of Israel simply do not appear in the New Testament. But neither do they occur in rabbinic literature. This is ample testimony to the wholesale replacement of the weight image in favor of debt" (*Sin*, 33).

129. On the concept of "bearing sin" in the Hebrew Bible, see Chapter Two.

130. Nathan Eubank, *Wages of Cross-Bearing and Debt of Sin: The Economy of Heaven in Matthew's Gospel*, BZNW 196 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013).

131. Ibid., 53–67, quote at 67.

132. Matt 5:12, 46; 6:19–24; 10:41–42; 16:24–27; 19:21, 28–29; 24:45–47; 25:20–23, 34–40. Ibid., 68–104.

133. Matt 19:26; 20:9; 25:28–29. Ibid., 105.

16:24–26; 19:27–29).[134]

While Anderson's study brilliantly illumines the cultural development of the debt metaphor, he overstates the case for the universality, or perhaps even predominance, of the metaphor in Second Temple Judaism.[135] As Rikard Roitto remarks, "a more accurate description of the development is that the metaphor of [sin as a] debt became prevalent, but without eradicating the metaphor of [sin as a] substance."[136] On a similar note, Eubank's work helpfully elucidates one dimension of the evangelist's conception of sin.[137] However, students of Matthew have challenged the claim that the gospel writer utilizes the debt metaphor exclusively. As discussed below, scholars have noted that Matthew also calculates Israel's iniquity in terms of the blood poured out upon the land (Matt 23:35–36). According to Marius Nel, the

---

134. Ibid., 109–98.

135. For example, the Qumranites understood sin as a ritually defiling matter requiring physical purification (Jonathan Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000], 67–91). John's baptism was conceived as an atonement rite effecting moral cleansing from sins (ibid., 138–44. Cf. Mark 1:4). An influential text for early Christian soteriology, Isa 52:13–53:12 portrays sin as a burden borne by the Suffering Servant (Isa 53:4–6, 11–12; cf. Matt 8:17; 1 Pet 2:24; Rom 4:25; John 1:29; 1 John 3:5). In Enochic Judaism, the iniquity of the Watchers beckons the purgation of the Flood and the scapegoat-like expulsion of Asael/Azazel and his host (1 Enoch 9–11, 54–55, 86–89:9). Surprisingly, Anderson mentions Isaiah 53 only once in his book (*Sin*, 207).

136. Rikard Roitto, "The Two Cognitive Frames of Forgiveness in the Synoptic Gospels," *NovT* 57 (2015): 136–58, at 143. Roitto provides numerous examples from Second Temple and early Christian literature.

137. However, I agree with Nicholas G. Piotrowski on a number of critiques of Eubank's thesis: "[Matt] 6:12 and 18:21–35 are not enough to provide the reader with a comprehensive understanding of sins as debt across the Matthean universe ... when sin and atonement finally do take center stage (Matt 26:28, long expected since Matt 1:21), the economic language recedes and *cultic* language swells (Matt 20:28 does not explicitly mention sins)" (review of *Wages of Cross-Bearing*, by Nathan Eubank, *JETS* 57 [2014]: 816–19, at 819). According to Piotrowski, Eubank constructs two types of sin in Matthew without warrant—one type of sin that Jesus pays down and another type of sin that Jesus's followers pay down for themselves and others: "This would solve the riddle only if Matthew gave any indication that there are two kinds of sins. Yet he does not" (ibid., 818). Piotrowski alternatively argues that "wages earned by Jesus's disciples are not immediately allocated upon entrance into glory, but put into a treasury to enjoy forever. In fact, in the Gospel these wages are described explicitly as thrones, resurrection life, stewardship of Jesus's possessions, more money, and the kingdom, but *never* as a payment for one's own (or anyone else's) sins. Thus, Matthew certainly does motivate his followers with the promise of heavenly wages (as is not uncommon in the late-first century), but not wages good for atoning for sin" (ibid., 819).

evangelist conceives the iniquity of bloodguilt in Israel's history as a growing burden that the present generation must bear (Matt 27:25).[138] Jesus taunts the scribes and Pharisees, "*Fill up* the measure of your fathers" (Matt 23:32), painting the image of an increasing quantity of sin reaching its divine limit.[139] Matthew seems to assume the metaphor of sin as a burden with the redactional phrase, "weightier matters of the law" (τὰ βαρύτερα τοῦ νόμου, Matt 23:23; cf. Luke 11:42), which suggests that the weightier a particular law is, the greater the burden one carries as a consequence of breaking it. This reading seems to be confirmed by the editorial phrase, "heavy burdens" (φορτία βαρέα, Matt 23:4; cf. Luke 11:45), which Matthew employs to describe how the scribes and Pharisees purportedly place enormous legal requirements upon the shoulders of others. Because such requirements are perceived as impossible to keep, those who labor under their weight become weary: "Come to me, all you who toil and are carrying heavy burdens [πεφορτισμένοι], and I will give you rest" (Matt 11:28). The transgression of legal requirements is metaphorically burdensome in the evangelist's thought.

---

138. Marius J. Nel, "The Conceptualisation of Sin in the Gospel of Matthew," *In die Skriflig/ In LuceVerbi* 51 (2017): 1–8, at 7. See Lev 5:1, 17; 7:18; 17:16; 20:17, 19; 22:16; Num 5:31; 14:34; 30:15.

139. Eubank novelly interprets Matt 23:32 as Jesus telling the religious leaders "to bring the debt of their fathers to its limit, the point at which the creditor can tolerate it no more and steps in to collect what is due" (*Wages of Cross-Bearing*, 67). This reading is unconvincing for the following reasons. First, nothing in the immediate context of Matt 23:32 suggests the debt frame. Second, debts were *recorded* not on weight scales (μέτρον) but in books. Third, Eubank provides no examples from antiquity wherein πληρόω + μέτρον evokes the image of a compiling debt on a weight scale, whereas examples of πληρόω + μέτρον used in reference to a liquid filling a container are quite common (e.g., Aesop, Ζεὺς καὶ Ἄνθρωποι; Strabo, 17.1.3.62; Apoc. Mos. 13.6; Galen, *De praesagitione ex pulsibus*, 304). Fourth, Eubank's reliance on Anderson's theory, that the phrase "to complete the sin" in the Hebrew Bible utilizes the same conceptual framework of a creditor stepping in to collect a debt, is questionable. Anderson undestands the phrase (לכלא הפשע) in Dan 9:24 in this manner, and yet the context of Daniel 9 evokes no debt frame (*Sin*, 82–89). Rather, curses and evil are repeatedly portrayed as coming *upon* (על) Israel (Dan 9:11–14, 27). It is more probable that, in light of Matt 23:25 ("You clean the inside of *the cup* and of the plate, but inside *they are full* of greed and self-indulgence"), the image in Matt 23:32 is of a measuring container being filled to the brim with iniquity.

Matthew's use of ἀφίημι further suggests that he imagines sin as an object to be removed. Rikard Roitto argues that ἀφίημι in post-Exilic literature utilizes two distinct cognitive frames with regards to forgiveness: (1) a sender sends an object on a trajectory, and (2) a benefactor remits a debt for a person:[140] "In one construction, removal of substance is the conceptual metaphor upon which forgiveness is modelled... In the other construction, remission of debt is the conceptual metaphor upon which forgiveness is modelled."[141] The Synoptics employ the concrete-object frame of ἀφίημι when Jesus heals the paralytic and declares ἀφίενταί σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι (Matt 9:2, 5 parr.). This pericope plays on the belief that sin and disease are linked, so that Jesus's healing the man is an *a fortiori* (*a minore ad maius*) argument for his authority to forgive sin:[142] "That Jesus can remove the bodily sickness proves that Jesus has also removed its cause, sin."[143]

Nel highlights two other metaphors for sin in the First Gospel: sin as a stain and sin as a stumbling block.[144] Though they are not univocal, these metaphors conceive sin as a concrete object requiring removal. In a polemic against the Pharisees, Jesus declares, "It is not what goes into the mouth that defiles a person, but

---

140. Roitto, "Polyvalence of ἀφίημι," 144–47. Roitto's analysis applies the linguistic theory of constructive grammar, which posits that syntax and semantics are inseparable. He employs the taxonomy of "agent" (the forgiver), "patient" (the thing forgiven), and "beneficiary" (the one to whom the patient is forgiven). According to Roitto, when sin is conceived in the substance frame, ἀφίημι possess *only* a divine agent (i.e., God), and the patient is *always* stated as ἁμαρτία without exception. When sin is conceived in the debt frame, ἀφίημι may possess either a divine or human agent, a patient (a debt), and a beneficiary, though when humans forgive the patient is left unstated. The theological implication is that, "Only God has the power to remove the substance of sin, but humans both could and should forgive the moral debt wronged them, just like God" (ibid., 157).

141. Ibid.

142. Nel, "Sin in the Gospel of Matthew," 5; cf. 6.

143. Roitto, "Polyvalence of ἀφίημι," 148.

144. Nel, "Sin in the Gospel of Matthew," 5–7.

what comes out of the mouth—this defiles a person... For out of the heart come evil intentions, murder, adultery, fornication, theft, false witness, slander. These are what defile a person" (Matt 15:11, 19–20a). According to Jonathan Klawans, Jesus here prioritizes moral purity over the perceived Pharisaic emphasis on ritual impurity.[145] This notion of moral impurity assumes a metaphor of sin as an object or stain to be washed away.[146] Nel observes Matthew's penchant for the metaphor of the stumbling stone (σκάνδολον, σκανδαλίζω), which also evokes a material frame.[147] The First Evangelist perceives all causes of sin as requiring removal.[148] The Son of Man will gather all σκάνδαλα and workers of lawlessness and "cast them into a fiery furnace" (Matt 13:41–42). Those who scandalize young disciples would justly be drowned in the depths of the sea (Matt 18:6). The right eye or hand that causes one to sin should be torn out and thrown away (Matt 5:29–30; 18:8–9). When Satan becomes a σκάνδολον to Jesus, he is told to "depart" (Matt 16:23). Jesus himself becomes a σκάνδολον (Matt 11:6; 13:37) to be discarded as "the stone that the builders rejected" (Matt 21:42; cf. 21:39).[149]

The banishment of stumbling stones is constituent of a prevailing concept of sin in the Gospel Matthew, namely, that sin, and those whose lives are characterized

---

145. Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 148–49.

146. Nel, "Sin in the Gospel of Matthew," 6. Nel also suggests the metaphor of stain with regards to the cleansing (καθαρίζω) of lepers (Matt 8:2–3; 10:8; 11:5) and in Jesus's indictment of the Pharisees for not cleansing (καθαρίζω) their inner selves (23:25–26), though here sin seems also to be conceived as a compounding object that fills a container (ibid., 6).

147. Matt 5:30; 11:6; 13:21, 57; 18:6–9; 26:31, 33 (with parallels in Mark and Luke); Matt 5:29; 13:41; 15:12; 16:23; 17:27; 24:10 (only in Matthew). Nel, "Sin in the Gospel of Matthew," 6.

148. According to BDAG (s.v. "σκανδαλίζω"), Matthew's predominant usage of σκανδαλίζω is "to cause to or be led into sin" (Matt 5:29–30; 11:6; 13:21, 57; 18:6–9; 24:10; 26:31, 33), and his predominant usage of σκάνδολον is "temptation to sin" (Matt 16:23; 18:7).

149. Nel, "Sin in the Gospel of Matthew," 7.

by sin, must be physically removed or eliminated.[150] Matthew employs this notion

primarily in eschatological contexts. John the Baptist proclaims, "Every tree that does

not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire" (Matt 3:10; cf. 3:12).

Disciples who loose their saltiness are "thrown out and trampled under foot" (Matt

5:13). They are commanded to "remove the log" (major sin) from their eyes before

they "remove the speck" (minor sin) from their neighbor's eye (Matt 7:3–5). The

unfruitful tree "is cut down and thrown into the fire" (Matt 7:19). Evildoers are told,

"I never knew you. Go away from me" (Matt 7:23). The weeds sowed in the field are

"collected and bound in bundles to be burned" (Matt 13:30; cf. 13:41–42). The

eschatological harvestmen "throw out" the bad fish "into the furnace of fire" (Matt

13:48, 50). Every plant that the heavenly Father has not planted "will be uprooted"

(Matt 15:13). The man dressed in garments of unrighteousness is bound and "hurled

into the outer darkness" (Matt 22:13). Noah's wicked generation is "swept away" by

the Flood (Matt 24:39). The unfaithful steward is "cut in pieces and placed with the

hypocrites" (Matt 24:51). The lot of unrighteous goats are told, "Depart from me into

the eternal fire" (Matt 25:41; cf. 25:46). Such statements assume a concept of sin that

evokes a material frame.[151] That is, in addition to conceiving sin as a debt to be repaid,

Matthew imagines sin, whether abstractly or as embodied in sinners, as a material

object requiring physical removal or elimination. Students of the First Gospel have

yet to consider how this notion of sin has influenced Matthew's theology of

---

150. Of the passages discussed, the following occur only in Matthew: Matt 7:19 (cf. 3:10; Luke 3:9); 13:30, 41–42, 48; 15:13; 22:13; 25:41, 46; the saying in Matt 5:29–30 is also uniquely repeated (Matt 18:8–9).

151. Apocalyptic traditions have certainly influenced the vision of eschatological judgment in the First Gospel (David C. Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew*, SNTMS 88 [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996], 129–40). Sim argues that Matthew, more than nearly all early Jewish and Christian writers, emphasizes the fiery eschatological punishment of sinners.

atonement.

## C. Jesus's Death as the New Exodus and Paschal Defeat of Dark Powers

N. T. Wright understands the Gospels to be telling the story of how God defeats the dark powers that had imprisoned Israel in a state of exile, by means of a new exodus and Passover, namely, Jesus's death and resurrection.[152] Crucial to Wright's thesis is that Jesus seems to have purposefully chosen Passover as the occasion on which he would suffer death at the hands of the Jewish and Roman authorities:

> With Passover as the context and his repeated clashes with hostile forces both human and nonhuman during his public career, there is every reason to suppose that he saw the task as paralleling the liberation of Israel from Egypt ... Just as Israel's God overcame the power of Egypt and even the myth-laden power of the Red Sea, so, Jesus believed, God would use the upcoming event to overthrow all the dark powers that had kept not only Israel but also the whole human race in captivity.[153]

While all the evangelists retain the Passover context in their PNs, only the Synoptic tradition situates the Last Supper squarely within this paschal framework, inclining the reader to interpret Jesus's eucharistic words in light of this symbol-laden holy day.[154]

---

152. N. T. Wright, *The Day the Revolution Began: Reconsidering the Meaning of Jesus's Crucifixion* (New York: HarperOne, 2016), esp. 107–20, 169–226.

153. Wright, *Revolution*, 180, 183.

154. According to John P. Meier, "The Synoptics portray the Last Supper on Thursday evening as a Passover meal (specifically in the story of the preparation of the meal, Mark 14:12–17

The fact that Matthew uniquely adds "for the forgiveness of sins" to Jesus's saying over the cup (Matt 26:28) suggests that, for the First Evangelist, this new Passover and forgiveness of sins are bound together—but how?[155] Wright remarks:

> The original exodus had nothing to do with the forgiveness of sins; the slavery in Egypt was never seen as a result of Israel's sins. The Babylonian exile, however, was seen in exactly that way. Thus two themes combined into a new, complex reality. The "new exodus," freeing Israel from foreign oppression, would also be the "forgiveness of sins," the real return from exile ... Forgiveness of sins and the overthrow of the enslaving power would belong exactly together.[156]

Wright's thesis is supported by the fact that there is little evidence that the blood of the Passover lamb was thought to possess expiatory value in its original context or in early Jewish tradition.[157] He points out that the biblical prophecies of Israel's exilic

---

parr.; also Luke 22:15). Here the story of the preparation of the meal must take place on Thursday in the daytime, which is the fourteenth of Nisan, when the Passover lambs were being slaughtered (so Mark 14:12; Luke 22:7). The Passover meal (Mark 14:20–30 parr.), held in the evening after sundown, would take place as the fifteenth of Nisan, Passover Day proper, began. Therefore, according to the Synoptics, the arrest, trial, crucifixion, death, and burial of Jesus took place on a Friday which was (until sunset) the fifteenth of Nisan, Passover Day... John presents us with a different chronology. Nothing in John's narrative designates the Last Supper as a Passover meal" (*A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus: Volume 1* [New York: Doubleday, 1991], 389).

155. Cf. 1 Cor 11:23–25; Mark 14:22–25; Matt 26:26–29; Luke 22:19–20.

156. Wright, *Revolution*, 117–18.

157. On the original meaning of the Passover blood rite, see William K. Gilders, who summarily remarks, "The blood signals the presence of the Israelites in the houses and benefits them by keeping Yahweh from striking their firstborns" (*Blood Ritual in the Hebrew Bible: Meaning and Power* [Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2004], 43–49). On the reception of the rite in the Second Temple era, see Baruch M. Bokser, "Unleavened Bread and Passover, Feasts of," *ABD* 6:760–63); Federico M. Colautti, *Passover in the Works of Josephus*, JSJSup 75 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 155–90; cf. 133–43; Jesper T. Nielsen, "The Lamb of God: The Cognitive Structure of a Johannine Metaphor," in *Imagery in the Gospel of John: Terms, Forms, Themes, and Theology of John*, WUNT 2:200 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 233–39. Those who argue that the blood of the paschal lamb possesses atoning value often point to 2 Chr 30:15–19, Ezek 45:18–24, Philo, *Spec.* 2.147–48, Josephus, *Ant.* 2.312, or dubiously late rabbinic traditions (Nielsen, "Lamb of God," 239 n. 69). The most impressive of these is *Ant.* 2.312, which states that the paschal lamb's blood sanctified (ἁγνίζω) the houses of the Israelites in Egypt. But according to Nielsen, ἁγνίζω precludes an atoning function

return are often accompanied by the promise that God will forgive Israel's sins.[158]

Wright goes so far as to say, "Forgiveness of sins is another way of saying 'return

from exile.'"[159] However, beside for the saying over the cup, he provides no specific

textual evidence for the claim that the agenda of the evangelists is to fuse together

Passover and atonement.

Whether his reading is correct for the Jesus of history, Wright's interpretation

is quite plausible when it comes to the Gospel of Matthew.[160] Like Wright, Richard

---

and should rather be understood as transferring a person/object from a profane domain to one that is holy ("Lamb of God," 238). Having surveyed the literature, Nielsen concludes, "The interpretation that the Passover lamb in Early Judaism had an atoning function must be rejected ... The fundamental motif in every early Jewish interpretation of Passover and the Passover lamb is transferral; through Passover the Israelites are brought from slavery to freedom and because of the Passover lamb they are brought from a situation threatened by death to a situation protected from death" (ibid., 239). Cf. Tamara Prosic, *The Development and Symbolism of Passover until 70 CE*, JSOTSup 414 (London: T&T Clark International, 2004), 49–50. For a recent treatment on whether the "lamb of God" in John 1:29 and 1:36 is an atoning *paschal* lamb, see Gary Wheaton, who concludes, "It seems best to concede that the Passover tradition does not contribute to the question of the atoning value of Jesus's death [in the Gospel of John]" (*The Role of Jewish Feasts in John's Gospel*, SNTSMS 162 [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015], 91–93, quote at 92). Cf. Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John (I–XII)*, AB (New York: Doubleday, 1966), 62.

158. Wright, *Revolution*, 114–16.

159. N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 268; see also 268–71. He cites Lev 26:27–45; Deut 30:1–10; Lam 4:22; Jer 31:31–34; 33:4–11; Ezek 36:24–33; 37:21–23; Isa 33:24; 40:1–2; 43:25–44:3; 52:1, 3, 9; 53:5–6, 11–12; 54:1, 3, 8; 55:7, 12; 64:8–12; Dan 9:16–19; Ezra 9:6–15; Neh 9:6–37. On the continuation of this motif in Second Temple Judaism, see Brant Pitre, *Jesus, the Tribulation and the End of Exile: Restoration Eschatology and the Origin of the Atonement*, WUNT 2:204 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 41–130, esp. 129 n. 277.

160. Many scholars think Matthew frames Jesus's identity and mission against the background of Israel's exile and the eschatological hope for the nation's restoration, especially in the first two chapters of the Gospel; e.g., N. T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 384–90; Blaine Charette, *The Theme of Recompense in Matthew's Gospel*, JSNTSup 79 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1992), e.g., 49–82; Adrian M. Leske, "The Influence of Isaiah 40–66 on Christology in Matthew and Luke: A Comparison," in *Society of Biblical Literature 1994 Seminar Papers*, ed. Eugene H. Lovering Jr., *SBLSP* 33 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994), 897–916; Mervyn Eloff, "Exile, Restoration, and Matthew's Genealogy of Jesus Ὁ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ," *Neotestamentica* 38 (2004): 75–87; Richard B. Hays, "The Gospel of Matthew: Reconfigured Torah," *HTS* 61 (2005): 165–90, at 170–77; Young S. Chae, *Jesus as the Eschatological Davidic Shepherd: Studies in the Old Testament, Second Temple Judaism, and in the Gospel of Matthew*, WUNT 2:216 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 194–98; Joel Willitts, *Matthew's Messianic Shepherd-King: In Search of "The Lost Sheep of the House of Israel*," BZNW 147 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007), 122–34; Joel Kennedy, *The Recapitulation of Israel: Use of Israel's History in Matthew 1:1–4:11*, WUNT 2:257 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck), 97–101; Jason B. Hood, *The Messiah, His Brothers, and the Nations*, LNTS 441 (London: T&T Clark, 2011), 80–86, 155–56; Nicholas Perrin, *Jesus the Temple* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010), 59–61; Eubank, *Wages of Cross–Bearing*, 109–20; Nicholas Piotrowski, *Matthew's New David at the End of Exile: A Socio-Rhetorical Study of Scriptural Quotations*, NovTSup 170

Hays understands Matthew's opening chapter as identifying Jesus as the one who will bring Israel's exile to an end.[161] Having unexpectedly included the Babylonian deportation as the third major focal point in his genealogy (Matt 1:11–12, following Abraham [1:2] and David [1:6]), the evangelist writes, "So all the generations from Abraham to David are fourteen generations; and from David to the deportation to Babylon, fourteen generations; and from the deportation to Babylon to the Messiah, fourteen generations" (Matt 1:17). According to Hays, this summary "unmistakably signals that the coming of Jesus portends the end of Israel's exile."[162] He continues:

> The genealogy functions, for the reader who remembers the complexity of the stories evoked by Matthew's list of names, as a *Sündenspiegel*, a long and tortured narrative in which Israel sees its corporate sins reflected. Yet at the same time, the structure of the genealogy clearly points forward to hope, for it leads finally to "the Messiah" Jesus, the one who "will save his people form their sins" (1:21) ... The Messiah, in Matthew's narrative world, is precisely the

---

(Leiden: Brill, 2016), 14–16, 34–37; Anders Runesson, *Divine Wrath and Salvation in Matthew: The Narrative World of the First Gospel* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2016), 367 n. 64; H. Daniel Zachariah, *Matthew's Presentation of the Son of David: Davidic Tradition and Typology in the Gospel of Matthew* (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017), 42–45; Hays, *Scripture in the Gospels*, 109–116; Catherine Sider Hamilton, *The Death of Jesus in Matthew: Innocent Blood*, SNTSMS 167 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 191–202. On the alleged continued-sense of exile in Second Temple Judaism as a whole, which is argued by Wright (*Jesus and the Victory of God*), see Pitre, who argues that the hope was not for Judah's return but for the restoration of the ten northern tribes of Israel (*Jesus, the Tribulation*), and Craig Evans, who defends Wright's basic position ("Jesus and the Continuing Exile of Israel," in *Jesus and the Restoration of Israel: A Critical Assessment of N. T. Wright's* Jesus and the Victory of God, ed. Carey C. Newman [Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1999], 77–100). Cf. Clive Marsh, "Theological History? N. T. Wright's *Jesus and the Victory of God*," *JSNT* 69 (1998): 77–94; Maurice Casey, "Where Wright is Wrong: A Critical Review of N. T. Wright's *Jesus and the Victory of God*," *JSNT* 69 (1998): 95–103.

161. Hays, *Scripture in the Gospels*, 109–39, esp. 109–12; Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 385–86.

162. Hays, *Scripture in the Gospels*, 110.

one who saves his people from the consequences of their sins by

closing the chapter of powerlessness and deprivation that began with

"the deportation to Babylon."[163]

Hays's interpretation is supported by the fact that Matthew writes the phrase "exile to

Babylon" (ἡ μετοικεσία Βαβυλῶνος) *four times* in his genealogy (Matt 1:11, 12, 17),

and he frequently appropriates scriptural passages directly pertaining to Israel's exile,

such as Hos 11:1 (Matt 2:15), Jer 31:15 (Matt 2:18), and Ezek 37:1–14 (Matt 27:52–

53).[164]

So if, for Matthew, God initiates a new exodus and Passover through Jesus in

order to bring Israel's long exile to a close and thus "save his people from their sins"

(Matt 1:21), then how exactly does Jesus accomplish this mission? Wright argues that

the Gospels tell "the story of how evil draws itself to its height so that it can then be

defeated by the Messiah."[165] In Matthew, this mounting evil is manifest, for example,

in Herod's scheme to kill Jesus and the flight to Egypt (Matt 2:13–15), Jesus's

temptation by the Devil (Matt 4:1–11), growing resistance from the religious

authorities (Matt 12:1–42), mockery of Jesus on the cross (Matt 27:39–44), and

darkness covering the land (Matt 27:45).[166] Somehow, the Devil's authority over the

kingdoms of the earth (Matt 4:9) is transferred to Jesus by means of his death and

resurrection (Matt 28:18): "Something has happened to dethrone the satan and to

enthrone Jesus in its place."[167] What has happened? According to Wright, Jesus takes

---

163. Ibid., 111.

164. See below.

165. Wright, *Revolution*, 205.

166. Ibid., 203–7

167. Ibid., 207.

the weight of Israel's sins and thereby the world's sins upon himself and "dies under the accumulated force of evil, so that now at last the kingdom can come in its fulness."[168] Jesus accomplishes the new Passover by becoming a ransom and taking the place of many (Matt 20:28; Mark 10:45), a notion that derives from Isaiah 53, according to Wright.[169]

While Wright's interpretation as applied to the Gospel of Matthew is compelling on the whole, it faces a few challenges. First, as noted above, Matthew is strikingly conservative in his application of the Servant typology to Jesus in his PN. If the evangelist conceives Jesus as taking upon himself all the accumulated evils of the age and suffering exile on behalf of Israel, then why does Matthew not exploit Isaiah 53 in the PN? Second, with the exception of Matt 26:28, Wright leaves one wondering how the evangelist in his capacity as a redactor ties together the threads of Passover and atonement in his PN. Third, Wright hints at a *Christus Victor* understanding of Jesus's death but fails to explain how this aspect of atonement relates to the "forgiveness of sins" aspect of atonement in the Gospel.

### D. Jesus's Death as a Matter of Innocent Blood in Matthew

Catherine Sider Hamilton contends that Matthew frames Jesus's death as a matter of innocent blood.[170] She argues that, in his reference to the blood of Abel (Matt 23:35),

---

168. Ibid., 217. Wright sees this theme as slightly more emphasized in Luke.

169. Ibid., 222–23.

170. Hamilton, *Death of Jesus*, esp. 32–44. Hamilton's study is very elucidating. Paul Foster warns that innocent bloodshed should not be construed as *the* central theme of Matthew's PN (review of *Death of Jesus*, by Hamilton, *ExpTim* 129 [2017]: 230–31). Indeed, Hamilton does not argue that it is. Rather, she advances "innocent blood" as a unique interpretive lens for reading Matthew's PN that opens up new insights into the author's literary intent.

Matthew is informed by Jewish traditions that narrate a primeval act of bloodshed resulting in divine (eschatological) judgment—what Hamilton calls the "Cain/blood-flood/judgment traditions," since the trope usually involves an allusion to Cain and/or shedding of blood, and the Noahic flood and/or a cataclysmic act of judgment that atones for the bloodshed.[171] In his reference to the blood of Zechariah (Matt 23:35), Matthew also echoes Zechariah traditions that associate innocent blood with divine judgment on the Jerusalem temple.[172] These traditions inform the complex of passages pertaining to bloodguilt, argues Hamilton.[173] She remarks, "For Matthew, the problem of sin is concrete. It is measured in the blood poured out on the land. The recalcitrance of the people, this killing of the prophets, is not only a moral problem but a physical one: sin stains the land."[174]

Against this backdrop, Matthew understands the city marred with the blood of the prophets—and now with the blood of the messiah—as auguring an eschatological purgatory event, namely, the destruction of Jerusalem. In Matthew 27, the bloodguilt

---

171. Hamilton, *Death of Jesus*, 47–129. Accordingly, the main biblical texts pertaining to primeval bloodshed are Gen 4:8–11 and Gen 6:1–5, 11–13 (although Genesis 6 does not explicitly mention bloodshed; see also Lev 17:11 and Num 35:33); in early Jewish traditions: 1 En. 7.4–5; 9.1–2; 22.5–7; 85.4; 86.5–6; 87.1; Jub. 4.2–4, 31; 5.2; 6.4–9 (see Gen 9:4–6; Lev 17:11); 7.20–24, 27; CD 2.8, 18–20; Sib. Or. 3.311–312; Sus 36–41, 62; LAB 16.2; and Jude 11. The main biblical texts pertaining to the judgment that comes as a result of bloodshed in the context of the Flood are Gen 6:6–7, 13; 7:11–12, 17–23; in early Jewish traditions: 1 En. 10:1–22; 88:1–3; 89:5–6; 90:22–27; Jub. 5.4–11, 24–25; 7.25, 28–29, 33; CD 2.5–9; Sib. Or. 3.303, 307, 314; Sus 55, 59; LAB 16.3, 6; and in Jude 6, 7, 13, 15. Hamilton's argument is strongest in the case of the Book of Watchers, the Animal Apocalypse, and Jubilees. Crucial to Hamilton's thesis is the influence of the Book of Watchers on the entire Cain/blood-flood/judgment tradition, and the recognition of an allusion to Gen 4:10 in 1 En. 9.1–2, which ties the sin of Cain to the sin of the Watchers (ibid., 57–59). Hamilton writes, "In 1 Enoch 6–11 I have identified a sequence that constitutes an interpretation of Genesis's primordial narrative: moving from the blood that has been poured out upon the earth to the flood and final judgment, it finds in Cain's bloodshed the primordial sin and in the flood (which is also eschatological cataclysm) that sin's consequence ... The basic logic of this sequence... reappears in a number of diverse texts from Jubilees to Pseudo-Philo and Jude" (ibid., 127).

172. Ibid., 130–48. On these traditions, see Chapter Three.

173. Ibid., 151–228. See further in Chapter Three.

174. Ibid., 160.

of Jesus is passed around as a defiling object, touching the hands of Judas (Matt 27:3), the ναός (Matt 27:5), the chief priests (Matt 27:6), Pilate (Matt 27:24), and eventually "all the people" (Matt 27:25).[175] Israel's history of unbridled bloodshed pollutes the holy city to such an extent that Jerusalem's desolation becomes its only means of purification (Matt 23:29–24:2).[176] This conception is fundamentally the classical Hebrew Bible notion of moral impurity as articulated by Klawans.[177] Sins like bloodshed, idolatry, and sexual immorality are considered so wicked that they are not ritually but morally defiling. As Klawans explains, "The sinners, land, and sanctuary are defiled by these sins in a very substantial way. This defilement, in turn, brings about tangible results for sinners, the sanctuary, and the land... if the defilement becomes severe enough, the people are exiled from it."[178] This notion undergirds Matthew's bloodguilt discourse and assumes a certain material "thingness" about sin (see above).[179]

Hamilton situates the saga of innocent blood within Matthew's larger exile-atonement-restoration complex. Adopting the increasingly popular view that the gospel author introduces Jesus as the figure who will bring Israel's exile to an end (see above), she argues that the theme of innocent blood surfaces in Matthew's quotation of Jer 31:15 after Herod's infanticide (Matt 2:16–18): "Jeremiah's prophecy

175. Ibid., 182–91.

176. Ibid., 231–33.

177. Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 26–31.

178. Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 41. E.g., see Lev 18:24–30; Num 35:33–34; Psa 106:34–41; Ezek 22:1–4.

179. Anderson coins the phrase (*Sin*, 3–4), though the idea was first popularized by Jacob Milgrom), who articulated the Priestly theology's concept of sin as a miasma: "For both Israel and her neighbors impurity was a physical substance, an aerial miasma which possessed magnetic attraction for the realm of the sacred" ("Israel's Sanctuary: The Priestly 'Picture of Dorian Gray,'" *RB* 83 [1976]: 390–99, quote at 392).

of exile realized first in the time of Babylon is now again fulfilled. The blood of Bethlehem's children enacts the exile, even as it points forward to the blood of Jesus and the question of Jerusalem's fate."[180] Matthew narrates Joseph's family's exile to Egypt in the context of Herod's massacre, so that Jesus may come "out of Egypt" (Matt 2:15), thereby fulfilling Hos 11:1, and finally return "to the land of Israel" (Matt 2:21), signaling the eschatological restoration of Israel. According to Hamilton, the evangelist links exodus and exile, just as they are connected in Hosea 11, where Israel's Assyrian exile is portrayed as Israel returning to the land of Egypt (Hos 11:5, 11): "In Jesus, both moments of this history are repeated, with exodus this time, [and] the return εἰς γῆν Ἰσραήλ as the final word."[181] Jesus ends Israel's exile, Hamilton argues, by means of his death and resurrection, which, in accordance with Ezekiel 37, ushers in the eschatological resurrection and restoration of the "holy ones" to the "holy city" (Matt 27:52–53): "If exile follows upon defilement, return marks the reversal of that defilement."[182] For Hamilton, Jesus's blood is not merely innocent blood but also atoning blood in the Gospel (Matt 26:28).[183] Matthew's emphasis on the holiness of the land following Jesus's crucifixion (Matt 27:53) proves the efficacy of Jesus's sacrificial blood: "It is salvation 'for his people,' for it is Jerusalem that is now again holy, and Jerusalem to which the saints return."[184]

Hamilton offers a persuasive reading of Matthew's presentation of Jesus's

---

180. Hamilton, *Death of Jesus*, 192.

181. Ibid.

182. Ibid., 206–12, quote at 211. On the scriptural allusions in Matt 27:52–53, see Chapter Five.

183. Ibid., 221–24.

184. Ibid., 225.

death as a matter of innocent blood. Yet more needs to be said for the question lingering at the end of her study, namely, "Why, if Jesus's blood forgives, need the temple and the city be destroyed?"[185] Hamilton's answer is that the cataclysmic purging of blood-stained Jerusalem is simply what the paradigm of innocent blood requires: "It is not just forgiveness that is necessary but purgation."[186] But for Hamilton, Jesus's forgiveness of sins also entails purgation of sins, as suggested by Matthew's echo of the language of Leviticus 16 in Jesus's saying over the cup (Matt 26:28).[187] Indeed, in the Priestly theology of Leviticus, purgation is forgiveness, and forgiveness is (at least in part) purgation.[188] So why does Jesus's death not purge blood-stained Jerusalem, in the evangelist's thought? How can Jesus's innocent and sacrificial blood simultaneously mean the end of Israel's current exile and the beginning of a new one (i.e., 70 CE)? Might Matthew's concept of atonement extend beyond Jesus's sacrificial death to include the cataclysmic purgative event of 70 CE and, perhaps, the cataclysmic purgation of *all* the unrighteous at the Son of Man's return (Matt 25:41–46)? If Matthew thinks of sin as a concrete object needing removal or purgation, as in the Priestly theology, then should we not consider expanding the evangelist's conception of atonement to include the eschatological purgative event of Jerusalem's destruction and, perhaps, the final judgment?

E. Other Views on Atonement in the Gospel of Matthew

---

185. Ibid., 226.

186. Ibid.

187. Ibid., 221–22. See Chapter Five.

188. See Chapter Two.

A common approach to the question of atonement in Matthew is the notion that Jesus suffered the great tribulation on the cross. According to John P. Meier, Matthew "apocalyptizes" the events surrounding Jesus's death (Matt 27:51–54), the empty tomb narrative (Matt 28:2–3), and Jesus's appearance to his disciples (Matt 28:16–20), in order to communicate that Jesus's death-resurrection is "*the* apocalyptic event ushering in the Kingdom of heaven in a new, decisive form."[189] Dale Allison presents a very similar interpretation of these redaction-laden verses.[190] Accordingly, Jesus's fate is to drink the cup of God's judgment on the cross (Matt 10:22–23; 26:39),[191] which transpires when darkness covers the land (Matt 27:45), Jesus utters his cry of dereliction (Matt 27:46), and the cosmic signs unfold (Matt 27:51–54).[192] As Jeffery Gibbs remarks, "This is judgment day, as all the apocalyptic signs that break loose demonstrate (Matt 27:51–53). The judgment has come upon Jesus."[193]

But commentators are not agreed on whether the tribulation of God's wrath is directed specifically toward Jesus in Matthew's Gospel.[194] Like Brown, Ulrich Luz

---

189. John P. Meier, *The Vision of Matthew: Christ, Church, and Morality in the First Gospel* (New York: Paulist, 1979), 33–38, quote at 32–33.

190. Dale C. Allison, *The End of the Ages has Come: An Early Interpretation of the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 40–50. So also Scot McKnight, though he does not connect the apocalyptic events at Jesus's death with the atonement (*Jesus and His Death: Historiography, the Historical Jesus, and Atonement Theory* [Waco: Baylor University Press, 2005], 361).

191. Davies and Allison note that "cup" (כוס/ποτήριον) often figuratively means suffering, especially suffering God's wrath or judgment (*Matthew*, 3:89). They cite Ps 11:6; 75:7–9; Isa 51:17, 22; Jer 25:15, 17, 27–28; 49:12; Lam 4:21; Ezek 23:31–32; Hab 2:16 (cf. Isa 63:6; Job 21:20; Obad 16); Pss. Sol. 8.14–15; 1QpHab 11.14; 4QpNah 4.6; LAB 50.6; Rev 14:10; 16:19; 18:6.

192. Meier (*Matthew*, 229, 324, 349) and Davies and Allison (*Matthew*, 3:89–90, 101, 497, 622; 221–22) gesture toward this reading. More explicit is Carson, "Matthew," 543–44, 577–78; R. T. France, *The Gospel of Matthew*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 1005; Jeffery A. Gibbs, "The Son of God and the Father's Wrath: Atonement and Salvation in Matthew's Gospel," *CTQ* 72 (2008): 211–25, at 221–23.

193. Ibid., 222.

194. For example, Allison does not discuss atonement in his study of the great tribulation in Jewish literature and its reception in the Jesus tradition and the Synoptic Gospels (*End of the Ages*, 5–

understands the "cup" that Jesus must drink (Matt 26:39), not as the cup of divine judgment, but as the cup of death:[195]

> However, the readers of the Gospel of Matthew, influenced by the redactional "sons of Zebedee" in Matt 20:37, will understand the term ["cup" in Matt 26:39; cf. 26:37] primarily on the basis of 20:20–23, where Jesus likewise confronted the "sons of Zebedee" by speaking of his death as the cup that he must drink—thus too following a Jewish usage. Thus I regard the interpretation of "cup" as God's wrath as a soteriological overinterpretation that probably never would have arisen without the influence of the interpretation of our text in the Reformation.[196]

Brown interprets the darkness on the land in Mark and Matthew as communicating God's judgment, not on Jesus, but the world.[197] With regards to the cry of dereliction, he remarks that "the issue in Jesus's prayer on the cross is God's failure to act... Nothing in the Gospel would suggest God's wrath against Jesus as the explanation."[198] On the contrary, Brant Pitre argues that the historical Jesus "sought to take the sufferings of the tribulation upon himself in order to atone for the sins of Israel and thereby bring about the end of exile," pointing to Second Temple literature that evinces a connection between tribulation and atonement.[199] But besides the witness of

---

50, 74–79, 115–141).

195. Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 1:170.

196. Luz, *Matthew*, 3:396. Luz points out that "an interpretation in terms of God's wrath... is scarcely possible in Mark 10:38–39 // Matt 20:22–23," since then the Sons of Zebedee would also have to drink the cup of God's wrath, which seems highly improbable (ibid., 3:396 n. 30).

197. Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 2:1035, 1045 n. 38.

198. Ibid., 2:1051 n. 54.

199. Pitre lists Dan 9:24; T. Mos. 9.7; 4QpPs[a] 2.8–10; 1QS 8.1–3; CD[b] 19.35–20:1; CD[a]

a few texts from Qumran, it is not always evident that atonement or redemption in this literature is accomplished by means of the saints suffering the wrath of God.[200] In sum, while he certainly showcases Jesus's death as *the* apocalyptic event of the end times, the claim that Matthew conceives Jesus *himself* as suffering the divine wrath of the great tribulation remains contentious.

Turning to the ransom logion (Mark 10:45), which Matthew retains (Matt 20:28) and Luke omits, John Nolland warns that "what exactly is thought to be involved in the Son of Man giving his life as a ransom for many remains quite imprecise."[201] Λύτρον simply means "price of release" or "payment for redemption."[202] Appealing to the word's use in Hellenistic contexts, Yarbro Collins argues that "the term λύτρον ('ransom') in Mark 10:45 is a synonym of ἱλαστήριον ('expiation' or 'propitiaton'). Jesus's death is interpreted here as a metaphorical ritual act of expiation for the offenses of many."[203] But to speak of "expiation" is

---

14.19; 1QM 1.11–12 (*Jesus, the Tribulation*, 452–54; cf. 129 n. 277).

200. By Pitre's own admission, the eschatological tribulation in Daniel and the *Testament of Moses* "is in essence the unleashing of the covenant curses of Deuteronomy *on apostate Israel*," that is, not upon God's righteous (e.g., Daniel, Taxo, or the remnant) (ibid., 89). Pitre's examples from the *Damascus Document* and the *War Scroll* evince merely a broad connection between the great tribulation and atonement—the logical link between the two is by no means apparent. The only two texts presented by Pitre that show a clear connection between the tribulation and atonement are 4QpPs^a 2.8–10 and 1QS 8.1–3, where the community of the faithful are thought to be suffering an eschatological time of distress that in some way atones for sin. Interestingly, the notion of an ongoing Yom Kippur probably lies in the background of these texts (see Chapter Two).

201. John Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 826.

202. LSJ, s.v. "λύτρον"; BDAG, s.v. "λύτρον." In the LXX, λύτρον is used as payment for the redemption of the life of a man whose bull has repeated gored people to death (Exod 21:30), as payment for the redemption of the lives of people participating in a (ritually volatile) census (Exod 30:12), as payment for redeeming mortgaged land (Lev 25:24, 26), as payment for redeeming a kinsman-slave (Lev 25:51–52), in reference to the Levites as God's payment for the redemption of firstborn Israelites (Num 3:12), and as payment for the redemption of (the remaining) firstborn (Num 3:45–51; 18:15).

203. Yarbro Collins, "Mark's Interpretation," 549; eadem, "The Signification of Mark 10:45 among Gentile Christians," *HTR* 90 (1997): 371–82.

inadequate, since it evokes the technical blood rituals of the Priestly theology, which is nowhere in view in Matt 20:28 or Mark 10:45. "Propitiation" is also problematic, since it imports the concept of appeasing an angry deity, which is also foreign to the context. Yet a propitiatory nuance is congruent with Matthew's peculiar notion that God has punitively sent Israel into exile due to its sins, from which Jesus will save Israel (Matt 1:21). In fact, Pitre takes up this line of interpretation, arguing that Dan 7:11–27 and 9:24–27 is the dominant background to the ransom logion: "Jesus is saying that the Son of Man as Messiah will perish in the tribulation, the climax of the exile, and that his life will function as a 'ransom' for the 'many' who have been scattered. His death will atone for sin and will restore the tribes of Jacob."[204] While accepting the possibility of Danielic influence on the logion, J. Christopher Edwards is skeptical that λύτρον means payment for the release from exile for the tribes scattered among the nations: "If λύτρον is understood to mean redemption from exile/ enslavement, or a new exodus, then Mark and Matthew may be better understood as asserting redemption from enslavement to Satan or demons."[205] Edwards's critique demonstrates the great difficulty scholars have in pinpointing a specific context and referent for λύτρον in Matt 20:28 and Mark 10:45. One should not rule out the possibility that, in Matthew, the bondage from which Jesus serves to release "the many" as a "ransom" pertains to Satan, sin, *and* exile, conceived as an interrelated set of hostile powers. Finally, one ought to be wary of employing the ransom logion (Matt 20:28), the "cup" passages (Matt 20:22–23; 26:39), and the cry of dereliction

---

204. Pitre, *Jesus, the Tribulation*, 417; cf. 384–417.

205. J. Christopher Edwards, *The Ransom Logion in Mark and Matthew: Its Reception and Its Significance for the Study of the Gospels*, WUNT 2:327 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 153. Similarly, see Sharyn Dowd and Elizabeth Struthers Malbon, "The Significance of Jesus's Death in Mark: Narrative Context and Authorial Audience," *JBL* 125 (2006): 271–97.

(Matt 27:46) to determine one's understanding of Matthew's atonement theology, since the evangelist gives very little editorial attention to these passages.

Lastly, Leroy Huizenga has argued that Matthew crafts an Isaac typology, which provides the bedrock for the gospel writer's theology of atonement: "Both are promised children conceived under extraordinary circumstances, beloved sons who go obediently and willingly to their redemptive deaths at the hands of their respective fathers at the season of Passover."[206] According to Huizenga, the Isaac typology serves Matthew's theology of Jesus as the replacement of the temple and initiator of a new sacrificial program, since the Akedah was construed as a sacrifice performed at the locale of the temple mount in early Judaism.[207] However, it is questionable whether Matthew has consciously constructed an Isaac typology, since many of the proposed allusions are weak. For example, the most striking and "unmistakable allusion" is the alleged use of Gen 17:19 LXX in Matt 1:20–21.[208] However, Matthew's language is far more easily explained by Isa 7:14 LXX, which the evangelist quotes two verses later (Matt 1:23), or as stock biblical language.[209] Huizenga's dismissal of redaction criticism is all too convenient for his thesis.[210] The phrase "beloved son" (ὁ υἱός μου ὁ

---

206. Huizenga, *New Isaac*, 2.

207. See 2 Chr 3:1; Jub. 18.13; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.224, 226. Huizenga, *New Isaac*, 78–79, 82–83, 278–91.

208. Ibid., 266. Matt 1:20–21: μὴ φοβηθῇς παραλαβεῖν Μαρίαν τὴν γυναῖκά σου ... τέξεται δὲ υἱόν, καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν. Gen 17:19 LXX: ἰδοὺ Σάρρα ἡ γυνή σου τέξεταί σοι υἱόν, καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰσαάκ.

209. Isa 7:14: τέξεται υἱόν, καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουήλ (see Matt 1:23). The collocation τίκτω + καλέω + τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ occurs 25 times in the LXX: Gen 16:11, 15; 19:37, 38; 21:3; 29:23, 33, 34, 35; 30:20, 21; 38:3, 4, 5; Judg 13:24 (with ἡ γυνή); Ruth 4:17; 1 Sam 1:20; 2 Sam 12:24; 1 Chr 4:9; 7:16, 23; Hos 1:6; Isa 7:14; 8:3.

210. Huizenga, *New Isaac*, 2–9, 269–70. While he faults Matthean scholars who utilize redaction criticism because they may neglect narrative dimensions of the Gospel, Huizenga commits the reverse mistake by largely ignoring the positive contribution that redaction criticism can make to the study of Matthew. It seems that for Huizenga, one must entirely dispense with redactional methodology in order to employ narrative tools of analysis. This is a fallacious proposition.

ἀγαπητός, Matt 3:17; 17:5), which Huizenga claims alludes to Isaac (Gen 22:2, 12, 16 LXX), remains untouched by the editorial hand of the First Evangelist, who merely copies it from his Markran *Vorlage* (Mark 1:11; 9:7).[211] In fact, Matthew omits the phrase υἱός ἀγαπητός from his Parable of the Wicked Vineyard Tenants (Matt 21:33–44; cf. Mark 12:6), though Luke faithfully reproduces it (Luke 20:13). Again, Matthew's mention of "swords" (μάχαιραι) and "clubs" (ξύλα), which purportedly evokes the "knife" (μάχαιρα) and "wood" (ξύλα) of Isaac's sacrifice (Gen 22:3, 6, 7, 9, 10), is not redactional but copied from his Markan source-text (Matt 26:47, 55; Mark 14:43, 48).[212] Perhaps one would do better searching for an Isaac typology in the Gospel of Mark? On the whole, Paul Foster's evaluation seems fair: "Why would Matthew bury what is supposedly a controlling typological figure so deeply in the narrative? ... Has the history of interpretation been totally deaf, or has Matthew been unbelievably incompetent?"[213] While Isaac may faintly lurk behind a few passages in the Gospel, the evidence is not strong enough to suggest a significant impact of the Akedah on Matthew's conception of Jesus's death.

## Conclusion

Modern scholarship has left the question of the Day of Atonement's influence on the Gospel of Matthew largely untouched. While Crossan, Koester, Yarbro Collins,

---

211. More probable is that Matthew interprets the "beloved son" (ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός), in whom God is "well pleased" (εὐδοκέω), in light of the Isaianic Servant, of whom the evangelist uniquely speaks by citing Isa 42:1: ὁ ἀγαπητός μου εἰς ὃν εὐδόκησεν ἡ ψυχή μου (Matt 12:18). Though Matthew does not here render from the LXX, his translation of Isa 42:1 seems to be influenced by the language of Mark 1:11. Note that Matthew adds εὐδοκέω in Matt 17:5 (cf. Mark 9:7).

212. Huizenga, *New Isaac*, 251–60.

213. Paul Foster, review of *The New Isaac*, by Leroy A. Huizenga, *JSNT* 33 (2011): 51–52.

DeMaris, Wratislaw, Maclean, and Stökl Ben Ezra have advanced our knowledge on the topic, more remains to be explored and accomplished.

First, there is yet to be a comprehensive analysis of Matthew's PN in light of Leviticus 16 and Day of Atonement traditions. The primary task of this dissertation is to undertake such a investigation, so that the question of whether the First Evangelist has constructed a sustained Yom Kippur typology can be adequately assessed.

Second, there are various difficulties with the heretofore proposed Day of Atonement typology in Matthew 27. To summarize, the chief of these are (1) the failure to take into account Second Temple Yom Kippur *traditions* (not just Leviticus 16) in the analysis of Matthew's PN, (2) the need for clarity as to how Matthew's goat typology relates to his larger innocent-blood discourse, (3) the lack of an explanation of how Barabbas can function as a sin-bearing scapegoat, (4) the uncertainty of whether the evangelist's typology extends into Matt 27:24–25, (5) the failure to consider whether Matthew's Roman-abuse scene (Matt 27:27–31) follows Mark in drawing upon elimination-ritual traditions, not least the scapegoat tradition, (6) the question of how and why Matthew would conceive multiple scapegoats, and (7) the want of an analysis of the remainder of the PN in light of the evangelist's purported goat typology.

Third, there are numerous inadequacies with the state of scholarship concerning Matthew's concept of atonement, some of which the Yom Kippur typology has potential to address or resolve. I summarize these as follows:

(1) As Huizenga observes, "relatively little of a comprehensive character seems to have been written pertaining to the mechanics of Jesus's sacrificial death in the Gospel of Matthew; the issue is not a central concern of major Matthean

scholars."[214] If Yom Kippur has influenced Matthew's PN, then one can locate more precisely the mechanism of atonement the evangelist deems operative in Jesus's death.

(2) Anderson and Eubank fail to account for a prevailing concept of sin in the Gospel, namely, sin as a concrete object needing physical removal or elimination. In this light, one expects a schema of atonement in Matthew whereby Jesus physically removes or eliminates sins, since a given model of atonement should assume a logically corresponding concept of sin. A scapegoat typology would fit such a schema, since the scapegoat's role was physically to remove and elimination the contaminant of sin.

(3) While Wright's claim that the evangelists' agenda was to fuse together Passover and the forgiveness of sins seems credible, it lacks substantial textual support. In addition to Matt 26:28, the Day of Atonement typology in Matthew's Barabbas episode (Matt 27:15–26) could provide evidence for this interpretation, since the amnesty ritual, which the evangelist allegedly remodels as a lottery between two goats, is specifically identified as a *Passover* custom (Matt 27:15).

(4) Scholars such as Moo, Brown, Davies, and Allison have difficulty explaining the abscondence of the Suffering Servant figure in Matthew's PN. A scapegoat Christology would aid in explaining this phenomenon, since the Servant and the scapegoat both possess the unique quality of bearing sins. If Matthew employs a scapegoat Christology in the PN, then the Servant typology may be regarded as functionally redundant.

(5) Hamilton does not consider whether Matthew's concept of atonement

---

214. Huizenga, *New Isaac*, 268.

extends beyond Jesus's sacrificial death to include 70 CE. If Matthew conceives sin as a concrete object requiring purgation or removal, as in the Priestly theology, then we should consider expanding the evangelist's notion of atonement to include the purgative event of Jerusalem's destruction. The gospel writer's Yom Kippur typology may actually point in this direction.

(6) Wright fails to explain how the *Christus Victor* trope intersects with the "forgiveness of sins" trope in Matthew. If the Azazel tradition has influenced the evangelist's Yom Kippur typology, then is it possible that the scapegoat Christology, wherein Jesus becomes the "goat for Azazel," stands at the confluence of these two currents of atonement theology?

In the course of this investigation, I hope to bring some clarity and insight to these lacunae in my analysis of the influence of Leviticus 16 and Yom Kippur traditions on the Gospel of Matthew.

CHAPTER TWO:

OVERVIEW OF LEVITICUS 16 AND YOM KIPPUR TRADITIONS

IN EARLY JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY

Given the arcane nature of the biblical ritual described in Leviticus 16 and the complex development of traditions associated with Yom Kippur in the Second Temple period, it is fitting first to review both of these topics before investigating their possible influence on the Gospel of Matthew. I do not intend this summary of biblical, early Jewish, and early Christian material to be exhaustive, but adequate for the purposes of my analysis of Matthew.

## Leviticus 16: An Overview of Critical Issues

Deriving from the priestly sources of the Pentateuch, Leviticus 16 records the instructions for the ancient Israelite holy day, Yom Kippur, or "the Day of Atonement."[1] Contemporary knowledge of Yom Kippur owes a great debt to the work of Hebrew Bible scholar and Jewish rabbi, Jacob Milgrom, whose research remains the touchstone for scholarly engagement with Leviticus today.[2] In his seminal article,

---

1. Scholars generally agree that Leviticus 1–16 derives from P and that Leviticus 17–27 originates from H, a distinct Priestly school. According to Jacob Milgrom, most of Leviticus 16 belongs to P or an earlier source incorporated into P, except for Lev 16:29–34a, which derives from H (*Leviticus: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB, 3 vols. [New York: Doubleday, 1991–2001], 1:1021).

2. As Jonathan Klawans points out, Milgrom is significantly indebted to Mary Douglas in assuming that the Levitical purity laws possess a systematic and coherent inner-logic and that this system is fundamentally symbolic (*Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism* [Oxford: Oxford University Press], 27–29). Mary Douglas's *Purity and Danger* was a turning point in biblical scholarship (*Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concept of Pollution and Taboo* [London: Routledge, 1966]), since she refuted the anti-ritualistic and evolutionary bias in prior Hebrew Bible and comparative-religion scholarship, as embodied in the influential works of William Robertson Smith (*The Religion of the Semites: The Fundamental Institutions*, 3rd ed. [New York: Macmillan, 1927 [1889]]) and James George Frazer (*The Golden Bough: A Study of Magic and Religion* [New York: The Floating Press: 2009 [1890]]). According to Douglas, the aim of Robertson

"Israel's Sanctuary: The Priestly 'Picture of Dorian Gray,'" Milgrom brought to light

the fact that, "for both Israel and her neighbors impurity was a physical substance, an

aerial miasma that possessed magnetic attraction for the realm of the sacred."[3] Baruch

Schwartz's important essay, "The Bearing of Sin in the Priestly Literature," advanced

Milgrom's theory.[4] According to Schwartz, "though invisible, defilement is believed

to be quite real; though amorphous, it is substantive... The entire priestly system of

impurity and its disposal rests on the postulate that impurity is not simply a condition,

a ritual 'state'; it is the defilement itself. It is *real*."[5] This understanding of the Priestly

conception of impurity is now the consensus view among scholars.[6] Milgrom showed

that, according to the Priestly theology, impurity and sin have the ability to penetrate

and pollute sacred space from afar and that they do so in a tripartite gradation of

holiness: the inadvertent sins and impurities of individual Israelites pollute the

courtyard, the inadvertent sins of the community or priesthood pollute the shrine (the

outer sanctuary), and Israel's defiant sins pollute the outer sanctuary but also penetrate

---

Smith "was to scrape away the clinging rubble and dust of contemporary savage cultures and to reveal the life-bearing channels which prove their evolutionary status by their live functions in modern society. This is precisely what *The Religion of the Semites* attempts to do. Savage superstition is there separated from the beginnings of true religion, and discarded with very little consideration" (*Purity*, 17). For Douglas, Frazer advanced this bias by dividing human culture into three evolutionary stages— magic, religion, and science—and by unquestioningly assuming that "ethical refinement is a mark of advanced civilisation... [and that] magic has nothing to do with morals or religion" (*Purity*, 28–29).

3. Jacob Milgrom, "Israel's Sanctuary: The Priestly 'Picture of Dorian Gray,'" *RB* (1976): 390–99, at 392.

4. Schwartz, "Bearing of Sin," 3–22. Schwartz solved the riddle of how the phrase נשא עון/חטא/ פשע can mean both "to be guilty" and "to be forgiven," by realizing that the phrase assumes a concept of sin as a physical object: "When the sinner 'bears' his sin, it weighs upon him; when someone else 'bears' it, the sinner is relieved of it... the sinner who bears his sin carries it about with him, as an encumbrance, an everlasting yoke, under whose strain he may eventually be crushed... when the sinner is relieved of his burden, it means not 'carry' but 'carry off, take away, remove'" (ibid., 10).

5. Ibid., 5 (emphasis original).

6. See the critique of Milgrom by Hyam Maccoby (*Ritual and Morality: The Ritual Purity System and its Place in Judaism* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999], 165–81]) and the comprehensive response by Milgrom ("Impurity is Miasma: A Response to Hyam Maccoby," *JBL* 119 [2000]: 729–46).

the פרכת and pollute the adytum (the Holy of Holies) and the כפרת—the very throne of God (cf. Lev 16:2, Isa 37:16).[7] As Milgrom and Schwartz indicate, the principal task of the high priest on Yom Kippur was to purge and remove the accumulated sins and impurities of Israel from the sanctuary and sancta by means of the חטאת offering of the immolated goat and the ritual expulsion of the scapegoat. According to Schwartz, "*even though* wanton sins cannot be eradicated, they must not be allowed to accumulate in the divine abode. They *must* be driven away, so that the divine Presence will not be driven away. Maintaining the welfare of the community, ensuring the continued abiding Presence of the Lord, is paramount."[8] Milgrom similarly remarks that "the sanctuary needs constant purification lest the resident god abandons [*sic*] it."[9] The preservation of God's presence in the tabernacle seems to have been the main purpose of the biblical Yom Kippur ritual according to P.[10]

The חטאת offering, or so-called "sin-offering," is a key part of the Day of Atonement.[11] Milgrom describes the blood of the חטאת offering as a "ritual detergent"

---

7. Milgrom, "Israel's Sanctuary," 393–94.

8. Schwartz, "Bearing of Sin," 21 (emphasis original).

9. Milgrom, "Israel's Sanctuary," 398–99.

10. For H (Lev 16:29–34a), it may be that the prevention of Israel's expulsion from the land comprised the rite's chief aim. As Joshua M. Vis suggests, "In P, humanity is constantly a threat to Yhwh due to their natural impurity and wrongdoing, all of which could lead to Yhwh's departure from the tabernacle. In H, the end result of disobedience and pollution is not the expulsion of Yhwh from his earthly abode, but the expulsion of the Israelites from the land and from the presence of Yhwh" ("The Purification Offering of Leviticus and the Sacrificial Offering of Jesus" [PhD diss., Duke University, 2012], 227).

11. Milgrom refers to the חטאת offering as "purification offering," instead of the usual English translation, "sin offering" (*Leviticus*, 1:253; idem, "Sin-Offering or Purification Offering," *VT* 21 [1971]: 237–39). One reason for this choice is that the חטאת offering is usually prescribed for situations having nothing to do with sin (e.g., Lev 14:13, 19, 22, 31; 15:15, 30). James W. Watts critiques Milgrom's translation, "purification offering," since it obscures the fact that the Hebrew of Leviticus 4–5 repeatedly uses the root חטא (*Ritual and Rhetoric in Leviticus: From Sacrifice to Scripture* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007], 82). For the generally positive reception of Milgrom's proposal, see ibid., 80–81.

that is capable of decontaminating the sanctuary and its sancta of the defilement caused by sin or impurity; the blood is never applied to people but only to the sanctuary and its furniture (e.g., Lev 16:14–16, 18–20).[12] While an impersonal object may be the direct object of the verb כפר (Lev 16:20, 33a) or take the prepositions על or ב in conjunction with that verb (e.g., Lev 16:16–18), a person is never the direct object of כפר, but the verb almost always requires the preposition על or בעד in this scenario (e.g., Lev 16:6, 24, 30, 33).[13] One of Schwartz's key insights is that sin and impurity comprise two distinct types of pollution in the Priestly theology, and that sin, while not causing defilement (as impurities do), behaves *like* defilement and must therefore also be purged by means of the חטאת blood.[14] The verb that the Priestly writers usually employ to describe the effect of the חטאת offering is כפר, which Milgrom interprets as "to purge" in cultic settings, hence his gloss, "the Day of

---

12. Milgrom, "Israel's Sanctuary," 391. Responding to Yehezkel Kaufmann, who maintained that Hebrew biblical theology is thoroughly monotheistic, Baruch Levine contends that Near Eastern religious beliefs influenced the ancient Israelite conception of impurity and expiatory sacrifice (*In the Presence of the Lord: A Study of Cult and Some Terms in Ancient Israel* [Leiden: Brill, 1974], 67–77). Accordingly, Levine argues that impurities were thought to release demonic contagions into the community and provoke the wrath of Yahweh. The function of an expiatory offering, such as the חטאת, was apotropaic and warded off the demonic threat, thereby protecting the presence of Yahweh and (indirectly) the impure worshipper and his community (for many examples, see David P. Wright, *The Disposal of Impurity: Elimination Rites in the Bible and in Hittite and Mesopotamian Literature*, SBLDS 101 [Atlanta: Scholars, 1986], 31–72). Milgrom steers a *via media* between Kaufmann and Levine, claiming that, while earlier Israelite cultic practice involved such beliefs concerning the demonic, by the time of the Priestly school the cult had largely been devitalized: "The demons have been expunged from the world but man has taken their place. This is one of the major contributions of the priestly theology: man is demonized... He alone is the cause of the world's ills. He alone can contaminate the sanctuary and force God out" (Milgrom, "Israel's Sanctuary," 397). So also Wright, *Disposal of Impurity*, 72–74; Mary Douglas, *Leviticus as Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 10–11.

13. Milgrom, "Israel's Sanctuary," 391; idem, *Leviticus*, 1:255–56. See further in note below.

14. Schwartz, "Bearing of Sin," 6–7. Schwartz summarizes: "Just as with bodily impurities, so with sin: the contamination of the sanctuary and its sancta must be expunged by means of the purification offering: the חטאת. Most importantly, both types of decontamination are referred to by a single term, the verb כפר" (ibid., 4). On the distinction between ritual and moral impurity in the Hebrew Bible, see Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 21–42.

Purgation" (יום הכפרים, Lev 23:27; 25:9).[15] It is possible that in cultic contexts the verb

כפר also contains the implied meaning, "to ransom" or "to appease," but it seems

exegetically prudent to determine whether such a secondary meaning is implied on a

case-by-case basis.[16]

---

15. According to Watts, the typical appeal to the relatively late Arabic cognate *kafara*, meaning "to cover," to define the Hebrew verb כפר "has been discredited over the last few decades in favor of one [explanation] from an Akkadian cognate term meaning 'to wipe off'" (*Ritual and Rhetoric*, 131). For example, Levine writes, "In the Hebrew Bible, the verb kipper was never used to convey either the graphics of 'covering' sins, or that particular notion of atonement or forgiveness ... There is no real evidence for relating any of the terms based on the root k-p-r in the cultic vocabulary to the notion of covering" (*Presence of the Lord*, 60, 63). Milgrom argues that the Hebrew כפר (*kippēr*) derives from the Akkadian *kuppuru*, meaning "to rub" or "rub off, wipe" (*Leviticus*, 1:1079–84), which has become the consensus view. Many Near Eastern rites attest to the practice of wiping an impure object with a material that absorbed the pollutant and then was carefully eliminated. A classic example is a purgative rite at the Mesopotamian New Year's festival, wherein a priest wipes a sanctuary with the carcass of a ram and throws the ram's carcass into a river to dispose of the impurity (ibid., 1:1067–70). According to Milgrom, the verb כפר in Priestly ritual texts *always* means "to rub or wipe off": "As has been demonstrated, כפר in all instances of the חטאת offering bears this meaning exclusively. The blood of the sacrifices is literally daubed or aspersed on the sancta, thereby 'rubbing off' their impurities" (ibid., 1:1081). Milgrom distinguishes an entirely separate meaning of the verb כפר, which he classifies as a denominative from the noun כפר (*kōper*), which means "ransom" or "appeasement." These passages "assign to *kippēr* the function of averting God's wrath... [that is,] innocent life spared by substituting for it the guilty parties or their ransom" (ibid., 1082) (e.g., Exod 30:12–16; 32:30 Num 8:19; 35:31–33; Deut 21:1–9; 2 Sam 21:3–6; cf. Num 1:53; 18:22–23; 25:10; Isa 47:11). For Milgrom, this meaning of the verb כפר is distinct from its cultic usage in the Priestly literature and is a later stage of the word's semantic development, possibly deriving from the fact that the wiping material requiring elimination could be conceived as a "substitute" or "ransom" on behalf of the offender. Finally, the Hebrew verb evolves to adopt a general and abstract meaning, "to atone" or "to expiate" (e.g., Exod 5:16, 18, 26; 29:33; Num 17:11; Isa 6:7; 22:14; 27:9; Jer 18:23; Ezek 16:63; Pss 65:4; 78:38; 79:9). Levine (*Presence of the Lord*, 67–69) and Schwartz ("The Prohibitions Concerning the 'Eating' of Blood in Leviticus 17," in *Priesthood and Cult in Ancient Israel*, ed. Gary A. Anderson and Saul M. Olyan, JSOTSup 125 [Sheffield: Sheffield, 1991], 34–66, at 52–54) advance such a hard distinction between the two meanings of *kippēr*, namely, "to purge" and "to ransom." For alternative viewpoints, see notes below.

16. See note above on Milgrom's etymology of כפר. Jay Sklar challenges the claim that *kippēr* and *kōper* are "unrelated homographs" (Schwartz, "Prohibitions," 54), arguing that the verb כפר always carries both meanings "to purge" and "to ransom/appease" (*Sin, Impurity, Sacrifice, Atonement: Priestly Conceptions* [Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2005]). Sklar contends that major impurities requiring *kippēr* not only pollute but also endanger, and that inadvertent sins requiring *kippēr* not only endanger but also pollute, suggesting that the *kippēr*-rite both purges and ransoms in either context. Sklar writes that "the end point of sin and impurity is the same: both endanger (requiring ransom) and both pollute (requiring purgation). As a result, it is not simply *kōper* that is needed in some instances and purgation that is needed in others, but *kōper*-purgation that is needed in both" (ibid., 182). Sklar's thesis is persuasive as a synchronic reading of the Pentateuch as a whole, which may be the framework in which the gospel writers read Leviticus. However, Sklar's thesis is not ultimately persuasive with regards to the theology of P. He contends, for example, that the verbs כפר and סלח frequently occur in contexts of sin and that the latter usually involves a *kōper*-payment in place of a deserved penalty. In these contexts, the verb כפר describes the act of the priest making a *kōper*-payment on behalf of the sinner by means of a sacrifice (Jay Sklar, "Sin and Impurity: Atoned and Purified? Yes!" in *Perspectives on Purity and Purification in the Bible*, ed. Baruch J. Schwartz et al. [New York: T&T

The debate on the relationship of the verb כפר (*kippēr*) and the noun כפר (*kōper*) largely hinges on the interpretation of Lev 17:11, a text deriving from the Priestly H source, which postdates P.[17] In recent years, Jonathan Vis has offered a compelling reading of this contentious verse, since it allows Lev 17:11 to be a general

---

Clark, 2008], 18–31, at 21). However, the primary example provided (Num 14:11–25) neither derives from the P source, nor from a cultic setting, nor does it contain the words *kippēr* or *kōper*, and thus it seems problematic to use Num 14:11–25 to explicate the meaning of *kippēr* in the cultic settings of P. A key text for Sklar is Num 35:30–34, which states that no ransom (*kōper*) may be accepted for the life of a murderer (Num 35:31) and that the only atonement (*kippēr*) that can be made for the polluted land is the blood of the murderer himself (Num 35:33). According to Sklar, the verb כפר in Num 35:33 refers to "the effecting of a ransom payment which has purgative results" ("Sin and Impurity," 30; cf. *Sin, Impurity*, 154–56). But one must ask whether this constitutes evidence for the meaning of *kippēr* in the cultic contexts of P. Rick J. Barry IV notes that Num 35:33, deriving from H, dates later than the main body of Leviticus 1–16 and that, while drawing on the concepts of pollution and purgation, Numbers 35 has very little to do with cultic practice—is the murderer conceived as an acceptable sacrifice to God without blemish (cf. Lev 22:17–20) (*The Two Goats: A Christian Yom Kippur Soteriology* [PhD diss., Marquette University, 2017], 230)? Surely not. Barry would agree with Milgrom and Schwartz in reading Num 35:33 as a later development in the semantic development of the verb כפר. In another instance, Sklar notes that a priest in an unclean state is endangered by means of his uncleanness (Lev 22:3, 9) and claims that the verb כפר in this context involves not only cleansing but also a *kōper*-payment (*Sin, Impurity*, 130). But while ritual purifications are clearly prescribed for unclean priests (e.g., Lev 22:6), nowhere does Lev 22:1–9 prescribe a *kōper*-payment for the unclean priest who defiles the sancta. Rather, he is "cut off" (Lev 22:3) and "incurs guilt" and "dies in the sanctuary" as a consequence of his actions. On Lev 17:11, see note below.

17. Unlike many of his other suggestions, Milgrom's interpretation of Leviticus 17 has not won wide scholarly support. Milgrom argues that Lev 17:11, deriving from H, applies only to the שלמים offering mentioned earlier in v. 5 (*Leviticus*, 2:1474–78). He takes vv. 3–4 as indicating that the slaughter of animals—even sacrificial animals—is a capital offense in H and contends that the blood of the שלמים (v. 5) functions to "ransom" (v. 11) the offerer from this crime. Thus, the verb כפר in Lev 17:11 means "to ransom," but only in regards to the שלמים offering in the H source. Concuring with Milgrom about the unique quality of Lev 17:11, Schwartz writes, "It is the only place in the Priestly code, or for that matter in the Bible, in which sacrificial blood is said to be a ransom for human life" ("Blood in Leviticus," 55–56; so also Gilders, *Blood Ritual in the Hebrew Bible*, 170–76). However, Schwartz criticizes the notion that sacrifice is intrinsically sinful in Priestly thought and instead takes Lev 17:11 as the innovation theology of H that attributes a ransoming effect to *all* sacrifices effecting כפר ("Blood in Leviticus," 58–59). Milrom's claim that Lev 17:11 applies only to the שלמים offering has not garnered wide support (see the critics cited in Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 2:1474–75). As Sklar notes, Lev 17:10 "takes its eyes off the peace offering to make a general prohibition against the consumption of the blood of any animal," and Lev 17:11 grounds this prohibition (*Sin, Impurity*, 177). Vis notices that Lev 17:10–15 forms a single unit, vv. 10–12 concerning the blood of sacrificial animals and vv. 13–15 concerning the blood of non-sacrificial animals ("Purification Offering," 211). In short, the immediate context of Lev 17:11 is too far removed from the שלמים in Lev 17:5 and concerns a broader context of bloodshed (Barry, "Two Goats," 235). Against Milgrom, Sklar takes Lev 17:11 as a general statement concerning the function of sacrificial blood, but he agrees with Milgrom and Schwartz that the verb כפר means "ransom" (*Sin, Impurity*, 163–82). In keeping with his general thesis, Sklar maintains that כפר also carries a (secondarily) purgative meaning in Lev 17:11 (ibid., 182). But as Vis notes, such a double meaning of כפר in Lev 17:11 is by no means apparent ("Purification Offering," 216).

statement about sacrificial blood (as it plainly seems to be) and permits the verb כפר to mean what it usually seems to mean in the cultic texts of P, namely, "to purge."[18] Vis translates Lev 17:11, "For the spirit of the flesh is in the blood, and I have placed it for you upon the altar to purge your spirits; for it is the blood that purges by means of the spirit" (כי נפש הבשר בדם הוא ואני נתתיו לכם על־המזבח לכפר על־נפשתיכם כי־הדם הוא בנפש יכפר).[19] In other words, sacrificial blood has the potency to purge the offerer's נפש, since the blood contains the נפש (or animating lifeforce) of the offering. Interestingly, it is *the people* who are purged by means of כפר in Lev 16:29–34a (also from the H source): "For on this day, he [the priest] shall purge you [יכפר עליכם] to purify you [לטהר אתכם] of all your sins" (Lev 16:30a).[20] This is the first time in Leviticus 16 that the people are the objects of כפר, a point that H emphasizes in vv. 33b–34. Vis remarks, "Why would the author of H, the editor of P and the Pentateuch, use the same verb (כפר) with the same preposition (על) differently in a sacrificial context less than one chapter later? It is more probable that Lev 17:11, from the same author as Lev 16:30, is also using כפר in the sense of 'purge,' with the object of cleansing being the offerers, and more specifically, the נפשות of the offerers."[21] In short, Leviticus

---

18. Ibid., 209–30.

19. Ibid., 205 (emphasis mine).

20. Vis makes the compelling case that כפר + על and כפר + את function equivalently to mark the object or person being purged in Lev 16:2–28 (where only the sancta are the objects of purging) and Lev 16:29–34a (where the santa *and the people* become the objects of purging), in which privative מן marks the substance being purged from the object (Lev 16:16, 30, 34a) (ibid., 97–109, 124–34). Levine had previously reached a very similar conclusion (*Presence of the Lord*, 66). Vis exposes the self-contradictory position of Milgrom (who does not take כפר + על as marking the object of purgation [see note above]), by showing how Milgrom understands כפר + על as indicating the purgation of the adytum in Lev 16:16 (כפר על־הקדש) but not in Lev 16:18 (כפר עליו), while Lev 16:20 (in which את + כפר is used to indicate the purgation of sancta) seems to require both Lev 16:16 and 16:18 to be taken as functionally equivalent to כפר + את ("Purification Offering," 98–100; cf. Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 1:1033–37).

21. Vis, "Purification Offering," 224–25.

17:11 need not complicate Milgrom's insight concerning the purgative meaning of the verb כפר in the Priestly literature. Rather, it elucidates the close relationship between the purgation of the sanctuary (the emphasis of P, Lev 16:1–28) and the purgation of the people (the emphasis of H, Lev 16:29–34a), which becomes a unique feature of Yom Kippur from the perspective of the final form of Leviticus 16. Milgrom's thesis regarding the Priestly theology of blood's purgative power therefore stands: "Impurity is the realm of death. Only its antonym, life, can be its antidote. Blood, then, as life is what purges the sanctuary [and in H, one might add, the people as well]. It nullifies, overpowers, and absorbs the Israelite's impurities that adhere to the sanctuary, thereby allowing the divine presence to remain and Israel to survive."[22]

Much more could be said about contemporary research on Leviticus and the biblical Yom Kippur rite, but an exhaustive history of scholarship is not the aim of the present work. What follows is a brief exposition of the biblical ritual with a focused attention on those elements most apropos to this study.

### Leviticus 16: A Summary of the Biblical Yom Kippur Ritual

Leviticus 16 presents a two-part sacerdotal ritual, chief occasion of which is the

---

22. Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 1:711–12. This is not to say that Milgrom's theory has gone otherwise unchallenged. For example, Hartmut Gese ("The Atonement," in *Essays on Biblical Theology*, trans. Keith Crim [Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1981], 93–116) and Bernd Janowski (*Sühne als Heilsgeschehen: Studien zur Sühnetheologie der Priesterschrift und zur Wurzel KPR im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament*, WMANT 55 [Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1982], 198–259) deny the purgative effect of blood in the Priestly literature, arguing that the hand-leaning rite (Lev 1:4) identifies the offering with the offerer's spirit (נפש), which vicariously and punitively dies by means of the animal's slaughter and is revivified when the sacrificial blood comes into contact with the sacred realm. Roy Gane contends that the hand-leaning rite transfers the offerer's sins onto the sacrificial animal, whose blood is not purgative but a means of transmitting Israel's sins into the sacred realm where they can be removed on the Day of Atonement (*Cult and Character: Purification Offerings, Day of Atonement, and Theodicy* [Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005], 164–81). For recent criticisms of these positions, see Vis, "Purification Offering," 189–91, 216–21; Barry, "Two Goats," 240, n. 187.

purgation of Israel's impurities and sins from the sanctuary and the people. Yom Kippur is notably the one day of the year on which the high priest is permitted to enter the adytum, the most sacred realm in the tabernacle or temple.

In the first part of the biblical ritual, Aaron purges the three principal parts of the tabernacle—the adytum, the shrine, and the outer altar—of Israel's impurities and sins with חטאת blood.[23] To do this, Aaron selects two male goats from the congregation of Israel as a חטאת offering for the people (v. 5). He takes the two goats and presents them before the Lord at the entrance of the tent of meeting (v. 7) and then casts lots over them, "one lot for the Lord and one lot for Azazel" (גורל אחד ליהוה וגורל אחד לעזאזל, v. 8).[24] Aaron is instructed to offer the immolated goat as a חטאת for the people (vv. 9, 15) and to send the scapegoat "to Azazel in the wilderness" (v. 10). Before manipulating the blood of the immolated goat, Aaron immolates a bull as a חטאת for himself and for his household (v. 3, 6, 11).[25] He creates a cloud of incense to protect himself from the divine Presence that appears over the כפרת (vv. 12–13; cf. v. 2), and then he enters the adytum and sprinkles the חטאת blood upon the כפרת and before the כפרת seven times (v. 14). Aaron repeats the same procedure in the adytum

---

23. Aaron also receives from the congregation of Israel one ram for an עלה offering (Lev 16:5). He additionally slaughters a ram as an עלה for himself (Lev 16:3). Lev 16:24 states that these burnt offerings effect כפר (*kippēr*) for Aaron and the people. According to Milgrom, the עלה is one of Israel's most ancient sacrifices (certainly predating the חטאת, which arose with the advent of the tabernacle) and possesses a vast array of functions, including entreaty, expiation, and propitiation (*Leviticus*, 1:172–77). However, Milgrom's explanation of Lev 16:24 is vague: "While it atones, however, it does not purge" (ibid., 1:1049). According to Gary A. Anderson, the עלה "survives vestigially in the P source. Although P generally holds that only the purification and reparation offerings deal with sin, in Lev 1:4 it is said that the burnt offering 'shall make atonement' for the offerer. We say this is a vestigial usage because nowhere else does P spell out how this atonement would work" ("Sacrifice and Sacrificial Offerings [OT]," *ABD* 5:878). Anderson would seem to take a similar approach to the עלה in Lev 16:24. Vis writes, "I find this verse very perplexing" ("Purification Offering," 114).

24. See further below.

25. As Milgrom points out, ביתו probably indicates Aaron's fellow priests (*Leviticus*, 1:1019).

with the חטאת blood of the immolated goat for the people (v. 15). He then purifies the

shrine (v. 16b), probably in accordance with the instructions set forth in Lev 4:5–7,

16–18.[26] Finally, Aaron goes to the outer altar and applies the חטאת blood from both

the bull and the goat to the horns of the altar and sprinkles the blood thereon seven

times (vv. 18–19). In sum, by means of this first part of the Yom Kippur ritual, Aaron

purges the adytum, the shrine, and the courtyard of two distinct polluting substances

with חטאת blood, namely, Israel's impurities and sins, as Lev 16:16 summarily states.[27]

Though the first half of the Day of Atonement ritual purges impurities and

inadvertent sins from Israel's sacred realm, it cannot purge Israel's defiant sins

therefrom, which cling stubbornly to the furniture of the adytum and must be

physically removed by means of the scapegoat ritual, which comprises the second half

of the Yom Kippur rite.[28] Scholars generally agree that, at some point in Israel's

---

26. Wright, *Disposal of Impurity*, 16.

27. Schwartz, "Bearing of Sin," 6–7, 17. As noted above, the sins and impurities of the high priest and the priesthood are also purged in this part of the ritual.

28. Schwartz, "Bearing of Sin," 17–20.

religious history,[29] Azazel was regarded as a deity or demon of the wilderness.[30] After

he has made purgation with the blood of the immolated goat (v. 20), Aaron brings

forth the living goat, lays both hands on its head, and confesses over it all Israel's

iniquities, transgressions, and sins (v. 21a).[31] This two-handed hand-leaning rite, in

conjunction with Aaron's confession, is the means by which the high priest transfers

---

29. Treatment of the origin and tradition history of "Azazel" (Lev 16:8, 10, and 26) in ancient Israel defies the scope of this study. Scholars typically propose one of several possibilities: (1) "Azazel" was the name of a supernatural deity, (2) "Azazel" was the name or description of the (type of) place where the scapegoat was sent, (3) "Azazel" was an abstract noun indicating the sacerdotal function of the scapegoat, or (4) "Azazel" denoted the act of sending away the scapegoat (for a recent summary of these viewpoints, see Aron Pinker, "A Goat to Go to Azazel," *JHebS* 7 [2007]: 2–25, at 4–13; see also Bernd Janowski and Gernot Wilhelm, "Der Bock, der die Sünden hinausträgt," in *Religionsgeschichtliche Beziehungen zwischen Kleinasien, Nordsyrien und dem Alten Testament*, ed. Bernd Janowski et al., OBO 129 [Freiburg: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993], 109–69, at 119–29, 134–58; Bernd Janowski, "Azazel," in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, ed. Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking, and Pieter W. van der Horst, 2nd ed. [Leiden: Brill, 1999], 128–31, at 128–29). Yet most scholars affirm the demonic identity of Azazel at some point in Israel's history. Milgrom, whom most scholars follow on this point, argues that Azazel was originally conceived as a wilderness demon but was later eviscerated of his supernatural identity in the Priestly redaction of the Pentateuch (*Leviticus*, 1:1021). Wright agrees with Milgrom, adding that in Leviticus 16 the scapegoat "does not appear to be a propitiary offering to Azazel, but only serves as a vehicle for transporting the sins" (*Disposal of Impurity*, 21–25, 30). Janowski reverses the position of Milgrom and Wright, arguing that Azazel only came to posses a demonic identity in post-exilic Judaism ("Der Bock," 130). Pinker proposes that Azazel was originally a name for the pre-Temple desert-dwelling God of Israel (i.e., Yahweh), whose identity was transformed to a demon when the Temple was constructed ("Goat to Go to Azazel," 19–25).

30. Several factors suggest this: (1) The words יהוה and עזאזל are set in direct parallelism in Lev 16:8, suggesting that "Azazel," like "Yahweh," is a divine name: "And Aaron shall casts lots over the two goats, one lot for the Lord and one lot for Azazel" (גורל אחד ליהוה וגורל אחד לעזאזל) (Wright, *Disposal of Impurity*, 21–22; Baruch A. Levine, *Leviticus*, JPSTC [Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1989], 102; Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 1:1020; Janowski, "Azazel," 128). (2) The wilderness was the abode of evil spirits, including goat demons (שעיר) (cf. Isa 13:21; 34:14; 2 Chr 11:15). Just several verses after Leviticus 16, Lev 17:7 prohibits sacrificing to goat demons, suggesting that the Israelites had been doing this: "And they shall no longer offer their sacrifices to goat demons [שעירם], whom after they whore" (Wright, *Disposal of Impurity*, 22; Levine, *Leviticus*, 102, 251–53; Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 1:1020; Janowski, "Azazel," 129). (3) A good case is made that עזאזל is a metathesized form of עזזאל, meaning "fierce god" or "angry god" (Hayim Tawil, "Azazel, Prince of the Steepe: A Comparative Study," *ZAW* 92 [1980], 43–59, at 57–59; Wright, *Disposal of Impurity*, 22; Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 1:1020). (4) Many analogous expulsion rites involving wilderness deities have been identified in ancient Near Eastern religions, some of which share striking resemblances to the scapegoat ritual (Tawil, "Azazel," 47–52; Wright, *Disposal of Impurity*, 31–74; Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 1:1071–79).

31. Most follow Milgrom, who mtaintains that the terms פשע and עון refer to two types of deliberate wrongdoings and that the phrase לכל-חטאת is inclusive and not a distinct category of sin (i.e., "including all of their sins") (*Leviticus*, 1:1034, 43–44). Cf. Schwartz, "Bearing of Sin," 18 n. 59.

Israel's moral impurities onto the scapegoat.[32] His verbal confession "releases" these inexpiatable sins, enabling their transference onto the Azazel goat.[33] It seems that Aaron momentarily bears Israel's moral impurities between the time of his purging the adytum with the blood of the immolated goat and the time of his transferring the nation's defiant sins onto the scapegoat.[34] Once he deposits Israel's sins upon the scapegoat, the high priests banishes the Azazel goat into the wilderness by means of a handler (v. 21b). The Priestly writers emphasize that the task of the scapegoat is to transport the burden of sins into the desert: "The goat shall bear all their iniquity to a remote area, and he shall release the goat into the wilderness" (v. 22). In sum, by means of the Azazel goat, the moral impurities that endangered the abscondence of the divine Presence and menaced Israel's own exile are removed from the realm of human habitation where they pose no further threat.[35]

---

32. Wright, *Disposal of Impurity*, 17; Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 1:1041–43; Gane, *Cult and Character*, 245. According to Milgrom, the one-handed hand-leaning rite (e.g., Lev 1:4; 3:2; 4:4, 24) symbolizes ownership of the sacrificial animal (*Leviticus*, 1:152; so also Wright, *Disposal of Impurity*, 17 n. 6). Some scholars such as N. Kiuchi take the one-handed rite as signifying substitution (*The Purification Offering in the Priestly Literature: Its Meaning and Function*, JSOTSup 56 [Sheffield: Sheffield, 1987], 112–19; see further in Leigh M. Trevaskis, *Holiness, Ethics, and Ritual in Leviticus* [Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2011], 178–96).

33. Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 1:1042–43; Schwartz, "Bearing of Sin," 17; cf. Levine, *Leviticus*, xx. Apparently, for Schwartz the חטאת blood "removes" the deliberate sins from the adytum, but the blood cannot ultimately purge them; they must be transferred onto the scapegoat ("Bearing of Sin," 20). Thus, Israel's deliberate sins seem to "hang in suspension" between the rites of the immolated goat and the scapegoat. See below for the possibility that Aaron temporarily bears these sins.

34. Schwartz speaks of Aaron acquiring Israel's defiant sins for himself (ibid., 17). Vis plausibly argues that the difficult phrase לכפר עליו (Lev 16:10) refers to the purgation of *Aaron*, who temporarily bears Israel's sins as a priestly representative ("Purification Offering," 109–24; see Chapter Five). He notes three Pentateuchal passages (Exod 28:38; Lev 10:17; Num 18:1) that indicate that one of Aaron's (and his sons') roles was to bear Israel's iniquities (נשא עון). Vis thus contends against Milgrom (*Leviticus*, 1:1023), who takes the phrase לכפר עליו (Lev 16:10) to mean "to effect purgation upon it [the scapegoat]" (so also Schwartz, "Bearing of Sin," 18). Incidentally, Vis understands the scapegoat as bearing sins not from the sanctuary but from the people ("Purification Offering," 111–12). I see no reason to doubt that the Priestly writers conceive the scapegoat as removing sins from both sanctuary and people, as Schwartz suggests ("Bearing of Sin," 19–20).

35. Wright, *Disposal of Impurity*, 29–30. Against Tawil ("Azazel," 43–59), Wright argues that the Priestly writers do not conceive the wilderness as connected to the underworld, though Tawil cites many examples of such a connection in other Near Eastern writings (*Disposal of Impurity*, 25–29).

Even though the scapegoat is not a sacrifice nor is חטאת blood applied to it, Lev 16:5 refers to the two goats as a single חטאת, which highlights their collective role of purging and removing the sins and impurities of Israel from the sanctuary. In the words of Schwartz, the two rites involving the two goats effectively comprise a "two-part חטאת."[36] Lastly, one should not forget that the redaction of H brings the purgation of the people to the foreground in Lev 16:29–34a. The sins and impurities *of* the people are also purged *from* the people by means of, not only the tabernacle ritual, but the people's self-affliction, repentance, and rest.

## Apocalyptic Yom Kippur Traditions

In Second Temple Judaism, numerous traditions arose with regards to the Day of Atonement. Those reviewed here from the Book of Watchers, 4Q180–181, the Book of Giants, and the Apocalypse of Abraham are of the apocalyptic *imaginaire*.[37]

### The Book of Watchers (1 Enoch 1–36)

Many scholars maintain that the scapegoat tradition of Leviticus 16 influenced the composition of 1 Enoch 10, a chapter in the Book of Watchers (BW), which narrates the archangels' punishment of the fallen angels and the cosmic purgation resulting

---

36. Schwartz, "Bearing of Sin," 18.

37. I derive the term "*imaginaire*" from Stökl Ben Ezra, who defines it as "the collective repertoire of motifs of a certain collective (Y) regarding the element X, from which an author of this collective (Y) derives the items with which to weave his text on X ... Any member of the collective can play around with the elements of the *imaginaire* of a concept and even add new elements that will slowly become part of the common *imaginaire*" (*Impact of Yom Kippur*, 8–10, 78–141, quote at 8–9).

from this retributive act.[38] In the present work, I take it for granted that Asael's banishment in 1 En. 10.4–8 evokes the biblical scapegoat ritual. However, it is fitting to overview the arguments in favor of the influence of Yom Kippur on 1 Enoch 10, since this tradition is the foundation of the apocalyptic *imaginaire* of Yom Kippur with which Matthew may have been familiar.

1 Enoch 6–11 elaborates upon the story of the Sons of God's descent in the days of Noah (Gen 6:1–4), and it contains two primary strata of tradition: the older Shemihazah tradition, which recounts the fallen Watchers' cohabitation with women and bearing of giants, and the Asael tradition, which reports the Watchers' dissemination of secret knowledge to humankind.[39] In 1977, Paul D. Hanson and

---

38. A. Geiger, "Zu den Apokryphen," *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben* 3 (1864): 196–204, at 199–201; T. K. Cheyne, "The Date and Origin of the Ritual of the Scapegoat," *ZAW* 15 (1895): 153–56, at 154–55; R. H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch: Translated from the Editor's Ethiopic Text* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1912), 22–23; G. R. Driver, "Three Technical Terms in the Pentateuch," *JSS* 1 (1956): 97–105, at 97; Sidney B. Hoenig, "The New Qumran Pesher on Azazel," *JQR* 56 (1966): 248–53, at 249; Devorah Dimant, "The Fallen Angels in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Related Apocryphes and Pseudepigrapha" [in Hebrew] (PhD diss., The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1974); J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), 313; Paul D. Hanson, "Rebellion in Heaven, Azazel and Euhemeristic Heroes in 1 Enoch 6–11," *JBL* 96 (1977): 195–223, at 220–25; Devorah Dimant, "1 Enoch 6–11: A Methodological Perspective," *SBLSP* (1978): 323–39, at 326–27, 336; Tawil, "Azazel," 52–55; Ryszard Rubinkiewicz, *Die Eschatologie von Henoch 9–11 und das Neue Testament*, trans. Herbert Ulrich, ÖBS 6 (Klosterneuburg: Österreichisches Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1984), 88–89; Lester Grabbe, "The Scapegoat Tradition: A Study in Early Jewish Interpretation," *JSJ* 18 (1987): 152–67, at 153–56 (although Grabbe is hesitant to posit direct influence); Levine, *Leviticus*, 251; Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 1:1021 ("The reference to Azazel is obvious"); Robert Helm, "Azazel in Early Jewish Tradition," *AUSS* 32 (1994): 217–26, at 217–22; Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants from Qumran: Texts, Translation, and Commentary* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 81; Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, "Yom Kippur in the Apocalyptic Imaginaire and the Roots of Jesus' High Priesthood," in *Transformations of the Inner Self in Ancient Religions*, ed. Jan Assmann and Guy Stroumsa (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 349–66, at 351–57; Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, "The Revelation of the Sacral Son of Man: The Genre, History of Religions Context and the Meaning of the Transfiguration," in *Auferstehung – Resurrection*, ed. Friedrich Avemarie and Hermann Lichtenberger (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 247–98, at 259; Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 85–90; Daniel Olson, *Enoch. A New Translation: The Ethiopic Book of Enoch, or 1 Enoch* (North Richland Hills: Bibal, 2004), 34 ("A comparison of Enoch 10.4–8 with the Day of Atonement ritual... leaves little doubt that Asael is indeed Azazel"); Pinker, "Goat to Go to Azazel," 4–5, 18–19; Andrei A. Orlov, *Dark Mirrors: Azazel and Satanael in Early Jewish Demonology* (Albany, NY: State University of New York, 2011), 27–46; idem, *Divine Scapegoats: Demonic Mimesis in Early Jewish Mysticism* (Albany, NY: SUNY, 2015), 60–74; idem, *Atoning Dyad*, 49–57.

39. On the complex tradition history of the Shemihazah and Asael's traditions, and the Book of Watchers more generally, see Milik, *Enoch*, 30–31; Paul Hanson, "Rebellion in Heaven," 195–223;

George W. E. Nickelsburg offered competing theories concerning the *Traditionsgeschichte* of this material, and this debate shaped the way scholars approach the issue of the influence of Yom Kippur on 1 Enoch 10.[40] Hanson suggested that the Asael material in BW drew upon the Leviticus 16 scapegoat ritual to furnish its cosmic imagery, but he was criticized for only employing the considerably late Targum Pseudo-Jonathan in his analysis.[41] Since then, scholars such as Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra have brought forward a broad range of biblical, Second Temple, and early rabbinic material to demonstrate the impact of Yom Kippur traditions on 1 Enoch

---

George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Apocalyptic and Myth in 1 Enoch 6–11," *JBL* 96 (1977): 383–405, at 383–405; John J. Collins, "Methodological Issues in the Study of 1 Enoch: Reflections on the Articles of P. D. Hanson and G. W. Nickelsburg," *SBLSP* (1978): 315–22; Dimant, "1 Enoch 6–11," 323–39; Carol Newsom, "The Development of 1 Enoch 6–19: Cosmology and Judgment," *CBQ* 42 (1980): 310–29; John J. Collins, "The Apocalyptic Technique: Setting and Function in the Book of Watchers," *CBQ* 44 (1982): 91–111; James C. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*, CBQMS 16 (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984), 123–29; Corrie Molenberg, "A Study of the Roles of Shemihaza and Asael in 1 Enoch 6–11," *JJS* 35 (1985): 136–46; Helge S. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man*, WMANT 61 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988), 270–80; Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *Prophets of Old and the Day of the End: Zechariah, the Book of Watchers and Apocalyptic*, OtSt 35 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 165–82; Archie T. Wright, *The Origin of Evil Spirits: The Reception of Genesis 6:1–4 in Early Jewish Literature*, WUNT 2:198 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 29–37. Having reviewed this literature, Wright concludes, "As can be understood from the above presentation, no consensus can be reached about the origin of the Fallen Angel tradition in BW, except that it was not original to the author" (ibid., 37).

40. Hanson contended that an ancient Semitic rebellion-in-heaven motif shaped the more primitive Shemihazah material which was then appropriated by the author of BW and amplified in his construction of the "Azazel" material, which in turn was influenced by Leviticus 16 and the figure of the scapegoat ("Rebellion in Heaven," 202–18, 220–25). Nickelsburg argued that the Shemihazah and Asael strata are two entirely distinct traditions, which were collected and woven together by the author of BW ("Apocalyptic and Myth," 395–97, 399–401). According to Nickelsburg, the Shemihazah tradition was informed by the Greek Titanomachian mythology, and the Asael tradition was shaped by the Prometheus myth, especially as narrated in Aeschylus's *Prometheus Bound*. Those who prefer Nickelsburg's general reconstruction sometimes deny the influence of Leviticus 16 on the formation of the Asael material, since this thesis constituted part of Hanson's overarching theory concerning 1 Enoch 6–11, although the former was not essential to the latter. But as Stökl Ben Ezra suggests, the question of cultural influence on the tradition strata of BW need not be framed in stark either-or alternatives (*Impact of Yom Kippur*, 86 n. 36). For instance, it is possible that the Asael tradition was originally inspired by the Prometheus myth but then was assimilated to the conceptual matrix of Leviticus 16 and the scapegoat tradition. Devorah Dimant, for example, though rejecting Hanson's reconstruction of the Asael tradition, accepts the influential role the biblical scapegoat tradition upon the material in 1 Enoch 10 ("1 Enoch 6–11," 327, 336 n. 38).

41. Hanson, "Rebellion in Heaven," 402–3; Dimant, "1 Enoch 6–11," 336 n. 38; Grabbe, "Scapegoat Tradition," 155 n. 6.

10.[42] The most pertinent passages are 1 En. 10.4–8 and 10.20–22:

> [4]Go, Raphael, and bind Asael hand and foot, and cast him into the darkness; And make an opening in the wilderness [ἔρημον] that is in Doudael [Δαδουήλ]. [5]Throw him there, and lay beneath him sharp and jagged stones. And cover him with darkness, and let him dwell there for an exceedingly long time. Cover up his face, and let him not see the light. [6]And on the day of the great judgment, he will be led away to the burning conflagration. [7]And heal the earth, which the Watchers have desolated; and announce the healing of the earth, that the plague may be healed, and all the sons of men may not perish because of the mystery that the Watchers told and taught their sons. [8]And all the earth was made desolate by the deeds of the teaching of Asael, and over him [ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ] write all the sins [τὰς ἁμαρτίας πάσας] ... [20]Cleanse [καθάρισον] the earth from all impurity [πάσης ἀκαθαρσίας] and from all wrong [πάσης ἀδικίας] and from all lawlessness [ἀσεβείας] and from all sin [πάσης ἁμαρτίας], and godlessness and all impurities [ἀκαθαρσίας] that have come upon the earth, remove. [21]And all the sons of men will become righteous, and all the peoples will worship (me), and all will bless me and prostrate themselves. [22]And all the earth will be cleansed [καθαρισθήσεται] from all defilement and from all uncleanness [ἀκαθαρσίας], and I shall not again send upon them any wrath or scourge for all the

---

42. Stökl Ben Ezra, "Apocalyptic Imaginaire," 351–57; idem, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 85–90.

generations of eternity.[43]

There are at least four reasons to think that Leviticus 16 and Yom Kippur traditions have directly influenced the composition of 1 Enoch 10. First, "Azazel" was regarded as a deity or demon of the wilderness in Israel's religious history.[44] Second, the name "Asael" (עסאל/עשאל) closely resembles the name "Azazel" (עזאזל).[45] Third, the reception history of the Watchers myth shows that some Jews in the Second Temple era had no scruples identifying the chief Watcher Asael (עסאל/עשאל) with the enigmatic Azazel (עזאזל) of Leviticus 16.[46] And fourth, the two traditions share many linguistic and thematic parallels. As Stökl Ben Ezra remarks, "The elements of Yom Kippur are so numerous and central in this chapter that the Yom Kippur background could be recognized even without exact identity of the names."[47]

These linguistic and thematic parallels can be summarized as follows: (a) "All sin" is placed "upon" Asael, and "all sin" is placed "upon" the scapegoat (1 En. 10.8;

---

43. Unless otherwise noted, all translations of 1 Enoch are from G. W. E. Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam, eds., *1 Enoch: The Hermeneia Translation* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012), 28, 30. All Greek of 1 Enoch is from Matthew Black and Albert-Marie Denis, eds., *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece*, FPQSG (Leiden: Brill, 1970), 24–26. See the critical edition of Michael A. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*, vol. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1978).

44. See note above.

45. Lev 16:8, 10, and 26 MT reads עזאזל. These are the readings of the Aramaic fragments of 1 Enoch from Qumran: 4QEna I iii 9 reads עסאל (Milik, *Enoch*, 150), and Milik reconstructs עסאל in 4QEna I iii 23 (ibid., 150), עסאל in 4QEna I v 5 (ibid., 162), עשׂא[ל] in 4QEnc I ii 26 (ibid., 188), and עׄשׂא[ל] in 4QEnb I ii 26 (ibid., 168). For 1 En. 6.7, Syncellus (Syn.) reads Ἀζαλζήλ, and Panopolitanus (Pan.) reads Ἀσέαλ (Black and Denis, *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece*, 21), otherwise both Greek texts read Ἀζαήλ in 1 En. 8.1; 9.6; 10.4, 8; 13.1 (not extant in Syn.) (ibid., 22–25, 27). Though Nickelsburg was reticent to associate Asael with Azazel because of the difference in spelling, certain early tradents of the Watches tradition readily identified עסאל/עשאל with עזאזל (see below) ("Apocalyptic and Myth," 404 n. 83; so also Wright, *Evil Spirits*, 109).

46. See below.

47. Stökl Ben Ezra, "Apocalyptic Imaginaire," 353. Stökl Ben Ezra suggests that Asael was too well known in the tradition to be called "Azazel" when the final redactor of BW rewrote the story of Asael (ibid., 353). Once the association between Asael and Azazel became inscribed in the Enochic tradition, later tradents made the identification easily.

Lev 16:21).[48] (b) The locale of Asael's punishment is the ἔρημος (1 En. 10.4), which

is also the destination of the scapegoat's banishment (Lev 16:21–22 LXX). (c) Asael's

expulsion results in the earth's healing from sin (1 En. 10.20–22), similar to how the

scapegoat's expulsion results in the sanctuary's purgation of sin (Lev 16:22, 33).[49] (d)

As even Nickelsburg recognized, the archangel's command in 1 En. 10.20 verbally

echoes the catalogue of sins placed upon the scapegoat in Lev 16:21.[50] (e) The

"cleansing" of the earth in 1 En. 10.20 and 22 echoes the language of "cleansing" in

Lev 16:16, 19, 20 and 30.[51] (f) Asael is hurled downward (into an opening in the

desert), similar to how the scapegoat was pushed down a precipice according to early

Jewish tradition.[52] (g) Asael is bound, which recalls the binding of a scarlet band

---

48. 1 En. 10.8: "and upon him [ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ] write all the sins [τὰς ἁμαρτίας πάσας]." Lev 16:21–22: "And Aaron shall... confess upon it [ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῦ] all of the iniquities of the sons of Israel, all of their transgressions, and all of their sins [πάσας τὰς ἁμαρτίας] ... And the goat shall take upon itself [ἐφ᾽ ἑαυτῷ] all their iniquities" (Greek of Leviticus LXX is from John William Wevers, ed., *Leviticus*, Septuaginta, VTG 2:2 [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986], here at 185–86).

49. Stökl Ben Ezra, "Apocalyptic Imaginaire," 354.

50. Nickelsburg, "Apocalyptic and Myth," 402. Rubinkiewicz independently notes this as well (*Eschatologie von Henoch 9–11*, 88–89). Lev 16:21: "...all of the iniquities [πάσας τὰς ἀνομίας] of the sons of Israel, all of their transgressions [πάσας τὰς ἀδικίας], and all their sins [πάσας τὰς ἁμαρτίας]" (cf. Lev 16:16). Leviticus 16:21 LXX translates עון, פשע, and חטאת as ἀνομία, ἀδικία, and ἁμαρτία, and 1 En. 10.20 similarly lists ἀσέβεια, ἀδικία, and ἁμαρτία. But as Rubinkiewicz (*Eschatologie von Henoch 9–11*, 89) and Stökl Ben Ezra (*Impact of Yom Kippur*, 89 n. 53) note, the Septuagint can translate עון as either ἀνομία or ἀσέβεια (e.g., Gen 19:15; Exod 34:7; Ezek 33:9; Ps 32:5 [31:5 LXX]).

51. Lev 16:16: "And he shall make atonement for the sanctuary from the uncleanness [ἀκαθαρσιῶν] of the sons of Israel." Lev 16:19: "...and he shall cleanse [καθαριεῖ] it and sanctify it from the uncleanness [ἀκαθαρσιῶν] of the sons of Israel." Lev 16:20: "...he shall cleanse [καθαριεῖ] the priests." Lev 16:30: "For in this day he shall make an atonement for you, to cleanse [καθαρίσαι] you from all your sins before the Lord, and you shall be purged [καθαρισθήσεσθε]."

52. According to the Mishnah, the scapegoat's handler took the animal to a ravine and then "he pushed it from behind; and it went rolling down" (m. Yoma 6:6; translations of the Mishnah are from Herbert Danby, *The Mishnah: Translated from the Hebrew with Introduction and Brief Explanatory Notes* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933], 170). Targum Pseudo-Jonathan reports a similar tradition: "the goat shall go up on the mountains of Beth Haduri, and a blast of wind from before the Lord will thrust him down and he will die" (Tg. Ps.-J. Lev 16:22; translations of Tg. Ps.-J. Lev are from Martin McNamara, Robert Hayward, and Michael Maher, trans., *Targum Neofiti 1: Leviticus. Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Leviticus*, ArBib 3 [Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1994], 169). Philo attests to this practice, stating that the scapegoat is "banished, driven from the most holy places, tumbling into desolate and vile gulfs [βάραθρα/βάραθρώδη]" (*Plant.* 61 [Colson and Whitaker]). Philo's choice of the rare term βάραθρον is noteworthy, given that "βάραθρον was especially known as the name of the cleft at Athens into which criminals were thrown" (Daniel R. Schwartz, "Two Pauline

around the head of the scapegoat in Second Temple tradition.[53] (h) The treatment of Asael is harsh and severe, which brings to mind the abuses hurled upon the scapegoat in early Jewish tradition.[54] (i) There is a linguistic connection between the locale of Asael's punishment, "Dadouel," and the locale of the scapegoat's final destination, "Beith Hadudo."[55] (j) Asael's placement on "sharp and jagged stones" (1 En. 10.5) recalls the rugged terrain of the scapegoat's sending.[56] (k) Enoch's ascent into the heavenly throne room in 1 Enoch 14 evokes the high priest's entrance into the Holy of Holies on the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:2–4, 12–17).[57]

## 4Q180–181

Certain subsequent Second Temple authors also identified Asael of the Watchers myth

---

Allusions to the Redemptive Mechanism of the Crucifixion," *JBL* 102 [1983]: 259–83, at 262 n. 9; see LSJ, s.v. "βάραθρον"). In the Apocalypse of Abraham, Azazel's exile is not only into the wilderness but also into the "furnace of the earth" (Apoc. Ab. 14.5), suggesting "a two-step removal of the scapegoat: first to the earth itself and then to the fiery underworld" (Orlov, *Atoning Dyad*, 114).

53. Barn. 7.8, 11; m. Yoma 4:2; 6:6; m. Šabb. 9:3; Tertullian, *Marc.* 3.7; Hippolytus, *Frag.* 75 (see also Apoc. Ab. 13.14).

54. Barn. 7.8; m. Yoma 6:4; Tertullian, *Marc.* 3.7 (see also Apoc. Ab. 13.6–7, 11).

55. Cf. 1 En. 10.4 (Δαδουήλ [Pan.]/Δουδαήλ [Syn.]) and m. Yoma 6:8 (בית חדודו); Tg. Ps.-J. Lev 16:10, 22 (בית הדורי). On the relation between Δαδουήλ/Δουδαήλ, הדורי בית חדודו/בית, and other variants in the rabbinic material, see Driver, "Three Technical Terms," 97; Hanson, "Rebellion in Heaven," 223–24; Dimant, "1 Enoch 6–11," 327, 336 n. 39, n. 40, n. 41; Grabbe, "Scapegoat Tradition," 155 n. 6; Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 87–88, esp. 88 n. 4.

56. Dimant notes that the place-name, "Beith Hadudo," attested in m. Yoma 6:8, means "a place jagged and pointed" ("1 Enoch 6–11," 336 n. 40). Philo, *Plant.* 61: "[Like the scapegoat], the one who glorifies creation will be banished, being driven from the most holy places, and tumbling into desolate and vile gulfs." Tg. Ps.-J. Lev 16:10: "[The scapegoat shall] be sent to die in a rough and stony place which is in the desert of Soq, that is beth Haduri." Stökl Ben Ezra suggests that the ruggedness of Asael's punishment "could reflect an early Midrash on the meaning of גזר (cut, split up) in ארץ גזרה (Lev 16:22) and/or historical memory of the actual cliffs in the mountains of Jerusalem" (*Impact of Yom Kippur*, 88). See also Driver, "Three Technical Terms," 97–98; Hanson, "Rebellion in Heaven," 224; Dimant, "1 Enoch 6–11," 327, 336 n. 40.

57. See below.

as Azazel of Leviticus 16. The sectarian authors of 4Q180 and 4Q181, the so-called "Ages of Creation,"[58] refer to Asael not as עסאל or עשאל, but as עזזאל, the same spelling used in the Temple Scroll of Leviticus 16 for the desert-dwelling deity:[59]

> [And] interpretation concerning 'Azaz'el [עזזאל] and the angels wh[o came to the daughters of man] [and s]ired themselves giants. And concerning 'Azaz'el [עזזאל] [is written ...] [to love] injustice and to let him inherit evil for all [his] ag[e ...] [...] (of the) judgments and the judgment of the council of [...].[60]

The leader of the rebellious heavenly host, "Azazel," is destined to "inherit evil," just as the scapegoat inherited all of Israel's iniquity.[61]

---

58. The Hebrew fragments 4Q180 and 4Q181 are commentaries on the divinely preordained periods of history, recounting the (evil) deeds of angels and humankind in early biblical history. Contrary to Milik (*Enoch*, 251), who thinks both texts are copies of the same document, Devorah Dimant argues that 4Q180 and 4Q181 are related but distinct works, the latter possibly comprising a commentary on the former, or both drawing on a common third source ("The 'Pesher of the Periods' [4Q180 and 4Q181]," *IOS* 9 [1979]: 77–102, at 89–91). J. J. M. Roberts dates 4Q180 and 4Q181 to the first century BCE or earlier ("Wicked and Holy [4Q180–181]," in *Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Volume 2: Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents*, ed. James H. Charlesworth [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995], 204–13, at 205).

59. 11Q19 26:13: "And he [the high priest] shall place them [Israel's sins] upon the head of the he-goat and will send it to Azazel [לעזזאל], (to) the desert" (Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 2 vols. [Leiden: Brill, 1997, 1998], 2:1248–49). Annette Yoshiko Reed appears to miss the fact that עזזאל is the exact spelling used for עזאל in the Temple Scroll (*Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005], 98 n. 45). Wright's doubt, that the עזזאל of 4Q181 alludes to the Azazel of Leviticus 16, is puzzling in light of the Temple Scroll's clear preference for the spelling עזזאל (*Evil Spirits*, 110). He claims that the Temple Scroll does not "designate עזזאל as a demon, but only as a place in the wilderness" (ibid., 111 n. 70). But this claim is unfounded. Wright's hesitancy to ascribe an allusion to Yom Kippur in 4Q203 is equally perplexing, as not only does the spelling exactly match the Masoretic tradition, עזאזל, but the heavenly figure also receives punishment in the place of others (ibid., 109–10). The scapegoat in Leviticus 16, too, plays a substitutionary role, though this may not have been its original function (Wright, *Disposal of Impurity*, 72–73; Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 1:1021, 1082).

60. 4Q180 1.7–10 (Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1:370–73).

61. Rubinkiewicz, *Eschatologie von Henoch 9–11*, 100; Grabbe, "Scapegoat Tradition," 156; Stökl Ben Ezra, Impact of Yom Kippur, 87.

## The Book of Giants

The authors of the Book of Giants, an expansive retelling of the story of the fallen Watchers' infamous progeny, make the same interpretive move, assimilating Asael and Azazel. These authors, however, employ the spelling of the Masoretic tradition, עזאזל:

> Th[en] 'Ohyah [said] to Hahy[ah, his brother ...] Then he punished,
> and not us [bu]t Aza[ze]l [לעזא[ז]ל] and made [him ... the sons of]
> Watchers, the Giants; and n[o]ne of [their] be[loved] will be forgiven
> [...] ... he has imprisoned us and has captured yo[u].[62]

According to Józef Milik, "Azazel appears here in his expiatory role (Lev 16:8, 10, 26), for he seems to be punished for the sins of the giants."[63]

## The Apocalypse of Abraham

The authors of the Apocalypse of Abraham also identify Asael of the Watchers myth with Azazel of Leviticus 16.[64] In this Jewish text composed not long after 70 CE, the

---

62. 4Q203 7.5–7 (Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1:410–11). Stuckenbruck dates the Book of Giants between the late 3rd century and mid-second century BCE (*Book of Giants*, 28–31).

63. Milik, *Enoch*, 313. Granting the plausibility of Milik's reading, Loren Stuckenbruck states that "in the Book of Watchers this figure [Azazel] (though in the Qumran Aramaic probably in the form 'Asael') is associated with the atonement motif (1 En. 10.4, 5, 8). Moreover, correspondence with the spelling in biblical tradition may suggest a deliberate connection with the Yom Kippur ritual" (*Book of Giants*, 81). See also Grabbe, "Scapegoat Tradition," 155; Rubinkiewicz, *Eschatologie von Henoch 9–11*, 101.

64. Rubinkiewicz, *Eschatologie von Henoch 9–11*, 101; Grabbe, "Scapegoat Tradition," 156–58. According to Rubinkiewicz, "The author of the Apocalypse of Abraham follows the tradition of 1 Enoch 1–36. The chief of the fallen angels is Azazel, who rules the stars and most men. It is not difficult to find here the traditions of Genesis 6:1–4 developed according to the tradition of 1 Enoch. Azazel is the head of the angels who plotted against the Lord and who impregnated the daughters of men. These angels are compared to stars. Azazel revealed the secrets of heaven and is banished to the desert. Abraham, as Enoch, receives the power to drive away Satan. All these connections show that the author

angel Yahoel initiates Abraham in a series of symbolic events.[65] As Andrei Orlov

argues, many of these events employ Yom Kippur as a conceptual or liturgical

background.[66] In particular, the authors of the Slavonic apocalypse portray Abraham

as the priestly apprentice of the angel Yahoel, as well as the immolated goat brought

into the presence of the Lord.[67] Azazel again assumes the role of the scapegoat.

The authors of the Apocalypse of Abraham depict Azazel as the scapegoat in

the following ways. As Israel's high priest transfers the nation's sins to the scapegoat

(Lev 16:21), so Yahoel announces to Azazel that Abraham's corruption is being

transferred to him (Apoc. Ab. 13.14).[68] As a scarlet ribbon tied to the scapegoat's head

---

of the Apocalypse of Abraham drew upon the tradition of 1 Enoch" (*OTP* 1:685). Cf. Apoc Ab. 14.3–7 and 1 En. 6.4–8.4; 9.6; 10.4, 6; 54.1, 5; 55.4; 86.1–6.

65. The *terminus a quo* for the Apocalypse of Abraham, which was probably written in Palestine in Hebrew or Aramaic, is shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem's temple, since the work vividly describes this event (Apoc. Ab. 27.1–7). Although it is more difficult to establish, most scholars suggest a *terminus ante quem* in the mid-second century CE. Louis Ginzberg dates the work to the last decades of the first century CE ("Apocalypse of Abraham," in *The Jewish Encyclopedia* [New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1906], 91–92, at 92). G. H. Box and J. I. Landsman posit a date between 70 CE and the early second century (*The Apocalypse of Abraham* [London: SPCK, 1918], xv–xvi). Belkis Philonenko-Sayar and Marc Philonenko date the book to within several years of 70 CE (*L'Apocalypse d'Abraham*, Semitica 31 [Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1981], 34–35). Ryszard Rubinkiewicz establishes a date between 70 CE and the mid-second century CE, but he postulates a more precise date between 79 and 81 CE (*OTP* 1:683; idem, *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham en vieux slave: Introduction, text critique, traduction et commentaire* [Lublin: Société des Lettres et des Sciences de l'Université Catholique, 1987], 70–75). John C. Poirier suggests a mid-second century CE *terminus ante quem* ("On a Wing and a Prayer: The Soteriology of the Apocalypse of Abraham," in *This World and the World to Come*, ed. Daniel M. Gurtner, LSTS 74 [London: T&T Clark, 2011], 87–97, at 87–88). Amy Paulsen-Reed argues that "the Apocalypse of Abraham is an early Jewish document written during the decades following the destruction of the Second Temple," pointing to many shared qualities between the Apocalypse of Abraham, and 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch, which date between 70–132 CE ("The Origins of the Apocalypse of Abraham" [PhD diss., Harvard University], 2016, at iii; see 81–83, 136–204). Cf. A. Pennington, "The Apocalypse of Abraham," in *The Apocryphal Old Testament*, ed. H. F. D. Sparks (Oxford: Clarendon, 1984), 363–92, at 363–67; John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 194–95, 225–32; Alexander Kulik, *Retroverting Slavonic Pseudepigrapha: Toward the Original of the Apocalypse of Abraham* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 2–3.

66. Orlov *Dark Mirrors*, 27–46; idem, *Divine Scapegoats*, 9–36, 55–74; idem, *Atoning Dyad*, 81–160.

67. Orlov suggests that Yahoel functions as a senior priest training his priestly initiate, Abraham, in how to conduct proper sacrifices (Apoc. Ab. 12.1–13.1) and in how to properly dispatch the eschatological scapegoat (Apoc. Ab. 14.5–14) (*Dark Mirrors*, 44–45).

68. Helm, "Azazel," 223. Grabbe, "Scapegoat Tradition," 157.

represents Israel's iniquity transferred onto the goat in early Jewish tradition (see below), so Abraham's filthy garments represent the patriarch's iniquity transferred onto Azazel: "For behold, the garment which in heaven was formerly yours has been set aside for him, and the corruption which was on him has gone over to you [Azazel]."[69] As the scapegoat suffers physical abuse in early Jewish tradition (see below), so Azazel suffers verbal abuse (Apoc. Ab. 13.6–7, 11–12).[70] As the scapegoat is banished into the wilderness (Lev 16:21–22), so Azazel is banished "into the untrodden parts of the earth" (Apoc. Ab. 14.6).[71] As Asael is cast into a fiery abyss (1 En. 10.4–6), so Azazel becomes "the firebrand of the furnace of the earth" (Apoc. 14.5).[72]

The Slavonic apocalypse portrays Abraham as the immolated goat in the following ways. Abraham refers to himself as a sacrifice: "Accept my prayer, <and let it be sweet to you,> and also the sacrifice which you yourself made to yourself through me who searched for you" (Apoc. Ab. 17.20).[73] As the immolated goat is also adored with a ribbon in early Jewish tradition (m. Yoma 4:2), so Abraham is given a garment (Apoc. Ab. 13.14).[74] As the high priest brings the immolated goat's blood into the adytum (Lev 16:15–17), so Yahoel brings Abraham's soul into the heavenly adytum (Apoc. Ab. 15–18).[75] As the carcass of the immolated goat is consumed by

---

69. Translations of the Apocalypse of Abraham are from Kulik, *Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, here at 20. Orlov, *Divine Scapegoats*, 13–34; idem, *Atoning Dyad*, 95–106.

70. Orlov, *Atoning Dyad*, 107–11.

71. Kulik, *Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 21. Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 94.

72. Orlov, *Divine Scapegoats*, 62–66; idem, *Atoning Dyad*, 112–15.

73. Kulik, *Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 23. Orlov, *Atoning Dyad*, 154–57.

74. Ibid., 140–44.

75. Orlov, *Dark Mirrors*, 38–39; idem, *Atoning Dyad*, 132–32.

fire (Lev 16:27), so Abraham must pass through fire (Apoc. Ab. 13.4; 15.3; 17.1).[76] Finally, the patriarch's movement upward as an eschatological sacrifice is juxtaposed to Azazel's movement downward as an eschatological scapegoat, which parallels the antagonistic movement of the two goats of Leviticus 16—one goat moves into the most sacred adytum, the other goat moves into the demonic wilderness.[77]

The biblical scapegoat ritual takes on new significance in light of the apocalyptic interpretation and visa-versa. As Stökl Ben Ezra remarks, "The annual Yom Kippur was perceived—at least by some—as a ritual anticipation of the eschatological purification of God's creation from sin. The goat originally sent *to* Az'azel was seen as the personification *of* Az'azel, the demonic source of sin *himself*... the relationship between myth and ritual, word and deed, is reciprocal: i.e., the myth also reveals information about the ritual."[78] Jan Bremmer observes a similar phenomenon in Greek expulsion rites, where the literary myths that appropriate the ritual practices of society are considered to have "clarified the meaning of the ritual," and, inversely, "symbolic acts in the ritual became reality in the myth."[79]

## Additional Yom Kippur Traditions in Second Temple Judaism

The following surveys the relevant Day of Atonement traditions in Zechariah 3, the Book of Jubilees, 11QMelchizedek, and the heavenly-ascent apocalypses.

---

76. Ibid., 148–53.

77. Orlov, *Dark Mirrors*, 38; idem, *Atoning Dyad*, 145–47. See further in Chapter Five.

78. Stökl Ben Ezra, "Apocalyptic Imaginaire," 356.

79. Jan N. Bremmer, *Greek Religion and Culture, the Bible and the Ancient Near East*, JSRC 8 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 191. Walter Burkert also suggests that the literary myths interpret the meaning of the rituals (*Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical* [Oxford: Blackwell, 1985], 8).

The Book of Zechariah

Scholars have long suggested the influence of Yom Kippur on Zechariah's fourth
night vision in Zech 3:1–10.[80] Some early Jewish and Christian sources also connect
Zechariah 3 to the Day of Atonement.[81] In Zech 3:1–5, the prophet sees Joshua the
high priest standing before the divine assembly, accused by the Satan. Joshua is
dressed in filthy garments, symbolizing impurity.[82] The Angel commands that
Joshua's dirty clothes be removed, declaring, "See, I have taken your iniquity [עָוֹן]
away from you, and I will clothe you with rich apparel" (Zech 3:4). A clean turban is
placed on Joshua's head (Zech 3:5), the priesthood receives a charge (Zech 3:6–8),
and the Angel of the Lord announces, "I am going to bring my servant the Branch.
For on the stone that I have set before Joshua, on a single stone with seven facets, I

---

80. Henri Blocher, "Zacharie 3: Josué et le Grand Jour des Expiations," *ETR* 54 (1979): 264–
70; Stökl Ben Ezra, "Apocalyptic Imaginaire," 360–61; M. A. Sweeney, *The Twelve Prophets: Volume
2* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 2000), 599; Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer, "The Guilty Priesthood (Zech 3),"
in *The Book of Zechariah and its Influence*, ed. Christopher Tuckett (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2003),
1–19, at 8–11; Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 80–82; Thomas Pola, *Das Priestertum bei
Sacharja: Historische und traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur frühnachexilischen
Herrschererwartung* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 222; Mark J. Boda, *Haggai, Zechariah* (Grand
Rapids: Zondervan, 2004), 258; Byron G. Curtis, *Up the Steep and Stony Road: The Book of Zechariah
in Social Location Trajectory Analysis*, AcBib 25 (Atlanta: SBL, 2006), 136; Tiemeyer, *Priestly Rites
and Prophetic Rage: Post-Exilic Prophetic Critique of the Priesthood* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck,
2006), 249–51; Michael R. Stead, *The Intertextuality of Zechariah 1–8*, LHBOTS 506 (London: T&T
Clark, 2009), 159–60, 170–72; Orlov, *Atoning Dyad*, 43–48. As Tiemeyer notes, some reject such a
connection based on the differences between Leviticus 16 and Zechariah 3 ("Guilty Priesthood," 9).

81. Apoc. Ab. 13.11–14; Tertullian, *Marc.* 3.7; Origen, *Hom. Lev.* 9.5.1; 9.6.4.

82. According to Boda, "Joshua is not only portrayed a steward for God's temple palace but
also represents the entire community" (*Haggai, Zechariah*, 252). According to Anthony R. Petterson,
"Given the high priest's representative role, it suggests that the people, even though they have returned
from the fire of exile, still stand condemned" (*Behold Your King: The Hope of the House of David in
the Book of Zechariah*, LHBOTS 513 [London: T&T Clark, 2009, 52]). See Zech 1:4, 12, 15; 3:2; 5:5–
11; 7:11–14; 8:2, 14. Alternatively, James C. VanderKam understands Joshua's filthy garments as
representing only Joshua's guilt (*From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests After Exile* [Minneapolis:
Fortress, 2004], 25).

will engrave its inscription, says the Lord of Hosts, and I will remove the iniquity of this land in a single day" (Zech 3:8b–9).

Scholars identify several connections between Zechariah 3 and the Day of Atonement. First, the notion of the removal of Israel's iniquity (עון) in one day (יום אחד, Zech 3:9) recalls Yom Kippur, the one day of the year (אחת בשנה, Lev 16:34) on which all Israel's iniquity (עון) was removed (Lev 16:21–22). Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer points out the repetition of the key term עון and remarks that the phrase "in one day" signals "a ceremony which takes place in one day... the only day known in the OT when God removes the sins of His people is the annual Day of Atonement."[83] Second, the turban given to Joshua the high priest in Zech 3:5 recalls Aaron's priestly turban (Exod 28:4, 39; 39:28, 31; Lev 16:4).[84] The inscribed seven-sided stone set before Joshua in Zech 3:9 likely alludes to the golden rosette (ציץ) placed upon Aaron's turban, which possessed an inscription of the divine Name (Exod 28:36 and 39:30) and the function of removing Israel's iniquity (Exod 28:38).[85] Aaron donned the

---

83. Tiemeyer, "The Guilty Priesthood," 9 (emphasis mine). So also Stead, *Zechariah 1–8*, 170.

84. James C. VanderKam, "Joshua the High Priest and the Interpretation of Zechariah 3," *CBQ* 53 (1991): 553–70, at 557; David L. Petersen, *Haggai and Zechariah 1–8: A Commentary*, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1984), 211–12; Tiemeyer, "The Guilty Priesthood," 9–11; Stead, *Zechariah 1–8*, 169–70. Scholars commonly recognize that Zechariah's vocabulary does not match the terms for all of Aaron's regalia: "turban" (צניף [Zech 3:5] vs. מצנפת [Exod 28:4, 37, 39; 29:6; 39:28, 31; Lev 8:9; 16:4]), "stone/plate" (אבן [Zech 3:9] vs. ציץ [Exod 28:36; 29:30; Lev 8:9]), and "crown/diadem" (עטרה [Zech 6:11] vs. נזר [Exod 29:6; 39:30; Lev 8:9]). They sometimes suggest that the "turban" (צניף, Zech 3:5) alludes to the "royal turban" (צניף מלוכה) of Isa 62:3 (e.g., Carol L. Meyers and Eric M. Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1–8*, AB 25B [New York: Doubleday, 1987], 191–92; VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas*, 27).

85. There are two main views regarding the referent of the "stone" (אבן) in Zech 3:9: (1) the stone refers to the engraved rosette/plate of Aaron's priestly turban (Exod 28:36–38) and possibly to the twelve engraved gemstones of Aaron's breastplate (Exod 28:17–21) or the two engraved gemstones of his ephod fasteners (Exod 28:9–12), or (2) it refers to the two (temple) stones of Zech 4:7 and 4:10 associated with Zerubbabel. Meyers and Meyers opt for a solution that includes both referents (*Zechariah 1–8*, 206–7). According to VanderKam, though the second theory is appealing, "it does encounter sizable difficulties ... [that] invite one to consider another approach," and while the objections to the first option are significant, in his opinion, "they do not undermine the case for seeing a connection between Zech 3:9 and Exodus 28" (*From Joshua to Caiaphas*, 32–34). He argues that the breastpiece is the primary referent. Stead proposes that both the breastpiece and (especially) the rosette are in view (*Zechariah 1–8*, 169). Tiemeyer also contends that the stone of Zech 3:9 should be

priestly headdress on Yom Kippur (Lev 16:4), and it became a notable symbolic item in later traditions associated with the Day of Atonement.[86] Tiemeyer writes, "The removal of the iniquity of the land in one day, together with the occurrence of the inscribed stone, identified with the ציץ, an essential part of the costume of the high priest which signifies his ability to carry iniquity, point to the celebration of the Day of Atonement."[87] Third, the change of Joshua the high priest's garment (Zech 3:4) may evoke the clothing ritual of Yom Kippur, since the Day of Atonement was one of the only two occasions on which the Torah legislates the high priest's change of apparel.[88] Fourth, the set of characters in Zechariah 3 structurally parallels the character set in the Yom Kippur ceremony. Orlov observes that "the high priest, Joshua, finds himself in the company of a distinctive pair: a celestial being endowed with the divine name (Angel of Yahweh) and an antagonistic creature that is accursed (Satan). This peculiar constellation of the eschatological triad is reminiscent of the three main actors of the Yom Kippur ordinance: the high priest, the goat for Yahweh, and the accursed scapegoat."[89] For Stökl Ben Ezra, "Regarding the number of corresponding elements, a connection to Yom Kippur is probable."[90]

Orlov notes two novel developments of the Yom Kippur *imaginaire* in

---

identified with the ציץ of Exod 28:36 and 39:30, attributing this interpretation to H. G. Mitchell and citing a number of scholars in support ("The Guilty Priesthood," 9–10; see also 17 n. 65 and n. 66; H. G. Mitchell, *Haggai, Zechariah*, ICC [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1912], 157–58).

86. E.g., Sir 50.5–7; Apoc. Ab. 11.3; m. Yoma 6:2; 7:5; Tg. Ps.-J. Lev 16:21. On this topic, see Orlov, *Divine Scapegoats*, 24–29.

87. Tiemeyer, "Guilty Priesthood," at 15 (emphasis mine). So also Stead, *Zechariah 1–8*, 170.

88. Tiemeyer, *Priestly Rites*, 249.

89. Orlov, *Atoning Dyad*, 48.

90. Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 81.

Zechariah's fourth night vision.[91] First, the Day of Atonement conceived in Zechariah 3 acquires a distinctly eschatological context and flavor. Second, the two goats become associated with personal entities—here, the Angel of the Lord and the Satan. Stökl Ben Ezra adds a third novelty, namely, the conception of Yom Kippur as a day of judgment.[92] In conjunction with the eschatological atonement envisioned in the scene, God rebukes the accusing Satan standing at Joshua's right hand (Zech 3:1–2). It is also notable that the prophet's first mention of the "Branch" (צמח) comes at Zech 3:8. The Branch, who will rebuild the temple, reappears in Zech 6:12, just after Joshua's high-priestly investiture is apparently completed (Zech 6:11),[93] as the picture of a priest-king dyarchy emerges (Zech 6:13; cf. Zech 4:11–14).

## The Book of Jubilees

The second-century BCE Book of Jubilees contains two distinct etiologies of Yom Kippur (Jub. 5.17–18; 34:10–19). The first etiology occurs immediately after the fallout of the Watchers's transgression in Jubilees 5:

> Wickedness increased on the earth... They began to devour one another... The Lord saw that the earth was corrupt... He was pleased with Noah alone... He obliterated all from their places... Regarding the Israelites it has been written and ordained: "If they turn to him in the right way, he will forgive all their wickedness and will pardon all their

---

91. Orlov, *Atoning Dyad*, 48.

92. Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 81–82.

93. Stead, *Zechariah 1–8*, 169. See Chapter Four.

sins." It has been written and ordained that he will have mercy on all who turn from all their errors once each year.[94]

Anke Dorman argues that this etiology arises in response to the bloodshed of the antediluvian era, as described in Jubilees 7:[95] "Everyone sold himself to commit injustice and to shed innocent blood, the earth was filled with injustice ... Then the Lord obliterated all from the surface of the earth because of their actions and because of the blood which they had shed in the earth."[96] Dorman points out that Jubilees's second Yom Kippur etiology is also linked to bloodshed, as it occurs immediately after Jacob's sons effectively murder Joseph:[97]

> Jacob's sons slaughtered a he-goat, stained Joseph's clothing by dipping it in its blood, and sent (it) to their father Jacob on the tenth of the seventh month... [Jacob] continued mourning Joseph for one year and was not comforted but said: "May I go down to the grave mourning for my son." For this reason, it has been ordained regarding the Israelites that they should be distressed on the tenth of the seventh month — on the day when (the news) which made (him) lament Joseph reached his father Jacob — in order to make atonement for themselves on it with a kid — on the tenth of the seventh month, once a year — for their sins... This day has been ordained so that they may

---

94. Jub. 5.2, 3, 5, 11, 17–18 (translations of Jubilees are from James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: Translated*, CSCO 511 [Louvain: Peeters, 1989], here at 32–34; for the critical edition, see James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text*, CSCO 510 [Louvain: Peeters, 1989]).

95. Anke Dorman, "'Commit Injustice and Shed Innocent Blood': Motives Behind the Institution of the Day of Atonement in the Book of Jubilees," in *The Day of Atonement: Its Interpretations in Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*, 49–62, at 49–52, 58–60.

96. Jub. 7.23, 25 (VanderKam, *Jubilees*, 47).

97. Dorman, "Innocent Blood," 55–58.

be saddened on it for their sins, all their transgressions, and all their errors; so that they may purify themselves on this day once a year."[98]

In both instances, the Day of Atonement is linked to the forgiveness of corporate bloodguilt.[99] The close proximity between Yom Kippur and the punishment of the Watchers in Jubilees's first etiology (Jub. 5.6–11, 17–18) is also notable.

Jubilees's second Yom Kippur etiology has been the topic of much scholarly discussion.[100] As the author(s) of the pseudepigraphon places the Yom Kippur etiology at the end of the story about Joseph's betrayal (Genesis 37), the Pentateuchal narrative acquires new significance in light of the sacerdotal context. For example, some suggest a correspondence between Jacob's great mourning for his lost son (Gen 37:34–35; Jub. 34.13–19) and the command of the people to "afflict yourselves" on Yom Kippur (Lev 16:29, 31; 23:27–32; Num 29:7).[101] Dorman posits that this element of mourning, linked to the command of self-affliction, "seems to be the most important aspect of the festival in Jubilees."[102]

---

98. Jub. 34.12, 17–19 (VanderKam, *Jubilees*, 228–29).

99. Dorman summarizes: "The key for solving the puzzle as to how the two references to the Day of Atonement are related can be found in Jubilees 7. The sins that can also be ascribed to the brothers (committing injustice and shedding innocent blood) are mentioned in Jub. 7.23 to summarize the reasons for the Flood (Jub. 7.23–25)" ("Innocent Blood," 58).

100. James P. Scullion, "A Traditio-Historical Study of the Day of Atonement," (PhD diss., Catholic University of America, 1990), 125–31; Calum Carmichael, "The Origin of the Scapegoat Ritual," *VT* 50 (2000): 167–82; James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, GAP 9 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001), 74; Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 95–97; Mary Douglas, *Jacob's Tears: The Priestly Work of Reconciliation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 38–60; Carmichael, *Illuminating Leviticus: A Study of Its Laws and Institutions in Light of Biblical Narratives* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2006), 38–52; Dorman, "Innocent Blood," 55–58; Orlov, *Divine Scapegoats*, 64; idem, *Atoning Dyad*, 32–42. For Carmichael, Jubilees unmasks the true etiology of the Yom Kippur ritual, which is "a purely native, Israelite invention" and "a ritualized annual performance of the drama of the brothers' actions" ("Scapegoat Ritual," 182; idem, *Illuminating Leviticus*, 45). Few scholars have accepted this thesis.

101. Scullion, "Day of Atonement," 128; Dorman, "Innocent Blood," 56–57; Orlov, *Atoning Dyad*, 33.

102. Dorman, "Innocent Blood," 57.

A striking development in the Day of Atonement *imaginaire* of Jubilees is the association of both goats with one figure, the patriarch Joseph.[103] According to Jub. 34.12, "Jacob's sons slaughtered a he-goat, stained Joseph's clothing by dipping it in its blood, and sent (it) to their father on the tenth of the seventh month [i.e., Yom Kippur]."[104] The slaughter of a goat and the manipulation of its blood upon Joseph's clothing (cf. Gen 37:31) associates the patriarch with the immolated goat.[105] Jubilees 34.18 strengthens this connection by affirming that the sacrificial goat achieves atonement for the nation's sins. According to Orlov, "Although in the biblical story Joseph is not slaughtered and his blood is not used for cultic purposes, his role as the goat for YHWH appears to be symbolically affirmed through the transference of the goat's blood onto his attire."[106] A tradition in Targum Pseudo-Jonathan attests to the association between the sin-offering goat and Joseph.[107]

Scholars have also suggested Joseph's association with the scapegoat. Stökl Ben Ezra observes that the "brothers dip the garment in *blood* and then *send* it to the father (Jub. 34.12)."[108] Dorman notes that "the sending away of Joseph into a foreign land reminds the reader of the sending away of the goat to Azazel."[109] Mary Douglas

---

103. Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 96 n. 88; Orlov, *Atoning Dyad*, 36.

104. VanderKam, *Jubilees*, 228.

105. Scullion, "Day of Atonement," 130; Carmichael, "Scapegoat Ritual," 172–73; VanderKam, *Jubilees*, 74; Orlov, *Atoning Dyad*, 33–35.

106. Ibid., 35.

107. Tg. Ps.-J. Lev 9:3: "And you shall speak to the children of Israel, saying, 'You also are to take a male goat and offer it as a sin offering, lest Satan who is comparable to it speak with a slanderous tongue against you over the affair of the male goat which the tribes of Jacob slaughtered in order to deceive their father" (McNamara et al., *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*, 143). Stökl Ben Ezra notes that, while this text "is not directly linked to Yom Kippur, all of the traditions contained in this passage are sometimes associated with the Day of Atonement" (*Impact of Yom Kippur*, 129).

108. Ibid., 96.

109. Dorman, "Innocent Blood," 57.

remarks that "Joseph is a better parallel to the Go-Away Goat... the brothers got rid of him to Egypt, a land which was certainly very remote."[110] Orlov adds that, in the biblical narrative (Gen 37:24), Joseph is placed in a pit, similar to how Asael is cast into an abyss in the apocalyptic scapegoat tradition.[111] Calum Carmichael suggests an echo of the demon Azazel in the figure of the "wild beast" who preys upon Joseph (Gen 37:33; Jub. 34.13).[112] Subsequently, the brothers transfer their offense onto this wild beast (i.e., Azazel), as the high priest transfers Israel's iniquity onto the scapegoat.[113]

A few scholars have also posited a correspondence between Joseph and the high-priest. Carmichael perceives a connection between Joseph's garment dipped in blood and the garment of the high priest, which would become blood-spattered upon slaughtering the goat for Yahweh and the other immolated animals (Lev 16:3–5).[114] Dorman also suggests that "Joseph's coat could refer to the tunic of the high priest."[115] Following Stökl Ben Ezra, Orlov points to the association of Joseph's coat and the high priest's garment in later rabbinic sources.[116] For example, y. Yoma 7.5 contains the following tradition: "Rebbi Simon said, just as sacrifices atone, so the garments atone, shirt, trousers, turban, and vest. The shirt was atoning for [wearers of *kilaim*. There are those who want to say,] for spillers of blood, as you are saying, *they dipped*

---

110. Douglas, *Jacob's Tears*, 57.

111. Orlov, *Atoning Dyad*, 36–37.

112. Carmichael, "Scapegoat Ritual," 173.

113. Ibid., " 174, 182.

114. Carmichael, *Illuminating Leviticus*, 45.

115. Dorman, "Innocent Blood," 57.

116. Orlov, *Atoning Dyad*, 39–41; cf. Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 96–97.

*the shirt in blood.*"[117]

In summary, both Yom Kippur etiologies in Jubilees are situated in the context of corporate bloodguilt. The second etiology presents a complex amalgam of sacerdotal symbolism linked with the patriarch Joseph.[118] The author(s) of the pseudepigraphon associates Joseph with *both* the immolated goat and the scapegoat, while also possibly linking his blood-stained garment to that of the high priest.

## 11QMelchizedek

A *pesher* on Lev 25:9–13, Deut 15:2, Isa 52:7, 61:1–3, Pss 7:8–9, 82:1–2, and Dan 9:25–26, the sectarian Qumran scroll 11QMelchizedek describes an eschatological Day of Atonement during which the heavenly warrior and high-priest Melchizedek is destined to judge Belial and his demonic forces, liberate the "sons of light" from Belial's dominion, make atonement for the children of light, and restore their lost inheritance:[119] "And the D[ay of Atone]ment i[s] the e[nd of] the tenth [ju]bilee, in

---

117. Heinrich W. Guggenheimer, *The Jerusalem Talmud. Tractates Pesahim and Yoma. Edition, Translation, and Commentary*, SJ 74 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013), 587. Similarly, *b. Zevachim* 88b: "R. ʻInyani b. Sason also said: Why are the sections on sacrifices and the priestly vestments close together? To teach you: as sacrifices make atonement, so do the priestly vestments make atonement. The coat atones for bloodshed, for it is said, And they killed a he-goat, and dipped the coat in the blood" (Isidore Epstein, ed., *The Babylonian Talmud*, [London: Soncino, 1935–1952]). See also *b. Arachin* 16a. *Leviticus Rabbah* 10.6 contains a relateld tradition.

118. Dorman rightly cautions that "the connection is based upon consciously and unconsciously felt similarities between Leviticus 16 and Genesis 37, but they must not be over interpreted" ("Innocent Blood," 57). There are also many obvious dissimilarities between the Yom Kippur ritual and the Joseph story. For example, Joseph is not actually slaughtered, his sending-place is not the Judaean desert, there is only one Joseph while there are two goats, etc.

119. For text and translation, see Florentino García-Martínez, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and Adam S. van der Woude, eds., *Qumran Cave 11. Vol. II: 11Q2–18, 11Q20–31*, DJD 23 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998, 221–41). On Melchizedek traditions, see Fred L. Horton, *The Melchizedek Tradition*, SNTSMS 30 (Cambridge University Press, 1976); Paul J. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchiresa*, CBQMS 10 (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981); Birger A. Pearson, "Melchizedek in Early Judaism, Christianity, and Gnosticism," in *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*, ed. Michael Stone and Theodore Bergen (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity International, 1998), 176–202;

which atonement shall be made for all the sons of [light and for] the men [of] the lot of Mel[chi]zedek[  ] over [th]em [ ] accor[ding to] a[ll] their [doing]s, for it is the time for the year of grace of Melchizedek and of [his] arm[ies."[120] According to Stökl Ben Ezra, the "extant fragments of the story resemble the punishment of Shemihaza by Michael" in BW (1 En. 10.11–22)[121]—the stratum that bears the general influence of Yom Kippur—only the link to the Day of Atonement is now explicit.[122] According to William Gilders, "this is another example of the sect's interpretive appropriation of 1 Enoch in relation to Yom Kippur."[123] As in Zechariah 3 and the Book of Watchers, atonement and cleansing ride in tandem with the judgment of cosmic powers antagonistic to God. Melchizedek's eschatological defeat of Belial and his lot is "prefigured in the rite of expulsion to Azazel" and in the protological judgment of the Watchers and their children.[124] Additionally, the heavenly figure fulfills the office of both priest and king.

## Yom Kippur at Qumran

---

Marcel Poorthuis, "Enoch and Melchizedek in Judaism and Christianity: A Study in Intermediaries," in *Saints and Role Models in Judaism and Christianity*, ed. Marcel Poorthuis and Joshua Schwartz, JCPS 7 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 97–120; Eric F. Mason, *You Are a Priest Forever: Second Temple Jewish Messianism and the Priestly Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, STDJ 74 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 138–90.

120. 11QMelch 2.7–8 (García-Martínez et al., *Qumran Cave 11*, 229).

121. Based on a reconstruction of 4QAmram[b], Kobelski argues that Melchizedek, the archangel Michael, and the Prince of Light are the same figure in Qumran literature (*Melchizedek and Melchiresa*, 36).

122. Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 90–91. He raises the question of whether 11QMelchizedek depicts the evil opponent in terms of the scapegoat and responds that "the extant text is far too short and too fragmentary to resolve this question" (ibid., 92).

123. William K. Gilders, "The Day of Atonement in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Hieke and Nicklas, *Day of Atonement*, 63–73, at 71.

124. Ibid., 72.

The notion of Yom Kippur as the occasion of God's final judgment of evil may be linked to the fact that the persecution of the Qumran community probably began on the Day of Atonement.[125] Consequently, the sect apparently interpreted its present sufferings as the afflictions of an ongoing Yom Kippur. Joseph Baumgarten and Stökl Ben Ezra point to 4Q171 as an example of this notion, suggesting that the phrase "period of affliction" (מועד התענית) likely derives from the command to "afflict yourselves" (תענו את־נפשתיכם, Lev 16:29):[126] "And the poor shall possess the land and enjoy peace in plenty. Its interpretation concerns the congregation of the poor who will tough out the period of distress [מועד התענית] and will be rescued from all the snares of Belial."[127] The community's past and current afflictions therefore pointed to the eschatological period of liberation from Belial's dungeon and restoration by the priest-king Melchizedek. As Stökl Ben Ezra notes, "the people from Qumran understood their own existence through the image of the two lots—they themselves are the people of God's lot in opposition to the lot of Belial led by the wicked priest."[128] The Yom Kippur *imaginaire* thus influenced the sect's self-perception, cosmic outlook, and eschatological expectation.

---

125. 1QpHab 11:2–8. See Joseph M. Baumgarten, "Yom Kippur in the Qumran Scrolls and Second Temple Sources," *DSD* 6 (1999): 184–91, at 184; VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas*, 266–70.

126. Baumgarten, "Yom Kippur," 186, 188; Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 98–99. Baumgarten also points to 4Q508.2.2–4, 4Q509.16.iv.2–4, and 4Q510.1.5 ("Yom Kippur," 186–88).

127. 4Q171 2.9–11 (Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1:342–43).

128. Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 98. A dualistic outlook associated with the two goats of Yom Kippur is also expressed in Philo, *Her.* 179; *Plant.* 61.

Heavenly Ascents in the Yom Kippur *Imaginaire*

Heavenly-ascent traditions warrant mention, since the high priest's ascent into the adytum on Yom Kippur underlies these traditions. Martha Himmelfarb demonstrates that the momentous ascent of Enoch in the Book of Watchers (1 Enoch 14) conveys Enoch as entering a celestial sanctuary.[129] For example, Himmelfarb notes correspondences between the tripartite structure of the earthly and heavenly temples, God's throne of cherubim in the adytum of both sanctuaries, the cherubim that guard the perimeter of both temples, and the presence of priestly ministers in both holy spaces.[130] Enoch's ascent into the heavenly Holy of Holies mirrors the high priest's journey into the earthly adytum, and upon reaching this destination Enoch adopts a role of priestly intercession.[131] The seventh-antediluvian patriarch's priestly profile is expanded in the Animal Apocalypse, the Book of Jubilees, and 2 Enoch.[132] In addition to Enoch, the priestly ascents of Abraham in the Apocalypse of Abraham and Levi in the Testament of Levi are noteworthy, since both patriarchs acquire a sacerdotal

---

129. On Enoch's priestly heavenly ascent, see Martha Himmelfarb, "Apocalyptic Ascent and the Heavenly Temple," *SBLSP* 26 (1987): 210–17; David J. Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Response to Ezekiel's Vision*, TSAJ 16 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988), 79–84; Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic*, 101–2; Martha Himmelfarb, "The Temple and the Garden of Eden in Ezekiel, the Book of Watchers, and the Wisdom of ben Sira," in *Sacred Places and Profane Spaces*, ed. Jamie Scott and Paul Simpson-Housley (New York: Greenwood, 1991), 63–78; idem, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 9–28; Fletcher-Louis, "Sacral Son of Man," 259–60; Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 82–83; Andrei A. Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, TSAJ 107 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 70–76.

130. Himmelfarb, "Apocalyptic Ascent," 210–11.

131. Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 83.

132. 1 En. 87.3–4; Jub. 4.23–25; 2 En. 18.8–9; 22.6–9. See James C. VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for all Generations* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1995), 117; Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, STDJ 42 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 22–24; Philip S. Alexander, "From Son of Adam to Second God: Transformations of the Biblical Enoch," in *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*, ed. Michael E. Stone and Theodore A. Bergren (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity International, 1998), 87–122, at 107; Orlov, *Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, 74–76, 200–203.

quality upon their celestial journeys.[133] According to Himmelfarb, "the purpose of the ascent [of Levi] is God's appointment of Levi as priest, and the consecration is thus the fulfillment of the ascent."[134] Regarding the Slavonic apocalypse, Orlov summarily writes, "the seer [Abraham] becomes not merely a mystical adept but a high priestly figure... the practitioner is able to learn and then to reenact the actions of the high priest in crucial ceremonies, including the rites of the central festival of the Jewish tradition, which is known to us as Yom Kippur."[135]

One interesting trope in this survey of heavenly-ascent traditions is the binary cosmic movement of the protagonist and the antagonist.[136] This trope probably has its origins in the binary movement of the goats of Yom Kippur: the high priest enters into the most-sacred realm of the adytum with the blood of the immolated goat and the scapegoat is sent away into the demonic domain of the wilderness. In the apocalyptic *imaginaire*, the banishment of Asael/Azazel into the cosmic abyss coincides with the ascent of the priestly visionary into the celestial sanctuary.[137] The trope of the binary movement of the two goats made an impression on Philo of Alexandria, the halakhic material of Barnabas, and Origen, as well.[138]

---

133. T. Levi 2–5; Apoc. Ab. 9–32.

134. Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 37.

135. Andrei A. Orlov, *Heavenly Priesthood in the Apocalypse of Abraham* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 191.

136. See further in Chapter Five.

137. 1 En. 10.4–8; 13:1–10; 14:1–25; 87:1–4; 88:1–3; Apoc. Ab. 13–14; 15–32.

138. Philo, *Her.* 179; Barn. 7.9; Origen, *Hom. Lev.* 9.4.2; 9.5.2. See Chapter Five.

## Extra-Biblical Scapegoat Rituals in Second Temple Tradition

Several extra-biblical traditions pertaining to the scapegoat ritual of the Second Temple period ought to be highlighted for the purposes of this study. With sparse supplementation, I follow the methodologically careful work of Stökl Ben Ezra, who remarks, "Those temple rites that are confirmed by independent Second Temple sources are almost certainly historic."[139] Thus, according to Second Temple tradition, (1) the goat for Yahweh and the goat for Azazel are to be exactly alike in quality and appearance,[140] (2) a scarlet ribbon or garment is tied onto the head of the scapegoat or placed around the scapegoat,[141] (3) the scapegoat is severely abused, both physically and verbally,[142] (4) and the scapegoat is cast downward into an abyss or a ravine.[143] Orlov notices that, in temple-ritual tradition, the scapegoat undergoes a two-stage removal: first, it is sent into the wilderness; second, it is cast down a ravine. Similarly, in the apocalyptic *imaginaire*, the antagonist "is not just banished to the wilderness, but is placed in a pit in the wilderness."[144]

---

139. Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 19. Joshua Ezra Burns summarizes the state of the question on the use of rabbinic literature as comparative "background" for the New Testament: "The continuing efforts of scholars since Neusner to refine the critical discourse on the classical rabbinic tradition have helped diminish its once pervasive influence over the field of New Testament studies. In view of these efforts, one can no longer simply cite 'the rabbis' as witnesses to the early Christian tradition, nor even quote a specific rabbinic authority without encroaching upon the integrity of its textual source" ("Rabbinic Literature: New Testament," OEBB 2:247–56, at 249–50).

140. Barn. 7.6, 10; m. Yoma 6:1; Justin, *Dial.* 40.4; Tertullian, *Marc.* 3.7; *Adv. Jud.* 14.9.

141. Barn. 7.8, 11; m. Yoma 4:2; 6:6; m. Šabb. 9:3; Tertullian, *Marc.* 3.7; Hippolytus, *Frag.* 75 (see also Apoc. Ab. 13.14).

142. 1 En. 10.4–5; Apoc. Ab. 13.6–7, 11; Barn. 7.8; m. Yoma 6:4; Tertullian, *Marc.* 3.7.

143. Philo, *Plant.* 61; 1 En. 10.4–5; Apoc. Ab. 14.5; m. Yoma 6:6; Tg. Ps.-J. Lev 16:22. See note above.

144. Orlov, *Atoning Dyad*, 114.

## Yom Kippur Christologies in the New Testament

Here I survey the christological Yom Kippur typologies in the Pauline corpus, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Book of Revelation, the Epistle of Barnabas, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Hippolytus, Origen, Jerome, and the first commentary on the Gospel of Mark.[145]

### The Pauline Letters

There may be several allusions to Yom Kippur in the Pauline corpus. The two most plausible cases are Galatians 3:13 and Romans 3:25.[146] Daniel Schwartz and others have argued that the logic of Gal 3:13 involves the notion of Christ becoming the curse-bearing scapegoat in order to redeem those under the "curse of the Law."[147] As Bradley H. McLean points out, in his quotation of Deut 21:23, Paul does not employ the Septuagint's word for "curse," καταράομαι, but he chooses ἐπικατάρατος, a term that Barnabas applies to the scapegoat twice (Barn. 7.7, 9).[148] In the cognate passage

---

145. For a recent treatment of the (potential) influence of Yom Kippur in many of these texts, including John 1:29, 1 Peter 2:24, and 1 John 2:2; 4:10, see Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 145–227. Regarding the latter two passages, Stökl Ben Ezra concludes, "In sum, the scapegoat ritual may, at most, have served as a catalyst for applying Isaiah 53 to Christ, similar to the instance of the Lamb of God in John 1:29" (ibid., 179).

146. Scholars have also suggested the influence of Yom Kippur in Phil 2:6–11, 2 Cor 5:21, Rom 8:3, and Col 1:12–20 (ibid., 207–212). See Bradley H. McLean, *The Cursed Christ: Mediterranean Expulsion Rituals and Pauline Soteriology*, JSNTSup 126 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996), 105–145; Stephen Finlan, *The Background and Content of Paul's Cultic Atonement Metaphors* (Atlanta: SBL, 2004), 98–100, 111–15; idem, *Problems with Atonement: The Origins of, and Controversy About, the Atonement Doctrine* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 2005), 39–62.

147. Schwartz, "Two Pauline Allusions," 260–63, 266–68; McLean, *Cursed Christ*, 113–40; Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 173–76; Finlan, *Atonement Metaphors*, 101–11; idem, *Problems with Atonement*, 44–48.

148. McLean, *Cursed Christ*, 131–36.

of Gal 4:4–7, Paul deviates from his usual verb for "sending" (πέμπω or ἀποστέλλω) and chooses a word he writes nowhere else in his entire corpus—ἐξαποστέλλω, the verb that Leviticus 16 employs to describe the sending away of the scapegoat and, with it, Israel's sins.[149] Stökl Ben Ezra proposes an additional verbal echo, namely, Paul's phrase, "Christ redeemed [ἐξηγόρασεν] us from the curse of the Law," may be a pun on Lev 16:21, "And he shall confess [ἐξαγορεύσει] over it all the iniquities of the people of Israel."[150] Schwartz sets forth his understanding of Paul's thought: "Christ was hung on a tree, and so became a curse, and so could become a scapegoat which, by being sent forth to its death, redeemed the Jews from their curse."[151]

The second Pauline text is Rom 3:25, where Paul speaks of God as setting forth Jesus as a ἱλαστήριον "through faith, in his blood." Based on solid lexical evidence, Daniel Bailey and others have argued that ἱλαστήριον here means "mercy seat," the *kapporet* where Yahweh appeared and upon which the sacrificial blood of Yom Kippur was applied (Lev 16:2, 13–15).[152] Some scholars argue that ἱλαστήριον in Rom 3:25 means "votive offering," as often occurs in Hellenistic literature (cf. 4 Macc 17.22),[153] but Bailey rejects this thesis, stating that this "mainstream use of

---

149. Schwartz, "Two Pauline Allusions," 261. See also Leviticus 14 for this unique usage of ἐξαποστέλλω.

150. Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 175.

151. Schwartz, "Two Pauline Allusions," 263.

152. Daniel P. Bailey, "Jesus as the Mercy Seat: The Semantics and Theology of Paul's Use of *Hilasterion* in Romans 3:25" (PhD diss., University of Cambridge, 1999); idem, "Jesus as the Mercy Seat: The Semantics and Theology of Paul's Use of *Hilasterion* in Romans 3:25," *TynBul* 51 (2000): 155–58 (a summary of Bailey's dissertation); Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 197–205; Finlan, *Atonement Metaphors*, 140–57; *Problems with Atonement*, 39–41; Markus Tiwald, "Christ as Hilasterion (Rom 3:25): Pauline Theology on the Day of Atonement in the Mirror of Early Jewish Thought," in Hieke and Nicklas, *Day of Atonement*, 189–209; Eberhart, "To Atone or Not to Atone," 228.

153. For such viewpoints and alternative interpretations, see Douglas J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 231–37; Tiwald, "Christ as Hilasterion," 189–90.

ἱλαστήριον finds no parallel in the 'law and the prophets' to which Paul appeals (Rom. 3:21)."[154] Noting that ἱλαστήριον is the *terminus technicus* for *kapporet* in the overwhelming majority of cases in the Septuagint, Stökl Ben Ezra concludes, "I find it hard to imagine that Greek-speaking Christian Jews... did not immediately make an association with the most frequent usage in the Septuagint, especially considering the mention of blood and sins in the context [of Romans 3]... [Paul] is most probably referring to the use of ἱλαστήριον in the best-known text, i.e., as *kapporet* in the Torah, and therefore to the ritual of Yom Kippur."[155] In summary, the Day of Atonement seems to have shaped Pauline soteriology in a subtle but discernable manner.

## The Epistle to the Hebrews

Gabriella Gelardini remarks, "Past and present Hebrews scholarship has sufficiently acknowledged the fact that Yom Kippur is of major if not fundamental importance for the interpretations of Hebrews."[156] The epistle presents the picture of Jesus entering the heavenly sanctuary as a high priest and presenting his own sacrificial blood in the manner of the Yom Kippur ritual.[157] David Moffitt's work on atonement in Hebrews

---

154. Bailey, "Jesus as the Mercy Seat," 157.

155. Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 200.

156. Gabriella Gelardini, "The Inauguration of Yom Kippur according to the LXX and its Cessation or Perpetuation according to the Book of Hebrews: A Systematic Comparison," in Hieke and Nicklas, *The Day of Atonement*, 225–54, at 227. For a summary on the subject, see Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 180–97.

157. E.g., see Heb 1:3; 2:17; 3:1; 4:14–15; 5:5–10; 6:19–20; 7:26–28; 8:1–2; 9:11–28; 10:10–25; see esp. 9:11–14, 23–28; 10:19–22

has been very influential in recent years.[158] Prior scholarship generally presupposed that the author of Hebrews employs a Yom Kippur typology to interpret the crucifixion from an earthly and heavenly perspective—the crucifixion itself is viewed as the slaughter of a sacrificial victim like the goat for Yahweh on Yom Kippur, and the spiritual effect of Jesus's crucifixion is conceived in terms of the high priest's entrance into the Holy of Holies with the blood of the sacrifice.[159] In this paradigm of thought, the crucifixion is conflated with Jesus's heavenly work of atonement. Moffitt argues that the author of Hebrews does not conflate Jesus's atoning work with the crucifixion; rather, the author emphasizes Jesus's presentation of himself to God in the heavenly sanctuary as the chief moment of atonement: "The offering of blood in the Mosaic cult did not symbolize the entry and presentation of death before the presence of God, but that of life. In the same way, Hebrews's emphasis on Jesus's living presence in heaven—the location where the author consistently claims Jesus made his offering—implies that it is not the death/slaughter of Jesus that atones, but the presentation of his life before God in the heavenly holy of holies."[160] If correct, Moffitt's thesis demonstrates that the author of Hebrews has composed a Yom Kippur typology based upon a nuanced understanding of the theology of Leviticus 16 and the Priestly literature. It grants paramount significance to Jesus's bodily ascension as the moment of his priestly work of atonement.

---

158. David M. Moffitt, *Atonement and the Logic of Resurrection in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, NovTSup (Leiden: Brill, 2011).

159. David M. Moffitt, "Blood, Life, and Atonement: Reassessing Hebrews' Christological Appropriation of Yom Kippur," in *The Day of Atonement*, 211–24, at 213. See here for a list of scholars who hold this view.

160. Moffitt, "Blood, Life, and Atonement," 221.

## The Book of Revelation

Two passages in the Book of Revelation utilize imagery from the Yom Kippur *imaginaire.* First, Rev 1:13 describes Jesus as "one like a Son of Man, clothed with a long robe and with a golden sash across his chest." William Loader has argued that the apparel described in this verse portrays Jesus as a heavenly high priest.[161] Stökl Ben Ezra points out that Jesus's "long robe" (ποδήρης) is the same term used to describe Joshua's priestly robe in the Yom Kippur setting of Zech 3:4 and Jesus's scarlet robe in the Day of Atonement typology of Barn. 7.9.[162] A Yom Kippur allusion in Rev 1:13 fits nicely with Crispin Fletcher-Louis's suggestion that the Son of Man figure of Daniel 7 possesses priestly qualities associated with Yom Kippur.[163] Second, Orlov has argued that the punishment of the dragon in Rev 20:1–3 draws upon the apocalyptic scapegoat tradition.[164] Orlov notes seven motifs from the tradition that have possibly influenced this scene: (1) the antagonist's banishment, (2) the angelic handler, (3) the scapegoat's binding, (4) the sealing of the scapegoat in an abyss, (5) the temporary healing of the earth, (6) the scapegoat's temporary unbinding before its demise, and (7) the scarlet ribbon. Though this is not a christological application of the Yom Kippur *imaginaire*, this tradition may be relevant to Matthew's crucifixion-death narrative.[165]

---

161. William R. G. Loader, *Sohn und Hoherpriester: Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur Christologie des Hebräerbriefes*, WMANT 53 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchen, 1981), 233–36. See, e.g., Exod 28:4; 29:5; Ezek 9:2–3, 11; Dan 10:5; Let. Aris. 96; Philo, *Fug.* 185; *Leg.* 2.56; Jos. Asen. 3.153; Bel 5.231; T. Levi 8.2; Barn 7.9.

162. Stökl Ben Ezra, "Apocalyptic Imaginaire," 365.

163. Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, "The High Priest as Divine Mediator in the Hebrew Bible: Dan 7:13 as a Test Case," *SBLSP* 36 (1997): 161–93.

164. Andrei A. Orlov, "Apocalyptic Scapegoat Traditions in the Book of Revelation: Part I: The Dragon" (forthcoming).

165. I argue for the influence of the apocalyptic scapegoat tradition on Mark's Gerasene

## Yom Kippur Christologies in Early Christianity

Before transitioning to Christian material beyond the New Testament, it is important to note that scholars posit that Barnabas, Justin Martyr, and Tertullian were already familiar with an earlier typology of Jesus as the two goats of Yom Kippur.[166] Stökl Ben Ezra relays his reconstruction of this proto-typology, based upon the traditions contained in Barnabas, Justin, and Tertullian:

> Since acquaintance with halakhic traditions is more likely for the Christian Jewish proto-typology than for later generations, those elements that go beyond Leviticus 16 and exist in later Halakhah are most probably ancient. If this supposition holds, then the following elements form parts of the proto-typology: a) the similarity between the goats; b) their beautiful appearance; c) the mistreatment of the scapegoat; d) the cursing of the scapegoat; e) the killing of the scapegoat; f) the red woolen ribbon placed on the scapegoat's head; g) before pushing the scapegoat over the precipice, the ribbon is put on something else; h) the eating of the sin-offering goat, probably in a special manner … i) the offering of the sacrificial goat; j) the sending out of the scapegoat; k) the fasting of the people.[167]

---

demoniac account in Hans M. Moscicke, "The Gerasene Exorcism and Jesus's Eschatological Expulsion of Cosmic Powers: Echoes of Second Temple Scapegoat Traditions in Mark 5:1–10," *JSNT* 41 (2019): 363–83.

166. Pierre Prigent, *Les Testimonia dans le Christianisme Primitif: L'Épître de Barnabé I–XVI et ses Sources*, EBib (Paris: Gabalda, 1961), 99–110; James Carleton Paget, *The Epistle of Barnabas: Outlook and Background*, WUNT 2:62 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 140; Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 158–61; Maclean, "Barabbas," 317–21.

167. Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 159–60.

Given the early date of Barnabas, the origin of this proto-typology probably dates to some time within the first century CE.

## The Epistle of Barnabas

Composed between 70–135 CE, the Epistle of Barnabas is the first known source to draw an explicit typological correspondence between Jesus and the two goats of Yom

Kippur.[168] Of unknown provenance,[169] the author suggests a correlation between

168. Given the importance of the traditions contained in Barnabas for this study, extended discussion of its date and provenance is warranted. Debates concerning Barnabas's date revolve around Barn. 4.3–5 and 16.3–4. In the former passage, the author relays a prophecy from "Enoch" and Daniel (cf. 7:7–8, 24), regarding an eleventh king, "a small horn," who will rise up after ten "kingdoms" (or "horns") and humble "three of the great horns at one time" (Barn. 4.4–5). Some scholars do not think Barn. 4.3–5 has any bearing on the date of the epistle (for proponents of this view, see Paget, *Barnabas*, 11 n. 46). Others have argued that Barnabas understands the prophecies in 4.3–5 as anticipating imminent fulfillment. J. B. Lightfoot, for example, interpreted the tenth kingdom as Vespasian, the three kings destined to humiliation as the three Flavian emperors, and the "little horn" as the Antichrist in the figure of Nero *redivivus* (*The Apostolic Fathers*, ed. J. R. Harmer [London: Macmillan, 1907], 240–41). Following Martin B. Shukster and Peter Richardson ("Barnabas, Nerva, and the Yavnean Rabbis," *JTS* 34 [1983]: 31–55), Paget posits that Nerva is in view in 4.3–5, since he immediately followed the three Flavian emperors (the "three great horns") and apparently held a positive attitude toward the Jews, whence hope for a rebuilt temple may have arisen (*Barnabas*, 9–30; so also William Horbury, "Jewish-Christian Relations in Barnabas and Justin Martyr," in *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135*, ed. J. D. G. Dunn, WUNT 1:66 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992], 315–45, at 319–21). Barnabas 16.3–4 relates that, although the Jerusalem temple was destroyed, a prophecy concerning its rebuilding is about to be fulfilled: "Moreover he says again, 'See, those who have destroyed this temple will themselves build it.' This is happening [γίνεται]" (16.4; Ehrman) (while S and H omit γίνεται and only G and L preserve this reading, there is good reason to take it as original; see Reidar Hvalvik, *The Struggle for Scripture and Covenant: The Purpose of the Epistle of Barnabas and Jewish-Christian Competition in the Second Century*, WUNT 2:82 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996], 18). Some scholars hold that the Christian "spiritual temple" is here in view, not the physical Jerusalem temple (e.g., Lightfoot, *Fathers*, 241). Thus, Pierre Prigent states: "Mais dans une épître qui prône si souvent le caractère spirituel du seul culte que Dieu agrée, et dans un chapitre dont la pointe est l'affirmation que le seul vrai temple où Dieu habite c'est le coeur de l'homme, comment ne pas songer en tout premier lieu à une interprétation spiritualiste…." (*Épître de Barnabé*, ed. Robert A. Kraft, SC 172 [Paris: Cerf: 1971], 191; for further advocates of this view, see Hvalvik, *Struggle*, 19 n. 10). Others have concluded that this passage refers to the expectation that Hadrian would rebuild the Jewish temple (Leslie W. Barnard, "The Date of the Epistle of Barnabas: A Document of Early Egyptian Christianity," *JEA* 44 [1958]: 101–7; Bart D. Ehrman, *The Apostolic Fathers. Volume 2*, LCL [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003], 7; for further supporters of this view, see Johannes Quasten, *Patrology I: The Beginnings of Patristic Literature*, repr. ed. [Westminster, MD: Christian Classics, 1950, 1983], 90–91). Some argue that Barn. 16.3–4 refers to Hadrian's supposed building of a temple to Jupiter in Jerusalem. Klaus Wengst concludes: "Da nun Barnabas keine Kenntnis des jüdischen Krieges von 132–35 verrät, wird sich seine Anspielung in 16, 3f auf den 130 gegebenen Befehl Hadrians zum Bau eines Jupitertempels beziehen. Daher dürte sein Brief zwischen 130 und 132 geschrieben sein" (*Tradition und Theologie des Barnabasbriefes*, AK 42 [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1971], 112–13; for proponents of this view, see Hvalvik, *Struggle*, 21 n. 26). The argument for a Nervan dating around 96–98 CE seems most satisfactorily to account for the data in both Barn. 4.3–5 and 16.3–4.

169. An Alexandrian provenance is often assumed, since Clement of Alexandria is the first to cite Barnabas (e.g., *Strom.* 2.6; 2.7; 2.20) and since the author utilizes an "allegorical" mode of scriptural interpretation (Lightfoot, *Fathers*, 239–240; Quasten, *Patrology*, 89; Robert Kraft, *The Epistle of Barnabas: its Quotations and their Sources* [PhD diss., Harvard University, 1961], 13; Paget, *Barnabas*, 36–42; for more proponents of this view, see Paget, *Barnabas*, 30 n. 142). Others argue for a Syrian-Palestinian provenance, given the author's supposed knowledge of traditions from Qumran, rabbinic material, and the Didache (Leslie W. Barnard, "The Epistle of Barnabas and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Some Observations," *SJT* 13 [1960]: 45–59; Prigent, *Barnabé*, 22–24; Martin B. Shukster and Peter Richardson, "Temple and *Bet Ha-midrash* in the Epistle of Barnabas," in *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity. Volume 2: Separation and Polemic*, ed. Stephen G. Wilson [Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1986], 17–31, at 19–20; for further advocates of this view, see Hvalvik, *Struggle*, 35, n. 4). Still others suggest Asia Minor as a possibility (Wengst, *Barnabasbriefes*, 113–18; for supporters of this view, see Hvalvik, *Struggle*, 36 n. 5). It is equally unclear whether the author is Jewish or

Jesus's physical sufferings and the physical abuses of the scapegoat, as attested in Second Temple tradition (Barn. 7.8).[170] Both Jesus and the scapegoat are "cursed" (Bar. 7.7, 9). He also associates the eschatological return of Christ with the scapegoat, by suggesting that Jesus will be crowned and robed just as the scapegoat was crowned with scarlet wool in early Jewish tradition (Barn. 7.9). Jesus's long robe (ποδήρης) may also recall the high priest's attire.[171] The halakhic requirement that the two goats must be exactly similar leads the author to conceive Jesus as *both* Yom Kippur goats (Barn. 7.10). Jesus's death corresponds to the immolated goat as a "burnt offering for sins" (ὁλοκαύτωμα ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν, Barn. 7.6).[172] The author of the pseudepigraphon bases his christology on an earlier Christian typology and on extra-biblical halakhic traditions, making Barnabas 7 especially significant for this study.[173]

---

Gentile. On this, see James Carleton Paget, "The Epistle of Barnabas," *ET* 117 (2006): 441–46, at 442.

170. Barn 7.6–11: "⁶Pay attention to what he commands: 'Take two fine goats who are alike and offer them as a sacrifice; and let the priest take one of them as a whole burnt offering for sins.' ⁷But what will they do with the other? 'The other,' he says, 'is cursed.' Pay attention to how the type of Jesus is revealed. ⁸'And all of you shall spit on it and pierce it and wrap a piece of scarlet wool around its head, and so let it be cast into the wilderness.' When this happens, the one who takes the goat leads it into the wilderness and removes the wool, and places it on a blackberry bush, whose buds we are accustomed to eat when we find it in the countryside. (Thus the fruit of the blackberry bush alone is sweet.) ⁹And so, what does this mean? Pay attention: 'The one they take to the altar, but the other is cursed,' and the one that is cursed is crowned. For then they will see him in that day wearing a long scarlet robe around his flesh, and they will say, 'Is this not the one we once crucified, despising, piercing, and spitting on him? Truly this is the one who was saying at the time that he was himself the Son of God.' ¹⁰For how is he like that one? This is why 'the goats are alike, fine, and equal,' that when they see him coming at that time, they may be amazed at how much he is like the goat. See then the type of Jesus who was about to suffer. ¹¹But why do they place the wool in the midst of the thorns? This is a type of Jesus established for the church, because whoever wishes to remove the scarlet wool must suffer greatly, since the thorn is a fearful thing, and a person can retrieve the wool only by experiencing pain. And so he says: those who wish to see me and touch my kingdom must take hold of me through pain and suffering" (Ehrman).

171. See below.

172. This is an odd phrase, given that the immolated goat was not a "burnt offering" (ὁλοκαύτωμα) but a "sin offering" (ἁμαρτία) (Lev 16:5, 9, 15). See note in Chapter Two on the vestigial usage of עלה in P.

173. On Barnabas's use of earlier Jewish traditions, see Gedaliah Alon, "Halakha in the Epistle of Barnabas," *Tarbiz* 12 (1940–1941): 23–43, at 29–32; Kraft, *Barnabas*, 172–73; Wengst, *Barnabasbriefes*, 29–32; Leslie W. Barnard, *Studies in Church History and Patristics* (Thessalonike: Patriarchikon, 1978), 52–106; Grabbe, "Scapegoat Tradition," 161–65; Paget, *Barnabas*, 134–35; Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 159–60. Kraft summarily remarks that "there can be little doubt that

Justin Martyr

Writing in the mid-second century CE, Justin Martyr preserves a similar but distinct goat typology, independent from that of Barnabas.[174] For Justin, the halakhic requirement of the goats' similarity points to the two comings of Christ (*Dial.* 10.4).[175] Jesus typologically corresponds to the scapegoat in the fact that he was seized, sent away, and put to death by the leaders of Jerusalem during his first *parousia* (*Dial.* 10.4). Christ corresponds to the immolated goat by becoming a sacrificial offering in the city of Jerusalem, where he will return at his second *parousia* and appear to those who subjected him to shame (*Dial.* 10.4–5).

---

the materials of Barn 7 and 8 basically come from the same background of midrashic commentary on Jewish ritual. It is difficult to imagine how or why a Christian author would produce such haggadic/halakic details from nowhere" (*Barnabas*, 177–78).

174. Kraft notes only three verbal parallels between Barnabas and Justin: (1) the term νηστεία to describe the holy day, (2) the term τράγοι for "goats" instead of χιμάροι, which is found in most LXX manuscripts, and (3) that the goats should be ὁμοίοι (ibid., 174). But points (1) and (2) are easily explained by common cultural tradition, and point (3) is attested independently in the Mishnah. Prigent summarizes: "Il est difficile d'imaginer que Justin dépend de Barnabé. Trop de détails sont différents et le raisonnement ne s'appuie pas sur les mêmes éléments" (*Barnabé*, 136). Crossan notes the difference in how the two goats represent the two comings of Christ (*Cross that Spoke*, 129). Paget adds that, unlike Barnabas, Justin fails to allude to the scapegoat's severe abuse and the scarlet band tradition (*Barnabas*, 138). Stökl Ben Ezra relates that the scapegoat's death in Justin is not included in Barnabas (*Impact of Yom Kippur*, 156). Cf. Wengst, *Barnabasbriefes*, 29.

175. Justin, *Dial.* 40.4–5: "⁴Likewise, the two goats which were commanded to be similar (one of which was to be the scapegoat, and the other the sacrificial goat) were an announcement of the two comings of Christ: Of the first coming, in which your priests and elders sent him away as a scapegoat, seizing him and putting him to death; of the second coming, because in that same place of Jerusalem you shall recognize him whom you had subjected to shame, and who was a sacrificial offering for all sinners who are willing to repent and to comply with that fast which Isaiah prescribed when he said, *loosing the strangle of violent contracts*, and to observe likewise all the other precepts laid down by him (precepts which I have already mentioned and which all believers in Christ fulfill). ⁵You also know very well that the offering of the two goats, which had to take place during the fast, could not take place anywhere else except in Jerusalem" (I have modified the translation of Thomas B. Falls, *St. Justin Martyr: Dialogue with Trypho*, rev. Thomas P. Halton, ed. Michael Slusser, SFC 3 [Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2003], 62). See also Justin, *Dial.* 111.1.

Tertullian

Active in the early third-century CE, Tertullian relays a goat typology that contains similarities to the typologies in Barnabas and Justin.[176] Like Barnabas, he emphasizes the correspondence between the physical abuses of the scapegoat—being cursed, spit upon, pulled about, and pierced—and the afflictions of Christ.[177] Also, Tertullian notes that Jesus was "surrounded with scarlet" in a manner similar to the scapegoat (*Marc*. 3.7). As with Justin, the likeness of the two goats points to the two comings of Christ. For Tertullian, however, it seems that Jesus's identity as the sin-offering goat is primarily realized at his second coming, when all sins will have finally received atonement.[178]

---

176. Prigent (*Testimonia*, 108–9) and Grabbe ("Scapegoat Tradition") argue that Tertullian is independent of Barnabas, Prigent positing that he is dependent on a pre-existent Christian typology and on Justin. On the contrary, Hermann Tränkle contends for Tertullian's dependence on Barnabas (*Q. S. F. Tertullian, "Adversus Iudaeos." Mit Einleitung und kritischem Kommentar* [Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1964], lxxvi–lxxvii). Paget cautions: "the details they [i.e., scholars who argue in favor of Tertullian's independence of Barnabas] cite in support of their case can equally be explained by arguing for literary dependence" (*Barnabas*, 139). Stökl Ben Ezra suggests that Tertullian may have been aware of the proto-typology in addition to Barnabas and Justin (*Impact of Yom Kippur*, 158).

177. Tertullian, *Marc*. 3.7: "If also I am to submit an interpretation of the two goats which were offered at the Fast, are not these also figures of Christ's two activities? They are indeed of the same age and appearance because the Lord's is one and the same aspect: because he will return in no other form, seeing he has to be recognized by those of whom he has suffered injury. One of them, however, surrounded with scarlet, cursed and spit upon and pulled about and pierced, was by the people driven out of the city into perdition, marked with manifest tokens of our Lord's passion: while the other, made an offering for sins, and given as food to the priests of the temple, marked the tokens of his second manifestation, at which, when all sins have been done away, the priests of the spiritual temple, which is the Church, were to enjoy as it were a feast of our Lord's grace, while the rest remain without a taste of salvation. So then, seeing that the first advent was for the most part prophesied under the obscurity of figures, and borne down with every sort of indignity, while the second was both clearly told of, and was of divine dignity, they set their eyes on that one alone which they could easily understand and easily believe, the second, and thus were, as might have been expected, misled in respect of the less evident, admittedly less dignified, which was the first. Thus even until this day they refuse to admit that their Christ has come, because he has not come in majesty, being unaware that he was first also to come in humility" (translation from Ernest Evans, *Tertullian: Adversus Marcionem: Books 1–3* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1972], 191). See also Tertullian, *Adv. Jud.* 14.9–10.

178. Perhaps, then, Tertullian's theology has been more influenced by the Epistle to the Hebrews, which conceives Jesus's atoning function as the goat to Yahweh as effectively continuing in the heavenly sanctuary.

Hippolytus

A contemporary of Tertullian, Hippolytus also draws a typological correspondence between Jesus and the two goats of Yom Kippur.[179] As the goat for Yahweh, Jesus is a sacrifice for the sins of the world. As the scapegoat, Jesus is crowned with scarlet wool and sent into the desert "to the Gentiles" (*Frag.* 75). Hippolytus uniquely links the goat typology to the ransom logion (Mark 10:45; Matt 20:28), indicating that Jesus became a λύτρον in his capacity as goat(s) of Yom Kippur.[180]

Origen

In his *Homilies on Leviticus*, Origen offers an intriguing Yom Kippur typology.[181] Jesus becomes the scapegoat's handler (Lev 16:21, 26), who leads away the evil powers into the wilderness of the underworld: "So no one else [besides Christ] could 'triumph over' and lead 'into the wilderness' of Hell 'the principalities and powers and rulers of the world.'"[182] Thus, for Origen, the scapegoat is associated with God's

---

179. Hippolytus, *Frag.* 75: "And a goat leading the goatherd. For this one, it says, is the one sacrificed for the sin of the world, and as an offered sacrifice, and as one sent into the desert to the Gentiles, and as one crowned with scarlet wool [κόκκινον ἔριον] on the head by the unfaithful, and one who has become a ransom [λύτρον] for humankind, and shown to be life for all" (my translation, based on the Greek text from M. Richard, "Les fragments du commentaire de S. Hippolyte sur les Proverbes de Salomon," *Mus* 79 [1966]: 65–94, at 94).

180. See Edwards, *Ransom Logion*, 76.

181. Origen, *Hom. Lev.* 9.5.2: "But also the statement that 'he fastened the principalities and opposing powers upon his cross and he triumphed over them,' in this he fulfilled 'the lot of the scapegoat' and as 'a prepared man' he led them 'into the wilderness' … But he would make 'the lot of the scapegoat' the opposing powers, 'the spirits of evil and the rulers of this world of darkness,' which, as the Apostle says, 'he led away with power triumphing over them in himself.' 'He led them away.' Where 'did he lead' them except 'to the wilderness,' to desolate places?" (translation from Gary Wayne Barkley, *Homilies on Leviticus 1–16*, FC 83 [Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1990], 184).

182. Origen, *Hom. Lev.* 9.5.3.

cosmic antagonist, as in early Jewish apocalyptic literature.[183] The two "lots" of each

goat (Lev 16:8–10) correspond to the communities of the faithful and faithless,

respectively.[184] Additionally, Origen maps the binary movement of the two goats onto

two biblical narratives. Lazarus, as the goat for Yahweh, moves in a positive direction

into Abraham's bosom, and the rich man, as the goat for Azazel, moves in a negative

direction to a place of torment.[185] The faithful criminal who was crucified with Jesus

ascended into Paradise as the goat for Yahweh, and the criminal who reviled Jesus

descended into Hell as the goat for Azazel.[186]

Origen is also the first known ancient writer to draw an explicit typological

correspondence between Jesus and Barabbas, and the two goats of Yom Kippur.[187] In a

way similar to the scapegoat, Barabbas is released living, somehow bearing with him

the sins of the Jewish crowd into the wilderness. In a way similar to the immolated

goat, Jesus is sacrificed as an offering for sins. Pilate corresponds to the scapegoat's

---

183. *Cels.* 6.43: "Further, the averter in Leviticus, which the Hebrew text called Azazel, is none other than he [i.e., the Devil]. The goat upon whom the lot fell had to be sent forth in the desert so that it should avert evil. For all who, on account of their sin, belong to the portion of the evil power and who are opposed to the people of God's inheritance, are deserted by God" (Henry Chadwick, *Origen: Contra Celsum* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953], 360). Earlier in the work, Origen describes Christ's *pharmakos*-like death as averting evil powers and destroying the Devil: "Let people therefore who do not want to believe that Jesus died on a cross for men, tell us whether they would not accept the many Greek and barbarian stories about some who have died for the community to destroy evils that had taken hold of cities and nations. Or do they think that, while these stories as historically true, yet there is nothing plausible about this man (as people suppose him to be) to suggest that he died to destroy a great daemon, in fact the ruler of daemons, who held in subjection all the souls of men that have come to earth?" (*Cels.* 1.31; Chadwick, *Origen*, 31).

184. Origen, *Hom. Lev.* 9.3.2–4.

185. Origen, *Hom. Lev.* 9.4.2; cf. Luke 16:19–31.

186. Origen, *Hom. Lev.* 9.5.2; cf. Luke 23:39–43.

187. Origen, *Hom. Lev.* 10.2.2: "Then all the people cried out to release Barabbas but to hand Jesus over to be killed. Behold, you have a he-goat who was sent 'living into the wilderness,' bearing with him the sins of the people who cried out and said, 'Crucify, crucify.' Therefore, the former is a he-goat sent 'living into the wilderness' and the latter is the he-goat which was offered to God as an offering to atone for sins and he made a true atonement for those people who believe in him" (Barkley, *Homilies on Leviticus 1–16*, 204–5).

handler, who must wash himself and be made clean after leading the scapegoat into the desert (Lev 16:26).

## Jerome

Jerome follows Origen's typology, but he transforms it by associating Barabbas with the Antichrist.[188] The goat of the Jews is the scapegoat Barabbas, who is cursed, spit upon, and cast into the wilderness. The goat of the Christians is Jesus, the goat for Yahweh who is slain before the altar of the Lord and enters Paradise.

## The First Commentary on Mark

The first commentary on the Gospel of Mark also typologizes Jesus and Barabbas as the two goats of Yom Kippur.[189] Barabbas is released bearing the sins of the people into the wilderness of hell. Jesus is slain as a sacrificial lamb (and apparently as the immolated goat) for the sins of the Lord's portion.[190]

---

188. Jerome, *Hom.* 93: "They have rejected Christ, but accept the Antichrist; we have recognized and acknowledge the humble Son of God, that afterwards we may have the triumphal Savior. In the end, our he-goat will be immolated before the altar of the Lord; their buck, the Antichrist, spit upon and cursed, will be cast into the wilderness. Our thief enters Paradise with the Lord; their thief, a homicide and blasphemer, dies in his sin. For them, Barabbas is released; for us, Christ is slain" (translation from Marie Liguori Ewald, *The Homilies of St. Jerome: Volume 2 [Homilies 60–96]*, FC 57 [Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1996], 249).

189. Michael Cahill dates the *terminus a quo* to the early-seventh century CE (*The First Commentary on Mark: An Annotated Translation* [New York: Oxford University Press, 1998], 6–7).

190. Pseudo-Hieronymus's commentary on Mark 15:11: "The High Priest stirred up the crowds so that they would ask for Barabbas, and so that they might crucify Jesus (cf. Mark 15:11). Here we have the two goats. One is termed ἀποπομαίος meaning 'the scapegoat.' He is set free with the sin of the people and sent into the desert of hell. The other goat is slain like a lamb for the sins of those who have been set free. The Lord's portion is always slaughtered. The portion of the devil, who is their master, is cast out, without restriction, into the infernal regions" (Cahill, *First Commentary on Mark*, 116).

## Conclusion

Two salient points for this study come into view. First, besides a possible faint echo of the scapegoat tradition in Galatians 3–4, the New Testament contains no clear scapegoat Christology. Depending on the results of this investigation, the Gospel of Matthew may emerge as containing the clearest and strongest scapegoat Christology in canonical literature. Second, the fact that the New Testament otherwise contains no unambiguous scapegoat Christology is odd, given the prevalence of the scapegoat typology in early Christian materials. The question arises: whence did the scapegoat typology derive? Interestingly, nine out of the eleven elements of the proto-Yom Kippur typology may already be present in Matthew's goat typology.[191] Additionally, Maclean observes that, when early Christian writers associate Christ with the scapegoat, they only do so while simultaneously identifying Christ with the immolated goat, just as Matthew possibly does.[192] These two instances of continuity between Matthew's potential goat typology and that of the very-early church lends initial support to the thesis that the Gospel's PN contains a Yom Kippur goat typology.

---

191. The elements common to Matthew 27 and the proto-typology are (1) the similarity of the goats, (2) their beautiful appearance, (3) the mistreatment of the scapegoat, (4) the cursing of the scapegoat, (5) the scarlet garment placed upon the scapegoat, (6) the removal of the scapegoat's garment, (7) the sending out of the scapegoat, (8) the killing of the scapegoat, and (9) the offering of the sacrificial goat (Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 159–60). See Chapters Three, Four, and Five for elaboration on these points of correspondence.

192. Maclean, "Barabbas," 320–21.

CHAPTER THREE:

JESUS, BARABBAS, AND THE CROWD AS ACTORS

IN MATTHEW'S DAY OF ATONEMENT TYPOLOGY (MATT 27:15–26)

Several contemporary scholars have argued that Matthew crafts a typological correspondence between Jesus and Barabbas and the two goats of the Day of Atonement in the Barabbas scene (Matt 27:15–26).[1] As on Yom Kippur—the one day on the Jewish calendar when lots were cast over two goats, one goat "for the Lord" and one goat "for Azazel" (Lev 16:7–10, 15–22)—so it is in Matt 27:15–26: two figures identical in appearance yet starkly juxtaposed, Jesus Barabbas and Jesus the messiah, are presented to the crowd; Jesus Barabbas, the scapegoat, is released living, and Jesus the messiah, the immolated goat, is put to death. This interpretation has ancient roots,[2] possesses strong explanatory power for Matthew's agressive redaction of his Markan *Vorlage*,[3] and has found favor with an increasing number of interpreters.[4]

---

1. See Chapter One.

2. Origen, *Hom. Lev.* 10.2.2; Jerome, *Hom.* 93; pseudo-Hieronymus's commentary on Mark 15:11. See Chapter Two.

3. Matthew's Barabbas account (27:15–26) constitutes a discreet unit. These twelve verses revolve around two characters, Jesus and Barabbas. The First Evangelist reproduces the same basic structure of his Markan *Vorlage*, yet he makes some significant changes. The most striking redactions are (1) the addition of Barabbas's name, Ἰησοῦς (Matt 27:16, 17; cf. Mark 15:7); (2) referring to Pilate as ὁ ἡγεμὼν (Matt 27:15, 21; cf. Mark 15:9, 12, 14); (3) the ambiguous status of Barabbas (Matt 27:16; cf. Mark 15:7); (4) the emphasis on the crowd's choice between the two prisoners (Matt 27:17, 20, 21; cf. Mark 15:9); (5) referring to Jesus as χριστός (Matt 27:17, 22), instead of Mark's βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων (Mark 15:9, 12); (6) the addition of the story about Pilates wife (Matt 27:19); and (7) the addition of Pilate's hand-washing and proclamation of innocence (Matt 27:24), and (8) the people's pronouncement of bloodguilt (Matt 27:25).

4. E.g., Duran, *Power of Disorder*, 87; Bond, "Barabbas Remembered," 66; Beavis, *Mark*, 226; LaCocque, *Jesus the Central Jew*, 246 n. 30; Orlov, *Atoning Dyad*, 58–64; Eberhart, "To Atone or Not to Atone," 230–31; Buol, *Martyred for the Church*, 79–80; An, "Baptism and Temptation of Jesus," 22–23 n. 27. Stökl Ben Ezra correctly notes that "only few reviews of my book have expressed reservations against my understanding of this passage" ("Fasting with Jews," 179) (see further in Chapter One).

But there are three problems with this reading as it stands. First, it is unclear from the exegesis of Stökl Ben Ezra and Maclean how Matthew's goat typology relates to his larger innocent-blood discourse that runs through Matt 23:29–39; 27:3–10 and arrives at its climax in the proclamation, "His blood on us and on our children" (Matt 27:25). Scholars generally agree that the rhetorical thrust of Matt 27:15–26 is the attribution of bloodguilt to the crowd.[5] Yet Stökl Ben Ezra and Maclean do not explain how the Yom Kippur typology relates to this theme. Second, it is unclear how Barabbas functions as a scapegoat, since he is neither banished from Jerusalem, abused, nor bears Israel's iniquity. Third, Stökl Ben Ezra and Maclean offer competing interpretations of Pilate's hand-washing and the proclamation of bloodguilt (Matt 27:24–25). Maclean suggests that the blood, not of Jesus, but of Barabbas, is in view in these verses.[6] This claim is questionable, given the prediction that "all righteous blood" will come "upon this generation" (Matt 23:35–36).[7] Stökl Ben Ezra assumes the traditional view.[8] The question is whether the evangelist's Yom Kippur typology extends into Matt 27:24–25, and if so, how exactly?

Setting aside, for a moment, the regretful reception history of Matt 27:25, I propose an alternative way of conceiving the Yom Kippur typology in Matthew's Barabbas account that solves these exegetical problems and strengthens the overall case for the goat typology in Matt 27:15–26. I submit that the "crowd" (ὄχλος) adopts

---

5. E.g., John P. Meier, *Matthew*, NTM 3 (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1981), 340; Robert H. Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on His Handbook for a Mixed Church under Persecution*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 561; Luz, *Matthew*, 3:494; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:579; France, *Matthew*, 1048.

6. Maclean, "Barabbas," 321–24.

7. See further in Chapter One.

8. Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 169; idem, "Fasting with Jews," 183.

the function of "Azazel," the shadowy figure from Leviticus 16, who both receives the scapegoat (i.e., Barabbas), and, in Second Temple tradition, subsumes the scapegoat's role of bearing iniquity.[9] The evangelist has Pilate transfer the pollutant of bloodguilt off his hands and onto the crowd, who, with their children, will bear the curse of exile from Jerusalem in 70 CE.[10] Matthew thus inverts the Yom Kippur ritual for polemical effect, applying to his Jewish opponents the demonic personae of Azazel and the scapegoat. The Gentile Pilate becomes the priestly officiant of the satirical rite, and Jerusalem looms on the horizon as a new wilderness.

Following Stökl Ben Ezra's taxonomy, I present the argument according to the seven typological correspondences I deem operative in the episode: (1) the similarity of the two goats, (2) the opposing designations of the two goats, (3) the priestly lottery between the two goats, (4) the sending of the scapegoat to Azazel, (5) the transference of iniquity by ritual hand-action and confession, (6) exile and inhabitation in the wilderness, and (7) the inheritance of iniquity and curses.[11] These typological correspondences emerge nearly entirely from Matthew's editorial hand. Before proceeding, it is important to situate Matt 27:15–26 within the evangelist's larger innocent-blood discourse.

---

9. See Chapter Two and below.

10. Wratislaw had gestured toward this interpretation years ago: "The Jewish nation did not confess its sins by the mouth of the priest over the head of the scape-goat, but, at the instigation of the priests, deliberately took its greatest sin upon itself" (*Notes and Dissertations*, 19).

11. The first three items in this list derive from Stökl Ben Ezra (*Impact of Yom Kippur*, 169), who by-in-large follows Wratislaw (*Notes and Dissertations*, 18–19). I have modified the third to make it "the *priestly* lottery between the two goats." The last four items are my own.

## Matthew's Innocent-Blood Discourse and the Watchers Tradition

Uttered at the end of Jesus's diatribe against the scribes and the Pharisees (Matt 23:13–39), Matt 23:34–35 is programmatic for the gospel writer's discourse on innocent blood: "Therefore I send you prophets, sages, and scribes, some of whom you will kill and crucify, and some of whom you will flog in your synagogues and pursue from town to town, so that upon you might come all the righteous blood poured out on the earth [ἐφ᾽ ὑμᾶς πᾶν αἷμα δίκαιον ἐκχυννόμενον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς], from the blood of righteous Abel to the blood of Zechariah son of Barachias, whom you murdered between the sanctuary and the altar."[12] The language of Matt 23:35 foreshadows the people's declaration, "His blood on us and on our children" (τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἐφ᾽ ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα ἡμῶν [Matt 27:25]), and Pilate's wife's statement, "Have nothing to do with that righteous [δικαίῳ] man" (Matt 27:19). It presages Jesus's eucharistic words, "this is my blood [αἷμα] of the covenant, which is poured out [ἐκχυννόμενον] for many for the forgiveness of sins" (Matt 26:28). It looks ahead to the story of Judas and the blood-money ("I have sinned by betraying innocent blood [αἷμα ἀθῷον]" [Matt 27:4]) and Pilate's declaration, "I am innocent [ἀθῷός] of this man's blood [αἵματος]" (Matt 27:24).

In her recent monograph, Catherine Sider Hamilton contends that Matthew frames Jesus's death primarily as a matter of innocent blood.[13] She argues that, in his reference to the blood of Abel (Matt 23:35), Matthew is informed by Jewish traditions that narrate a primeval act of bloodshed resulting in divine (eschatological)

---

12. Cf. Luke 11:50, who substitutes τῶν προφητῶν for δίκαιος. The emphasis in Matthew is on righteous and innocent blood.

13. Hamilton, *Death of Jesus*, esp. 32–44.

judgment—what Hamilton calls the "Cain/blood-flood/judgment traditions."[14] She posits that, in his reference to the blood of Zechariah (Matt 23:35), Matthew also echoes Zechariah traditions that associate innocent blood with divine judgment on the Jerusalem temple.[15] These traditions, according to Hamilton, inform the complex of passages in Matthew pertaining to bloodguilt:[16] "For Matthew, the problem of sin is concrete. It is measured in the blood poured out on the land. The recalcitrance of the people, this killing of the prophets, is not only a moral problem but a physical one: sin stains the land."[17] Against this backdrop, the city marred with the blood of the prophets, and now with the blood of the messiah, augurs an eschatological purgatory event, namely, the destruction of Jerusalem.

Hamilton's illuminating study supports the standard interpretation of Matt 23:35–36. For example, Davies and Allison take Matt 23:36 as a prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem, as the following verses indicate:[18] "Jerusalem, Jerusalem, the city that kills the prophets ... Behold, your house is left to you a desert" (Matt 23:37–38). For Davies and Allison, the "chief parallel" to Matt 23:35–36 is Matt

---

14. Ibid., 47–129. On these traditions, see Chapter One.

15. Ibid., 130–48. On the identity of "Zechariah son of Barachias," see Davies and Allison (*Matthew*, 3:318–19) and Luz (*Matthew*, 3:154–55), who both identify the figure with the Zechariah of 2 Chr 24:20–22. This passage contains a brief story about King Joash's murder of Zechariah, the son of the priest Jehoiada, in the temple precincts after God had spoken through Zechariah to rebuke the king. Zechariah's dying words are: "May the Lord see and avenge!" (Chr 24:22). The story is expanded in the Lives of the Prophets 23: "And Joash the king of Judah killed him [Zechariah] near the altar, and the house of David poured out his blood in front of the Ailam" (Liv. Pro. 23.1 [Hare, *OTP* 2:398]). Because of this evil act, the temple grows silent (Pro. Liv. 23.2). The rabbinic traditions expanded upon this tradition (b. Git. 57b; b. Sanh. 96b), relating that the blood of Zechariah perpetually called out for vengeance in the temple and eventually led to Israel's exile (Catherine Sider Hamilton, "'His Blood Be upon Us': Innocent Blood and the Death of Jesus in Matthew," *CBQ* 70 [2008]: 82–100, 86–89).

16. Hamilton, *Death of Jesus*, 151–228.

17. Ibid., 160.

18. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:317–23.

27:25, where the crowd "unwittingly assents to Jesus's dire prophecy."[19] Indeed, the redactional verses of Matt 27:19 (δικαίῳ ἐκείνῳ), 27:24 (ἀθῷός ... αἵματος), and 27:25 (αἷμα ... ἐφ᾽ ἡμᾶς ... ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα ἡμῶν) recall the language of Matt 23:35 (αἷμα δίκαιον ... ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς), 23:36 (ἐπὶ τὴν γενεὰν ταύτην), and 23:37 (τὰ τέκνα σου). Matt 23:35–37 is uniquely linked to Matt 27:24–25.[20]

Hamilton also argues that the Book of Watchers has influenced the evangelist's conception of bloodguilt. 1 Enoch 9 describes the plight of the blood-stained cosmos of the antediluvian era, which raises its cry to heaven like the blood of righteous Abel (Gen 4:10; cf. Heb 11:4):[21]

> Then Michael and Sariel and Raphael and Gabriel looked down from the sanctuary of heaven upon the earth and saw much blood poured out on the earth [αἷμα πολὺ ἐκχυννόμενον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς]. All the earth was filled with the godlessness and violence that had befallen it. And entering in, they said to one another, "The earth, devoid (of inhabitants), raises the voice of their cries to the gates of heaven."[22]

Hamilton identifies a verbal echo of 1 En. 9.1 in Matt 23:35, where Jesus references the bloodshed of the antediluvian era, namely, that of Abel: "...so that upon you might come all the *righteous blood poured out on the earth [πᾶν αἷμα δίκαιον ἐκχυννόμενον*

---

19. Ibid., 3:317.

20. David Moffitt also argues for the verbal and thematic affinity between Matt 23:35–24:2 and chapter 27 ("Righteous Bloodshed, Matthew's Passion Narrative, and the Temple's Destruction: Lamentations as a Matthean Intertext," *JBL* 125 [2006]: 299–320, at 308–9). If Lamentations is indeed an intertext in Matthew 27, as Moffitt argues, then this strengthens the conclusion that the destruction of Jerusalem is in view in Matt 27:25.

21. Hamilton, *Death of Jesus*, 174–75.

22. 1 En. 9.1–2 (emphasis added). I have modified the translation of Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch*, 26. Black and Denis, *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece*, 23.

*ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς],* from the blood of righteous Abel to the blood of Zechariah...."[23] Noting

several Matthean allusions to Enochic material in Matt 22–25, Hamilton remarks, "It

seems likely, then, that Matthew knows 1 Enoch in its Greek version... Whether

Matthew uses 1 Enoch itself, Enochich influence in Matthew 22–25 is clear. In this 1

Enoch-saturated context, Matthew presents his tale of innocent blood."[24]

Significantly, just a chapter later in BW, the expulsion of the fallen Watcher

Asael (=Azazel) into the cosmic wilderness evokes the scapegoat ritual (cf. Lev 16:8,

10, 26), whereby the earth is cleansed and restored (1 En. 10.4–8, 20–22).[25] Hamilton

mentions neither this cultic element of the Asael tradition nor the Yom Kippur

typology in the Barabbas account. But Asael's banishment and bearing of sins is a

crucial component of the eschatological atonement envisioned in the Enochic

---

23. As Hamilton notes, the wording in Matt 23:35 is closer to 1 En. 9.1 than Luke 11:50, which reads ἵνα ἐκζητηθῇ τὸ αἷμα πάντων τῶν προφητῶν τὸ ἐκκεχυμένον ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου (*Death of Jesus*, 174). Unlike Luke, Matt 23:35 includes ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς and possess the exact form of 1 En. 9.1, ἐκχυννόμενον, whereas Luke 11:50 has ἐκκεχυμένον. Codex Panopolitanus, which is closer to the Greek Enoch with which Matthew was familiar (David C. Sim, "Matthew 22.13a and 1 Enoch 10.4a: A Case of Literary Dependence?" *JSNT* 47 [1992]: 3–19, at 9–10), reads ἐκχυννόμενον, whereas Syncellus reads ἐκκεχυμένον (Black and Denis, *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece*, 23). In terms of volume, a search for ἐκχύννω + ἐπί + γῆ in the LXX, the Greek Pseudepigrapha, Philo, Josephus, the New Testament, and the Apostolic Fathers yields only two results: 1 En. 9.1 and Matt 23:35. Five out of the seven words in Matt 23:35 exactly match 1 En. 9.1 in Codex Panopolitanus (πᾶν αἷμα δίκαιον ἐκχυννόμενον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς). Thematically, both passages refer to acts of bloodshed in the antediluvian period. In terms of availability and reoccurrence, Matthew alludes to Enochic material in a number of other places (see note below).

24. Hamilton, *Death of Jesus*, 175. Matthew 22:13 verbally alludes to 1 En. 10.4 (Rubinkiewicz, *Die Eschatologie von Hen 9–10*, 97–113; Sim, "Matthew 22.13a," 3–19, at 6–13; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:206; G. W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108*, Hermeneia [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001], 84; Hamilton, *Death of Jesus*, 171–72). Matthew 24:37–39 likely alludes to the Watchers myth (Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:380; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 83–84; Peter S. Perry, "Disputing Enoch: Reading Matt 24:36–44 with Enochic Judaism," *Currents in Theology and Mission* 37 [2010]: 451–59; Hamilton, *Death of Jesus*, 167–70). The Parables of Enoch have probably influenced Matt 25:31–45 and Matthew's portrayal of the Son of Man (David R. Catchpole, "The Poor on Earth and the Son of Man in Heaven: A Re-appraisal of Matthew 25:31–46," *BJRL* 61 [1979]: 378–83; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 84; idem, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction*, 2nd ed. [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005], 255; Leslie W. Walck, *The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and in Matthew* [London: T&T Clark, 2011], 194–220; Hamilton, *Death of Jesus*, 172–74).

25. For the influence of Leviticus 16 on 1 Enoch 10, see Chapter Two.

tradition:

> Go, Raphael, and bind Asael hand and foot, and cast him into the darkness; And make an opening in the wilderness that is in Doudael. [5]Throw him there, and lay beneath him sharp and jagged stones. And cover him with darkness, and let him dwell there for an exceedingly long time. Cover up his face, and let him not see the light. [6]And on the day of the great judgment, he will be led away to the burning conflagration. [7]And heal the earth, which the Watchers have desolated; and announce the healing of the earth, that the plague may be healed, and all the sons of men may not perish because of the mystery that the Watchers told and taught their sons. [8]And all the earth was made desolate by the deeds of the teaching of Asael, and over him write all the sins.[26]

Matthew is aware of this text, since he alludes to it in his redactional conclusion to the Parable of the Wedding Feast (Matt 22:1–14).[27] Here, a man at the feast must recapitulate the fate of the celestial scapegoat, since he is (presumably) clothed in garments of unrighteousness:[28] "Then the king said to his servants, '*Bind him hand and foot and cast him into the* outer *darkness....*'" (Matt 22:13).[29] According to Rubinkiewicz, Matthew draws upon the same current of the scapegoat tradition as

---

26. 1 En. 10.4–8 (Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch*, 28, 30).

27. Those who support a verbal allusion to 1 En. 10.4 in Matt 22:13 include Rubinkiewicz, *Die Eschatologie von Hen 9–10*, 98–100; Sim, "Matthew 22.13a and 1 Enoch 10.4a," 6–13; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:206; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 84; Hamilton, *Death of Jesus*, 171–72.

28. Meier, *Matthew*, 248; Rubinkiewicz, *Die Eschatologie von Hen 9–10*, 109.

29. Matt 22:13: δήσαντες αὐτοῦ πόδας καὶ χεῖρας ἐκβάλετε αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον. 1 En. 10.4 (Codex Panopolitanus): Δῆσον τὸν Ἀζαὴλ ποσὶν καὶ χερσίν, καὶ βάλε αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ σκότος (Syncellus reads slightly differently [Black and Denis, *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece*, 24–25]).

attested in the Apocalypse of Abraham.[30] In other words, Matthew seems to read 1 En. 10.4 against the cultic background of Leviticus 16 as other Second Temple Jews had done.[31]

If we take Enochic influence on the First Evangelist seriously, not least on his conception of bloodguilt as Hamilton argues (Matt 23:35; 1 En. 9.1), then an allusion to the sin-bearing scapegoat at the apex of his innocent-blood discourse is quite possible. This possibility becomes stronger in light of the fact that the Book of Jubilees also situates both of its Yom Kippur etiologies within the framework of atonement for innocent bloodshed.[32]

## 1. The Similarity of the Two Goats

In the opinion of Davies and Allison, "the most striking change" in Matt 27:15–26 is the evangelist's turning the name "Barabbas" into a double name "Jesus Barabbas" (27:16, 17).[33] Of all the Gospels, Matthew is the only one to include Barabbas's name Ἰησοῦς: "So Pilate said to them: 'Whom do you want me to release to you, *Jesus* Barabbas or *Jesus* who is called messiah?'" (27:17).[34] The vast majority of scholars

---

30. Rubinkiewicz, *Die Eschatologie von Hen 9–10*, 97–113.

31. See Chapter Two and below.

32. See Chapter Two and below.

33. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:584.

34. The principal witnesses that have preserved Ἰησοῦν (with reference to Βαραββᾶς in Matt 27:16, 17) are Θ, *f* [1], 700*, syr[s, pal(mss)], arm, geo[2], and (latin) Origen, who writes, "In multis exemplaribus non continetur quod Barabbas etiam Iesus dicebatur, et forsitan recte" (*Comm. Matt.* 121; Erich Klostermann, *Origenes Werke: Elfter Band: Origenes Matthäuserklärung*, GCS 38 [Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich'sche Buchhandlung, 1933], 255.24–26). As the UBS editorial committee suggests, the reading of B (τὸν Βαραββῶν) in Matt 27:17 "appears to presuppose in an ancestor the presence of Ἰησοῦν" (Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament* [Fourth Revised Edition], 2nd ed. [Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994], 56). The UBS committee notes that a scholium in a

have accepted this reading.[35] Any interpretation of Matt 27:15–26 must explain this

oddity. Robert Gundry offers a typical explanation: Matthew thereby dramatizes the

choice between the two Jesuses and thus "heightens the guilt of the Jewish leaders in

persuading the crowds to ask for Barabbas."[36] Yet this interpretation fails to account

for the fact that Matthew actually *omits* negative information about Barabbas from

---

tenth-century uncial manuscript (S) and twenty minuscule manuscripts, which is assigned to Origen in one manuscripts and to Chrysostom and Anastasuis of Antioch (ca. sixth century) in others, records: "In many ancient copies which I have met with I found Barabbas himself likewise called 'Jesus'" (ibid.). The UBS committee posits Origen as the source of this scholium (ibid.). Among the dissenting witnesses are ℵ, A, B, D, L, W, Δ, *f*[13], and 33.

35. Horace Abram Rigg, "Barabbas," *JBL* 64 (1945): 417–56, at 428–32; Richard C. Nevius, "Reply to Dr. Dunkerley," *ExpTim* 74 (1962–1963): 255; Hyam Z. Maccoby, "Jesus and Barabbas," *NTS* 16 (1969–1970): 55–60; W. F. Albright and C. S. Mann, *Matthew: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, AB 26 (Doubleday & Company, 1971), 344; David Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew* (London: Oliphants, 1972), 350; Paul Winter, *Trial of Jesus*, SJ 1 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1974), 138; H. Benedict Green, *The Gospel According to Matthew: Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975), 220; Francis Wright Beare, *The Gospel According to Matthew: Translation, Introduction, and Commentary* (Cambridge: Harper & Row, 1981), 528–29; Robert H. Mounce, *Matthew*, GNC (Cambridge: Harper & Row, 1985), 264; Douglas R. A. Hare, *Matthew*, IBC (Louisville: John Knox, 1993), 316; Gundry, *Matthew*, 561; Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 1:798; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:584 n. 20; Senior, *Matthew*, 321; Robert E. Moses, "Jesus Barabbas, a Nominal Messiah? Text and History in Matthew 27:16–17," *NTS* 58 (2011): 43–56, at 44–48. For a list of further scholars, see Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 1:799 n. 22. The editorial committee of the UBS remarks: "A majority of the Committee was of the opinion that the original text of Matthew had the double name in both verses and that Ἰησοῦν was deliberately suppressed in most witnesses for reverential considerations. In view of the relatively slender external support for Ἰησοῦν, however, it was deemed fitting to enclose the word within square brackets" (Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 56). Those ambivalent about the variant Ἰησοῦν include Hagner, *Matthew*, 2:820–21; Craig S. Keener, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 669 n. 182. Those who find the variant dubious include Roderic Dunkerley, "Was Barabbas also Called Jesus?" *ExpTim* 74 (1962–1963): 126–27; Meier, *Matthew*, 341. Probably the best explanation for the scribal omission of Ἰησοῦν is the rational behind Origen's (*Comm. Matt.* 121) rejection of the reading: the name "Jesus" too closely associates the "murderer" Barabbas with Jesus of Nazareth. Brown rightly suggests that "Origen's authority and attitude make it unlikely that Christian scribes of later centuries would have added 'Jesus' to Barabbas's name in Matthean mss. that lacked it. Indeed they would have been encouraged to delete it as an impiety where it already appeared" (*Death of the Messiah*, 1:798). Based on Origen's comments on Matt 24:5, W. Hersey Davis remarks that Origen "did not absolutely reject the reading Jesus Barabbas," but only rejected it for this theological reason ("Origen's Comment on Matthew 27:17," *RevExp* 39 [1942]: 65–67, at 65). Both Nevius ("Reply to Dr. Dunkerley," 255) and Brown (*Death of the Messiah*, 1:798 n. 21) note the general scribal tendency to suppress the name Ἰησοῦς when referring to figures besides Jesus Christ. Another explanation for the omission of Ἰησοῦν in Matt 27:17 is the presence of ὑμῖν just before it, which could cause a haplographic error, since ῑν was a common abbreviation for Ἰησοῦν. Davies and Allison add that assimilation to the other Gospels may have motivated its removal (*Matthew*, 3:584 n. 20). They claim that Origen's statement suggests most manuscripts did contain Barabbas's personal name. Matthew elsewhere has a tendency to add names lacking in his Markan *Vorlage* (Matt 9:9; 26:3, 57).

36. Gundry, *Matthew*, 561; so also ibid., 561–63; Hill, *Matthew*, 350; Green, *Matthew*, 220–21; Senior, *Matthew*, 321.

Mark's account. Whereas Mark states that "the one called Barabbas was bound with the rebels who had committed murder in the revolt" (Mark 15:7), Matthew merely reports, "they then had a famous prisoner called Jesus Barabbas" (Matt 27:16). If Matthew's rhetorical aim is *only* to magnify the bloodguilt of the Jewish populace, it would be to the evangelist's advantage to portray Barabbas in a poor light. Yet Matthew mitigates the criminal image of Barabbas and adds only ambiguous information about him: Barabbas is now called a δέσμιος ἐπίσημος (Matt 27:16). Translations that render this phrase, "notorious prisoner," are misleading.[37] A more objective translation is "notable," "marked," or "famous prisoner," since nothing in Matthew's context clearly suggests Barabbas's guilt.[38] Maclean rightly observes that "Matthew seems to have increased the ambiguity of Barabbas's guilt (perhaps inherent in Mark 15:7), in effect making him more like Jesus, who could also be

---

37. ESV, NABRE, NASB, NJB, NLT, NRSV. BDAG (s.v. "ἐπίσημος") provides two meanings for ἐπίσημος: "splendid, prominent, outstanding," and "notorious." LSJ (s.v. "ἐπίσημος") notes that ἐπίσημος often refers to stamped coinage (e.g., Philo, *Migr.* 79), hence the meaning, "marked." In Jewish literature the word ἐπίσημος usually carries a positive or neutral connotation and is usually not employed in reference to a bad person or circumstance. The term carries a positive connotation in Esth 5:4, 16:22 LXX; 2 Macc 15.36; 3 Macc 6.1; Let. Aris. 180; Jos. Asen. 2.7, 14:15, 17; Sib. Or. 3.336; Philo, *Her.* 180; *Fug.* 10, 11; *Somn.* 1.201 Josephus, *Ant.* 3.57, 3.128, 3.266, 9.223, 10.158, 10.240, 10.264, 12.92, 15.296, 15.364, 16.97, 16.140; *J.W.* 5.41, 5.314; *Ag. Ap.* 1.163; Rom 16:7. The term carries a neutral connotation in Gen 30:42 LXX; Artap. 3.20; 1 Macc 11:37; Pss. Sol. 17.30; Sib. Or. 8.244, 14.335; Philo, *Migr.* 79; *Prov.* 2.17; Josephus, *Ant.* 4.174, 7.58, 12.155, 13.128, 14.121, 15.22, 15.270, 16.16, 16.165, 17.189, 17.190, 17.321, 17.322, 20.148; *J.W.* 1.113, 1.181, 1.659, 2.418, 2.448; 3.65, 3.144, 3.342, 4.81, 4.139, 4.141, 4.280, 4.646, 5.532, 5.569, 6.201, 6.280, 6.302, 6.356, 6.380; *Life* 7. The term carries a negative connotation in Pss. Sol. 2.6; Philo, *Legat.* 325; Josephus, *Ant.* 5.233; *J.W.* 2.585. LSJ (s.v. " ἐπίσημος") provides three instances in Hellenistic literature where ἐπίσημος means "notorious," but, unlike in Matt 27:16, the context of these instances clearly necessitates a negative connotation: "Notorious for blame" (ἐπίσημον … εἰς τὸν ψόγον [Euripides, *Orest.* 249]), "conspicuous for courting the mob and for rashness" (διὰ δημοκοπίαν καὶ προπέτειαν ἐπισήμου [Plutarch, *Fab.* 14]), and "notable for the depravity of lifestyle" (ἐπίσημον … ἐπὶ τῇ μοχθηρίᾳ τοῦ τρόπου [Lucian, *Rhet. praec.* 25]). Maclean makes the same observation ("Barabbas," 325). In the estimation of LSJ, ἐπίσημος means "notorious" in Matt 27:16. But LSJ fail to recognize that Jesus is also conceived as a δέσμιος (Matt 27:2, 15). Thus, Barabbas being a δέσμιος is not adequate grounds for taking ἐπίσημος as "notorious." Cf. Moses, "Jesus Barabbas," 55.

38. Green, *Matthew*, 220; Luz, *Matthew*, 3:491; Maclean, "Barabbas," 325.

described fairly as δέσμιος ἐπίσημος."[39]

Horace Rigg and Hyam Maccoby propose an alternative explanation: Jesus and Barabbas were actually both the same historical figure—namely, Jesus of Nazareth—who later became mistakenly hypostatized as two separate individuals.[40] Although this interesting thesis is ultimately unsuccessful on the grounds of its speculative nature, it demonstrates how scholars have struggled to make sense of the unique likeness of the two Jesuses in Matthew's gospel account.[41] One might argue that, by adding Barabbas's first name, Matthew simply adds an historic detail lacking

39. Maclean, "Barabbas," 325.

40. Rigg argues the hypothesis most forcefully ("Barabbas," 417–56). Accordingly, Jesus of Nazareth was known as "Jesus Barabbas" during his ministry—although he tried to suppress this title in messianic secrecy—and was brought to Pilate by the Jewish authorities as "Barabbas," a notable (ἐπίσημος; Matt 27:16) rebel (στασιατής; Mark 15:7) and criminal (λῃστής; John 18:40) in their view, who had garnered a sizable following and disturbed the Jewish temple (Mark 11:15–19). Pilate released this "Barabbas," since the charges brought against him (i.e., religious blasphemy) lay outside his jurisdictional competence. The Jewish authorities, however, forced Pilate to reopen the trial and thereby condemn Jesus by bringing new charges against him, namely, treason for claiming to be "King of the Jews." These two trials of Jesus were eventually confused in Christian memory to the point that "Jesus Barabbas" became an entirely separate person. Maccoby arrives at a very similar conclusion ("Jesus and Barabbas," 55–60). He argues that Jesus was known for calling God his "Abba" (Mark 14:35; Gal 4:6; Rom 8:15) and thought of himself as a teacher (e.g., Luke 22:11). Thus, Jesus was known as "Jesus Barabbas." In the pre-Markan tradition, when relations between Christians and Jews were relatively peaceful, the Jewish crowds were thought to be in favor of Jesus and therefore to have shouted for his release during his trial, while only the religious authorities shouted for Jesus's crucifixion. Yet as tensions between Christians and Jews increased, the evangelists placed the blame for Jesus's death on the entire Jewish nation, and so invented the privilegium paschale and created two Jesuses out of the one historical figure. Steven L. Davies, agreeing with Rigg and Maccoby, claims that Jesus was known as "bar Abba," that is, Son of the Father or Son of the Teacher ("Who is Called Bar Abbas?" NTS 27 [1980–1981]: 260–62). He argues that the Aramaic word "abba" likely stood behind the terms ῥαββί and καθηγητής in Matt 23:8–10, indicating that Jesus regularly referred to God as "Abba," and that the charge against Jesus for calling God his own father (John 15:18) confirms that he was known as "Jesus bar Abba." But Davies contradicts himself, since he claims that Jesus reserved the term "Abba" for God, and yet in Matt 23:10 Jesus states that there is only one καθηγητής (or "abba," according to Davies), that is, ὁ Χριστός (ibid., 262).

41. Brown doubts that such an historical confusion would have occurred so early in the Gospel tradition, that is, in the pre-Marcan era (Death of the Messiah, 1:812). He points out that Jesus very infrequently speaks of God as his Father in the earliest known Gospel tradition, only calls God "Abba" once in all four Gospels (Mark 14:36), and never refers to himself as "Son of God," let alone "Son of the Father." What is more, "if [Barabbas] were a title of Jesus, then it should have been under the aspect of Barabbas that his enemies within Judaism wanted to kill him, e.g., John 5:18: 'For this reason the Jews sought all the more to kill him … he was speaking of God as his own father'" (Brown, Death of the Messiah, 1:812).

in Mark, or that Matthew's tendency to add secondary names explains the addition (Matt 9:9; 26:3, 57). But these suggestions fail to account for the broader similarity between Jesus and Barabbas crafted in Matthew's episode.

There are six categorical redactions that make Barabbas appear similar to Jesus: (1) the two-fold addition of Barabbas's name Ἰησοῦς (Matt 27:16, 17), (2) the inclusion of Jesus the messiah's name, Ἰησοῦς, three more times than in Mark 15:6–15 (Matt 27:17, 20, 22, 26), (3) the omission of the negative information about Barabbas in Mark 15:7,[42] (4) the application of the adjective ἐπίσημος to Jesus Barabbas (Matt 27:16), a term that could aptly describe Jesus of Nazareth,[43] (5) the verbal parallel between Ἰησοῦν τὸν λεγόμενον χριστόν (Matt 27:17, 22) and λεγόμενον Ἰησοῦν Βαραββᾶν (27:16),[44] and (6) the name Βαραββᾶς, which could easily be interpreted in a Jewish context as "son of the father,"[45] and which draws the figure into greater similarity with Jesus the messiah, whom Matthew, far more than Mark or Luke, portrays as referring to God as πατήρ.[46] The second categorical redaction often goes without mention, but without the repetition of Jesus the messiah's first name, Matthew's inclusion of Barabbas's first name would not have the same striking

---

42. Maclean, "Barabbas," 325; Stökl Ben Ezra, "Fasting with Jews," 181.

43. Rigg, "Barabbas," 444; Maclean, "Barabbas," 325.

44. Matthew might have simply referred to Jesus as Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, as in Matt 1:1 and 18. Cf. Matt 1:16.

45. So Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:585; Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 1:811. The name Βαραββᾶς can also be taken as an Aramaic patronymic derived from Bar Abba, "son of Abba," although some understand the name as deriving from Bar Rabban, "son of the teacher" (Michael J. Wilkins, "Barabbas," *ABD* 1:607), though there is only one ρ in the name in the Gospel tradition. Even if the name "Barabbas" derives from Bar Rabban, this meaning would parallel Matthew's unique emphasis on Jesus as authoritative teacher of Torah, again drawing both figures into similarity.

46. Matt 10:32–33; 11:25–27, 12:50; 15:13; 16:17, 27; 18:10, 19, 35; 20:23; 26:29, 39, 42, 53; cf. Mark 8:38; 13:32; 14:36; Luke 2:49; 9:26; 10:21–22; 22:29, 42; 23:46; 24:49.

effect.[47] The overall result of these changes, as Maclean suggests, is that the two prisoners become "nearly indistinguishable in the narrative."[48]

Wratislaw proposes that the similarity between Jesus and Barabbas evokes the image of the two goats of Yom Kippur.[49] According to Bernd Janowski and Gernot Wilhelm, "the symmetry of the two goats is characteristic of the address: for Yahweh and for Azazel,"[50] as observed in the broader parallelism of Lev 16:8b: גורל אחד ליהוה וגורל אחד לעזאזל.[51] As Stökl Ben Ezra and Maclean argue, Wratislaw's proposal is particularly compelling in light of the extra-biblical halakhic tradition that requires the two goats of Yom Kippur to be similar in appearance.[52] Although this tradition is not present in Leviticus 16, it most likely derives from the Second Temple period, since it is attested independently in the Mishnah, in a halakhic source used by the Epistle of Barnabas, and in Justin Martyr.[53] Mishna Yoma 6.1 reports that "the two he-goats of the Day of Atonement should be alike in appearance, in size, and in value, and have

---

47. In Matt 27:17, 20, and 22, the evangelist could have referred to Jesus of Nazareth simply as ὁ χριστός without reporting his personal name Ἰησοῦς, as he does in Matt 1:17; 2:4; 11:2; 16:16, 20; 22:42; 23:10; 26:63, 68.

48. Maclean, "Barabbas," 326. Green similarly remarks that "the only thing that is allowed to distinguish them is that one of them is 'called Christ'" (*Matthew*, 220–21).

49. Wratislaw, *Notes and Dissertation*, 18.

50. "[D]ie Symmetrie der beiden Böcke hinsichtlich der Adressierungen—'für JHWH' und 'für Azazel'—charakteristisch ist." Janowski and Wilhelm, "Der Bock," 162.

51. When compared to other rituals in the Hebrew Bible that require the participation of two animals of the same species, the duality of the goats of Yom Kippur stands out: "And from the Israelite community he shall take two he-goats for a purification offering … And he shall take the two he-goats and set them before the Lord at the entrance of the Tent of Meeting. And Aaron shall places lots upon the two goats...." (Lev 16:5, 7–8). Cf. the two rams for priestly ordination in Exod 29:1–3, 15–34 (cf. Lev 8:2, 18–29); the two lambs of the daily offering in Exod 29:38–42; the two turtledoves and two pigeons for the sin and burnt offerings of Lev 5:7–10; the two clean bird for the purification of lepers in Lev 14:4–7; and the many dual pairs of lambs, bulls, and rams in the various offerings described in Num 28–29.

52. Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 165–74; idem, "Fasting with Jews," 179–84; Maclean, "Barabbas," 324–30.

53. On the independence of Barnabas's Yom Kippur typology from that of Justin Martyr, see Chapter Two.

been bought at the same time."[54] Barnabas's source material reports, "Take two fine and similar [ὁμοίους] goats and offer them."[55] Not only should the goats be similar, they are to be equal: "For this reason the goats are similar [ὁμοίους], fine, and equal [ἴσους]...." (Barn 7.10). Justin Martyr similarly relates that the two goats "were commanded to be similar [ὅμοιοι], one of which was to be the scapegoat and the other the sacrificial goat...." (*Dial.* 40.4–5).[56]

The peculiar similarity between Jesus Barabbas and Jesus the messiah in Matthew's account is satisfactorily explained with reference to this Day of Atonement tradition, perhaps already reflected in the symmetry of the goats in Lev 16:8b: "Now, the people have to choose between two almost identical figures: Jesus Barabbas, i.e., Jesus the son of the father (Bar-Abba) on the one hand and Jesus the Messiah on the other hand."[57]

## 2. The Opposing Designations of the Two Goats

In the words of Couchoud and Stahl, "One does not see why the affair of Barabbas is mingled with that of Jesus ... The bizzarre connection that links Barabbas to Jesus and

---

54. Danby, *Mishnah*, 169.

55. Barn 7.6 (Ehrman). Scholars agree that Barnabas utilizes extra-biblical halakhic material (see Chapter Two).

56. I have modified the translation of Falls, *Dialogue with Trypho*, 62. The Greek reads, Καὶ οἱ ἐν τῇ νηστείᾳ δὲ τράγοι δύο ὅμοιοι κελευσθέντες γίνεσθαι, ὧν ὁ εἷς ἀποπομπαῖος ἐγίνετο, ὁ δὲ ἕτερος εἰς προσφοράν, τῶν δύο παρουσιῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ καταγγελία ἦσαν (Miroslav Marcovich, ed., *Iustini Martyris: Dialogus cum Tryphone*, PTS 47 [Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997], 147). Note that my modified translation differs significantly from that of *ANF* 1:215. Tertullian repots this tradition as well (*Marc*. 3.7.7; *Adv. Jud*. 14.9–10), but his knowledge of it may derive from Justin (see Chapter Two).

57. Stökl Ben Ezra, "Fasting with Jews," 181.

that means that if one is released, the other must be tortured, is an unexplained postulate."[58] Scholars often note that it would have been well within the jurisdiction of the Roman procurator to release Jesus, whom he knew to be innocent, by means of some pardoning custom, even after Barabbas's release.[59] Thus Pilate remarks in John, "Do you not know that I have the authority to release you and I have the authority to crucify you?" (John 19:10). Although amnesty customs existed in other ancient cultures, none are structured like the *privilegium pascale*, where the release of one prisoner and the death of the other are as intricately intertwined as they are in the gospel episode.[60] Why in Matthew is the trial structured so that Pilate seemingly *must* put to death the prisoner not chosen for release?

Matthew reproduces this arbitrary amnesty logic of his Markan *Vorlage*:

---

58. "On ne voit pas pourquoi l'affaire de Barabbas se mêle à celle de Jésus ... La connexité bizarre qui lie Barabbas à Jésus et qui fait que si l'un est relâché, l'autre doit être supplicié est un postulat inexpliqué." P. L. Couchoud and R. Stahl, "Jesus Barabbas," *HibJ* 25 (1926–1927): 26–42, at 28–29. Alois Bajsić similarly states that "die Synoptiker stellen die Entlassung Barabbas' und die Verurteilung Jesu eher als miteinander eng verbundene Handlungen dar" ("Pilatus, Jesus und Barabbas," *Bib* 48 [1967]: 7–28, at 10).

59. Couchoud and Stahl, "Jesus Barabbas," 28; Frankemölle, *Matthäus*, 2:484; Luz, *Matthew*, 3:499; Maclean, "Barabbas," 323. Although Keener posits *abolitio* (pardon before trial) or *indulgentia* (pardon after conviction) as parallels to the paschal amnesty (*Matthew*, 669), Wolfgang Waldstein argues that the closest Greco-Roman parallel is *venia*, which could be granted to individuals (not merely masses of people, as was usually the case with *abolitio* and *indulgentia*), even those who were guilty (*Untersuchungen zum römischen Begnadigungsrecht: Abolitio–Indulgentia–Venia*, CA 18 [Innsbruck: Wagner, 1964], 41–44). Following Johannes Merkel ("Die Begnadigung am Passahfeste," *ZNW* 6 [1905]: 293–316, at 308–9), Waldstein suggests that the paschal amnesty of the Gospels was influenced by the widespread practice of individual pardons at the time, and that a regular practice of *venia* in Jerusalem is within the realm of historical plausibility (*Begnadigungsrecht*, 42, 44). But what could have stopped the procurator from exercising this privilege for more than one prisoner? Josephus (*J.W.* 2.28) mentions Archelaus's release of multiple prisoners and Albinus's simultaneous release of many criminals who had committed minor offenses (*Ant.* 20.215).

60. See the many examples in Robert L. Merritt, "Jesus Barabbas and the Paschal Pardon," *JBL* 104 (1985): 57–68, at 59–66; Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 1:814–20. Regarding the historicity of the *privilegium pascale*, Brown concludes, "there is no good analogy supporting the historical likelihood of the custom in Judea of regularly releasing a prisoner at a/the feast (of Passover) as described in the three Gospels. Already in the early 3d cent. Origen... betrayed surprise at such a custom. Luke's omission of the custom, even though he knew Mark, has been thought to represent an earlier skepticism" (*Death of the Messiah*, 1:818–19). Granted John's independence of Mark, Brown is correct about the probable existence of a pre-Markan tradition regarding Barabbas and a paschal custom (1:809–11).

"Then he released to them Barabbas and delivered over Jesus" (Matt 27:26; cf. Mark 15:15). In contrast to the Lukan and Johannine accounts (Luke 23:18–25; John 18:39–40), Matthew reinforces this logic in the redactional statement, "But the chief priests and the elders persuaded the crowds *so that they might ask for Barabbas but destroy Jesus*" (Matt 27:20). In contradistinction, John does not even narrate the release of Barabbas (cf. Luke 23:25), and the criminal's pardon has no apparent connection to the condemnation of Jesus whatsoever (see John 18:28–19:16). Paul Winter comments that "it is surprising to find that Pilate should have limited the people's choice to two possibilities."[61]

Wratislaw observes a structural correspondance between the death and release of the goats of Leviticus 16, and the respective death and release of Barabbas and Jesus.[62] Although the goats were to be similar in appearance, once lots were cast, they acquired sacerdotally distinct functions and were designated to opposing divine powers: one goat "for the Lord," and one goat "for Azazel" (Lev 16:7–10).[63] The way Leviticus (16:10, 20–21) refers to the scapegoat as "living" serves to highlight the distinction between the two goats.[64] That Jesus is put to death and Barabbas released living "agrees with the halakhic ruling regarding the two goats on Yom Kippur. On the one hand the Mishnah demands similarity in look and value, on the other hand the ritual destinations of the two goats are totally different."[65]

---

61. Winter, *Trial of Jesus*, 134; so also Maccoby, "Jesus and Barabbas," 60.

62. Wratislaw, *Notes and Dissertations*, 18.

63. On "Azazel," see Chapter Two.

64. Levine, *Leviticus*, 106.

65. Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 169. Wratislaw suggests another possible juxtaposition between Jesus and Barabas: "As the two goats, so also were the two prisoners exact counterparts of each other. Jesus was the Messiah, Barabbas was the representative of the *kind* of Messiah, which the Jews expected and desired" (*Notes and Dissertations*, 18).

### 3. The Priestly Lottery between the Two Goats

Among the four Gospels, only Matthew places Barabbas and Jesus side-by-side throughout the account. Alois Bajsić therefore refers to Jesus and Barabbas as "disjunctively coupled" ("disjunktiv gekoppelt") in the Matthean narrative.[66] Four redactions reflect this pattern:

(1) Matt 27:17: Whom do you want me to release to you, *Jesus Barabbas or Jesus who is called messiah?*[67]

(2) Matt 27:20: …so that they might *request Barabbas but destroy Jesus.*[68]

(3) Matt 27:21: Which *from the two* do you want me to release to you?[69]

(4) Matt 27:26: Then he released to them *Barabbas, but Jesus*, after flogging him, he delivered, so that he might be crucified.[70]

Stökl Ben Ezra summarizes Matthew's tendency: "While Mark usually writes 'Do you want A?' Matthew changes this into 'Do you want A *or B*?'"[71]

---

66. Bajsić, "Pilatus, Jesus und Barabbas," 10. Similarly, see Green, *Matthew*, 220; Hagner, *Matthew*, 2:821–22; Gundry, *Matthew*, 563.

67. Mark 15:9: θέλετε ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων.

Matt 27:17: τίνα θέλετε ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν, *Ἰησοῦν τὸν Βαραββᾶν ἢ Ἰησοῦν τὸν λεγόμενον χριστόν;*

68. Mark 15:11: ἵνα μᾶλλον τὸν Βαραββᾶν ἀπολύσῃ αὐτοῖς

Matt 27:20: ἵνα αἰτήσωνται *τὸν Βαραββᾶν, τὸν δὲ Ἰησοῦν ἀπολέσωσιν*

69. [Mark contains no equivalent verse]

Matt 27:21: τίνα θέλετε *ἀπὸ τῶν δύο* ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν;

70. Mark 15:15: ἀπέλυσεν αὐτοῖς τὸν Βαραββᾶν, καὶ παρέδωκεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν φραγελλώσας ἵνα σταυρωθῇ

Matt 27:26: τότε ἀπέλυσεν αὐτοῖς *τὸν Βαραββᾶν, τὸν δὲ Ἰησοῦν* φραγελλώσας παρέδωκεν ἵνα σταυρωθῇ

71. Stökl Ben Ezra, "Fasting with Jews," 182. Stökl Ben Ezra fails to note, however, that Matthew intensifies the parallelism in Mark 15:15 by pushing παρέδωκεν back in word order, resulting in a more noticeable side-by-side placement of Barabbas and Jesus: τὸν Βαραββᾶν, τὸν δὲ Ἰησοῦν

Gundry is typical in suggesting that Matthew "never seems to tire of reiterating the choice between Barabbas and Jesus in order to stress Jewish guilt in the choice of Barabbas."[72] While this is possible, it is doubtful, since the crowd is presented with two *similarly-looking* figures in Matthew's episode, which strongly mitigates Barabbas's criminal status. Raymond Brown remarks, "One could form the mental image of a confused Pilate faced with two prisoners named Jesus."[73] Stökl Ben Ezra therefore suggests that the coupling of Jesus and Barabbas effectively generates a lottery between the two indistinguishable Jesuses: "In the Matthean version, not in the Markan and the other versions, the people have to decide between two monozygotic twins."[74] Maclean observes that Pilate's simultaneous presentation of Jesus and Barabbas to the crowd (Matt 27:17, 21) parallels Aaron's simultaneous presentation of the two goats in Lev 16:7–8:[75] "He shall take the two goats and set them before the Lord at the entrance of the tent of meeting, and Aaron shall cast lots on the two goats, one lot for the Lord and one lot for Azazel." Only in Matthew does Pilate actually present the two prisoners to the crowd at the same time (Matt 27:17, 21; cf. Mark 15:9, 12; Luke 23:18; John 18:39).[76] This suggests a correspondence between Pilate and the high priest of Leviticus 16, a correspondence strengthened by the positive portrayal of Pilate's wife in Matt 27:19 and the fact that the sins of the

---

(Matt 27:26).

72. Gundry, *Matthew*, 563; so also Senior, *Matthew*, 321.

73. Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 1:811.

74. Stökl Ben Ezra, "Fasting with Jews," 181.

75. Maclean, "Barabbas," 326.

76. Matthew calls Pilate by his personal name Πιλᾶτος nine times (Matt 27:2, 13, 17, 22, 24, 58 [twice], 62, 65) and by the title ὁ ἡγεμών eight times (Matt 27:2, 11, 14, 15, 21, 27; 28:14). The evangelist may have a rhetorical reason for appropriating ὁ ἡγεμών (e.g., Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:579), but it might also merely reflect a preference for variety in style.

high priest and "his house" first had to be expiated before the goat ritual could be performed (Lev 16:6, 11).[77]

## 4. The Sending of the Scapegoat to Azazel

I mentioned above that, in a similar manner to the goats of Yom Kippur, Jesus the messiah and Jesus Barabbas possess opposing designations, a fact that the evangelist chooses to emphasize. Matthew's emphasis on Jesus's messianic identity nicely fits Jesus's designation as goat "for Yahweh."[78] But is Barabbas a goat "for Azazel"? It is crucial to note that the scapegoat, the lot of which is "for Azazel" (לעזאזל, Lev 16:8), is also sent "*to* Azazel" (לעזאזל, Lev 16:10, 26). Azazel, then, receives the sins of the community by means of the scapegoat, whereas Yahweh receives the atoning blood of the sacrificed goat. It is probably not coincidental that, whereas Mark writes that Barabbas is released "to the crowd" twice (Mark 15:8, 15), Matthew repeats this phrase two more times than Mark: "The governor was accustomed to release one prisoner *to the crowd* [τῷ ὄχλῳ]" (Matt 27:15, redactional); "Whom do you want me to release *to you* [ὑμῖν]" (Matt 27:15); "Whom from the two do you want me to release *to you* [ὑμῖν]" (Matt 27:21, redactional); "Then he released *to them* [αὐτοῖς] Barabbas" (Matt 27:26). The possibility arise that Matthew has included "the crowd" in his Yom Kippur typology as "Azazel," the figure who in the sacerdotal drama receives the scapegoat and its burden of iniquity. This typological designation

---

77. In its original context, "house" (בית) meant Aaron's fellow priests (Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 1:1019).

78. Matthew adds the title χριστός to his Markan *Vorlage* twice (Matt 27:17, 22; cf. Mark 15:9, 12).

becomes more apparent when the crowd willingly inherits the iniquity of bloodguilt in Matt 27:25 (see below).

A possible verbal echo of Lev 16:8 in Matt 27:15 lends support to this interpretation. In the first verse of his Barabbas scene, Matthew awkwardly inserts τῷ ὄχλῳ between Mark's two words, ἕνα δέσμιον. Matthew's phrase ἕνα τῷ ὄχλῳ parallels the wording of Lev 16:8 LXX:

Lev 16:8: κλῆρον <u>ἕνα τῷ κυρίῳ</u> καὶ κλῆρον <u>ἕνα τῷ ἀποπομπαίῳ</u>[79]

Matt 27:15: ἀπολύειν <u>ἕνα τῷ ὄχλῳ</u> δέσμιον

Mark 15:6: ἀπέλυεν αὐτοῖς ἕνα δέσμιον

By sandwiching τῷ ὄχλῳ between the two words, Matthew emphasizes the clause, "release *one for the crowd* prisoner" (Matt 27:15), thereby echoing Lev 16:18: "one for the Lord... one for Azazel/sending-away." A search for this kind of syntactical construction—an accusative/nominative adjective, followed by a dative indirect object, followed by the modified accusative/nominative noun—yields no results in Matthew except for this verse.

Notably, Aquila's translation of Lev 16:10 employs the term ἀπολύω in reference to the sending-away of the scapegoat, the same term used by Matthew four times in reference to the sending-away of Barabbas (Matt 27:15, 17, 21, 26).[80] Instead of εἰς τὴν ἀποπομπήν, Aquila reads εἰς τράγον ἀπολελυμένον: "He shall send it away as a goat released" (Lev 16:10).[81]

---

79. Wevers, *Leviticus*, 185–86.

80. Matthew follows Mark's wording (Mark 15:6, 9, 11, 15).

81. Wevers, *Leviticus*, 186–87. One witness (416) interestingly reads ἀζαζὴλ εἰς τὴν ἔρημον.

## 5. The Transference of Iniquity by Ritual Hand-action and Confession

Pilate's hand-washing and declaration of innocence are usually interpreted as the governor's attempt to wash himself of the bloodguilt incurred by the unjust outcome of the trial:[82] "So when Pilate saw that he was gaining nothing, but rather that a riot was beginning, he took some water and washed off his hands before the crowd, saying, 'I am innocent of this man's blood; see to it yourselves'" (Matt 27:24). Some scholars understand Deut 21:1–9 as underlying Matthew's portrayal of Pilate's actions.[83] This ritual prescribes that when a human body is found dead and the murderer is not known, the elders of the nearest town are to break the neck of a heifer near a flowing stream and wash their hands over it, declaring their innocence and imploring God to remove the bloodguilt from the community. There may be verbal echoes of Deut 21:6–8 in Matt 27:24–25.[84] The force of the allusion would be that Pilate, by performing a ritual designed to remove bloodguilt from the Jewish community, ironically imputes bloodguilt to this community.[85]

---

82. Brown identifies the material in Matt 27:23b–25 as deriving from the same tradition underlying the story regarding Judas (27:3–10) and the scene of Pilate's wife (27:19) (*Death of the Messiah*, 1:833).

83. E.g., Frankemölle, *Matthäus*, 2:481. Other frequently cited texts are Ps 26:6 ("I wash my hands in innocence…") and 73:13 ("Only in vain have I kept my heart clean and washed my hands in innocence"), in which the washing of hands is a symbol of one's innocence. While there is a wide range of hand-washing parallels in Greco-Roman literature (I. Broer, "Der Prozess gegen Jesus nach Matthäus," *Der Prozess gegen Jesus*, ed. K. Kertelge, QD 112 [Freiburg: Herder, 1988], 84–110, at 106), it is likely that Matthew and his Jewish audience conceived Pilate's actions "as something that is much closer to their own [Jewish] horizon" (Luz, *Matthew*, 3:500).

84. The most impressive verbal parallels are νίψονται τὰς χεῖρας (Deut 21:6) and ἀπενίψατο τὰς χεῖρας (Matt 27:24), and τὸ αἷμα τοῦτο (Deut 21:7) and τοῦ αἵματος τούτου (Matt 27:24). There is also a cluster of conceptual parallels: the washing of hands, a verbal pronouncement, and the riddance of bloodguilt.

85. Green, *Matthew*, 221; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:590. I agree with Georg Strecker, that "Psychologische Überlegungen über die Motive des Pilatus sind fehl am Platz; sie würden den literarischen Charakter seiner Rolle verkennen" (*Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit: Untersuchung zur Theologie des Matthäus*, 3rd ed. [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1971], 116). Brown's remark is similarly directive: "Understanding that Matt is dramatizing theology is very important in the exegesis of this

Yet for some commentators the evangelist's application of the Jewish ritual to the Gentile governor seems forced and inappropriate. Ulrich Luz observes that in Deut 21:1–9, "the murder has already taken place, and the elders who wash their hands really are innocent. Here the murder has not yet happened; indeed, it could still be prevented."[86] Andrew Simmonds concludes, "The Deuteronomy hand-washing ritual happens to be the singularly most stunningly inappropriate Jewish ritual possible for Pilate to perform in Jerusalem on Passover."[87] Stökl Ben Ezra attempts to resolve the problem by suggesting that Deuteronomy *and* Leviticus 16 have influenced the scene, noting that "among the biblical descriptions of temple rituals, Yom Kippur stands out as the only ritual with a washing *after* the procedures."[88] This is a plausible solution, but once Matt 27:24–25 is read properly within Matthew's Yom Kippur typology, the need to posit an allusion to Deuteronomy 21 becomes unnecessary.

I propose the following scenario. The ritual of Leviticus 16 concludes with the high priest conveying the transgressions of Israel onto the scapegoat by means of a hand-leaning rite and a confession of iniquity (Lev 16:21). Barabbas cannot be a sin-bearing agent in any meaningful way for Matthew's community. But the figure Azazel—to which "the crowd" corresponds in the evangelist's typology—becomes a

---

scene" (*Death of the Messiah*, 1:832).

86. Luz, *Matthew*, 3:500; so also Beare, *Matthew*, 531; Maclean, "Barabbas," 326–27.

87. Andrew Simmonds, "Mark's and Matthew's Sub Rosa Message in the Scene of Pilate and the Crowd," *JBL* 131 (2012): 733–54, at 750. Simmonds posits that Matthew alludes to Ps 26:6, and that he wanted to "deceive" his readers, so that they first are led to think Pilate is enacting the Deut 21:6–8 ritual but then realize that his washing is a complete farce, indicating the removal of "Pilate/ Rome from the covenant between Jesus and the nation" (ibid., 752). This interpretation seems far too subtle to be taken seriously.

88. Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 169. Lev 16:24, 26, and 28 describe three consecutive washings near the end of the ritual: the washing of the high priest (16:24), the washing of the scapegoat's handler (16:26), and the washing of the handler of the sin-offering remains (16:28).

sin-bearing scapegoat in Second Temple tradition.[89] This opens the possibility that Matthew conceives *the crowd* as fulfilling the role of sin-bearer. It is the crowd, after all, who takes Jesus's bloodguilt upon itself, after Pilate washes the sin from his hands and tranfers it onto the crowd, who confesses its guilt (Matt 27:24–25).[90] Of course, it would be impossible for Pilate to perform a hand-leaning rite upon the large crowd. But since (1) Lev 16:24 dictates that the high priest must *wash* his body at the end of the ritual and (2) extra-biblical tradition prescribes that the high priest must *wash* himself of the blood of the sacrificial goat (see below), the evangelist is able to transform the hand-leaning rite of Lev 16:21 into a hand-washing rite that is functionally equivalent to the former. Pilate confesses and then transfers the guilt from his hands onto the sin-bearing agent, just as in Lev 16:21. The following points support this thesis.

First, the hand-leaning rite and the confession of iniquity are concomitant actions in the scapegoat ritual; the verbal confession "releases" the congregation's transgressions so they can be transfered onto the scapegoat.[91] The unique combination of ritual hand-action and confession occurs in Matthew as well: Pilate washes the sin

---

89. 1 En. 10.8: "And all the earth was made desolate by the deeds of the teaching of Asael, and *over him write all the sins*." 4Q180: "And concerning 'Azaz'el [is written ...] [to love] injustice and to *let him inherit evil for all [his] ag[e ...]*." 4Q203: "Then *he punished, and not us [bu]t Aza[ze]l and made [him ... the sons of] Watchers, the Giants; and n[o]ne of [their] be[loved] will be forgiven [...]*." Apoc. Ab. 13.14: "For behold, the garment which in heaven was formerly yours has been set aside for him, and *the corruption which was on him [Abraham] has gone over to you [Azazel]*." See Chapter Two.

90. Wratislaw, *Notes and Dissertations*, 19.

91. Milgrom remarks: "The hand-leaning, so to speak, is the vehicle that conveys the verbal pronouncement of the people's sins onto the head of the goat. A transfer thus takes place—not from the high priest, who is personally immune from the contamination produced by the sins he confesses—from Israel itself; its sins, exorcised by the high priest's confession, are transferred to the body of the goat, just as the sanctuary's impurities, absorbed by the purgation blood, are (originally) conveyed to the goat" (*Leviticus*, 1:1043; see also Schwartz, "Bearing of Sin," 17–18). The typology, then, does not perfectly map onto the biblical rite. However, it maps on quite well to the ritual as described in the Temple Scroll (see below).

off his hands, declaring his innocence (Matt 27:24b), and the people pronounce their

bloodguilt (27:25). As John Meier suggests, Pilate's actions are "an attempt to transfer

all responsibility to the crowds."[92] Matthew employs a verb with a ritual connotation,

ἀπονίπτω (ἀπό + νίπτω),[93] using it in the middle voice, "so that one catches the

innuendo of Pilate's attempt to *wash off from himself* [the bloodguilt]," as Raymond

Brown remarks.[94] Matthew therefore seems to conceive the bloodguilt as a physical

contaminant requiring elimination.[95] It is literally washed off Pilate's hands and

heaped onto the people (27:24–25).[96]

Second, the events in Matt 27:24–26 match the Temple Scroll's prescription

for Yom Kippur in a striking way.[97] Unlike in the biblical instructions, the high priest

---

92. Maier, *Matthew*, 342.

93. Let. Aris. 305; Jos. Asen. 29.5; Philo, *Migr.* 98; *Mos.* 2.138; *Spec.* 1.198; 3.89; Josephus, *Ant.* 12.106. BDAG (s.v. "ἀπονίπτω") relates a purported old Greek custom, reported by third-century BCE Anticlides: "whenever they killed a pers. or engaged in other kinds of slaughter, they would wash their hands [τὰς χεῖρας ἀπονίπτειν] with running water to purify themselves from pollution."

94. Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 1:835 (emphasis mine).

95. So also Hamilton, *Death of Jesus*, 160.

96. There are several interesting similarities between the scapegoat ritual (Lev 16:10, 21–22) and the broken-necked heifer ritual (Deut 21:1–9): (1) Both are elimination rites in which an animal becomes a vehicle for the transference and expulsion of a pollutant (Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 1:1082; David P. Wright ["Deuteronomy 21:1–9 as a Rite of Elimination," *CBQ* 49 [1987]: 387–403, at 403] summarizes the purpose of the Deut 21:1–9 rite: "The killing of the cow is a reenactment of the murder which removes impurity of bloodguilt to a place where it will not threaten the community and its concerns; the flowing wadi further removes the evil to distant bodies of water"). (2) In the heifer ritual, "The stream removes the cow's blood and thus represents the removal of the victim's blood and concomitant bloodguilt" (ibid., 398). In the scapegoat ritual, Israel's sins are transfered to the go-away goat, which then carries the sins away from the community and temple into the wilderness (Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 1:1041). (3) Both rituals involve placing hands "on/over" (ἐπί) the head of the animal in order to transfer the contaminant (Whereas Deut 21:6 MT reports that the elders shall "wash their hands over the heifer" [ירחצו את־ידיהם על־העגלה], the LXX records that they "shall wash their hands over the head [ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλήν] of the heifer"; so also in 11Q19 63.5 [על ראוש] and Josephus, Ant. 4.222 [ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς]. This phrase ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλήν occurs twice in Lev 16:21). (4) In both rites, a verbal pronouncement immediately succeeds the ritual hand-action (Deut 21:6–7; Lev 16:21). If Matthew is drawing from both Deuteronomy 21 and Leviticus 16, then these may be the grounds for his doing so. Accordingly, Pilate's declaration shares closer resemblance to the elders' statment in Deut 21:7–8, since both are pronouncements of innocence, and the people's confession of bloodguilt more closely parallels the confession of sins in Lev 16:21, since both admit brazen transgressions.

97. The Temple Scrolls is a late second-century BCE Qumran document, which describes an idealized temple and its institutions. On the dating of the Temple Scroll, see Yigael Yadin, *The Temple*

is to *wash his hands of the blood of the immolated goat* before transferring sin to the scapegoat, just as Pilate washes his hands of Jesus's blood and transfers iniquity to the crowd: "And he shall wash his hands and his feet from the blood of the sin-offering [ורחץ את ידיו ואת רגליו מדם החטאת] and will go to the living he-goat and will confess over its head all the sins of the children of Israel with all their guilt [אשמתמה] together with all their sins; and he shall place them upon the head of the he-goat and will send it to Azazel."[98] The sequence of events is impressively similar to that of Matt 27:24–26: (1) The priest washes his hands of the blood of the goat for Yahweh; Pilate washes his hands of the blood of Jesus. (2) The priest confesses the guilt of the people; Pilate and the crowd confess the guilt of the people. (3) The priest releases the scapegoat; Pilate releases Barabbas. Additionally, the Temple Scroll includes the confession of guilt (אשמת), unlike in Lev 16:21. In sum, the tradition attested in the Temple Scroll may have influenced Matthew's arrangement of his Yom Kippur typology.

Third, the Day of Atonement is uniquely linked to the theme of corporate

---

*Scroll: The Hidden Law of the Dead Sea Sect* (New York: Random House, 1985), 218–22; Martin Hengel, James H. Charlesworth, and Doron Mendels, "The Polemical Character of 'On Kingship' in the Temple Scroll: An Attempt at Dating 11Q Temple," *JJS* 37 (1986): 28–38; Lawrence H. Schiffman, *The Courtyards of the House of the Lord: Studies on the Temple Scroll*, ed. García Martínez, STDJ 75 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 8–10. The temple described in the Temple Scroll is an idealized Solomonic temple (not the eschatological temple), the instructions for which were apparently never recorded and handed down (see 1 Chr 28:11–19; Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 112–17). The Temple Scroll "can also be taken as being what the Second Temple should have looked like but certainly did not" (George J. Brooke, "The Ten Temples in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*, ed. John Day, LHBOTS 422 [London: T&T Clark, 2005], 417–34, at 425). Though he suggests that the author of the Scroll utilized descriptions of the temple(s) in Kings, Chronicles, Ezekiel, Ezra, and perhaps other Second Temple material, Yadin posits that "the Temple plan in the scroll is mainly his own creation" (*Temple Scroll*, 169). In contrast, Johann Maier maintains that, "although much may be laid to the account of contemporary polemics, the majority of these prescriptions must have an older origin—namely from the Zadokite cultic tradition before the troubles at the beginning of the 2nd century BCE" (*The Temple Scroll: An Introduction, Translation & Commentary*, JSOTSup 34 [Sheffield: University of Sheffield, 1985], 4). But Maier would agree with Schiffman (*Courtyards*, 340), that "the Temple Scroll is first and foremost a work of biblical interpretation" (*Temple Scroll*, 3).

98. 11Q19 26:10–13 (Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2:1248–49). For a detailed treatment of Yom Kippur in the Temple Scroll, see David Volgger, "The Day of Atonement according to the Temple Scroll," *Bib* 87 (2006): 251–60.

bloodguilt in Second Temple tradition. As already noted, the punishment of Asael as a sin-bearing scapegoat (1 En. 10.4–8) occurs in response to the bloodshed engendered by the Watchers' transgression (1 En. 9.1), when the archangels "looked down from the sanctuary of heaven upon the earth and *saw much blood poured out on the earth*."[99] According to Anke Dorman, the theme of injustice and shedding innocent blood links the two etiologies of Yom Kippur contained in Jub. 5.17–18 and 34.10–19.[100] The first etiology occurs in Jub. 5.17–18, after the fallout of the Watchers's transgression, which Jubilees 7 describes in the following terms: "Everyone sold himself to commit injustice and to *shed innocent blood*, the earth was filled with injustice ... Then the Lord obliterated all from the surface of the earth because of their actions and *because of the blood which they had shed in the earth*."[101] Jubilees's second Yom Kippur etiology occurs after Jacob's sons effectively shed Joseph's innocent blood:[102] "Jacob's sons slaughtered a he-goat, stained Joseph's clothing by *dipping it in its blood*, and sent (it) to their father Jacob on the tenth of the seventh month."[103] In both instances, Yom Kippur is linked thematically to atonement for corporate bloodguilt. Matthew's context bears the same thematic connection, albeit in an ironic way.

Fourth, the First Evangelist indicates elsewhere that "this generation" is an inheritor of the sins of prior generations: "So that upon you might come all the righteous blood poured out on the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel to the blood

---

99. 1 En. 9.1 (Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch*, 26).

100. Dorman, "Innocent Blood," 58. See Chapter Two.

101. Jub. 7.23, 25 (VanderKam, *Jubilees*, 47).

102. Dorman, "Innocent Blood," 55–58.

103. Jub. 34.12 (VanderKam, *Jubilees*, 228).

of Zechariah son of Barachias... All this will come upon this generation" (Matt 23:35–36). Those who have Jesus's blood on their hands bear not only their own bloodguilt but that of those who murdered the prophets before them. They are inheritors of iniquity like Azazel.

Fifth, Matthew introduces the new material of Matt 27:24–25 by stating, "So when Pilate saw that he was gaining nothing, but rather that *a riot was beginning....*" As Maclean observes, the evangelist's description matches a key criterion of ancient expulsion rites: the aversion of disaster.[104] Realizing that the crowd is on the verge of rampage at the prospect of Jesus's release, Pilate expedites the process in order to quell the imminent chaos. The riotous setting of the scene anticipates the appearance of a sin-bearing scapegoat.

In summary, understanding the crowd as corresponding to Azazel, the figure to whom the scapegoat is sent in Leviticus 16 and who himself inherits iniquity in Second Temple tradition, unlocks the way in which the scene of Pilate's hand-washing (Matt 27:24–25) completes the evangelist's Yom Kippur typology. The crowd both receives Jesus Barabbas as the scapegoat and inherits iniquity upon itself. Like the high priest in the Temple Scroll, Pilate washes the blood of the immolated goat, Jesus the messiah, off his hands. As in Leviticus 16, he utilizes a confession of guilt and ritual hand-action to transfer iniquity onto the sin-bearer. As in other Second Temple literature, Matthew's Yom Kippur typology is linked to the theme of corporate bloodguilt. In short, the unique conceptual cluster of verbal confession, ritual hand-action, transference of guilt, and bearing of iniquity suggests an allusion to Lev 16:21 in Matt 27:24–25, which, when viewed in light of Second Temple Day of Atonement

---

104. Maclean, "Barabbas," 328, who draws upon DeMaris, "Jesus Jettisoned," 98.

traditions, becomes quite compelling. By associating the bloodguilty populace with Azazel, the evangelist portrays the crowd as demon possessed, a portrait consistent with the inexplicable change in temperament of the crowd that has hitherto been favorably disposed toward Jesus.[105] This demonic portrait of the crowd coheres well with Matthew's generally negative attitude toward his disbelieving colleagues (Matt 12:27, 43–45; 23:33).

### 6. Exile and Inhabitation in the Wilderness

By having Jesus's blood come upon not only the people gathered before Pilate but also upon τὰ τέκνα ἡμῶν (Matt 27:25), Matthew evokes the desolation of Jerusalem that the generation of Jerusalemites in Matthew's day experienced. As in Matt 27:25, Jesus refers to the Jerusalemites as "your children" in Matt 23:37: "How often I desired to gather together your children [τὰ τέκνα σου]...." Here, Jesus's prophecy alludes to the destruction of the temple: "See, your house is left to you a desert [ἔρημος]" (Matt 23:38). Uniquely in the First Gospel, Matthew places Jesus's indictment of Israel's bloodguilt (Matt 23:35–36) *immediately before* his prediction of Jerusalem's destruction (Matt 24:1–2; cf. Luke 11:47–51; 21:5–6).[106] Jesus then prophesies both the temple's ruin (Matt 23:27; 24:2) and the exile of Judaeans (Matt 24:16–20): "Then those in Judea must flee to the mountains... Pray that your flight may not be in winter or on a Sabbath" (Matt 24:16, 20). It therefore seems that the

---

105. Joel Marcus makes the case that the crowd is demonically possessed in Mark's account (*Mark*: *A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 27A–B [New York: Doubleday, 2000], 2:1036–37). See the favorable portrait of the ὄχλος in Matt 7:28; 9:8; 9:33; 12:23; 15:31; 21:9, 11, 46; 22:33. The crowds follow Jesus during most of his public ministry in Matthew.

106. I thank David Burnett for pointing this out to me.

language of "your children" is linked to the image of Jerusalem as a wilderness, as Matt 23:37–38 suggests (Ἰερουσαλήμ... τὰ τέκνα σου... ἔρημος).[107] The people's pronouncement of guilt upon "our children" in Matt 27:25 becomes an "ironic prophecy of judgment,"[108] anticipating the destruction of Jerusalem and the exile of its inhabitants from the land.[109]

The scapegoat was also exiled from Jerusalem and made to inhabit the wilderness (ἔρημος): "The goat shall bear on itself all their iniquities to a barren region. And he shall release the goat into the wilderness [ἔρημον]" (Lev 16:21–22). This became a memorable trope in early Jewish thought. Raphael is told to "bind Asael hand and foot, and cast him into the darkness; and make an opening in the wilderness [ἔρημον] that is in Doudael. Throw him there...." (1 En. 10.4–5).[110] Philo reports that the scapegoat "was to be sent out into a trackless and desolate wilderness [ἐρημίαν]."[111] He allegorizes the Septuagint's term for scapegoat, ἀποπομπαῖος (Lev 16:8, 10), underlining that the goat "is removed, caused to live apart, and driven

---

107. The redactional statement of Pilate's wife, "Have nothing to do with that righteous man [τῷ δικαίῳ ἐκείνῳ]" (Matt 27:19), is also linked to the language of "righteous blood" (αἷμα δίκαιον) in Matt 23:35.

108. Saldarini, *Community*, 33.

109. See Josephus, *J.W.* 6.414–48. Josephus records the humiliating exile of Jews from Jerusalem exemplified in Titus's triumphal procession, when the emperor's retinue "selected the tallest and most handsome of the youth and reserved them for the triumph; of the rest, those over seventeen years of age he sent in chains to the works in Egypt, while multitudes were presented by Titus to the various provinces, to be destroyed in the theatres by the sword or by wild beasts; those under seventeen were sold" (*J.W.* 6.417–18 [Thackeray]). Josephus also reports that when Titus's march arrived at Antioch, the people asked him to expel the Jews from their city, to which Titus responded, "But their own country to which, as Jews, they ought in that case to be banished, has been destroyed, and no other place would now receive them" (*J.W.* 7.109 [Thackeray]). See Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ: Volume 1*, rev. and ed. Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar, and Matthew Black (London: Bloomsbury, 1973), 508–13.

110. Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch*, 28.

111. *Spec.* 1.888 (Colson); see also Josephus, *Ant.* 3.241.

away."[112] In the Apocalypse of Abraham, Yahoel banishes the demonic scapegoat Azazel "into the untrodden parts of the earth," that is to say, into the wilderness.[113]

Thus, both the temple scapegoat and its demonic counterpart, Azazel, are exiled and made to inhabit a wasteland in Jewish tradition. The children of the crowd standing before Pilate are also made to suffer exile and inhabit a symbolic wilderness in 70 CE. In fact, the link between the destruction of Jerusalem and Azazel is already present in Matthew's Parable of the Wedding Feast, where the fiery destruction of the city (Matt 22:7, redactional) anticipates the Azazel-like banishment of the unrighteous man into the outer darkness (Matt 22:13, also redactional; cf. 1 En. 10:4).[114]

## 7. The Inheritance of Iniquity and Curses

Matthew's switch from ὄχλος to πᾶς ὁ λαός likely reflects the prevailing reality in his day that the majority of the Jews had rejected Jesus's messianic identity.[115] Thus, the

---

112. *Her*. 179 (translation mine; cf. Colson and Whitaker).

113. Apoc. Ab. 14.5 (Kulik, *Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 21).

114. On the influence of 1 En. 10.4 and Azazel traditions on Matt 22:13, see above.

115. Scholars have extensively debated the precise referent of πᾶς ὁ λαός. There are two main viewpoints: (1) πᾶς ὁ λαός refers to the covenant people of Israel as a whole, or (2) πᾶς ὁ λαός is synonymous with ὄχλος and refers only to those Jews responsible for Jesus's death. In regards to the first view, Strecker understands Matt 21:43 as indicating Israel's permanent forfeiture of its privileged role as God's people, a theme supposedly brought to a climax in 27:25: "Die Absolutheit der Schuld schließt den Gedanken der Umkehrung der Geschichte aus" (*Der Weg*, 116–17). For Wolfgang Trilling, the words πᾶς and ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα ἡμῶν point to the entire association of Israel for all subsequent generations (*Das wahre Israel: Studien zur Theologie des Matthäus-Evangeliums*, SANT 10 [München: Kösel, 1964], 68–74, at 71). Hare is typical in positing that λαός is a theologically loaded term for Matthew denoting the whole nation of Israel (*Matthew*, 317) (for a list of scholars of this viewpoint, see Matthias Konradt, *Israel, Church, and the Gentles in the Gospel of Matthew*, trans. Kathleen Ess [Waco: Baylor University Press, 2014], 156 n. 374). In regards to the second view, Saldarini argues that λαός refers to Israel as God's chosen people only in Matt 1:21; 2:6; 4:16, 23, where λαός occurs in a context of Israel's need for salvation (*Community*, 28–32). In Matt 2:4; 21:23; 26:3, 47; 27:1, λαός occurs in the phrase οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι/γραμματεῖς τοῦ λαοῦ, referring to the status of the religious authorities as leaders of the Jewish community, not necessarily the people of God as a whole (so Strecker, *Der Weg*, 115). In Matt 26:5 and 27:64, ὁ λαός are conceived like ὄχλοι in Matthew, who are usually favorably disposed toward Jesus. In such passages,

people's statement does not anticipate the salvation of the bloodguilty crowd.[116] Rather, their confession portends the destruction of Jerusalem from the evangelist's perspective.[117] If Matthew intends to allude to the sprinkling of the people at Sinai with sacrificial blood (Exod 24:8), then such an allusion would be ironic.[118] As Davies and Allison submit, the thrust of Matt 27:25 is that the crowd "unwittingly assents to Jesus's dire prophecy" in Matt 23:35–36, "that upon you [ἐφ᾿ ὑμᾶς] may come all the

---

λαός refers to a subgroup of the unfaithful, not all Israel. Konradt emphasizes a purported "Jerusalem aspect" of πᾶς ὁ λαός (i.e., the crowd gathered in Jerusalem), pointing to Matt 2:3 (πᾶσα Ἱεροσόλυμα), 21:10 (πᾶσα ἡ πόλις), and 26:5 (θόρυβος ἐν τῷ λαῷ) (Israel, *Church*, 153–66) (for a list of further scholars of this viewpoint, see ibid., 156 n. 376). In the end, Saldarini's conclusion seems to be correct: "'All the people' in 27:25 is not a term burdened with salvation-historical weight, but a social and political description of the main body of Israel associated with the center: Jerusalem and its leadership" (*Community*, 33).

116. So Timothy Cargal, "'His Blood Be upon Us and upon Our Children': A Matthean Double-Entendre?" *NTS* 37 (1991): 101–12; John Paul Heil, "The Blood of Jesus in Matthew: A Narrative-Critical Perspective," *PRSt* 18 (1991): 117–24; Simmonds claims that, in light of Exod 24:8 (i.e., the blood of the covenant coming "upon" the people) and the Passover setting of Jesus's trial, the "crowd's oath is meant as a miraculous acceptance, confirmation, and corroboration of Jesus' offer of his blood" ("Pilate and the Crowd," 754). But Simmonds submits slim evidence for an allusion to Exod 24:8 in Matthew's Barabbas account. His reliance on late rabbinic material is methodologically questionable, and his confidence in the ability to access the evangelist's "repressed subconscious feelings" is dubious. Accepting the standard view that Matt 27:25 portends the judgment of Jerusalem, Hamilton perceives a glimmer of hope in the verse, particularly in view of the resurrection of the holy ones in Jerusalem (Matt 27:51b–53) ("His Blood Be upon Us," 99–100; eadem *Death of Jesus*, 206–28). Because Jesus's αἷμα is not only innocent blood in the Gospel but also sacrificial blood (Matt 26:28), this line of interpretation is possible. Nevertheless, it seems unlikely, since there are no other indications that the Jewish populace and their children are to attain forgiveness in Matthew's Barabbas account and its polemically-charged literary context.

117. Related to the question of the social referent of πᾶς ὁ λαός is the question of the duration of the bloodguilt/judgment implied in Matt 27:25. Scholars generally take the bloodguilt/judgment as either (1) limited to the Jews of Jesus and Matthew's own day, or (2) enduring throughout later generations. For the first view, see Albright and Mann, *Matthew*, 345; Green, *Matthew*, 221; Saldarini, *Community*, 33; Hagner, *Matthew*, 2:827; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:592; Senior, *Matthew*, 321; Keener, *Matthew*, 671; France, *Matthew*, 1058; Daniel M. Gurtner, *The Torn Veil: Matthew's Exposition of the Death of Jesus*, SNTSMS 139 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 135. For the second view, see Trilling, *Das wahre Israel*, 72; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "Anti-semitism and the Cry of 'All the People' (Mt. 27:25)," *TS* 26 (1965): 667–71; Meier, *Matthew*, 343; Beare, *Matthew*, 531; Nils A. Dahl, "The Passion Narrative in Matthew's Gospel," in *The Interpretation of Matthew*, ed. Graham Stanton (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 42–55, at 50; Gundry, *Matthew*, 565; Foster, *Community*, 233–34, 247. The phrase, "and on our children" (Matt 27:25), seems to indicate that the children of those who condemned Jesus to death, namely, those who experienced the tragic events of 70 CE, are only in mind.

118. Matthew's choice of "all the people" may be similarly ironic. The Temple Scroll describes the immolated goat as atoning for "all the people of the assembly [כול עם הקהל]" (11Q19 26:7, 9; cf. Lev 16:15), and Josephus reports that the scapegoat served as "an expiation for the sins of the whole people [τοῦ πλήθους παντός]" (*Ant.* 3.241 [Thackeray]).

righteous blood [αἷμα δίκαιον] shed on the land ... all this will come upon [ἐπί] this generation."[119] The language of Matt 27:25 evokes two further images from the Yom Kippur *imaginaire*, namely, the bloodguilty populace become the inheritors of iniquity and of curses.

First, Matthew paints the image of Pilate transferring the iniquity of bloodguilt from his own hands and onto the crowd, using the phrase, "His blood on us and on our children" (τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἐφ᾽ ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα ἡμῶν, Matt 27:25). Though this is standard biblical language to indicate bloodguilt,[120] the image may also evoke the scapegoat and Azazel's inheritance of iniquity. Leviticus 16:21–22 states: "And Aaron shall place his hands *on the head* [ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλήν] of the living goat ... and he shall confess *on it* [ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῦ] ... and he shall place [all Israel's sins] *on the head* [ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλήν] of the living goat ... and the goat shall take their iniquities *on itself* [ἐφ᾽ ἑαυτῷ]."[121] An extra-biblical tradition reports that a scarlet ribbon was placed upon the scapegoat's head, representing its burden of iniquity.[122] As demonic scapegoat, Azazel infamously inherits iniquity as well. God commands Raphael to place the sins of the Watchers upon him: "And all the earth was made desolate by the deeds of the teaching of Asael, and *on him* [ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ] write all the sins."[123] Repeating this theme, 4Q180 relates: "And concerning 'Azaz'el [is written ...] [to love] injustice and to *let*

---

119. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:317.

120. E.g., Josh 2:19; 2 Sam 1:16; 1 Kgs 2:32–33, 37; Jer 26:15.

121. Since the phrase τὸ αἷμα ἐφ᾽ ἡμᾶς is shorthand for τὸ αἷμα ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἡμῶν (cf. Ezek 18:13 and 33:4; Acts 5:28; 18:6), the image in Matt 27:25 is similar to the scapegoat's receiving Israel's sins *upon the head* (ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλήν, Lev 16:21–22).

122. M. Yoma 4:2; 6:6; Barn 7.8.

123. Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch*, 28 (modified translation; emphasis mine).

*him inherit evil for all [his] ag[e ...].*"[124] In the Apocalypse of Abraham, Azazel is

told, "The garment which in heaven was formerly yours has been set aside for him

[Abraham], and *the corruption which was on him has gone over to you [Azazel].*"[125]

Second, some scholars suggest that Matthew, by switching from "crowd"

(ὄχλος, Matt 27:15, 20, 24) to "all the people" (πᾶς ὁ λαός, Matt 27:25), echoes the

legal terminology of Deut 27:14–26, where the Levites pronounce twelve covenantal

curses and "all the people" (πᾶς ὁ λαός) response, "Amen!"[126] The phrase πᾶς ὁ λαός

occurs twelve times in Deut 27:16–26. The penultimate curse is especially

noteworthy, given its link to the theme of bloodguilt: "'Cursed [Ἐπικατάρατος] be

anyone who takes a bribe to shed innocent blood.' And all the people [πᾶς ὁ λαός]

shall say, 'Amen'" (Deut 27:25). In light of the verbal, thematic, and structural

parallels between Deut 27:25 and Matt 27:25, an allusion seems likely.[127] Matthew

therefore appears to portray those standing before Pilate as inheritors of the

Deuteronomic curses.[128]

---

124. Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1:373 (emphasis mine).

125. Apoc. Ab. 13.14 (Kulik, *Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 20; emphasis mine).

126. J. R. C. Cousland, *The Crowds in the Gospel of Matthew*, NovTSup 102 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 83; Frankemölle, *Matthäus*, 2:481–83; Hamilton, *Death of Jesus*, 186.

127. The most impressive verbal parallels are πᾶς ὁ λαός (Deut 27:25; Matt 27:25), αἵματος ἀθῴου (Deut 27:25), and ἀθῷός εἰμι ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος τούτου (Matt 27:24). Both Deut 27:25 and Matt 27:24b–25 thematically concern innocent blood, both possess an antiphonal structure, and Matthew has just told a story about bribery to shed innocent blood (Matt 26:14–16; 27:3–10). Luz's argument against an allusion to Deut 27:25 (i.e., πᾶς ὁ λαός is too common a phrase in the LXX to posit a textual allusion) neither takes into account the multiple verbal parallels between Matt 27:25 and Deut 27:25, nor their thematic and structural similarities (*Matthew*, 3:501).

128. Apart from the Deuteronomy 27 allusion, the people's statement still functions as a self-inflicted curse. So Luz, who remarks, "Since we are dealing here with a 'causative action sphere' in the biblical sense, whose negative effects the perpetrators unavoidably must bear, we are quite justified in speaking of a 'qualified self-curse' on the part of the people ... 'Curse' is not to be understood in the sense of a verbal curse that people pronounce on themselves but in the sense of a 'curse' of a deed, i.e., of an unavoidable negative consequence for the perpetrators" (*Matthew*, 3:502 and n. 85; so also Strecker *Der Weg*, 115; Meier, *Matthew*, 343).

The scapegoat and Azazel are also inheritors of curses. Philo reports that the scapegoat was sent into the wilderness "bearing on itself the curses [τὰς ἀράς] for those who have erred."[129] Barnabas's halakhic material calls the scapegoat "cursed" (ἐπικατάρατον).[130] The Mishnah reports the verbal cursing of the scapegoat: "And they made a causeway for it because of the Babylonians who used to pull its hair, crying to it, 'Bear [our sins] and be gone! Bear [our sins] and be gone!'"[131] Yahoel also curses Azazel in the Slavonic apocalypse: "This is iniquity, this is Azazel! ... Reproach is on you, Azazel! Since Abraham's portion is in heaven, and yours is on earth."[132]

To sum up, Matthew conceives Jesus's blood as a contaminant that Pilate physically washes off his hands and, accompanied by verbal confession, transfers onto crowd, causing them to inherit iniquity and curses.[133] This portrait coheres with Matthew's typology of the crowd as Azazel, the figure who receives the scapegoat (Jesus Barabbas), since in Second Temple tradition the roles of Azazel and the scapegoat are conflated, so that Azazel becomes the inheritor of iniquity and curses as well.

---

129. *Spec*. 1.888 (Colson; modified translation).

130. Barn. 7.9 (Ehrman); see also Tertullian, *Marc*. 3.7.7.

131. M. Yoma 6:4 (Danby, *Mishnah*, 169).

132. Apoc. Ab. 13.7 (Kulik, *Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 20).

133. Matthew may not have been the first Christian writer to link the Deuteronomic curses with the figure of the scapegoat, as some have argued that the apostle Paul does just this. Some argue that Paul's statement, "Christ redeemed us from the curse [κατάρας] of the law by becoming a curse [κατάρα] for us" (Gal 3:13a), assumes the logic of Christ becoming a scapegoat to redeem the Jews from the covenantal curses (so Schwartz, "Two Pauline Allusions," 260–63; McLean, *Cursed Christ*, 113–39; Finlan, *Atonement Metaphors*, 101–10). Paul merges the alleged scapegoat motif with a citation from Deut 21:23 LXX: "Cursed [ἐπικατάρατος] is everyone who hangs on a tree" (Gal 3:13b). Just three verses earlier (Gal 3:10), Paul cites Deut 27:26, the final verse in the series of covenant curses in Deut 27:14–26.

**Conclusion**

I have advanced the reading of those who posits Matthew's construction of a Yom Kippur typology in the Barabbas scene (Matt 27:15–26). I defended three previously proposed correspondences and advanced four of my own. To summarize, these are: (1) the similarity of the two goats, (2) the opposing designations of the two goats, (3) the priestly lottery between the two goats, (4) the sending of the scapegoat to Azazel, (5) the transference of iniquity by ritual hand-action and confession, (6) exile and inhabitation in the wilderness, and (7) the inheritance of iniquity and curses.

If my reading is on target, then the three major problems with positing a Yom Kippur typology in Matt 27:15–26, as outlined above, are resolved. Consequently, the case for such a typology is strengthened. First, prior scholarship failed to notice that the "crowd" plays an essential role in Matthew's typology, namely, as Azazel, who both receives the scapegoat, Jesus Barabbas, and inherits iniquity itself (Matt 27:25). This typological identification would be poignantly meaningful for the Matthean community in its Jewish social location, where it was engaged in virulent sectarian disagreement. Second, Matthew's goat typology now makes sense within his larger innocent-blood discourse that comes to its zenith in Matt 27:24–25. It is no coincidence that the theme of corporate bloodguilt is central to certain Second Temple Yom Kippur traditions. Third, we can understand "blood" as referring to the blood of Jesus (Matt 27:25), which is the plain reading of the passage. Consequently, the reader of Matthew can conceive Jesus's blood as both innocent blood, requiring restitution, and as sacrificial blood, offered for atonement.[134]

---

134. Thus, one does not have to drive a sharp wedge between the ideas of ritual impurity and

The genius of Matthew's typology is that it infuses theological significance into a bizarre and inexplicable Passover custom. The evangelist is able to merge Passover, a holiday not usually associated with atonement, and Yom Kippur, thereby presenting Jesus as a Passover sacrifice with expiatory value, not on the basis of Exodus 12, but Leviticus 16.[135] The typology creatively spells out what it means for Jesus's blood to be "poured out for the forgiveness of sins" in the context of a new Passover and covenant (Matt 26:28).[136] In light of the Yom Kippur typology, Matthew's emphasis on the name "Jesus," a key feature in the Yom Kippur typology of Matt 27:15–26, presages the atoning import of Jesus's death: "And you will name him 'Jesus,' for he will save his people from their sins" (Matt 1:21).

The Yom Kippur reading of Matt 27:15–26 is mutually reinforced by the fact that Matthew, fond of doublets,[137] also seems to portray Jesus as the scapegoat in the immediately following scene of his mockery (Matt 27:27–31).[138] Matthew apparently cannot allow Jesus to be just one of the two goats, which functioned *collectively* to make atonement for sin, according to Lev 16:5. As Orlov remarks, "Despite the fact that the Barabbas episode assigns the scapegoat's features and functions to Barabbas, the broader context of the gospel attempts to simultaneously envision Jesus as both the immolated goat and the scapegoat."[139] But how could the evangelist conceive two

religious guilt in this passage, as does Trilling, *Das wahre Israel*, 69.

135. LaCocque notes that Matthew similarly conflates Passover and Sukkoth when he has the children crying out in the temple, "Hosanna to the Son of David," on Passover eve in Matt 21:15 (*Jesus the Central Jew*, 258).

136. See Chapter Five.

137. E.g., Matt 8:28 (cf. Mark 5:2), Matt 9:27–28; 20:30 (cf. Mark 10:46), Matt 21:2, 7 (cf. Mark 11:2, 7), and Matt 26:60 (cf. Mark 14:57). See Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:87.

138. Koester, *Gospels*, 225; Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 170; idem, "Fasting with Jews," 183. See chapter 4.

139. Orlov, *Atoning Dyad*, 64. Orlov further notes, "This tendency to apply the feature of both

scapegoats? It seems that one of the scapegoats, Barabbas and the bloodguilty populace, functions as a generational scapegoat. Matthew follows a template exemplified in BW, wherein irreparable corporate bloodguilt requires a cataclysmic purging event—in the evangelist's case, the destruction of Jerusalem. This allows Jesus to be a scapegoat on behalf of those Jews and Gentiles who receive him as messiah and Lord.

However, the drama of sin-bearing and eschatological purgation of sins does not end with Jerusalem or Jesus in Matthew's Gospel. In an important study, Leslie Walck argues for the influence of Enochic Son of Man traditions on Matthew's "Parable" of the Sheep and the Goats, particularly on the redactional verses of Matt 25:31–34, 41, and 46.[140] Fascinatingly, the Son of Man tradition likely underlying Matt 25:31 is enjoined to an Azazel tradition that has also influenced Matt 25:41: "You will have to witness my Chosen One [=Son of Man], how *he will sit on the throne of glory and judge Azazel, and all his associates and all his host*" (1 En. 55.4).[141] According to Walck, "'The 'Devil and all his angels' (Matt 25:41) bears a striking resemblance to 'Azazel and all his associates and all his hosts.'"[142] The

---

cultic animals to a single protagonist in the story was previously noted in our analysis of Joseph's story" (ibid., 64; see also ibid., 32–42).

140. Walck, *Son of Man*, 194–225. See also Leslie W. Walck, "The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and the Gospels," in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 299–337, at 330. The majority of specialists now conclude that the Parables of Enoch were composed around the time of Herod the Great (Paolo Sacchi, "The 2005 Camaldoli Seminar on the Parables of Enoch," in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*, 499–512, at 510–511; James H. Charlesworth, "The Date and Provenience of the *Parables of Enoch*," in *Parables of Enoch: A Paradigm Shift*, ed. James H. Charlesworth and Darrell L. Bock [London: Bloomsberry, 2013], 37–57, at 56, 56 n. 47).

141. Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch*, 69 (emphasis mine).

142. Walck, *Son of Man*, 219. It would therefore seem that the Azazel tradition has influenced Matthew's conception of the Devil. What Grabbe says about Satan would seem to hold true for the Devil in Matt 25:41: "A reference to Satan did not necessarily suggest the Day of Atonement ceremony, yet it was always available in the background and its symbolism could be called on when needed" ("The Scapegoat Tradition," 166).

influence of this Azazel tradition upon Matthew's redaction suggests that the evangelist conceives the lot of cursed goats in terms of the goat for/to Azazel as well.[143] The evangelist therefore seems to apply the Azazel-scapegoat typology not just to the bloodguilty Jerusalem community, but to individuals from "*all* the nations" who reject the Son of Man.

A more nuanced portrait of atonement in Matthew's Gospel emerges from this analysis. Jesus's death purges sins, but so does the destruction of Jerusalem and all the wicked. These acts of judgment possess the common theme of the expulsion of iniquity, the same motif enacted in the scapegoat ritual. In his capacity as scapegoat Jesus is sent out of the city bearing the sins of others, those who murder the prophets bear their own iniquity and are exiled from Jerusalem in 70 CE, and the unrighteous from all the nations are cast into the darkness at the final judgment. For the gospel writer, then, atonement and judgment are closely associated phenomena. The former involves the removal and elimination of iniquity on behalf of others. The latter involves the removal and elimination of iniquity by bearing that iniquity oneself.

---

143. While space does not allow for the development of this interpretation here, I suggest that the following Yom Kippur motifs have exercised an influence on the parable: (1) The choice of *goats* (while ἔριφος and ἐρίφιον technically mean "kid" [Matt 25:32–33], Josephus uses ἔριφος to refer to the scapegoat [*Ant.* 3.240–41], and Jubilees's refers to the Yom Kippur goat as "kid," as based upon ἔριφος from Gen 37:31 [Jub. 34.12, 18]), (2) the imagery of two *lots* (Matt 25:32–33; Lev 16:8–10), (3) the *casting-out* of the goats (Matt 25:41; Lev 16:21–22), (4) the language of "cursedness" (Matt 25:41; Philo, *Spec*. 1.888; Barn. 7.9; Tertullian, *Marc*. 3.7.7), and (5) the influence of Azazel traditions on Matt 25:41.

CHAPTER FOUR:

THE KINGLY CURSE-BEARING SCAPEGOAT (MATT 27:27–31)

In the previous chapter, I argued that Matthew crafts a typological correspondence between Jesus and Barabbas and the two goats of the Day of Atonement in the narrative of the Passover amnesty custom (Matt 27:15–26). In lottery fashion, Pilate presents two figures identical in appearance to the crowd: Jesus Barabbas, the scapegoat, is released living, and Jesus the messiah, the immolated goat, is selected to be put to death. But this typology leaves the reader wondering: does Matthew conceive Jesus only as the goat for Yahweh, or does he also understand Jesus to be the sin-bearing goat for Azazel?

In his account of Jesus's mockery and abuse by the Roman auxiliary troops (Matt 27:27–31),[1] the evangelist's community perceives "a deeper, ironic truth: by his death-resurrection, Jesus indeed becomes divine cosmocrator, receiving the worship

---

1. The parallels are Mark 15:16–20; Luke 23:11; John 19:2–5. Matt 27:27–31 fulfills Jesus's third passion predication (Matt 20:19). Whereas Luke relocates the soldiers' mockery to the trial before Herod Antipas (Luke 23:11) and abbreviates the scene, Matthew follows his Markan *Vorlage* closely (Mark 15:16–20). Davies and Allison identify a redactional chiasmus in Matt 27:27–31, with χαῖρε, βασιλεῦ τῶν Ἰουδαίων at the center (*Matthew*, 3:597). The placement of the κάλαμος in "in his right hand" underscores Jesus's kingship, and Matthew's repetition of ἐμπαίζω highlights his mockery (Matt 27:29). The evangelist edits the content of Mark 15:17–19 so as to circumscribe neatly the royal mockery to Mat 27:29 and the physical abuse to Matt 27:30, whereas these are intertwined in Mark 15:17–19. Matthew uniquely refers to the Roman guard as οἱ στρατιῶται τοῦ ἡγεμόνος (Matt 27:27). These soldiers are "auxiliary troops who were recruited from the non-Jewish population in Palestine, and they probably belong to the cohort permanently stationed in Jerusalem" (Luz, *Matthew*, 3:513). The location is the πραιτώριον, the headquarters and secondary residence of the provincial governor (Adela Yarbro Collins, *Mark: A Commentary*, Hermeneia [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007], 725). Σπεῖρα is a tenth part of a legion (about 600 men), although the number varied (BDAG, s.v. "σπεῖρα"). The evangelist prefers the title ἡγεμών for Pilate (Matt 27:2, 11, 14, 15, 21, 27; 28:14), probably because it highlights the irony that the Son of Man, who will at his parousia judge "all the nations" (Matt 25:31–32), willingly submits himself to the provisional jurisdiction of the earthy sovereign (cf. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:579). Matthew uniquely states that the soldiers συνήγαγον ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν ὅλην τὴν σπεῖραν (Matt 27:27). This image recalls the riotous tumult of the crowd gathered before Pilate. Matthew changes Mark's πορφύρα (Mark 15:17) to a χλαμύς κοκκίνη (Matt 27:28), adds that the troops first "stripped" (ἐκδύσαντες) Jesus of his clothes (Matt 27:28), and modifies the language of the ἀκάνθινος στέφανος placed upon Jesus's head (Matt 27:29).

of both Jews and Gentiles."[2] But what has rarely been considered is whether, in this dark burlesque episode, Matthew narrates not only Jesus's royal *inauguration* but also his cultic *elimination* as a typological fulfillment of the Yom Kippur scapegoat. If in the immediately prior episode (Matt 27:15–26), the gospel writer designates Jesus as the immolated goat of Leviticus 16, then one should not be surprised to find a parallel scapegoat Christology in the curent scene. Such a dual typology fits Matthean style,[3] and it structurally corresponds to Leviticus 16, which first describes the rite of the goat for Yahweh (Lev 16:15–20) and then the rite of the goat for Azazel (Lev 16:21–22).[4]

I am not the first to posit a scapegoat typology in the Roman-abuse scene.[5] In fact, the evangelist may already intimate a scapegoat typology in the temptation narrative (Matt 4:1–11) and Jesus's saying over the cup (Matt 26:28).[6] Nevertheless, the unproductive quest for the *Religionsgeschichte* of the Roman-abuse scene has hindered commentators from seriously considering the influence of Yom Kippur on Matt 27:27–31. Once it is established that the strongest cultural resonance of the abuse scene is the widespread ancient practice of "elimination" or "curse-transmission" rituals, as some Markan scholars have recognized, the Matthean redaction is illuminated as an attempt to assimilate the account to the most famous

---

2. Meier, *Matthew*, 345.

3. Examples of Matthean doublets include Matt 8:28 (cf. Mark 5:2); Matt 9:27–28; 20:30 (cf. Mark 10:46); Matt 21:2, 7 (cf. Mark 11:2, 7); Matt 26:60 (cf. Mark 14:57). See further, Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:87.

4. See Chapter Two.

5. Barn. 7.9–11; Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 40.4–5; Tertullian, *Marc.* 3.7; *Adv. Jud.* 14.9–10; Hippolytus, *Frag.* 75; Crossan, *Cross that Spoke*, 114–59; Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 220–30; Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 170; Maclean, "Barabbas," 332–33; Orlov, *Atoning Dyad*, 63–64; Eberhart, "To Atone or Not to Atone," 230–31. See Chapters One and Two.

6. Hamilton, *Death of Jesus*, 221. See Chapter Five.

elimination ritual in Second Temple Judaism, namely, the Day of Atonement.

## The Cultural Background of Jesus's Roman Mockery Reconsidered

Raymond Brown summarizes the four cultural backgrounds that scholars have typically proposed for the scene of Jesus's mockery: (A) ancient games, (B) theatrical mimes, (C) historical incidents, and (D) carnival festivals.[7] Few scholars have critically examined these proposals since Brown's *Death of the Messiah*, and no consensus has been reached on the issue.[8] As I aim to demonstrate below, each background is problematic as a singular cultural touchstone for the gospel scene.

## A. Ancient Games

The closest proposed game of mockery is a Hellenistic game called βασιλίνδα, in which a person playing "king" issues commands that must be obeyed by all playmates.[9] But the play king was neither mocked, humiliated, nor abused during the game, and Jesus pronounces no such commands in the gospel narrative.[10] There is

---

7. Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 1:874–77. I have changed Brown's order to fit the purposes of this study.

8. Brown's analysis suffers from an in-depth engagement with most of the primary sources undergirding these proposals, and hence, he does not draw a firm conclusion on the issue: "The parallels establish verisimilitude. The content of what is described in the Gospels about the Roman mockery is not implausible, whether historical or not" (*Death of the Messiah*, 1:877).

9. Pollux (*Onom.* 9.110) describes the game as follows: βασιλίνδα μὲν οὖν ἐστιν ὅταν διακληρωθέντες ὁ μὲν βασιλεύς τις ὢν τάττῃ τὸ πρακτέον, ὁ δ' ὑπηρέτης εἶναι λαχὼν πᾶν τὸ ταχθὲν ὑπεκπονῇ (text from Guiliemus Dindorfius, *Julii Pollucis, Onomasticon: Vol. 1*, [Leipzig: Kuehniana, 1924], 189). According to Herodotus (*Hist.* 1.114), King Cyrus of Persia played some such game as a child, and when one of his playmates failed to comply with Cyrus's orders, that playmate was scourged. The possible reference to the game in Horace (*Carm.* 1.4) is too brief to be helpful.

10. Luz remarks that the game "has nothing to do with such malicious mocking scenes" (*Matthew*, 3:513 n. 12). As a second example of games of mockery, Brown mentions the (ca. 225 CE)

scant proof, moreover, that βασιλίνδα was a well known game in first-century Syro-Palestine.[11]

## B. Theatrical Mimes

There is little evidence for the ancient practice of theatrical mimes resembling the mockery of Jesus.[12] P. Oxy 413 contains a burlesque of a drunk king and his entourage, but it hardly resembles the gospel episode.[13] Scholars sometimes assume that mime actors would commonly mock kings by dressing in royal garb, but there is little data to support this claim.[14] Political rulers could be the object of jest or

Roman graffito of a crucified donkey being worshipped by the Christian Alexamenos (*Death of the Messiah*, 1:875).

11. The letter β discovered on the limestone pavement of the Antonia in Jerusalem may suggest that the game was played there (Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 1:875; Max Küchler, *Jerusalem: Ein Handbuch und Studienreiseführer zur Heiligen Stadt* [OLB 4.2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014] 276–67), but recent research suggests that (1) this pavement probably dates to the second-century CE, (2) there is "no firm archaeological connection between the Antonia Fortress and Pilate's praetorium," and, (3) though the precise site of the praetorium is debated, its likeliest location remains Herod's palace, not the Antonia (Helen K. Bond, "Praetorium," in *Encyclopedia of the Historical Jesus*, ed. Craig A. Evans [New York: Routledge: 2008] 460–61).

12. Philo compares the Alexandrian mocking of Agrippa I to theatrical mimes (*Flacc*. 38), but this is probably a general comparison, not a reference to a specific subgenre of "royal mime" (so J. Geffcken, "Die Verhöhnung Christi durch die Kriegsknechte," *Hermes* 41 [1906]: 220–29, at 228). Philo also reports Gaius's peculiar penchant for mime (*Legat*. 78–113; cf. *Legat*. 42, 359), on which, see T. P. Wiseman, "'Mime' and 'Pantomine': Some Problematic Texts," in *New Directions in Ancient Pantomime*, ed. Edith Hall and Rosie Wyles (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008) 146–53, at 150–51.

13. See lines 66–106. P.Oxy. 413 contains a Greek play set on the coastland of India, where the heroine Charition is delivered into the hands of a barbarian ruler but is rescued when her comrades intoxicate him and escape. But the barbarian ruler already is a king, he is not dressed in artificial royal apparel, and he is not physically abused. For the text, see Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri: Part III* (Oxford: Horace Hart, 1898), 44–57. On common themes in Greco-Roman mime, see Robert L. Maxwell, "The Documentary Evidence for Ancient Mime" (PhD diss., University of Toronto, 1993), 19–21, 24–53. For recent bibliography, see Costas Panayotakis, "Hellenistic Mime and its Reception in Rome," *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Comedy*, ed. Michael Fontaine and Adele C. Scafuro (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014) 378–96, at 393–96.

14. E.g., Craig S. Keener, *The IVP Bible Background Commentary*, 2nd ed. (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2014), 303; idem, *Matthew*, 674 and n. 198. In regards to the examples Keener provides, the Interview with Flaccus (P.Oxy. 1089) and Dio Cassius's (64.20–21) account of Vitellius's

imitation in Roman mime, yet such instantiations of royal mime faintly resemble the scene of Jesus's mockery.[15]

## C. Historical Incidents

Some scholars identify the closest parallel as the Karabas episode reported by Philo in his treatise on the Alexandrian Jewish pogrom of 38 CE, *Against Flaccus*.[16] When Herod Agrippa I, the newly-appointed king of Judaea, made a brief visit to the city of Alexandria, a Gentile mob reportedly dragged a lunatic named Karabas into a gymnasium, gave him the royal insignia, and mocked him as their "Lord."[17] In a

---

humiliating death do not involve theatrical mime, and Plutarch's (*Pomp.* 24.7–8) report about the Mediterranean pirates does not involve royal mime. The Acts of Paul and Antoninus (col. 1) allude to a royal mime performed in Alexandria in the early second century CE, but no details of the mime are reported (see below).

15. Elaine Fantham and Costas Panayotakis, "Mime," in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, ed. Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth, 4th ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 955–56, at 956. The mime writer Laberius famously uttered a veiled critique of Caesar's dictatorship before Julius himself (Seneca, *Ira* 2.11.3; Seneca, *Controv.* 7.3.9; Suetonius, *Jul.* 39.3; Macrobius, *Sat.* 2.3.10). Cicero (*Fam.* 34 = 7.11) playfully warned his friend, the jurist Trebatius, that mimes might be written about him. Another mime mocked Marcus Aurelius for advancing his wife's secret lovers to offices of honor (*Hist. Aug.* 4.29.1–3). Suetonius (*Vesp.* 19) reports that the mime actor Favor enacted episodes from Vespasian's life at his funeral. *Hist. Aug.* 1.5.7 relays that Verus became an object for ridicule on the stage in Antioch. Maxwell ("Ancient Mime," 246) notes a possible mime of Tiberius as well.

16. E.g., Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:599. Luz identifies it is the second closest parallel (*Matthew*, 3:514).

17. "Together they drove this poor man into the gymnasium and placed him there on a platform so that he could be seen by everyone. On his head [αὐτοῦ τῇ κεφαλῇ] they spread out a piece of papyrus for a diadem [διαδήματος] and clothed the rest of his body with a doormat for a robe [χλαμύδος]; and someone who had seen a small piece of native papyrus lying on the street, gave it to him for a sceptre [σκήπτρου]. And when, as in theatrical mimes [ὡς ἐν θεατρικοῖς μίμοις], he had been dressed up like a king and received the insignia of kingship, young men, bearing sticks on their shoulders as if they were carrying spears, stood on either side of him in imitation of bodyguards. Then others approached him, some as if to salute him, others as if to plead their cause before him, again others as if to consult him about the affairs of the state. Then there arose a strange shout from among the multitude of those standing around him: They called him 'Marin' — which is said to be the word for 'Lord' [κύριον] in Syriac — for they knew that Agrippa not only was by birth a Syrian but also ruled as a king [ἐβασίλευε] over a great part of Syria" (Philo, *Flacc.* 37–39 [Colson]; my modified translation from Pieter Willem van der Horst, *Philo's Flaccus: The First Pogrom: Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, PACS 2 [Leiden: Brill, 2003], 61.

manner similar to Jesus, Karabas is crowned, robed, given a scepter, and hailed as king. Hermann Reich argued that the "biblical mocking scene and the Alexandrian mock- and mime-scene are identical," positing that the Karabas episode comprised a well-known mime against the Jews that was later applied to Jesus.[18]

The problem with this widely-held assumption is that there is no extant independent testimony of such a royal mime. It has been suggested that the same mime is presupposed in the Acts of Paul and Antoninus, a document recounting a conflict between Jewish and Gentile Alexandrians following the 115–117 CE uprisings.[19] This text states that Lupus, the prefect of Alexandra, ordered the mockery of a Jewish "king."[20] Unfortunately, what exactly this mime entailed and whether it resembled the Karabas episode entirely alludes us. If extant literature is to be our guide, it seems that the Karabas event was a *sui generis* instantiation of royal mime.

---

18. Hermann Reich, "Der König mit der Dornenkrone," *NJahrb* 7 (1904): 705–33, at 728; see esp. 726–33. Cf. idem, *Der Mimus: Ein litterar-entwickelungsgeschichtlicher Versuch* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1903). Reich argues that the Roman soldiers became familiar with the mime of the Jewish king in Caesarea, where Pilate's headquarters were stationed, noting that the *Expositio totius mundi et gentium* mentions the prevalence of pantomime in Caesarea ("Der König," 730). Yet this evidence is late (fourth-century CE), and the Caesarea in view here is probably Caesarea Philippi, not Caesarea Maritima (*Expositio totius mundi et gentium* 159–63). Much of the evidence Reich references in his article exceedingly postdates the Gospel ("Der König," esp. 711–25). Prior to Reich, Paul Wendland had noted the parallel between *Flacc.* 36–39 and Matt 27:27–31 // Mark 15:16–20, though the first discovery is usually attributed to Hugo Grotius in the early seventeenth century ("Jesus als Saturnalien-Koenig," *Hermes* 33 [1989]: 175–79, at 175–76).

19. E.g., Herbert Box, *Philonis Alexandrini: In Flaccum* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1939), 92; Herbert A. Musurillo, *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs: Acta Alexandrinorum* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1954), 248; Yarbro Collins, "Mark's Interpretation," 552. The comments of these scholars might lead one to assume that these two events were identical, yet such a claim is conjectural. Musurillo argues that the text describes a Jewish embassy before Hadrian around 119–120 CE (*Pagan Martyrs*, 181–83). For text and translation, see Musurillo, *Acts of the Pagan Martyrs*, 49–59, 179–94; Victor A. Tcherikover and Alexander Fuks, *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum: Volume 2* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960), 87–107.

20. "Paulus (spoke) about the king, how they brought him forth and (mocked him?) [ἐτοσα(...)]; and Theon read the edict of Lupus ordering them to lead him forth for Lupus to make fun of the king in the stage-mime [χλευάζων τὸν ἀπὸ (σ)κνῆς καὶ ἐκ μίμου βασιλέα]" (Musurillo, *Acts of the Pagan Martyrs*, 49, 57). On the possible identification of this "king" as the Jewish revolutionary leader, Lukuas, see Tcherikover and Alexander Fuks, *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*, 95.

Besides, there are significant differences between the Jesus and Karabas accounts.[21]

The mockery of Jesus eventuates in death, while Karabas is released living.[22] Violent

abuse accompanies Jesus's mockery, whereas Karabas is not physically harmed.[23] In

Philo the imitator (i.e., Karabas) is distinct from the person imitated (i.e., Agrippa I).[24]

And the Alexandrian mime is directed at one who already is king, while the soldiers'

mock a claimant to the throne.[25] Though the Karabas affair illumines the mimic and

perhaps theatrical quality of Jesus's mockery, it cannot be used to establish a

"traditional topos of royal mocking," in which to situate the scene.[26]

Other historical incidents, such as the Palestinian soldiers' mockery of Agrippa

I,[27] and the Mediterranean pirates' charade of their prisoners,[28] offer little by way of

---

21. The following scholars critique the Karabas episode as a cultural parallel to Jesus's Roman mockery: Wendland, "Jesus als Saturnalien-Koenig," 176; Hans Vollmer, "Der König," *ZNW* 6 (1905): 194–98, at 197; Geffcken, "Die Verhöhnung Christi," 228; Karl Kastner, "Christi Dornenkrönung und Verspottung durch die römische Soldateska," *BZ* 6 (1908): 378–92, at 384–85; Theodor Birt, "Zum Königsmimus," *Phil* 77 (1921): 427–28, at 428; Box, *Philonis Alexandrini*, 91–92; Maclean, "Barabbas," 332–33.

22. Wendland, "Jesus als Saturnalien-Koenig," 176; Vollmer, "Der König," 197.

23. Kastner, "Christi Dornenkrönung," 384; Birt, "Zum Königsmimus," 428; so also Crossan, *Cross that Spoke*, 140; Maclean, "Barabbas," 333. Though the beating of the bald-headed *stupidus* was a common trope in Greco-Roman mime, and though imitative violence was not uncommon either (Maxwell, "Ancient Mime," 6, 10–11), actual violence appears to have been unordinary and shocking in ancient mime. Lucian (*Salt.*, 83–84) reports a case in which a pantomime lost his wits during a performance and began beating another actor on stage, causing his audience to think he had lost his mind. A famous mime was performed before Caligula in 41 CE, in which a brigand named Laureolus was captured and faux-crucified on stage with the use of fake blood (Josephus, *Ant.* 19.94; Juvenal, *Sat.* 8.187–88; Suetonius, *Cal.* 57). Martial (*Ep.* 9 [7]) may indicate that an actual criminal was crucified on stage at a later performance of the mime, but this would be an exceptional occurrence.

24. Geffcken, "Die Verhöhnung Christi," 228.

25. Birt, "Zum Königsmimus," 428.

26. So Koester, *Gospels*, 225. Cf. Crossan, *Cross that Spoke*, 139–40.

27. Josephus, *Ant.* 19.356–59. Following the death of Agrippa I, soldiers from Caesarea and Samaria reportedly stole images of the king's daughters, propped them up in brothels to defame them, and celebrated Agrippa's death by wearing garlands, pouring libations, and exchanging public toasts. Ulrich Luz claims to be "historically the closest parallel" to Jesus's abuse (*Matthew*, 3:513). But except for the theme of royal mockery, there is no significant similarity between this occasion and the gospel episode

28. Plutarch, *Pomp.* 24.7–8. Here a band of pirates reportedly ridiculed their prisoners in a

parallels to the gospel scene.

## D. Carnival Festivals

Paul Wendland proposed the background of the Roman Saturnalia, a joyous feast beginning on 17 December, in which the Roman military participated,[29] and during which the social order was inverted and a mock king chosen to rule temporally over the festivities.[30] Wendland cites the Martyrdom of Dasius, which recounts how the Christian martyr Dasius declined the honor of playing the mock king, whose alleged duty was to don the royal attire, participate in debauchery, and immolate himself with a sword.[31] Unfortunately, the Saturnalian king's death is not attested elsewhere in antiquity, and the Martyrdom of Dasius is a late witness.[32]

Hans Vollmer argued that the Mesopotamian Sacaean festival was absorbed into the Saturnalia and in turn influenced the gospel episode.[33] The third-century BCE Babylonian historian Berossus reported that masters were ruled by their slaves during this celebration, one of whom donned kingly attire and held authority over the household.[34] According to Dio Chrysostom (ca. 100 CE), "they take one of their

---

theatrical manner.

29. Livy, 22.1.20; Cicero, *Att*. 5.20.5.

30. Lucian, *Sat*. 2; Athenaeus, *Deipn*. 14.639b–640a; Seneca, *Apol*. 8; Epictetus, *Diatr*. 1.25.8; Tacitus, *Ann*. 13.15; Lucian, *Sat*. 2–4, 9. Wendland, "Jesus als Saturnalien-Koenig," 176–79; John Scheld, "Saturnus, Saturnalia," in *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 1322. On the related Roman Kronia festival, see Porphyry, *Abst*. 2.54, 56.

31. See lines 1–20 in Herbert Musurillo, *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972), 272–73.

32. Musurillo, *Acts of the Christian Martyrs*, xl–xli.

33. Vollmer, "Der König," 195–98.

34. Athenaeus, *Deipn*. 14.639c.

prisoners... who has been condemned to death, set him upon the king's throne, give him the royal apparel, and permit him to give orders, to drink and carouse, and to dally with the royal concubines during those days, and no one prevents his doing anything he pleases. But after that they strip and scourge him and then hang him."[35] This report parallels Jesus's mockery in several remarkable ways. Yet Karl Kastner rightly noticed that Jesus is not granted all the royal liberties of the Sacaean king,[36] and Dio Chrysostom is the only known witness to the slaughter of the royal pretender.

## Conclusion

The four of the backgrounds that scholars have typically proposed for the scene of Jesus's mockery have significant problems. The trend has been to locate the scene within a narrow cultural circumscription, but in each case there is either not enough evidence to establish the widespread knowledge or practice of the given cultural phenomenon, or the parallels are simply superficial, incomplete, or not strong enough to posit direct influence. In more recent years, since Brown's summative *Death of the Messiah*, Markan scholars have suggested that the abuse scene finds its strongest cultural resonance in the widespread ancient practice of "elimination" or "curse-transmission" rituals. As Laurence Wills suggests, such curse-transmission rituals may actually underly both the Karabas episode and the aforementioned carnival festivals, which would explain their shared points of similarity with the gospel scene.[37]

---

35. *4 Regn*. 4.67 (Cohoon).

36. Kastner, "Christi Dornenkrönung," 386. See Strabo, *Geogr*. 11.8.4–5.

37. Lawrence M. Wills, *The Quest for the Historical Gospel: Mark, John, and the Origins of the Gospel Genre* (London: Routledge, 1997), 37.

## Jesus's Roman Abuse as Ancient Elimination Rite

Though varying in form, elimination rituals in Mesopotamian, Hittite, Jewish, and Hellenistic religions share a common function: the transfer of a community's evil onto a subject and the expulsion of that subject from the community, thereby "eliminating" the evil.[38] The notion of transference is a key feature of such rites, and so the discriptor "curse-transmission" is also appropriate.[39] McLean, Adela Yarbro Collins, and Richard DeMaris independently argue that Mark 15 draws upon what I here refer to as "elimination ritual praxis." McLean writes, "Like many expulsion victims, Christ was given a special meal in preparation for his death (the Last Supper), was flagellated and invested with special garments... Finally, Jesus was expelled from society by being condemned as a criminal, by the betrayal and denial of his closest

---

38. These rituals are called by different names, such as scapegoat rituals (Burkert, Bremmer), elimination rituals (Wright), curative-exit rites (DeMaris), curse-transmission rituals (Finland), apotropaeic rites (McLean), and substitution rituals (Bottéro, Yarbro Collins). Here my intent is to focus on the similarities, not the differences, between these various rituals. See Hans Martin Kümmel, "Ersatzkönig und Sündenbock," *ZAW* 80 (1968): 289–318; Walter Burkert, "Transformations of the Scapegoat," in *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual* (Berkley: University of California Press, 1979), 59–77; Wright, *Disposal of Impurity*; Hughes, "Pharmakos," 139–65; Jean Bottéro, "The Substitute King and His Fate," in *Mesopotamia: Writing, Reasoning, and the Gods*, trans. Zainab Bahrani and Marc van de Mieroop (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 138–55; McLean, "Apotropaeic Rituals," in *Cursed Christ*, 65–104; Finlan, "Curse Transmission Rituals and Paul's Imagery," in *Atonement Metaphors*, 73–121; DeMaris, "Jesus Jettisoned," 91–111; Bremmer, "Scapegoat between Northern Syria," 169–214.

39. "It was thought, in fact, that evil, either actual or promised and predicted, could be transferred from one individual to another, and could in some way shift its weight—as with a burden... this transfer of evil played a major role" (Bottéro, "Substitute King," 142). "Following the investiture, the evil or curse which threatened the people was ritually transferred to the victim; the imposition constituted the removal of the curse from the group" (McLean, "Apotropaeic Rituals," 74). "This motif [of transfer] is evident in rites where an evil of some sort is removed from the patient... and transferred to another object or living being which becomes the bearer of the impurity. The bear of impurity is usually then disposed of or banished in some way" (Wright, *Disposal of Impurity*, 32). "We have the same action pattern of selecting, adorning, and driving away, and the message communicated by the action pattern is identical: transference of evil, salvation of one's own side at the expense of the enemy's" (Burkert, "Scapegoat," 61). "What followed—beatings, stonings, cursings at the hands of the entire group—signaled and enacted not only the transfer of community ills to them but also their status degradation" (DeMaris, "Jesus Jettisoned," 106).

followers, and by being led in procession through the streets of Jerusalem to Golgotha outside the city walls."[40] According to Yarbro Collins, the "scene in which the soldiers mock Jesus seems to be a literary reconfiguration of the ritual in which the *pharmakos* takes on himself all the impurity, disease, and sin of the community."[41] For DeMaris, "If the opening and middle chapters of Mark describe a world infected by sickness and impurity, then the passion narrative presents the ritual solution to the crisis: the designation of Jesus, via rites of elevation and degradation, who will bear the land's illness away."[42] Martin Hengel and Lawrence Wills already gesture toward such an interpretation.[43] More recently, Jennifer Maclean and Candida Moss affirm an elimination-ritual background for the gospel scene.[44] Here, I advance this ritual understanding of Matthew's Roman-abuse narrative (Matt 27:27–31). In particular, there are five features that most elimination rituals share in common and are clearly evidenced in the gospel episode: (1) a crisis threatening a community, (2) the marginal status of the victim, usually a criminal or a king, (3) the designation and transformation of the victim, who is feasted, adorned, or invested with royal regalia, (4) the abuse of the victim, and (5) the victim's exit from the community.[45]

---

40. McLean, "Apotropaeic Rituals," 105.

41. Yarbro Collins, "Finding Meaning," 194–95.

42. DeMaris, "Jesus Jettisoned," 108.

43. Martin Hengel, *The Atonement: The Origins and the Doctrine in the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981), 19–32 (though Hengel does not draw an explicit connection to Mark 15); Wills, *Quest for the Historical Gospel*, 37.

44. McLean, "Apotropaeic Rituals," 105; Maclean, "Barabbas," 333; Candida R. Moss, *The Other Christs: Imitating Jesus in Ancient Christian Ideologies of Martyrdom* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 185, 233.

45. See the similar taxonomy of DeMaris, "Jesus Jettisoned," 98.

A Threatening Crisis and the Victim's Marginal Status (1 & 2)

A plague, pollution, or portent threatening a community was usually the occasion for an elimination ritual. Such a threat would be transferred onto a ritual victim, who must be or represent a high-ranking member of society.[46] While in literary myths a king or noble could play the part, in actual practice marginal figures of society, usually prisoners or criminals, were designated for the task.[47] Yarbro Collins draws a parallel to Hittite king substitution rites, dating from the mid to late second-millenium BCE.[48] According to Jean Bottéro, the function of the substitute king was "to take upon himself and to draw upon himself the evil fate that threatened his master."[49] In one rite, a "healthy prisoner" was designated for the task.[50] In neo-Assyrian substitution rituals (ca. seventh century BCE), a naive simpleton or "ordinary subject ... whose fate really could not be of interest to anyone" was the typical substitute.[51] Several Hellenistic authors report that a Babylonian prisoner performed this rite on

46. Bremmer, "Scapegoat," 181.

47. Burkert, "Scapegoat," 65; Bremmer, "Scapegoat," 181–82. Bremmer writes: "When a catastrophe can be averted from the community by the death of one of its members, such a member must naturally be a very valuable one ... In real life, during the annual scapegoat ritual, there was of course little chance that the king (if any) would sacrifice himself or his children. Here, society chose one of its marginals" (ibid., 181). Bremmer provides a list of those marginal figures who could function as a *pharmakos*: "criminals, slaves, ugly persons, strangers, young men and women, and a king ... All these categories have in common that they are situated at the margin of Greek society" (ibid., 179–180). On the selection of elimination-rite victims, see Bottéro, "Substitute King," 147–48; Burkert, "Scapegoat," 67; McLean, "Apotropaeic Rituals," 73–74.

48. Yarbro Collins, "Finding Meaning," 181–82.

49. Bottéro, "Substitute King," 150.

50. James B. Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts: Relating to the Old Testament*, 3rd ed. with supp. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969), 355.

51. Bottéro, "Substitute King," 147. See Simo Parpola, *Letters from Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars*, SAA 10 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2014), 352 (henceforth *LABS*; I use the text number, not the page number, in my references to *LABS*).

behalf of Alexander the Great when omens had portended his death.[52] At the Sacaean festival, the king's alleged substitute was "one of the prisoners condemned to death."[53]

Yarbro Collins also compares the gospel scene to the *pharmakos* rite, the Greek equivalent of the scapegoat ritual, celebrated at the Thargelia festival of Apollo, intended to divert catastrophe from the community.[54] In the first century CE, it is reported that a slave functioned as *pharmakos* in Abdera,[55] and that "one of the poor" (*unus se ex pauperibus*) became ritual victim in Massilia.[56] The Leucadians chose a "criminal,"[57] and the Athenian *pharmakoi* were individuals that were "exceedingly sordid, poor, and useless."[58] In *Oedipus Rex*, the beloved king of Thebes unwittingly fulfills a prophecy that he would murder his father and sleep with his mother, thus drawing the wrath of the gods upon the city and requiring Oedipus to become "the criminal who must be expelled like a *pharmakos* so that the town can regain its purity and be saved."[59]

---

52. Plutarch, *Alex*. 73; Diod. Sic. 17.116; Arrian, *Anab*. 24.

53. τῶν δεσμωτῶν ἕνα τῶν ἐπὶ θανάτῳ; Dio Chrysostom, *4 Regn*. 4.67 (Cohoon). Bottéro is unsure whether the "Sacaean" rite reported by Dio Chrysostom should be equated with the neo-Assyrian king substitution ritual ("Substitute King," 139–40, 150). Regardless of whether the rituals should be equated, the influence of the substitution king ritual on Dio Chrysostom's account of the Sacaea seems obvious.

54. Burkert, "Scapegoat," 64; Yarbro Collins, "Finding Meaning," 182–87.

55. Diegesis on Callimachus, *Aetia* 90.

56. Petronius, *Frag*. 1 (Rouse and Warmington). The account derives from a first-century BCE or first-century CE summary of a work of the Greek poet Callimachus (third century BCE). Hughes finds the information from the Diegesis to be historically trustworthy on the whole ("Pharmakos," 157).

57. τινα τῶν ἐν αἰτίαις ὄντων; Strabo, *Geogr*. (Henderson).

58. λίαν ἀγεννεῖς καὶ πένητας καὶ ἀχρήστους; scholia on Aristophanes, *Eq*. 1136c (text from W. J. W. Koster, *Scholia in Aristophanem: Pars I* [Groningen, Netherlands: Wolters-Noordhoff N.V., 1969], 243).

59. Yarbro Collins, "Finding Meaning," 186. In the first century CE, Paterculus relates the well-known tale of Codrus, the last Athenian king, who, "laying aside his kingly robes and donning the garb of a shepherd, made his way into the camp of the enemy, deliberately provoked a quarrel, and was slain without being recognized," thereby saving Athens from defeat (*Hist*. 1.2.1 [Shipley]; cf. Lycurgus, *Leoc*. 83–87). In Rome, Publius Decius, having donned a purple toga, sacrificed his life for his troops

The Victim's Designation and Transformation (3)

The ritual designee undergoes a transformation of status, being feasted, adorned, or invested with royal regalia.[60] According to McLean, "Such rites serve to mark the victim's transformation from a previously 'normal' state to a new status, that of consecrated substitutionary victim."[61] Victims were decorated before their banishment in Hittite rites of disposal.[62] In the Pulisa ritual, when the king's army was stricken with plague, two prisoners and animals were elaborately dressed, the man attired with the king's clothing and the animals with earrings and wool, and they were sent bearing the infirmity into enemy territory.[63] In the ritual of Ashella, a ram was beautifully adorned: "Blue wool, red wool, green wool, black wool, and white wool they twine together. They make it as a wool crown. They put it on the head of the ram. The ram they drive forth to the road of the enemy."[64] Such thread manipulation "concretized" the evil transferred onto the victim.[65]

In neo-Assyria, the substitute king was seated on the king's throne,[66] "treated

---

in an act of *devotio* "to turn aside destruction [*pestem*] from his people and bring it on their adversaries" (Livy 8.9.11 [Foster]).

60. Burkert describes this stages as "rites of communication, especially offering food, and adornment, or investiture" ("Scapegoat," 67). McLean refers to it as "consecration" and "investiture" ("Apotropaeic Rituals," 74). For DeMaris, this is the first part of the "ritual response" to the group crisis, wherein the designee localizes the pollution and/or marshals supernatural power ("Jesus Jettisoned," 98).

61. McLean, "Apotropaeic Rituals," 74.

62. Wright, *Disposal of Impurity*, 45–60

63. Ibid., 45–47.

64. Ibid., 50–51, 55–56.

65. Ibid., 41–42. A similar practice is attested in the neo-Assyrian substitute king ritual, where the omens are written down and bound in the hem of the substitute's garment (*LABS* 12).

66. *LABS* 14, 25, 90, 189, 219, 240, 350, 351, 377.

with wine, washed with water and anointed with oil,"[67] and given the king's clothes, golden necklace, and sceptre.[68] The Babylonian prisoner, wanting to deliver Alexander from his portended death, "went to the royal chair, put on the royal dress and bound his head with the diadem, then seated himself upon the chair and remained quiet."[69] The Sacaean prisoner was seated "upon the king's throne" and given "the royal apparel."[70] In Massilia, the *pharmakos* was "fed for an entire year out of public funds on food of special purity. After this he was decked with sacred herbs and sacred robes [*vestibus sacris*]."[71] He enjoyed "a rich banquet" and was "fed to the full" in Abdera,[72] and in Ionia he was feasted with "dried figs, barley cake, and cheese."[73]

### The Victim's Abuse and Exit from the Community (4 & 5)

The victim is physically abused and then exits the community.[74] The neo-Assyrian substitute king, having absorbed the portended evils,[75] finally "went to his fate" and

---

67. *LABS* 2.

68. *LABS* 189.

69. Diodorus Siculus, 17.116 (Welles); so also Plutarch, *Alex*. 73.

70. Dio Chrysostom, *4 Regn*. 4.67 (Cohoon).

71. Petronius, *Frag*. 1 [Rouse and Warmington]. Similarly, see scholia on Aristophanes, *Eq*. 1136a.

72. Diegesis on Callimachus, *Aetia* 90 (Gelzer and Whitman).

73. Hipponax, *Frag*. 6–10 (Gerber). Hipponax's (sixth century BCE) report is contained in the work of the twelfth century CE Byzantine scholar, Johannes Tzetzes. For methodological reasons, I refrain from using Tzetzes's own description of the *pharmakos* here (Hughes, "Pharmakos," 141–49). On a different note, Oedipus and Codrus undergo no status transformation, since they are already kings. The plebeian Publius Decius, however, dons a magistrate's toga before his saving act (Livy, 8.9.11.).

74. Following Bruce J. Malina and Jerome H. Neyrey (*Calling Jesus Names: The Social Value of Labels in Matthew* [Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1988], 51, 88–91), DeMaris refers to this aspect of the *pharmakos* rite as a "status degradation ritual" ("Jesus Jettisoned," 93–95, 106).

75. *LABS* 2, 240, 351.

was killed on behalf of the king.[76] The threatening omens were disposed in the underworld when the substitute was buried in a tomb, a priest reciting, "your evils with [you] take down [....] to the Land of No Return."[77] The Sacaean substitute was stripped, scourged, and then hung.[78]

In Abdera, the *pharmakos* was stoned and chased away.[79] The victim in Massilia "would be led through the whole state while people cursed him, in order that the sufferings of the whole state might fall upon him; and so he was cast out."[80] According to Hipponax, the *pharmakos* in Ionia became "withered from hunger" and was then beaten and flogged with fig branches and squill.[81] He was apparently burned with "unprofitable wood" (ξύλοις ἀκάρποις) in another tradition.[82] In Chaeronea, a servant personifying "Famine" was beaten with branches of the *agnus castus* while driven outside.[83] The *pharmakos* was often abused with unproductive plants such as these.[84] When Oedipus discovers that he has fulfilled the wretched prophecy, the king gouges out his eyes and then exits the city.[85]

---

76. *LABS* 314, 352, 353.

77. W. G. Lambert, "A Part of the Ritual for the Substitute King," *AfO* 18 (1957–1958): 109–12, at 110. See also *LABS* 3, 352.

78. ἀποδύσαντες καὶ μαστιγώσαντες ἐκρέμασαν; Dio Chrysostom, *4 Regn.* 4.67 (Cohoon).

79. Diegesis on Callimachus, *Aetia* 90.

80. Petronius, *Frag.* 1 (Rouse and Warmington).

81. βάλλοντες... καὶ ῥαπίζοντες κράδῃσι καὶ σκίλλῃσιν ὥσπερ φαρμακόν; *Frag.* 6, 10; cf. *Frag.* 5. Bremmer doubts the historical veracity of Hipponax's claim that the scapegoat was flogged upon the genitals (*Frag.* 10) ("Scapegoat," 176). Indeed, "Hipponax's information should be used with the utmost care" (ibid.).

82. Scholia on Aristophanes, *Ran.* 733a (text from W. J. W. Koster, *Scholia in Aristophanem: Pars IV* [Groningen, Netherlands: Bouma's Boekuis B.V., 1969], 891–92.).

83. Plutarch, *Mor.* 693e–694a.

84. Bremmer, "Scapegoat," 184–89. In Athens, the *pharmakoi* reportedly wore the marginal black or white figs around their necks (ibid., 188).

85. Sophocles, *Oed. tyr.* 1269–84.

The Roman-abuse Scene (Matt 27:27–31) as Elimination Ritual

These five common features of ancient elimination rituals are clearly evinced in Matt 27:27–31 (and Mark 15:16–20). First, Matthew portrays a world no less "infected by sickness and impurity" than Mark.[86] The reader knows from the first two chapters that sin is the reason for Israel's current state of exile and that Jesus is destined to save his people from this threatening force (cf. Matt 1:17, 21).[87] Second, "in the eyes of society, the status of Jesus is low."[88] He is a messiah abandoned by his disciples (Matt 26:56, 69–75), a prisoner falsely condemned to the shameful punishment of crucifixion (Matt 27:11–26), and a king unrecognized by his subjects (Matt 27:27–31; cf. 1:6; 2:2; 21:5; 25:31–46; 27:37, 42). Third, Jesus experiences a drastic alteration of status when the soldiers decorate and salute him as king (Matt 27:29). "From the point of view of the *pharmakos* ritual, his dress and treatment as a king make him a fit offering to redeem the people."[89] Fourth, the soldiers physically abuse Jesus by beating and spitting upon him (Matt 27:30).[90] According to Yarbro Collins, Jesus "is crowned with thorns, a wild plant which does not benefit society, analogous to the twigs of the wild fig tree with which the *pharmakos* is driven out."[91] The only imperfect verb in the account makes the beating particularly vivid: "And when they

---

86. DeMaris, "Jesus Jettisoned," 108.

87. For the theme of exile in the Gospel of Matthew, see Chapter One.

88. Yarbro Collins, "Finding Meaning," 186. I here utilize Yarbro Collins's work only insofar as it is also applicable to Matthew.

89. Yarbro Collins, "Finding Meaning," 187.

90. Spitting was a mode of transferring impurity in ancient Hittite elimination rites, as Wright states: "Transer may also be effected by the patient spitting his evil onto the bearer of impurity" (*Disposal of Impurity*, 34).

91. Yarbro Collins, "Finding Meaning," 186–87.

had spat upon him, they took the reed *and were beating him [ἔτυπτον] on his head*"
(Matt 27:30).[92] The redactional clause, "they gathered against him the entire cohort,"
also carries a violent connotation (Matt 27:27).[93] Fifth, the soldiers led Jesus outside
of the city, far away from the community that he dies to save (Matt 27:31).

To sum up, curse-transmission rites are well attested throughout a wide
geographical, cultural, and temporal range, and their unique characteristic traits are
evinced in Matt 27:27–31. According to Maclean, "Recognition of this background
challenges the assumption that the soldiers were mocking Jesus' claims to royalty;
instead their actions identify him as a scapegoat."[94] But it seems more likely that both
aspects are in view for Matthew. Through their mockery, the Gentiles unwittingly
inaugurate Jesus as cosmic lord. But this royal inauguration subversively entails a
cultic elimination. Jesus is not the type of ruler who "lords his power" over his subject
as the Gentiles do (Matt 20:25), but he is a king who serves others by "giving his life
as a ransom for many" (Matt 20:28). He is the cosmic ruler who sufferingly bears the
curses of the denizens of his own kingdom according to Matthew.

### Jesus's Scarlet Cloak and the Scapegoat's Garment of Transgressions

Several Matthean redactions are elucidated in light of this elimination-ritual
background and seem to betray an editorial intent to cast Jesus as the scapegoat of
Yom Kippur, the most famous elimination ritual in ancient Judaism. Matthew alters

---

92. Luz, *Matthew*, 3:515.

93. See συνάγω + ἐπί + accusative object in Gen 34:30; Josh 10:6; Ps 34:15; Hos 10:10; Hab
2:16; Isa 18:6; 29:7; Ezek 13:5; 16:37; 1 Macc 3:52; 10:61; cf. Acts 4:26, 27; Ps 2:2.

94. Maclean, "Barabbas," 333.

the color of the mantel with which the soldiers dress Jesus, changing Mark's "purple

garment" (πορφύρα, Mark 15:17) to a "scarlet cloak": "And when they had stripped

him, they placed around him a scarlet cloak [χλαμύδα κοκκίνην]" (Matt 27:28). The

strong royal association of πορφύρα perfectly fits the context of the mockery scene,[95]

so why does Matthew change the garment to χλαμὺς κοκκίνη?[96] The typical

explanation is that the evangelist changed the color to that of the ordinary soldier's

cloak for the sake of historically plausibility, since a robe colored with the very

expensive murex shellfish was not likely to have been available to the Roman

cohort.[97] But this explanation is inadequate for several reasons. First, as Stökl Ben

95. Meyer Reinhold, *History of Purple as a Status Symbol in Antiquity* (Bruxelles: Latomus, 1970), 48–61; Liza Cleland, Glenys Davies, and Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones, eds., *Greek and Roman Dress from A to Z* (London: Routledge 2007), 128, 150, 155–57; Graham Sumner, *Roman Military Dress* (Stroud, ENG: The History Press, 2009), 118. According to Sumner, "the association of... purple with the Imperial rank is well known and beyond any doubt" (ibid., 118). Markan scholars often note that πορφύρα in the gospel context ironically symbolizes Jesus's royalty (e.g., Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20*, WBC [Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2001], 490; John R. Donahue and Daniel J. Harrington, *The Gospel of Mark*, SP 2 [Collegesville, MN: Liturgical, 2002], 435). Mark's πορφύρα indicates a garment colored with the costly dye-producing murex shellfish, "famously used for the clothing of kings and emperors" (Cleland et al., *Greek and Roman Dress*, 157; see also 128, 150, 155–56). See Judg 8:26; Esth 8:15; 1 Macc 10:20; 11:58; 2 Macc 4.38; 2 Josephus, *Ant.* 11.256; *J.W.* 1.671; 7.124; Horace, *Carm.* 1.35.12; Strabo, *Geogr.* 14.1.3; Plutarch, *Demetr.* 41; Suetonius, *Nero* 25.1, 32.3; *Cal.* 35.1. For instance, Caligula reportedly put to death Ptolemy, son of king Juba, for entering the gladiatorial theater clad in a purple cloak (Suetonius, *Cal.* 35.1), and Nero purportedly placed a ban on the use of tyrian purple dye (Suetonius, *Nero* 32.3). In line with the observation that Mark's πορφύρα symbolizes royalty, Thomas E. Schmidt argues that the Markan episode recalls a Roman triumphal procession ("Mark 15.16–32: The Crucifixion Narrative and the Roman Triumphal Procession," *NTS* [1995]: 1–18). According to Yarbro Collins, this parallel "seems far-fetched" (*Mark*, 725).

96. According to James Yates and Wallace M. Lindsay, the χλαμύς was a woolen outer mantle that originated from Macedonia and Thessaly and was approximately the equivalent in form and function to the Roman *paludamentum*: "The *chlamys* as worn by youths, by soldiers, and by hunters, differed in colour and fineness, according to its destination, and the age and rank of the wearer" ("Chlamys," in *A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*, ed. William Smith, William Wayte, and G. E. Marindin, 2 vol., 3rd ed. [London: John Murray, 1901], 1:415–17). The χλαμύς was commonly worn by kings and commanders (2 Macc 12:35; Philo, *Flacc.* 37; *Legat.* 94; Josephus, *Ant.* 5.33; Appian, *Bel. civ.* 2.90).

97. E.g., Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:602; Nolland, *Gospel of Matthew*, 1182. Beare asserts that the χλαμύς κοκκίνη is "intended to represent a royal robe" (*Matthew*, 532; so also Hagner, *Matthew*, 2:831; Keener, *Matthew*, 675). But Richard Delbrueck disproves the assumption that κόκκινος could stand for royal purple ("Antiquarisches zu den Verspottungen Jesu," *ZNW* 41 [1942]: 124–45, at 132). Delbrueck speculates that the χλαμύς κοκκίνη was the cloak of a Roman lictor (ibid., 132–33). But how would Matthew know a lictor was present at the praetorium, and Matthew is not interested in exacting, trivial historical precision.

Ezra notes, a search for the phrase χλαμὺς κοκκίνη within the entire corpus of the TLG produces only Matthew 27:28 and its commentaries, making it "an exceptional combination of words."[98] The phrase χλαμὺς κοκκίνη is an unprecedented descriptor for a military cloak.[99] Second, despite the remarks of numerous commentators,[100] the typical cloak of ordinary soldiers in the early empire was not red but yellowish-brown, which obtained its color naturally from un-dyed wool.[101] Κόκκινος (*coccinus*), deriving from the egg sacks of the female kermes insect, which needed to be collected by the thousands, was also an expensive color, "second only to purple."[102] If his aim was historical plausibility, Matthew could have chosen a number of colors other than

---

98. Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 170; idem, "Fasting with Jews," 183. A search on 23 February 2018 for the lemata χλαμύς and κόκκινος within a range of five words of each other on the TLG confirms this finding, with one exception. In a depiction of Helios in the Mithras Liturgy, the phrase χλαμὺς κοκκίνη appears: "Then, when | you do this, you will see a youthful god, beautiful in appearance, with fiery hair, in a white tunic and a scarlet cloak [χλα|μύδι κοκκίνη], and wearing a fiery crown" (lines 635–39; Hans Dieter Betz, *The "Mithras Liturgy,"* STAC 18 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003], 54). But the final form of the Mithras Liturgy dates to the early fourth century CE (ibid., 9).

99. Yet one finds references to the royal purple *chlamys* (χλαμὺς ἀλουργής) in Plutarch, *Sera* 554b; Cassius Dio, 59.17.3; Herodian, 4.8.9.

100. E.g., Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 1:866; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 602; Keener, *Matthew*, 675.

101. Cleland et al., *Greek and Roman Dress*, 125, 164. Sumner remarks, "There is no clear pattern as to whom or why some soldiers wore certain cloak colours. A yellow-brown colour is by far the most common for both *paenula* and *sagum* style cloaks for officers and ordinary ranks but off-white, white, red and blue are also fairly well represented too" (*Roman Military Dress*, 118; see also 88, 112, 119–59). According to Sumner, the red cloak became more common for ordinary officers only in the later empire (ibid., 88). Pliny remarks that "the 'coccum' is specially reserved to colour the military cloaks of our generals" (*Nat.* 22.3), indicating that the *coccinus*/κόκκινος dye was not used for the common soldier's cloak. Cf. Plutarch, *Phil.* 11.2.

102. Cleland et al., *Greek and Roman Dress*, 166. See also Judith Lynn Sebesta, "Tunica Ralla, Tunica Spissa: The Colors and Textiles of Roman Costume," in *The World of Roman Costume*, ed. Judith Lynn Sebesta and Larissa Bonfante (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1994), 65–76, at 69. Tyrian purple (from the murex shellfish) and *coccinus* scarlet (from the kermes insect) did not derive from plants, making them more difficult to obtain, though tyrian dye was by far the most costly to produce (Roland Gradwohl, *Die Farben im alten Testament: Eine terminologische Studie* [Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1963], 75; Cleland et al., *Greek and Roman Dress*, 128, 149, 166). Κόκκινος was defined by its origin of production, not by its reddish color that could be cheaply imitated. On the many colors of Roman costume, see Sebesta, "Tunica Ralla, Tunica Spissa," 65–76; Sumner, *Roman Military Dress*, 117–59.

the costly κόκκινος, worn only by high-ranking officers and even emperors.[103] Third, not only did Mark find πορφύρα realistic enough to retain, but so did the author of the Gospel of John, who uses ἱμάτιον πορφυροῦς (John 19:2), which elsewhere can indicate a garment of royalty or nobility.[104] Fourth, Matthew elsewhere modifies tradition in order to demonstrate Jesus's fulfillment of Scripture at the expense of historical plausibility.[105] The absurd image of Jesus riding on two animals at his triumphal entry demonstrates the point (Matt 21:5).[106] Matthew's arrangment of Jesus's genealogy into tripartite groups of fourteen generations (Matt 1:1–17) also strains historical credulity for the sake of proving scriptural fulfillment.[107]

Helmut Koester proposes what in my estimation is a much more plausible explanation for the "scarlet robe," namely, that it alludes to the scarlet ribbon that was tied around the head of the scapegoat in Second Temple tradition, which represented

---

103. *Hist. Aug.* 12.2.5 (κόκκινος worn by emperors). On the high value of κόκκινος, see Martial, 2.39.1; 4.28.2; 5.23.5. Scarlet (*coccinus*/κόκκινος) was typically reserved for commanders wearing the *paludamentum*, which could also be purple (Pliny, *Nat.* 22.3; Livy, 45.39.2; Valerius Maximus, 1.6.11; cf. Caesar, *Bell. afr.* 57 [here a *sagum*]). On the cloaks of military soldiers and officials, see further in William Ramsay and W. C. F. Anderson, "Paludamentum," in Smith et al., *Greek and Roman Antiquities*, 2:322–23; W C. F. Anderson, "Sagum," in Smith et al, *Greek and Roman Antiquities*, 2:588–89; Cleland et al., *Greek and Roman Dress*, 34, 57, 124–25, 137–38, 164; Sumner, *Roman Military Dress*, 71–96.

104. Polybius, *Hist.* 16.6.7; Epictetus, *Diatr.* 1.2.22; Pausanias, *Graec. des.* 10.25.5. Luke's brief account of Jesus's mockery (Luke 23:11) it situated in a different context (i.e., before Herod and his soldiers) and does not include the same sort of royal mockery reported in Mark 15:17–19; Matt 27:28–30; John 19:2–5. It is not at all implausible that the tetrarch Herod Antipas might have owned purple garments. According to Brown, Luke's ἐσθῆτα λαμπράν ("brilliant garment") "was primarily a sign of innocence, not of mockery" (*Death of the Messiah*, 1:866).

105. "Matthew is hardly interested in the historically probable," according to Dahl ("Passion Narrative," 48).

106. Whereas Mark (11:2–7), Luke (19:30–35), and John (12:14) report that Jesus rode into Jerusalem on a single animal, Matthew, eager to demonstrate Jesus's literal fulfillment of Zech 9:9, reports that Jesus straddled a donkey and a colt (Matt 21:2–7), "creating for his readers the notoriously baffling image of Jesus somehow astride both creatures" (Hays, *Scripture in the Gospels*, 106).

107. Raymond Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah* (New York: Doubleday, 1993), 74–85.

the deposit of sins that were placed upon the goat.[108] Though Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra has supported this proposal, it has not been robustly defended.[109] While this ritual tradition is not prescribed in Leviticus 16, the early halakhic source material of the Epistle of Barnabas and the Mishnah independently attest to the custom. It is therefore very probable that the tradition dates to the Second Temple era.[110] Writing between 70–135 CE, Barnabas reports:

> Pay attention to what he commands: "Take two fine goats who are alike and offer them as a sacrifice; and let the priest take one of them as a whole burnt offering for sins." But what will they do with the other? "The other," he says, "is cursed." Pay attention to how the type of Jesus is revealed. "And all of you shall spit on it and pierce it and *wrap a piece of scarlet wool around its head* [περίθετε τὸ ἔριον τὸ κόκκινον περὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ], and so let it be cast into the wilderness."[111]

The Mishnah contains a similar tradition:

> *He bound a thread of crimson wool* [קשר לשון של זהורית] *on the head of the scapegoa*t and he turned it toward the way by which it was to be sent out ... What did he do? *He divided the thread of crimson wool* and tied one half to the rock and the other half between its horns, and he pushed it from behind; and it went rolling down, and before it had reached half the way down the hill it was broken in pieces (m. Yoma

---

108. Koester, *Gospels*, 225.

109. Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 170; idem, "Fasting with Jews," 183.

110. See Chapter Two.

111. Barn. 7.6–8 (Ehrman).

4:2; 6:6; so also m. Šabb. 9:3).[112]

Writing around the beginning of the third century CE, Hippolytus attests to this tradition:

> And a goat leading the goatherd. For this one, it says, is the one sacrificed for the sin of the world, and as an offered sacrifice, and as one *sent into the desert* to the Gentiles, and *as one crowned with scarlet wool on the head* [κόκκινον ἔριον ἐπὶ κεφαλήν... στεφανωθείς] by the unfaithful, and one who has become a ransom for humankind, and shown to be life for all (*Frag.* 75).[113]

Tertullian (*Marc.* 3.7) is aware of the scarlet ribbon tradition as well, noting that the scapegoat was "*surrounded with scarlet*, cursed and spit upon and pulled about and pierced, was by the people driven out of the city into perdition."[114]

Four points commend Koester's suggestion. First, as Otto Michel, Davies, Allison, and Stökl Ben Ezra observe, κόκκινος/שני is often associated with atonement or moral impurity in early Jewish and Christian literature.[115] One perceives the association of atonement in the elimination ritual of Lev 14:2–7 and 14:48–53, which possesses "a striking similarity to the two-part purification rite on the Day of

---

112. Danby, *Mishnah*, 166, 170. Marcus Jastrow defines זהורית as "crimson; crocus; crimson (or safran) colored material, esp. silk" (*A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Tamud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* [London: Luzac, 1903], 381).

113. My translation, based on the Greek text from Richard, "Les fragments," 94. The mention of a κόκκινον ἔριον on the head makes it probable that Hippolytus has the scapegoat tradition in mind (cf. Barn. 7.8, 11). His language does not suggest literary dependence upon Barnabas (περιτίθημι vs. στεφανόω, περί vs. ἐπί, αὐτοῦ vs. the absence thereof). Cf. Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 158–59.

114. Evans, *Tertullian*, 191. See the similar account in *Adv. Jud.* 14.9–10.

115. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:602 n. 30; Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 170.

Atonement."[116] Scarlet material is used to sprinkle the blood of an immolated bird on

a leprous object,[117] thereby transferring the impurity onto a second bird, which is then

sent away.[118] Jesus commands a leper to observe this rite in Matt 8:4.[119] The same

scarlet material appears in the red heifer ritual (Num 19:6) and in the Sinai covenant

sacrifice according to Heb 9:19.[120] According to Michel, in the prophets, κόκκινος "is

often linked with ungodly and sinful conduct."[121] Isaiah writes, "Though your sins be

as purple, I will make them white as snow. *Though they be as scarlet* [κόκκινον], I

will make them white as wool" (Isa 1:18). Writing before the end of the first century

CE, Clement of Rome quotes a similar tradition: "Though your sins reach from the

earth to heaven, and *though they be redder than scarlet* [κόκκου] and blacker than

sackcloth, yet if you turn to me... I will listen to you" (1 Clem 8:3).[122] In Isa 3:23 and

---

116. Wright, *Disposal of Impurity*, 78.

117. שני תולעת, κεκλωσμένον/κλωστὸν κόκκινον (Lev 14:4, 6, 49, 51, 52).

118. כפר/ἐξιλάσκομαι (Lev 14:53). Wright, *Disposal of Impurity*, 75–78. It may be that the scarlet material and red cedar wood were chosen to reflect the color of blood. According to Milgrom, "the power of the blood, the symbol of life, was abetted by the addition of two red ingredients, the crimson yarn (see below) and the cedar wood, in order to counter and reverse the death process vividly and visually represented by the deterioration of the body sticken with scale disease" (*Leviticus*, 1:835). However, it may be that the scarlet material was thought to have an apotropaic power (Beyse, "שני," *TDOT* 15:342) (see below).

119. Meier, *Matthew*, 248.

120. Along similar but distinct rituals lines, Gradwohl argues that scarlet (κόκκινος/שני) possesses an apotropaic function in the tradition concerning Tamar's twins (Gen 38:28, 30), Rehab (Josh 2:18, 21), and in Song 4:3 (also Nah 2:4 [תלע]), as the color was believed to ward off demons (*Die Farben*, 74–78). Notably, Matthew mentions Zerah born by Tamar (Matt 1:3), around whose hand a scarlet thread was tied, and Rehab (Matt 1:5), who ties a scarlet cord to her window in Jericho. Scarlet (κόκκινος/שני) also ubiquitously features in the instructions for the tabernacle and high priest's garments. It is used for the ten surrounding curtains of the tabernacle (Exod 26:1; 36:8), the curtain to the most holy place (Exod 26:31; 36:8), the curtain at the entrance of the tabernacle (Exod 26:36; 36:37), the curtain at the entrance of the courtyard (Exod 27:16; 38:18), the high priest's ephod (Exod 28:6; 39:2), breastplate (Exod 28:15; 39:8), shoulder band (Exod 28:8; 39:5), sash (Exod 39:29), and the fabric of the pomegranates on the hem of his robe (Exod 28:33; 39:24). Blue, purple, and (sometimes) gold are almost always used in conjunction with scarlet in these instructions.

121. Michel, "Κόκκος, κόκκινος," in *TDNT* 3:810–14, at 812.

122. Text and translation from Michael W. Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 54–55. This text is thought to derive from the Apocryphon of Ezekiel. It is quoted in the early third-century CE Gnostic text, the Exegesis of the Soul (see William C.

Jer 4:30, Israel's scarlet garments become "a sign of ungodly extravagance and worldly desire."[123] This association is reflected in Revelation, where "red epitomizes demonic abomination, ungodly lasciviousness and the power which is hostile to God."[124] According to the rabbis, the scapegoat's scarlet band symbolized iniquity: "Whence do we learn that they tie a strip of crimson on the head of the scapegoat? Because it is written, *Though your sins be as scarlet they shall be as white as snow*" (*m. Šabbat* 9.3).[125] In sum, κόκκινος is often associated with atonement or moral impurity in early Jewish and Christian texts.

Second, in the nearly contemporaneous document, the Apocalypse of Abraham, a garment of transgressions is transferred onto a personified scapegoat, Azazel (cf. Lev 16:8, 10, 26).[126] Abraham discovers that his own iniquity, represented in the idolatrous practices of his father (Apoc. Ab. 1.1–7.12), is to be transferred onto Azazel (cf. Lev 16:8, 10, 26). Yahoel declares to the scapegoat, "the corruption which was on him has gone over to you" (Apoc. Ab. 13.14).[127] The scene of the removal of Joshua's filthy garments, symbolizing a cosmic Day of Atonement (Zech 3:3–4, 9; see below), has influenced the authors' conception of the sin-laden garment, but the scarlet ribbon tradition of the scapegoat has as well.[128] Whereas the sin-laden clothes

---

Robinson, "The Exegesis of the Soul," in *The Nag Hammadi Library*, ed. James M. Robinson, 3rd ed. [Leiden: Brill, 1990], 190–98, at 197).

123. Michel, *TDNT* 3:812.

124. Michel, *TDNT* 3:813. The prostitute, clothed in purple and scarlet (Rev 17:4), sits on a blasphemous scarlet beast (θηρίον κόκκινον, Rev 17:3; cf. 18:12, 16).

125. Danby, *Mishnah*, 108. A similar tradition is recorded in m. Yoma 6:8, which associates the scarlet band with Isa 1:18: "Had they not another sign also?—a thread of crimson wool was tied to the door of the Sanctuary and when the he-goat reached the wilderness the thread turned white; for it is written, Though your sins be as scarlet they shall be as white as snow" (Danby, *Mishnah*, 170).

126. Orlov, *Divine Scapegoats*, 13–22.

127. Kulik, *Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 20.

128. Rubinkiewicz, *Die Eschatologie von Hen 9–10*, 101–2; Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom*

of Joshua are doffed in Zech 3:4, Abraham's garments of transgressions are physically

transferred onto the scapegoat as in the temple tradition. According to Orlov, in the

Slavonic apocalypse "the crimson band is likewise understood as a garment. More

precisely, in chapter 13 of the Apocalypse of Abraham the band is represented as a

garment of the patriarch's transgressions. This becomes the deposit of human sins,

which is then placed upon Azazel."[129] Mishnah Šabbat 9.3 interprets the scarlet band

along very similar lines.

Third, Ryszard Rubinkiewicz demonstrates that, in the Parable of the Wedding

Feast (Matt 22:1–14; cf. Luke 14:16–24), Matthew draws upon the same Second

Temple tradition utilized in the Apocalypse of Abraham with regard to the scapegoat's

garment of sins.[130] Only in Matthew's account, the king discovers a man at the

wedding feast not dressed in proper wedding attire (Matt 22:11–13), that is, he is still

dressed in garments of unrighteousness,[131] and so the king casts him out:[132] "Then the

king said to his servants, 'Bind him feet and hands and cast him into the outer

darkness....'" (Matt 22:13). This verse verbally alludes to 1 En. 10.4, the *locus*

---

*Kippur*, 92–94.

129. Orlov, *Atoning Dyad*, 100. Similarly, see Grabbe, "Scapegoat Tradition," 157.

130. Rubinkiewicz, *Die Eschatologie von Hen 9–10*, 101–13.

131. Meier suggests that, "In the parable, the wedding garment symbolizes a life lived in keeping with God's call, a life of justice, of doing God's will. One boor has come into the banquet with dirty, rumpled clothing, symbolizing a life that has undergone no basic change, a life that has not produced fruits worthy of repentance" (*Matthew*, 248). Similarly, Rubinkiewicz remarks, "Das Kleid symbolisiert all die Taten eines Menschen, der der Teilhabe an der Freude der Königsherrschaft würdig ist, etwa die Erfüllung von Werken der Gerechtigkeit bzw. Werken der Liebe" (*Die Eschatologie von Hen 9–10*, 109). Davies and Allison relate the symbolism of the wedding garment to Matt 13:43, where Jesus says "the righteous will shine like the sun in the kingdom of their Father" (*Matthew*, 3:204). According to Luz, "in antiquity it was not the case that the guests had to appear in a special wedding garment. A normal, clean, festive garment was sufficient. Thus the strange 'wedding garment' invites the readers to interpret the parable metaphorically" (*Matthew*, 3:55).

132. These verses (Matt 22:11–14) are full of Mattheanisms. Davies and Allison suspect that Matt 22:11–14 is a free Matthean composition (*Matthew*, 3:194).

*classicus* of the apocalyptic scapegoat tradition: "[And the Most High] said to Raphael, 'Bind Asael feet and hands and cast him into the darkness.'"[133] In 1 En. 10. 4–8, Asael is banished into the cosmic wilderness as an eschatological scapegoat. 1 Enoch 10.14 states that all morally impure individuals "will be bound together" with Asael.[134] The man at the wedding banquet wears garments of unrighteousness not unlike Joshua (Zech 3:3) and Abraham (Apoc. Ab. 13.14). In the Apocalypse of Abraham, the patriarch finds salvation by having his garments of moral impurity transferred onto Azazel. But in the Parable of the Wedding Feast, since the man's sin-laden garments have not been removed or transferred, on the day of judgment *he* will be removed, just as the primordial corruptor of humanity was removed (cf. Matt 25:41): "But every guest is also obligated to reconciled with God. If he does not, the same fate of Asael will meet him."[135]

Fourth, as in the scarlet ribbon tradition, Jesus's cloak is both wrapped around him and then removed: "And they wrapped around [περιέθηκαν] him a scarlet cloak ... And when they had mocked him, they stripped him of the cloak."[136] In contrast to Mark's ἐνδιδύσκω (15:17), Matthew's verb περιτίθημι recalls the binding of the ribbon around the scapegoat: "and wrap [περίθετε] a piece of scarlet wool around its head...." (Barn. 7.8). Matthew employs περιτίθημι to describe acts of clothing

---

133. On the verbal allusion to 1 En. 10.4 in Matt 22:13, see Chapter Three.

134. Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch*, 29.

135. "Aber jeder Eingeladene ist auch verpflichtet, sich mit Gott zu versöhnen; tut er das nicht, trifft ihn das gleiche Los wie Asael" (Rubinkiewicz, *Die Eschatologie von Hen 9–10*, 112).

136. Matthew changes Mark's ἐνδιδύσκω (Mark 15:17) to περιτίθημι. The fact that Mark uses περτίθημι with regard to the crown (Mark 15:17) may have influenced Matthew's word choice. Military cloaks were placed around the back and chest from the left side and closed with a fibula on the right shoulder (Delbrueck, "Antiquarisches," 125; George Ronald Watson and Brian Campbell, "Dress," in *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 478).

nowhere else in his gospel.[137] The Tannaitic tradition also mentions the wrapping of the scarlet band: "He bound [קשר] a thread of crimson wool on the head of the scapegoat" (m. Yoma 4:2; so also m. Šabbat 9:3).[138] The scarlet ribbon was reportedly then taken off the scapegoat before it was pushed down a cliff. Mishnah Yoma 6.6 relates: "What did he do? He divided the thread of crimson wool and tied one half to the rock and the other half between its horns, and he pushed it from behind." Barnabas recounts: "The one who takes the goat leads it into the wilderness and removes the wool, and places it on a blackberry bush" (Barn. 7.8; cf. 7.11). As opposed to John 19:1–16, Matthew narrates the doffing of the colorful garment.[139]

Matthew's χλαμύς κοκκίνη is therefore most likely intended to allude to the scarlet ribbon tied onto the scapegoat in Second Temple tradition. This conclusion becomes highly probable in light of the broad elimination-ritual template of the scene of mockery. Jesus's scarlet cloak, in a manner similar to the garment of unrighteous of the man cast out like Asael/Azazel at the messianic wedding banquet (Matt 22:11–12), symbolizes the iniquity being transferred unto Jesus. This conclusion is further supported by the evangelist's redaction of the thorny crown.

---

137. Elsewhere, Matthew writes ἐνδύω (Matt 6:25; 22:11), ἀφιέννυμι (Matt 6:30; 11:8), ἐπιτίθημι (Matt 21:7), and περιβάλλω (Matt 6:29, 31; 25:36, 38, 43) for clothing. Matthew could have chosen another word for the donning of the χλαμύς; e.g., τίθημι (Plutarch, *Ag. Cleom.* 46.2), ἐνδύω (Pausanias, 4.27.2), ἐνσκευάζω (Philo, *Legat.* 94), or στολίζω (*Anthrologia Graeca*, 7.468). Ancient authors up to the third century CE do not ubiquitously employ περιτίθημι and χλαμύς together. Besides Matthew and his commentators, this collocation appears in Sappho, *Lyr. Frag.* 54.1; Polybius, 4.5.5; Plutarch, *Amat.* 760B.4; *An seni*, 796E.10; Artemidorus, *Onir.* 1.54.11.

138. קשר in the qal means "to join, knot, tie; to fold" (Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim*, 1432).

139. Mark (15:20) also narrates this.

## The Crown of Thorns and the Scapegoat's Burden of Sins

The gospel witness to the crown of thorns tradition is as follows:[140]

Mark 15:17b:  καὶ περιτιθέασιν αὐτῷ πλέξαντες ἀκάνθινον στέφανον

Matt 27:29a:  καὶ πλέξαντες στέφανον ἐξ ἀκανθῶν ἐπέθηκαν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ

John 19:2a:  πλέξαντες στέφανον ἐξ ἀκανθῶν ἐπέθηκαν αὐτοῦ τῇ κεφαλῇ

Matthew's redaction appears to reflect deliberate editorial activity.[141] The evangelist alters his Markan *Vorlage* so that the crown is now composed *from thorns* and explicitly placed *on Jesus's head.* Why the change? One could answer that the head is simply the place where a crown is placed.[142] But this explanation is unsatisfactory,

---

140. Scholarly discussion of the crown of thorns has focused on the kind of thorns utilized by the Roman soldiers. This interesting question, which has yet to find a certain answer, cannot occupy our attention here. See E. Ha-Reubéni, who posits the small thorns of the Palestinian Poterium spinosam bush ("Recherches sur les plantes de l'Évangile: l'épine de la couronne de Jésus," *RB* 42 [1933]: 230–34). Delbrueck submits an honorable wreath made from the acanthus plant ("Antiquarisches," 129). H. St. J. Hart suggests the long thorns of the date palm (*Phoenix dactylifera*), which would give the appearance of Helios's radiant crown, as commonly adapted on the coinage of certain emperors ("The Crown of Thorns in John 19.2-5," *JTSNS* 3 [1952]: 66–75)—a theory commended by Campbell Bonner ("The Crown of Thorns," *HTR* 46 [1953]: 47–48). E. R. Goodenough and C. B. Welles put forward the acanthus mollis, with soft and shiny leaves ("The Crown of Acanthus [?]," *HTR* 46 [1953]: 241–42). Yarbro Collins believes the plant was the Syrian acanthus (*Mark*, 726), a "thorny plant [that] produces long spikes and large flowers with spines" (Irene Jacob and Walter Jacob, "Flora," *ABD* 2:815). Having summarized most of these positions, Brown draws no conclusion (*Death of the Messiah*, 1:866–67). Davies and Allison state that, "given that over a hundred Palestinian plants belong to the category of thorns and thistles (IDB, s.v., 'Flora', A.12), speculation is vain" (*Matthew*, 3:602 n. 32). Many scholars follow Hart, Bonner, Goodenough, and Wells in positing that the crown of thorns was not intended as an instrument of torture. It seems more prudent to leave open the possibility that the thorns were meant to mock Jesus's kingship and inflict pain, as does Hart ("Crown of Thorns," 67).

141. The reasons for this are: (1) Ἐπιτίθημι belongs to Matthew's special vocabulary, the evangelist adding the word five times in redactional material (Matt 19:13, 15; 21:7; 23:4; 27:37; Gundry, *Matthew*, 566). (2) Whereas Mark uses ἐπιτίθημι with ἐπί just once (Mark 8:25), Matthew writes this combination four times (Matt 9:18; 21:7; 23:4; 27:29; cf. 27:37; Luz, *Matthew*, 3:513, n. 6). (3) Of the Synoptics, only Matthew employs ἐπί + κεφαλή elsewhere (Matt 26:7). (4) Matthew tends to change Markan historical presents to verbs in a past tense, especially with words other than λέγω (Luz, *Matthew*, 1:25), thus explaining the change from περιτιθέασιν to ἐπέθηκαν. The similarity of language in John 19:2 can be explained by positing that John reproduced Matthew coincidently or that Matthew generated a tradition that John later appropriated.

142. So Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:603.

since the collocation ἐπιτίθημι + στέφανος + κεφαλή is rare in early Jewish and Christian literature, occurring just four times (Zech 6:11; Jos. Asen. 21:4; Matt 27:29; John 19:2).[143] In antiquity, crowning events are more frequently described with the verb στεφανόω.[144] A more plausible explanation is that Matthew echoes Lev 16:21, conceiving the thorns as symbolic of the curses being transferred onto the scapegoat. Four points support this claim.

First, unproductive plants were frequently used in the abuse and expulsion of *pharmakos* victims.[145] As Yarbro Collins remarks, Jesus's thorny crown "is analogous to the use of the twigs of the wild fig tree to drive out the human scapegoat, the *pharmakos*."[146] Jan Bremmer posits that the marginality of the plant reflected the marginality of the ritual victim, but it seems equally plausible that the unproductively of these plants also reflected the curse being transferred to the *pharmakos*.[147]

Second, the collocation ἐπιτίθημι + ἐπί + article + κεφαλή appears twice in the biblical instruction regarding the scapegoat ritual, corresponding to Matthew's redactional ἐπέθηκαν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς.[148] In the New Testament, this collocation occurs only in Matt 27:29. Leviticus 16:21 reads:

---

143. In contemporary Greek literature, ἐπιτίθημι + στέφανος + κεφαλή is a rare collocation (e.g., Plutarch, *Caes*. 47.6; Cassius Dio, 91.13).

144. E.g., Ps 8:6; 102:4 LXX; Song 3:11; Judt 15:13; 3 Macc 3.28; 4 Macc 17.15; Philo, *Legum* 1.80; 2.108; *Deus* 147; *Agr*. 112, 171; *Her*. 47; *Congr*. 159; *Somn*. 2.62; *Praem*. 13, 52; *Contempl*. 57; *Legat*. 12; Josephus, *Ant*. 19.358; *J.W*. 4.273; 7.124, 126; *Ag. Ap*. 2.256; 2 Tim 2:5; Heb 2:7, 9.

145. E.g., Hipponax, *Frag*. 6; Scholia on Aristophanes, *Ran*. 733a; Plutarch, *Mor*. 693e–694a. See above.

146. Yarbro Collins, *Mark*, 726. Similarly, Maclean, "Barabbas," 333.

147. Bremmer, "Scapegoat," 184–85.

148. The collocation ἐπιτίθημι + ἐπί + article + κεφαλή (genitive or accusative) occurs most frequently in cultic settings in the LXX (e.g., Exod 29:10, 15, 17, 19; Lev 1:4, 10; 3:2, 8, 13; 4:4, 15, 24, 29, 33; 8:9, 14, 18, 22; 14:18, 29; 16:21; 24:14; Num 8:12).

And Aaron *shall lay* his hands *on the head* [ἐπιθήσει... ἐπὶ τὴν

κεφαλήν] of the living goat, and he shall confess over it all the iniquity

of the children of Israel, and all their unrighteousness, and all their

sins, and *he shall place* them *on the head* [ἐπιθήσει... ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλήν]

of the living goat, and he shall send it away into the desert by the hand

of a prepared man.

In the Priestly theology, through Aaron's laying on of hands Israel's sins are literally

conveyed upon the head of the scapegoat.[149] According to Philo (*Spec.* 1.888), the

scapegoat physically bore "curses" upon itself.[150]

Third, only Matthew associates the word "thorn" (ἄκανθα) with the curse of

Genesis 3 in the likely redactional verse of Matt 7:16,[151] where the evangelist writes

---

149. Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 1:1041–46. In Lev 16:21 LXX, the feminine plural pronoun αὐτάς refers either to "all their sins" (πάσας τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν), or to all three feminine plural nouns in the clause πάσας τὰς ἀνομίας τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ καὶ πάσας τὰς ἀδικίας αὐτῶν καὶ πάσας τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν. The MT uses a variety of gendered nouns and the masculine plural pronoun אתם.

150. Barnabas's halakahic material calls the scapegoat "cursed" (Barn. 7.7, 9).

151. Matt 7:16: μήτι συλλέγουσιν ἀπὸ ἀκανθῶν σταφυλὰς ἢ ἀπὸ τριβόλων σῦκα. Luke 6:44: γὰρ ἐξ ἀκανθῶν συλλέγουσιν σῦκα οὐδὲ ἐκ βάτου σταφυλὴν τρυγῶσιν. It is difficult to ascertain with certainty whether Matt 7:16 is a total redaction of Q 6:44, or whether Matthew was working with a different recension of Q (i.e., QMatt), or if both might be the case. It seems that Matt 7:16 is mostly redactional. Luz observes that Matt 7:16–20 reflects careful editing (*Matthew*, 1:375). The material in Matt 7:16–17 corresponds in part to Q 6:43–45, but Matthew removes Q 6:45 entirely from the discourse and places it at Matt 12:34–35. Whereas Luke places Q 6:43–45 after the speck-in-the-eye saying in Luke 6:41–42, Matthew situates Q 6:43–44 within a warning about false prophets (Matt 7:15). He moves Q 6:44a up in order to Matt 7:16a and crafts an *inclusio* between Matt 7:16a and 7:20 (ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιγνώσεσθε αὐτούς). Matthew is also responsible for the antithetical parallelism in Matt 7:17 and 7:18 (Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:709) and for adding the ethical opposites ἀγαθός/πονηρός in these verses (Luz, *Matthew*, 1:375; Matthew enjoys combining ἀγαθός and πονηρός more than the other evangelists; Matt 5:45; 12:34; 20:15; 22:10; cf. Luke 6:45 = Matt 12:35; Luke 11:13 = Matt 7:11). Regarding Matt 7:16, Gundry notices that "the verse attains a tightly knit unity" (*Matthew*, 129). In Matt 7:16b the verb συλλέγω is brought forward and the second verb of Q 6:44b omitted, so that the following Matthean parallelism is crafted: ἀπὸ ἀκανθῶν σταφυλὰς ἢ ἀπὸ τριβόλων σῦκα. Notice that, whereas Q 6:44b uses the preposition ἐκ, Matt 7:16b utilizes ἀπό, the same preposition appropriated in the two verses of the Matthean *inclusio* (i.e., Matt 7:16a and 7:20). Such editing makes it likely that τρίβολος is a redactional creation of the evangelist. This conclusion is strengthened by Matthew's unique echoes of Genesis 3:1–5 in Matt 10:16 and Matt 4:3 (see note below; NA28, 836). Scholars are divided on whether Logion 45 of The Gospel of Thomas reflects knowledge of an independent version of Q 6:44–45 or an oral tradition thereof, or whether it reflects knowledge of Matthew and Luke, and thus it is of limited value in determining the source of Matt 7:16: "¹Jesus said: Grapes are not harvested from thorn-bushes, nor are figs gathered from hawthorns, [f]or

ἄκανθα and τρίβολος in the same order as in Gen 3:18: "Beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheep's clothing, but inside they are ravenous wolves. From their fruits you will recognize them. Are grapes gathered from thorns [ἀκανθῶν] or figs from thistles [τριβόλων]?" (Matt 7:15–16). The evangelist echoes the language of Gen 3:17–18:[152] "Cursed is the earth in your labors; with pains you will eat it all the days of your life; thorns and thistles [ἀκάνθας καὶ τριβόλους] it shall cause to grow up for you."[153] In the Hebrew Bible, "thorn" (קוֹץ) bears an wholly negative connotation.[154] In the Septuagint, "thorns" (ἄκανθαι) are associated with curses, punishments, suffering,

---

they yield no fruit. ²[A go]od man brings forth good from his treasure; ³a bad man brings forth evil things from his evil treasure, which is in his heart, and he says evil things, ⁴for out of the abundance of his heart he brings forth evil things" (Beate Blatz, "The Coptic Gospel of Thomas," in *New Testament Apocrypha: Volume I*, ed. Wilhelm Schneemelcher, rev. ed. [Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1990], 110–33, at 124). Without access to the Logion in Greek, it is difficult to know whether the wording of L. 45.1 reflects the exact thorn-thistle language of Gen 3:18 LXX like Matt 7:16b. While the order of "grapes" and "figs" matches Matt 7:16b, Logion 45 is closer to Luke in nearly every other regard: (1) L. 45.1 is a declarative sentence, as in Luke 6:44b (it is a question in Matt 7:16a), (2) L. 45.1 contains two verbs, as in Luke 6:44b (Matt 7:16a has only one verb), (3) L.45.1 is followed by the saying about good and evil treasure, as in Luke 6:45 (which Matthew moves to 12:34–35), and (4) L. 45.1 includes explanatory "for," as in Luke 6:44a (absent in Matt 7:16, but present in 12:33). Yet Davies and Allison oddly remark, "Gos. Thom. 45 does not exhibit any peculiarly Lukan features" (*Matthew*, 1:708). On the question of the source of Logion 45, see April D. DeConick, *The Original Gospel of Thomas in Translation* (London: T&T Clark, 2006), 169.

152. Meier (*Matthew*, 73), Gundry (*Matthew*, 129), and Luz (*Matthew*, 1:375 n. 6) find an allusion to Gen 3:18 plausible. The following reasons support this conclusion: (1) Gen 3:18 is one of only two texts in the LXX where ἄκανθα and τρίβολος appear together (the other is Hos 10:8). (2) Τρίβολος is a rare word in the LXX, occurring only four times (Gen 3:18; 2 Sam 12:31; Prov 22:5; Hos 10:8). (3) Ἄκανθα and τρίβολος are plural in both Matt 7:16b and Gen 3:18. (4) Ἄκανθα and τρίβολος appear in the same order in Matt 7:16b and Gen 3:18. (5) Both texts concern the theme of moral evil (i.e., Adam's transgression, the bearing of evil fruit). (6) Both texts feature deceptive figures (i.e., the serpent [Gen 3:1–5], false prophets [Matt 7:15]). (7) Matthew alludes to Gen 3:1 in Matt 10:16 (NA28, 836), a passage that also mentions wolves and sheep, as in Matt 7:15 (in the LXX and NT, the words ὄφις and φρόνιμος occur together only in Gen 3:1 and in Matt 10:16). (8) Matthew may echoe Gen 3:1–7 in his temptation narrative in Matt 4:3 (NA28, 836). (9) Hebrews 6:8, the only other NT passage that writes ἄκανθα and τρίβολος together, does so in allusion to Gen 3:18 (the exact form ἀκάνθας καὶ τριβόλους [Gen 3:18] is employed, as is the word κατάρα [ἐπικατάρατος in Gen 3:17]; see Gareth Lee Cockerill, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, NICNT [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012], 279 n. 52).

153. Text from John William Wevers, ed., *Genesis,* Septuaginta, VTG 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974), 93. Translation from NETS.

154. According to Jutta Hausmann, the connotations of קוֹץ (the Hebrew equivalent of ἄκανθα) "are uniformly negative, in both literal and figurative usage" ("קוֹץ," *TDOT* 13:1).

pain,[155] and they are used as a metaphor for the wicked and their unrighteous deeds.[156] In the context of Matt 7:15–20, the evangelist uniquely associates false prophets and their evil deeds with Adam's primordial transgression.[157] Ἄκανθα carries a similar connotation in the Parable of the Sower and the Seed (Matt 13:3–9, 18–23), where thorns represent vicious capitulation to the trappings of the world, inhibiting the production of good works (Matt 13:7; 22; cf. Mark 4:7, 18; Luke 8:7, 14). Among the evangelists, Matthew is particularly fond of the image of fruit-bearing and non fruit-bearing plants as a metaphor for the righteous and the wicked, and for their respective good and evil deeds.[158] One pertinent example is the Parable of the Wicked Vineyard Tenants, which is based upon Isaiah's Song of the Vineyard (Isa 5:1–7). Matthew uniquely writes that, when the Lord of the vineyard returns to his tenants who killed his servants and son, "He will put those wretches to a miserable death and hand over the vineyard to other farmers, *who will yield to him the fruits at harvest time*" (Matt 21:41; cf. Mark 12:9; Luke 20:16). In the Septuagint of Isaiah 5, to which the evangelist conforms his language,[159] the Lord's vineyard produces not "wild grapes" (MT, באש) but *thorns* (ἄκανθα, Isa 5:2, 4 LXX). In short, thorns are uniquely

---

155. Gen 3:18; Judg 8:7, 16; Hos 9:6; 10:8; Isa 7:23–25; 32:13; 33:12; Jer 12:13; Ezek 28:24; Psa 31:4; 57:9; 117:12; Prov 15:19; 26:9; Sir 28:24.

156. Isa 5:2, 4, 6; 2 Sam 23:6; Jer 4:3; cf. Philo, *Leg.* 3.248–249, *Somn.* 1.89. According to J. A. Motyer, with ἄκανθα "the symbolic is never far away" ("ἄκανθα," *NIDNTT* 1:725).

157. The impression in 4Q423 and Apoc. Mos. 24 is that the intended effect of the curse is directed at Adam as much as it is at the earth.

158. Matthew writes the term καρπός 19 times, Luke 12 times, John 10 times, and Mark 5 times. Only Matthew elaborates Jesus's saying, "You will know them by their fruits" (Matt 7:16–20; cf. Luke 6:43–45). Only he records the Parable of the Wheat and the Weeds, which employs a similar productive/unproductive plant metaphor (Matt 13:24–30; see esp. v. 26). He uniquely places the Parable of the Weeds immediately after the Parable of the Sower, suggesting that the Devil is (at least partly) responsible for the unproductively of the wicked (Matt 13:25, 28; cf. 13:19). Matthew does not, however, record the Parable of the Baren Fig Tree (Luke 13:6–9).

159. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:178–79; Luz, *Matthew*, 3:35.

associated with moral evil in the Gospel of Matthew. Their placement on Jesus's head evokes the distinct image of the scapegoat receiving the deposit of sins on its head.

Fourth, Matthew redacts the scene of the inscription given Jesus immediately after his crucifixion, changing Mark's (15:26) καὶ ἦν ἡ ἐπιγραφὴ τῆς αἰτίας αὐτοῦ ἐπιγεγραμμένη to καὶ ἐπέθηκαν ἐπάνω τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ τὴν αἰτίαν αὐτοῦ γεγραμμένην (Matt 27:37). Again, Matthew echoes the language of Lev 16:21 (ἐπιτίθημι + ἐπ-preposition + article + κεφαλή) and evokes the concept of sin-bearing, since in forensic contexts αἰτία usually means "guilt."[160] Thus, Matthew literally portrays guilt as hanging over Jesus's head on the cross. The reader understands that "his guilt" (αἰτίαν αὐτοῦ) is not truly his, but that of others. Here, the evangelist graphically portrays Jesus as the true "King of the Jews," who bears the sins of his people upon his own head.

In conclusion, Matthew probably intends ἐπέθηκαν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ (Matt 27:29a) to evoke Lev 16:21 and the placement of iniquity or curses upon the head of the scapegoat. The Epistle of Barnabas affirms this interpretation, as the author relates the "cursedness" of the scapegoat with the crowning of Jesus: "Pay attention: 'The one they take to the altar, but the other is cursed,' and *the one that is cursed is crowned*."[161] Like the scarlet cloak, the thorns appears to be symbolic of the moral impurity that the soldiers unwittingly transfer onto their scapegoat. But Matthew seems to combine this echo of Lev 16:61 with another scriptural allusion

---

160. LSJ, s.v. "αἰτία."

161. Barn. 7.9 (Ehrman). Barn. 7.11 further evinces the importance of the crown of thorns in the author's primitive scapegoat typology: "But why do they place the wool in the midst of the thorns? This is a type of Jesus established for the church, because whoever wishes to remove the scarlet wool must suffer greatly, since the thorn is a fearful thing, and a person can retrieve the wool only by experiencing pain. And so he says: those who wish to see me and touch my kingdom must take hold of me through pain and suffering" (Barn. 7.8, 11 [Ehrman]).

linked to the Day of Atonement. Before getting to that, one should recall that the scapegoat was also severely abused in Second Temple tradition.

## The Severe Abuse of the Yom Kippur Scapegoat

As Maclean observes, "by the time the gospels were composed, the Jewish scapegoat ritual had been deeply influenced by the pattern of curative exit rites, in particular, by the φαρμακός."[162] One chief way this influence manifests itself is in the tradition of the scapegoat's abuse. The halakhic source of Barn. 7.8 stipulates, "all of you shall spit on it and pierce it." The Mishnah reports that the goat's hair was tugged by the people as they cried, "Bear [our sins] and be gone! Bear [our sins] and be gone!"[163] According to Tertullian, the Azazel goat was "cursed and spit upon and pulled about and pierced."[164] Even the apocalyptic scapegoat tradition seems to reflect the ritual of abuse as well. Asael is to be bound "hand and foot," "thrown" into an abyss, lain upon "sharp and jagged stones" and "covered with darkness," so that his face does "not see the light," and he is to "dwell there for an exceedingly long time."[165] Verbal abuse is heaped upon the demonic scapegoat in the Apocalypse of Abraham: "This is disgrace, this is Azazel!... Shame on you, Azazel! For Abraham's portion is in heaven, and yours is on earth ... Hear, counselor, be shamed by me!"[166] This tradition of the scapegoat's abuse finds significant overlap in the soldiers' severe treatment of Jesus in

---

162. Maclean, "Barabbas," 316.

163. M. Yoma 6:4 (Danby, *Mishnah*, 169).

164. *Marc*. 3.7 (Evans, *Tertullian*, 191).

165. 1 En. 10.4–5 (Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch*, 28).

166. Apoc. Ab. 13.6–7, 11–12 (*OTP* 1:695).

Matt 27:27–31. In fact, this may be one of several scapegoat tropes running throughout Matthew 27.

### The Broader Scapegoat Typology in Matthew 27 (Preview)

In Chapter Five, I propose ten structural parallels between Jesus's passion in Matthew 27 and the scapegoat tradition, half of which are redactional. These ought to be taken into account here: (1) the scapegoat is bound (vv. 2, 15, 16, 28), (2) the scapegoat receives the sins of the community (vv. 27–31), (3) the scapegoat is adorned with a garment (v. 28), (4) the scapegoat is stripped of that garment before its final demise (v. 31), (5) a symbolic item is placed on the scapegoat's head (v. 29), (6) the scapegoat is abused (v. 30), (7) the scapegoat is escorted from the city by a handler (vv. 31, 36), (8) the scapegoat undergoes a two-stage removal (vv. 31, 51b–52), (9) the scapegoat's exile engenders eschatological restoration (vv. 52–53), and (10) the scapegoat is sealed in an abyss (vv. 64–66). These parallels support the central argument of this chapter and point to a broader scapegoat typology in Matthew 27, which I explore in Chapter Five.

### The Atoning Crown of the Priest-King:

### Matthew's Allusion to Zech 6:11, 13

The Apocalypse of Abraham recasts the scapegoat's burden of sins as a literal garment

of transgressions.[167] Scholars recognize that this conception derives in part from Zechariah's vision of Joshua the high priest in Zech 3:1–10, a passage closely linked to Yom Kippur and the crowning of Joshua in Zech 6:11. Surprisingly, most commentators fail to note the possibility of an allusion to Zech 6:11 in Matthew's episode of mockery:

Zech 6:11:[168]  καὶ ποιήσεις στεφάνους, καὶ ἐπιθήσεις ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἰησοῦ

Matt 27:29a:  καὶ πλέξαντες στέφανον ἐξ ἀκανθῶν ἐπέθηκαν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ

Barnabas Lindars proposes this allusion as part of Matthew's messianic temple-builder typology, which likely draws on Zech 6:12:[169] "Thus says the Lord Almighty, Behold, the man whose name is Branch. And he shall rise up from below and build the house of the Lord." Charlene McAfee Moss affirms the influence of Zech 6:12 in the gospel: "It appears that the imagery from Zech 6:12 has been split between the Infancy Narrative's use of the messianic 'name' (Branch-Ἀνατολή) at a deep level, and the Passion Narrative's use of the messianic expectation that the Branch-Ἀνατολή

---

167. Orlov, *Atoning Dyad*, 100.

168. Text from Ziegler, *Duodecim prophetae*, 302. Like the LXX, the MT reads "crowns" (עטרות) against the singular "crown" in some versions of the LXX, the Syriac, and Targum. Scholars debate whether one or two crowns are in view in Zech 6:11 and 6:14. For example, Meyers and Meyers argue for "crowns" in Zech 6:11 and "crown" in Zech 6:14 (*Zechariah 1–8*, 349–53, 362–63). Accordingly, the first crown is given to Joshua the high priest and the second crown is placed in the temple in anticipation of the restored monarchy. Anthony R. Petterson argues for only one crown given to Joshua (*Haggai, Zechariah, & Malachi*, ApOTC 25 [Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2015], 184–85).

169. Barnabas Lindars posits three echoes of Zech 6:12 (Ἰδοὺ ἀνήρ, Ἀνατολὴ ὄνομα αὐτῷ, καὶ ὑποκάτωθεν αὐτοῦ ἀνατελεῖ, καὶ οἰκοδομήσει τὸν οἶκον Κυρίου) in Matt 2:2 (τὸν ἀστέρα ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ), Matt 16:18 (οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν), and Matt 26:61 (δύναμαι καταλῦσαι τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν οἰκοδομῆσαι) (*New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961], 70; see 69–71).

will build the temple, in relation to the temple charge made at Jesus' trial."[170]

For the following reasons, an allusion to Zech 6:11 seems probable: (1) Zech 6:12 has likely influenced Matthew's messianic conception.[171] (2) Zech 6:11 is the only verse in the LXX where the words στέφανος, ἐπιτίθημι, and κεφαλή occur together. (3) The syntax of ἐπέθηκαν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ (Matt 27:29a) closely parallels ἐπιθήσεις ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἰησοῦ (Zech 6:11). (4) In both texts the crowned figure is named Ἰησοῦς. (5) Sequentially, a crown is *first* composed and *then* placed upon the head in both passages (Matthew's ἐξ ἀκανθῶν highlights the composition). (6) The editorial phrase ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ (Matt 27:29a) resembles the phrase ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ in Zech 6:13. (7) The soldiers remove Jesus's clothes only in Matt 27:28 (cf. Mark 15:17), and Joshua's clothes are removed in Zech 3:4 (see below). (8) Matthew quotes from Zechariah 9–14 three times (two of which are redactional),[172] and he may allude to Zechariah 1–8 elsewhere.[173] (9) In contrast to John 19:2 (ἐπέθηκαν αὐτοῦ τῇ κεφαλῇ), Matthew includes the preposition ἐπί, conforming his language more closely to Zech 6:11 LXX.[174]

---

170. Charlene McAfee Moss, *The Zechariah Tradition and the Gospel of Matthew*, BZNW 156 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter), 195. So also Green, *Matthew*, 222.

171. See above and below. Additionally, Green notes that "the crowning here is done, though in mockery, by Gentiles, and that Zech 6:15 foreshadows an Israel to which Gentiles will be admitted" (*Matthew*, 222).

172. Zech 9:9 in Matt 21:5 (also John 12:15), Zech 11:12–13 in Matt 27:9–10 (only Matthew), and Zech 13:7 in Matt 14:27 (also Mark 14:27).

173. NA28 (868–9) and UBS4 (900) list the following allusions: Zech 1:1 in Matt 23:35 (also Luke 11:51); Zech 2:6 in Matt 24:31 (only Matthew); Zech 8:6 in Matt 19:26 (also Mark 10:27); only NA28 lists Zech 7:9 in Matt 23:23 (only Matthew) and Zech 8:17 in Matt 5:33 (only Matthew). Paul Foster doubts the validity of most of these allusions ("The Use of Zechariah in Matthew's Gospel," in Tuckett, *Book of Zechariah*, 65–86). But Foster does not consider Zech 6:11–12.

174. While the textual variant επι την κεφαλην in Matt 27:29 can be explained by scribal conformity to τὴν κεφαλήν in Matt 27:30, the variant has relatively strong external support: A, D, K, N, W, Γ, Δ, *f,* 1, 565, 579, 700, 1241, 1424, *l* 844, and the Majority Text (NA28, 96). Matthew's deviation from the precise form of Zech 6:11 LXX can be explained by his preference for ἐπί + genitive article + κεφαλῆς (Matt 27:29 [κατέχεεν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ]; similarly, Matt 27:37 [ἐπέθηκαν ἐπάνω τῆς

It is not difficult to imagine why the evangelist might be interested in Zech 6:11. The crowning of Joshua accompanies the announcement of a Davidic king who will rebuild the temple of the Lord,[175] and Jesus's kingship is precisely on display in Matt 27:27–31.[176] Matthew also emphasizes the Davidic lineage of Jesus.[177] According to Moss, the expectation that Jesus, as the Davidic "Branch," would rebuild the temple of God is a recurrent theme in the evangelist's PN: "One is left with something like a midrash on 2 Sam 7 and Zech 6:12 informing Matthew's trial narrative at a deep level, with the bulk of influence coming from Zech 6:12 — the Messiah will build the (eschatological) temple."[178] However, Joshua the high priest is the one crowned in Zech 6:11, not the Davidic king. What interest would Matthew have in drawing a typological correspondence to the crowning of Joshua the high priest?[179]

---

κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ]).

175. Zechariah derives his concept of "Branch" (צמח) from Jer 23:5 and 33:15. Hebrew Bible texts speaking of a "Shoot" (נצר) of Jesse (Isa 11:1) or a "Branch" (צמח) of David (Jer 23:5; 33:15; Zech 3:8; 6:12) were central in Davidic messianic expectations of the Second Temple era (4Q161 3.11–25 [4QpIsaa]; 4Q174 1.4 [4QFlor]; 4Q252 5.3 [4QcommGen A]; 4Q285 5.2 [4QSM]; T. Jud. 24). Also appearing in these exegetical traditions are Gen 49:10, Num 24:17, 2 Sam 7:10–14, and Psalm 2. See John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: Messianism in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 52–78.

176. Matthew uniquely emphasizes the Davidic lineage of Jesus (redactional verses include Matt 1:1, 6, 17, 20; 2:6; 9:27; 12:23; 15:22; 21:15; cf. Matt 20:30–31; 21:9; 22:42–44). The Jewish counsel condemns Jesus for threatening to destroy the temple of God and rebuild it in three days (Matt 26:61; cf. Mark 14:58), and during his crucifixion Jesus is mocked for the same claim (Matt 27:40; cf. Mark 15:29). Luke omits these verses entirely. According to Moss, "one is left with something like a midrash on 2 Sam 7 and Zech 6.12 informing Matthew's trial narrative at a deep level, with the bulk of influence coming from Zech 6.12 — the Messiah will build the (eschatological) temple" (*Zechariah Tradition*, 195).

177. Redactional verses include Matt 1:1, 6, 17, 20; 2:6; 9:27; 12:23; 15:22; 21:15; cf. Matt 20:30–31; 21:9; 22:42–44.

178. Moss, *Zechariah Tradition*, 195. The Jewish counsel condemns Jesus for threatening to destroy the temple of God and rebuild it in three days (Matt 26:61; cf. Mark 14:58), and during his crucifixion Jesus is mocked for the same claim (Matt 27:40; cf. Mark 15:29). Luke omits these verses entirely.

179. On priestly messianic traditions, see Collins, *Scepter and the Star*, 79–109; Joseph Angel, "The Traditional Roots of Priestly Messianism at Qumran," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at 60: Scholarly Contributions of New York University Faculty and Alumni*, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and Shani Tzoref (Ledien Brill, 2010), 27–54.

It is possible that priestly messianic traditions have exercised an influence on Matthew.[180] One text from Qumran, 4QApocryphonLevi (ca. 100 BCE), describes an eschatological suffering priestly figure who will effect atonement for his community: "And distress will come upon him ... And he will atone [ויכפר] for all the children of his generation, and he will be sent for/to all the children of his [people] [וישתלח לכול בני עמה]... They will utter many words against him, and an abundance of [lie]s."[181] Some scholars suggest adumbrations of such a priestly messianic conception in the First Gospel.[182] Even apart from such a messianic conception, Jesus's priestly role may already be evoked in his discourse with Israel's high priest during the Sanhedrin trial (Matt 26:57–68), when Jesus alludes to Daniel 7 and Psalm 110 (Matt 26:64).[183] Oscar Cullmann remarks, "Is it not significant that Jesus applies to himself a saying

180. Aramaic Levi Document; Jub. 30.18–20; 31.11–17; Sir 45.6–26; 50.1–21; 4Q540–541 (4QapocLevi); CD 12.23–13.1; 14.19; 19.10; 20.1; 1QS 9.11; 1QSa; 4Q491 T. Levi 18. See Collins, *Scepter and the Star*, 79–109; Angel, "Traditional Roots," 27–54.

181. 4Q540 1.1; 4Q541 9.2–3, 5–6 (text and [modified] translation from Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2:1078–81). On the priestly quality of this figure and influence of Isaiah's Servant on this text, see Angel, "Priestly Tradition," 298–99. Interestingly, Stökl Ben Ezra argues that this priest's suffering recalls the ritual expulsion of the scapegoat ("Fasting," 177–78). He argues that the hithpael of שׁלח is extremely rare in Hebrew and Aramaic and was a terminus technicus for the scapegoat in Tannaitic literature: "If 'to atone' (ויכפר) is followed by the rare verb וישתלח that is usually part of a terminus technicus linked to atonement it is difficult to explain this combination otherwise than in the sense that the author of 4Q451 wants to allude to the scapegoat, one of the most famous means of atonement in Second Temple Judaism" (ibid., 178). Angel concurs ("Priestly Tradition," 299–300). Yet according to Collins, "The obvious implication is that he is a priest and makes atonement by means of the sacrificial cult. He does not atone by his suffering and death, as in the case with Isaiah's servant ... There is still no evidence for a Jewish interpretation of Isaiah 53 in terms of a suffering messiah" (*Scepter and the Star*, 144).

182. G. W. E. Nickelsburg, "Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee," *JBL* 100 (1981): 575–600; Fletcher-Louis, "Sacral Son of Man," 247–98; Joseph L. Angel, "Enoch, Jesus, and Priestly Tradition," in Enoch and the Synoptic Gospels: *Reminiscences, Allusions, Intertextuality*, ed. Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Gabriele Boccaccini (Atlanta: SBL, 2016), 285–316. On priestly traditions more broadly in the Jesus tradition and Synoptic Gospels, see Oscar Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament*, trans. Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall (London: SCM, 1959), 83–89, 130–33; Fletcher-Louis, "Jesus as the High Priestly Messiah: Part 1," *JSHJ* 4 (2006): 155–75; idem "Jesus as the High Priestly Messiah: Part 2," *JSHJ* 5 (2007): 57–79; Nicholas Perrin, *Jesus the Priest* (London: SPCK, 2018).

183. Parallels in Mark 14:62; Luke 22:69; John 6:62 (the combined allusion to Daniel 7 and Psalm 110 is contained only in the triple tradition). On the Son of Man in Daniel 7 as a priestly figure, see Fletcher-Louis, "Divine Mediator," 169–81; Perrin, *Jesus the High Priest*, 171–79.

about the eternal High Priest [Melchizedek] precisely when he stands before the Jewish high priest and is questioned by him concerning his claim to be the Messiah? He says in effect that his messiahship is not that of an earthly Messiah... but that he is the heavenly Son of Man and the heavenly High Priest."[184] While this may be the case, an additional explanation for Matthew's use of Zech 6:11 ought to be considered.

Joshua's Crown (Zech 6:11) as Priestly Diadem

Following his seven night visions, Zech 6:9–15 narrates a sign-act in which Zechariah is told to compose a crown (6:10), place it on the head of Joshua (6:11), and announce to him that "a man whose name is Branch [Ἀνατολή]... shall build the temple of the Lord... he shall bear royal honor, and shall sit and rule on his throne" (6:12–13). In accord with Zechariah's vision of the two "sons of oil," an anticipated priest-king dyarchy or some kind (Zech 4:11–14), we learn that "the priest shall be by his throne, and there will be peaceful counsel between the two of them" (Zech 6:14).[185] Zechariah 6:11 describes the crowning of Joshua: "And you shall take silver and gold, and you shall make the crowns, and you shall place one upon the head of Joshua, the high priest, the son of Josedek."

As Michael Stead argues, the coronation scene in Zech 6:11 likely completes Joshua's high priestly investiture that began in Zech 3:1–10,[186] a vision depicting

---

184. Cullmann, *Christology*, 88–89.

185. The issues of the identity of the "Branch" (צמח/ἀνατολή; Zech 3:8; 6:12) and the socio-religious dynamic between the priesthood and Davidic dynasty in Zechariah's post-exilic context cannot detain us here. For an overview, see Petterson, *Behold Your King*, 13–45.

186. Stead, *Zechariah 1–8*, 153–56, 166–72. On the similarity and continuity between Zech

Yahweh's removal of Israel's iniquity in a kind of cosmic Yom Kippur.[187] In Zech 3:1–5, the prophet sees Joshua the high priest standing before the divine assembly, accused by the Satan. Joshua is dressed in filthy garments, symbolizing impurity of himself and of the nation.[188] The Angel commands that Joshua's dirty clothes be removed, declaring, "See, I have taken your iniquity [עָוֹן] away from you, and I will clothe you with rich apparel" (Zech 3:4). A clean turban is placed on Joshua's head (Zech 3:5), the priesthood receives a charge (Zech 3:6–8), and the Angel of the Lord announces, "I am going to bring my servant the Branch. For on the stone that I have set before Joshua, on a single stone with seven facets, I will engrave its inscription, says the Lord of Hosts, and *I will remove the iniquity of this land in a single day*" (Zech 3:8b–9). As Lena-Sofia Tiemeyer argues, "The removal of the iniquity of the land in one day, together with the occurrence of the inscribed stone, identified with the צִיץ, an essential part of the costume of the high priest which signifies his ability to carry iniquity, point to the celebration of the Day of Atonement."[189]

The turban given Joshua in Zech 3:5 recalls the priestly turban of Aaron (Exod 28:4, 39; 39:28, 31; Lev 16:4), and the engraved stone given Joshua in Zech 3:9 for

---

3:1–10 and 6:9–15, see Mark J. Boda, "Oil, Crowns and Thrones: Prophet, Priest and King in Zechariah 1:7–6:15," *JHebS* 3 (2001): Article 10, at 4.1; Marko Jauhiainen, "Turban and Crown Lost and Regained: Ezekiel 21:29–32 and Zechariah's Zemah," *JBL* 127 (2008): 501–11, at 506–8; Stead, *Zechariah 1–8*, 133–35, 185–87. Boda remarks, "The same cast of characters from ch. 3 appears: prophet, Joshua, צמח ("the Branch," Zemah), and priestly associates while Zerubbabel is noticeably absent. Furthermore, one can discern here allusions to socio-ritual types drawn from royal, priestly and prophets contexts: a royal investiture ceremony, a priestly temple memorial rite, and a prophetic sign act" ("Oil, Crowns and Thrones," 4.1). Stead states, "These parallels suggest that the sign-act in Zech 6:9–15 is of a promisory nature, in some way symbolically guaranteeing the promises about the priesthood, the branch and the rebuilt temple in Zech 3–4" (*Zechariah 1–8*, 135). On the continuity between Zech 4:1–14 and 6:9–15, see Petersen, *Haggai and Zechariah 1–8*, 273–77.

187. See Chapter Two.

188. See Chapter Two.

189. Tiemeyer, "Guilty Priesthood," 15 (emphasis mine).

the removal of iniquity (עון) "in a single day" recalls the engraven golden rosette (ציץ) placed upon Aaron's turban (Exod 28:36; 39:30).[190] As James VanderKam suggests, "It is likely that the writer of Zechariah 3 had [Exod 28:36–38] before him or in his mind when he composed his vision report."[191] The priest's rosette is also called a "diadem" (נזר, Exod 29:6; 39:30; Lev 8:9; cf. Sir 50.7),[192] which later writers refer to as a στέφανος (Sir 45:12; Josephus, *Ant.* 3.172, 179; *J.W.* 5.235; Philo, *Mos.* 2.114).[193] The investiture of Aaron's headdress therefore involved a two-part process: first donning the turban, then donning the ציץ: "And you shall set the turban on his head, and put the holy diadem on the turban" (Exod 29:6; also Lev 8:9). The express purpose of the rosette/diadem (ציץ) was the removal of iniquity: "It shall be on Aaron's forehead, and *Aaron shall bear any iniquity* [נשא ... עון] from the holy things that the people of Israel consecrate as their holy gifts" (Exod 28:38).[194] Leviticus 10:17 and Num 18:1 also articulate the priest's role of "bearing iniquity" (נשא עון). Significantly, the stone given to Joshua in Zech 3:9 is specifically for the removal of "iniquity" (עון). Michael Stead observes that "the placement of a turban on Joshua's head in Zech 3:5 is an incomplete act, in as much that it requires 'the golden rosette, the holy crown' to complete the investiture... In Zech 3:9, Yahweh gives this stone to

---

190. See Chapter Two.

191. VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas*, 26.

192. Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 1:512.

193. Josephus (*Ant.* 3.172; *J.W.* 5.235) calls it a "golden crown" (στέφανος χρυσοῦς/χρύσεος), and Philo (*Mos.* 2.114), "a golden leaf like a crown" (χρυσοῦν δὲ πέταλον ὡσανεὶ στέφανος). Josephus also likens the priestly turban to a στεφάνη (*Ant.* 3.157).

194. Concerning the ציץ, Milgrom writes, "any inadvertent impurity or imperfection in the offerings to the sanctuary would be expiated by the ציץ" (*Leviticus*, 1:512). According to Schwartz, "The dynamic of sin-removal, as analogous to the removal of impurities, expressed by the image of bearing away sin, is also depicted in Exod 28:38... It is not that Aaron 'takes upon himself' the liability, or worse, the punishment, for the cultic sins of the community; rather, he is charged with their removal, their elimination" ("Bearing of Sin ," 16).

Joshua, probably to be later incorporated into his 'holy crown.' *The crowning of Joshua in Zech 6:11 is thus the completion of his investiture as high priest.*"[195] In other words, the crown of Zech 6:11 is to be understood as the priestly headdress with which Joshua would remove Israel's sins on the occasion of Yom Kippur.

### Matthew's High Priest Typology in the Roman-abuse Scene

Granted that Matthew was a competent reader of Zechariah, the possibility arises that Matthew, by echoing Zech 6:11, intends Jesus's crown to function not only as a royal crown but also as an atoning priestly headdress. Such an evocation would seem to muddy the typological waters. How could Jesus simultaneously be the scapegoat and the high priest of Yom Kippur in a meaningful way from Matthew's perspective? The answer may lie in Lev 16:10: "But the goat on which the lot fell for Azazel shall be presented alive before the Lord to purge (upon) it/him [לכפר עליו] by sending it away into the wilderness to Azazel." Schwartz summarizes the trouble scholars have with the phrase לכפר עליו: "Since the scapegoat is not sacrificed, nor is the חטאת-blood applied to it, nor is any other purification ritual performed over it, the use of the verb לכפר has plagued those commentators who have, correctly, insisted on taking all instances of the cultic כפר in the priestly literature as 'purge.'"[196] Milgrom explains the phrase by translating it, "to effect expiation upon it," suggesting that the scapegoat is understood as completing the purgation of the sanctuary.[197] But as Vis has pointed out,

---

195. Stead, *Zechariah 1–8*, 169 (emphasis mine). The continuity between Zech 3:5 and 6:11 is further established by use of the same expression ἐπιτίθημι ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλήν in both verses (twice in Zech 3:5). This phrase occurs nowhere else in Zechariah.

196. Schwartz, "Bearing of Sin," 18.

197. Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 1:1023. Schwartz follows Milgrom's interpretation ("Bearing of

texts such as Exod 30:10 problematize this interpretation, since they show that כפר +

על still implies the purgation of the object "upon which" purgation is made, which in

the case of Lev 16:10 would be the scapegoat—but virtually no scholar thinks the

scapegoat is the object of כפר.[198] Pointing to three texts in the Priestly literature that

assign the role of "bearing/removing iniquity" (נשא עון) to the Levitical priests (Exod

28:38; Lev 10:17; Num 18:1), Vis argues that לכפר עליו indicates the purgation of

*Aaron*, who bears Israel's defiant iniquities until he transfers them onto the the

scapegoat.[199] In other words, from the time he sprinkles the חטאת blood in the adytum

until the time he transfers those defiant sins "gathered" therein, Aaron carries Israel's

defiant sins upon himself until the scapegoat receives them and disposes of them in

the wilderness.[200] Leviticus 16 therefore seems to conceive two sin-bearing actors in

the Yom Kippur ritual: the high priest and the scapegoat.

Furthermore, some Second Temple authors recognized that both the high

priest and the scapegoat possess a sin-bearing function in the Yom Kippur drama.

Orlov notices, "in Jewish accounts, the imagery of the front-plate [i.e., the ציץ] of the

---

Sin," 18).

198. Vis writes, "As my analysis above has shown, כפר + על typically functions in the same way as כפר + את. This pattern holds true for the second occurrence of כפר + על in Exod 30:10, but not for the first. However in Exod 30:10, while the two occurrences of כפר + על cannot be rendered identically, the item affected is identical, the inner altar. Thus there has to be some suspicion about rendering the phrase as 'to perform purification/expiation upon it [the goat]' without also concluding that this ritual affects the goat, which no one believes to be the case" ("Purification Offering," 111).

199. Ibid., 115–18. Vis writes, "This confession for priests and laity, combined with the wearing of ordinary vestments, point to the high priest acting as a representative of all of the Israelites. Only Aaron can fulfill this transfer because he is the one who bears the iniquities of the people. Thus, it makes perfect sense that he, Aaron, be the object of purgation as Lev 16:10 states. Aaron is purged not by sacrifice, but by transfer. Just as Aaron bore the sins of the Israelites, now the goat bears them for Aaron and their removal is complete" (ibid., 117–18).

200. In this, I different from Vis, who thinks the scapegoat bears sins only from the people, not from the sanctuary ("Purification Offering," 118–23). I see no reason to doubt that the Priestly writers conceive the scapegoat as removing sins from both sanctuary and people, as Schwartz suggests ("Bearing of Sin," 19–20).

high priest often appears in the context of Yom Kippur rituals in which the scarlet headgear of the scapegoat is mentioned. It is thus possible that the scarlet band of the scapegoat is envisioned... as an ominous counterpart to the front-plate of the priest."[201] In the Apocalypse of Abraham, the angel Yahoel wears the priestly headdress of Exodus 28 (Apoc. Ab. 12.3) and affects atonement by transferring Abraham's moral impurity onto Azazel (Apoc. Ab. 13.14; cf. Zech 3:4).[202] Like Aaron, the angelic priest comes into contact with the impurity while affecting its transference.[203]

Thus, while it would seem to be a cleaner typological correspondence if Matthew designated Jesus *only* as the scapegoat in the abuse scene, one must allow for the possibility, and in my judgment probability, that Matthew, perceiving the sin-bearing role of the scapegoat *and the high priest* in Leviticus 16, constructs a maximalist Yom Kippur typology in his redaction of the episode. That Jesus's priestly role as sin-bearer comes unexpectedly by means of Zech 6:11 fits perfectly the royal-inaugural context of Zech 6:9–15 and Matt 27:27–31. Both texts explicitly describe the royal enthronement of a son of David.

Two further echoes of the Zechariah 3 and 6 complex in the redactional material of Matt 27:28–29 require comment, as they strengthen the likelihood of the Zech 6:11 allusion. First, the soldiers initially divest Jesus of his clothes (ἐκδύσαντες

---

201. Orlov, *Divine Scapegoats*, 26.

202. See Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 61–62. According to Orlov, "This creature, the angel Yahoel, baffles the seer's imagination with his enigmatic appearance... Dressed in purple garments, he wears a turban reminiscent of 'the bow in the clouds' ... Latter rabbinic traditions describe the high priest's front-plate (ציץ), which he wore on his forehead. Made of gold and inscribed with the divine Name, the plate shone like a rainbow" (*Heavenly Priesthood*, 96).

203. In keeping with the rabbinic understanding of the ציץ, Yahoel's diadem possesses a broader range of atonement than in Exod 28:38. Milgrom notes that the "rabbis extend its [i.e., ציץ] power even further... [they] include the impurity of the offerers as well as their offerings within the expiatory scope of the ציץ" (*Leviticus*, 1:512).

αὐτὸν, Matt 27:28), which recalls the removal of Joshua's dirty garments in Zech 3:4. Only Matthew narrates this initial disrobing of Jesus. Second, whereas the priest will be "at the right hand" (ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ) of the Davidic temple-builder (Zech 6:13), Matthew has Jesus hold "in his right hand" (ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ) the scepter of that figure (Mat 27:29a). Again, no other gospel account records this detail. By adapting the language of Zech 6:13, Matthew appears tacitly to indicate that Jesus is fulfilling the dual messianic offices of king *and priest.* One can therefore explain three unique editorial features of Matt 27:28–29 with reference to Zechariah 3 and 6: (1) the stripping of Jesus's clothes (cf. Zech 3:4), (2) the placement of the mock scepter in Jesus's right hand (cf. Zech 6:13), and (3) the placement of the crown of thorns on the head of Jesus (cf. Zech 6:11). Intriguingly, the golden rosette/diadem of the high priest possessed an ornate engraving of a plant with a particularly "thorny" (ἀκανθώδης) calyx according to Josephus (*Ant.* 3.176).[204]

To conclude, Lindars was right to posit an allusion to Zech 6:11 in the Matthean redaction of Matt 27:29a. In so doing, the evangelist introduces into the dark scene of Jesus's royal inauguration the additional element of Jesus's priestly vocation, which coheres well with Lev 16:32: "The priest *who is anointed* [ימשח/ χρίσωσιν]... shall make atonement... and shall wear the holy garments." Unlike

---

204. "It is a plant which often grows to a height of above three spans, with a root resembling a turnip... Now out of its branches it puts forth a calyx closely adhering to the twig, and enveloped in a husk which detaches itself automatically when it begins to turn into fruit... Its hemispherical lid adheres closely to it, turned (as one might say) to a nicety, and is surmounted by those jagged spikes whose growth I compared to that on the pomegranate, prickly [ἀκανθώδεις] and terminating in quite a sharp point. Beneath this lid the plant preserves its fruit which fills the whole of the calyx" (Josephus, *Ant.* 3.174, 3.176–77 [Thackeray]). On this plant, see Samuel Kottek, "Medicinal Drugs in the Works of Flavius Josephus," in *The Healing Past: Pharmaceuticals in the Biblical and Rabbinic World*, ed. Irene and Walter Jacob (Leiden: Brill, 1993), 95–106, at 99–100. Milgrom writes, "This word [ציץ] means 'flower, blossom' (Num 17:23; Isa 28:1; 40:6–8; Ps 103:15; Job 14:2)... It is possible that the plate was called ציץ because of its floral decoration... Because of its inscription 'holy to the Lord' (Exod 28:36), it had the power 'to remove the sin of the holy things that the Israelites consecrate, from any of their sacred donations' (Exod 28:38)" (*Leviticus*, 1:511–12).

Zechariah, Matthew perceives both royal and priestly offices as being fulfilled in one messianic figure. This portrait coheres with the image of the priest-king Melchizedek from Qumran, and also from Psalm 110, to which the evangelist makes prior allusion (Matt 26:64). Jesus's priestly role typologically corresponds to the high priest Joshua, who, like Aaron, was to bear Israel's sin on the Day of Atonement, a role assigned to Aaron in Lev 16:10 and more broadly assumed in Exod 28:38, Lev 10:17, and Num 18:1. Matthew seems to play off the ambiguity implied in the fact that there are two sin-bearing agents in the Yom Kippur drama, namely, the scapegoat and the high priest. This reading grants additional significance to the name Ἰησοῦς, which Matthew interprets in line with Jesus's mission to "save his people from their sins" (Matt 1:21).

## Conclusion

Behind the cruel mockery of Pilate's auxiliary troops (Matt 27:27–31), Matthew portrays the royal inauguration of the true cosmic lord. But as I have argued in this chapter, this kingly inauguration also entails a cultic elimination. The four cultural backgrounds that scholars usually propose for the mockery episode are unsatisfactory for a diversity of reasons. Though the abuse scene betrays facile similarities to some of these backgrounds, the Markan and Matthean episodes should be primarily situated in the broader cultural current of curse-transmission or elimination rituals. Along with his Markan *Vorlage*, Matt 27:27–31 conforms to the five-fold pattern betrayed in a vast host of ancient elimination rites. However, Matthew seems to embellish and assimilate the scene to the most famous elimination rite in Second Temple Judaism,

namely, the Day of Atonement scapegoat ritual.

The evangelist's unique modifications to Jesus's royal apparel acquire symbolic significance, designating Jesus as the scapegoat of Leviticus 16. The typical explanation for Matthew's change from the apposite πορφύρα to the obscure χλαμύς κοκκίνη is inadequate. I have supported the claim of Koester and Stökl Ben Ezra, who argue that Matthew's scarlet cloak is an allusion to the scarlet ribbon that was wrapped around the scapegoat in Second Temple tradition. As in the case of the Apocalypse of Abraham, the evangelist conceives the symbolic attire as a transferable garment of transgressions, representing the moral impurity "worn" by the scapegoat. Matthew betrays an acquaintance with this early Jewish tradition in his Parable of the Wedding Feast, where the man dressed in garments of unrighteousness is destined to the same fate as the primordial antagonist and scapegoat, Azazel (Matt 22:13; cf. *1 En.* 10.4–8).

This interpretation of the scarlet cloak is mutually reinforced by Matthew's redaction of the "thorny crown" (ἐπέθηκαν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ, Matt 27:29a), which echoes the language of Lev 16:21: "And Aaron shall place [the sins of Israel] on the head [ἐπιθήσει... ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλήν] of the living goat." Jesus's crown of thorns is analogous to the unproductive plants with which the *pharmakos* victims were abused, and only Matthew associates ἄκανθα with the Genesis 3 curse (Matt 7:16; cf. Gen 3:18). Given that in early Jewish and Christian literature ἄκανθαι are frequently associated with iniquity, and κόκκινος with moral impurity and atonement, it is not surprising that both items of apparel—the στέφανος ἐξ ἀκανθῶν and the χλαμύς κοκκίνη—appear to become symbolic of the moral impurity transferred onto the messianic scapegoat. This impurity, conceived also as "guilt," literally hangs over

Jesus's head on the cross, when Matthew uniquely writes, "And they placed over his head his guilt" (ἐπέθηκαν ἐπάνω τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ τὴν αἰτίαν αὐτοῦ, Matt 27:37). Here, the evangelist powerfully yet ironically portrays Jesus as the true "King of the Jews," who bears the sins of his people over his own head.

It also seems to be the case that Matthew, perceiving that there are in fact two sin-bearing agents in the Leviticus 16 ritual (i.e., the scapegoat and Aaron), blends his scapegoat typology with a high priest typology through an allusion to Zech 6:11. Zechariah 6:11 is the only place in the LXX where a crown (στέφανος) is placed (ἐπιτίθημι) upon (ἐπί) a head (κεφαλή), not least upon the head of a Jesus/Joshua (Ἰησοῦς). The evangelist uniquely employs all these terms in Matt 27:29. He also echoes the phrase ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ (Zech 6:13) by means of his editorial ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ in the same verse. Matthew thereby intimates that Jesus is not only the royal Davidic "Branch," who rebuilds the temple of the Lord, but he is the messianic priest who bears Israel's sins. Joshua's crown (Zech 6:11) is the priestly headdress (צִיץ) that completes his investiture and enables him to remove iniquity (Zech 3:4–5, 9; Exod 28:38). By donning what appears to be the antitype of this crown, Jesus becomes a high priest destined to expiate Israel's sins "in a single day" (Zech 3:9). The crown of thorns therefore seems to function as both a royal *and* priestly crown. As with Psalm 110's portrayal of Melchizedek, the evangelist paints Jesus as a priestly king.

Finally, it is significant that Matthew's clearest allusion to the Servant Songs occurs in the parallel scene of Jesus's mockery by the Sanhedrin (Matt 26:67–68), where the gospel writer evokes Isa 50:6 LXX.[205] Is it coincidental that in the two parallel episodes of Jesus's "Jewish" and "Roman" abuses (Matt 26:67–68; 27:27–

---

205. See Chapter One.

31), Matthew likens Jesus to two scriptural figures who possess a strikingly similar function, namely, bearing the sins of others? Probably not. It is more likely that the Servant and the scapegoat are akin typological figures in the evangelist's theology.

For Matthew, Jesus's kingship differs from that of the Gentiles, who brandish their positions of authority as tyrants (Matt 20:25). As the evangelist sees it, Jesus is a king who takes upon himself the moral impurity of the denizens of his own kingdom, offering his life as a ransom for many (Matt 20:28) for the release of sins (Matt 26:28).

CHAPTER FIVE:

A NEW DAY OF ATONEMENT:

JESUS'S DEATH AND THE DESCENT TO THE UNDERWORLD

Thus far I have argued that, in his Barabbas episode (Matt 27:15–26) and Roman-mockery scene (Matt 27:27–31), Matthew typologically portrays Jesus as the immolated goat and scapegoat of Leviticus 16 respectively.[1] The bloodguilty populace can only be a provisional sin-bearing "scapegoat" (Matt 27:24–25), since Jesus has announced the advent of a new exodus that will engender the eschatological release of sins *for many* (Matt 26:28). But how does Jesus's "blood poured out" accomplish this release according to Matthew? One catches only a faint glimpse of Jesus's role as the immolated goat in the Barabbas trial scene. By means of Pilate's lottery before the crowd, Jesus is designated as the goat for Yahweh, whose blood the high priest shall present "to Yahweh" in the Holy of Holies for the expiation of sins (Lev 16:8–9, 15–17). Does Matthew return to this seemingly significant typology or abandon it entirely? Though scholarship has tended toward a wholly negative interpretation of the *velum scissum* in recent years (Matt 27:51a), I here consider whether the evangelist intends the veil's rending to recall Jesus's identity as the immolated goat, whose chief function was to expiate Israel's sins and procure the divine Presence.

These moral impurities, however, having been removed by the blood of the goat for Yahweh, were released into the wilderness by means of the goat for Azazel. In the Roman-abuse scene, Matthew also portrays Jesus as the scapegoat that inherits all moral impurity and is banished from the holy city. In Second Temple tradition, the

---

1. See Chapters Three and Four.

scapegoat not only was exiled from Jerusalem but also experienced a fatal journey into an abyss. While Jesus's descent to the underworld (or *descensus ad inferos*, as some call it) has not been a popular topic in Matthean scholarship, there may be reasonable grounds to posit a descent narrative in the evangelist's PN as part of his broader scapegoat typology.[2]

With these pieces in place, the possibility arise that the Day of Atonement has exercised a structural influence on the evangelist's seemingly-bizarre narrative of the cosmic events that accompany Jesus's death (Matt 27:50–53). It may be, in this brief scene, that Matthew paradoxically conceives Jesus as fulfilling the destiny of both goats of Yom Kippur. The notion would be that Jesus's death and burial accomplishes a cosmic purgation of sins that gives rise to a host of eschatological events, making possible God's new Passover and exodus for Jesus's new covenant community.

### Jesus as Goat for Yahweh (Matt 27:50–51a)

The *Velum Scissum* as Dual Temple Portent

In his work on the atonement, Martin Hengel maintained that the saying over the cup "illumines the whole of the subsequent passion narrative" and that the rending of the

---

2. Summarizing his study of "hell" in the Jesus tradition, Kim Papaioannou writes, "Gehenna and the outer darkness are always connected to the final judgment, Hades is a place of waiting, the Abyss a prison of fallen angels ... Traditionally it has been presumed that the Gehenna language of the Gospels had been inspired by a perpetual fire that was burning in the valley of Hinnom outside the walls of Jerusalem where the city's rubbish was thrown to be consumed. This view, however, has fallen from favor in recent years primarily because there is no documentary evidence earlier than the thirteenth century testifying to the existence of such a dump" (*The Geography of Hell in the Teaching of Jesus: Gehenna, Hades, the Abyss, the Outer Darkness Where There is Weeping and Gnashing of Teeth* [Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2013], 241, 234). Richard Bauckham remarks, "The location of the devil in Gehenna and his role as its ruler seem to be unknown in ancient Jewish literature and developed only slowly in Christian thought after the second century" (*The Fate of the Dead: Studies on the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*, NovTSup 93 [Leiden: Brill, 1998], 122).

sanctuary veil "is similarly best understood in the light of Lev 16, the sacrifice on the Day of Atonement."[3] Despite the *prima facie* connection between Jesus's eucharistic words and the *velum scissum*, the notion that the torn veil in Matthew solely or chiefly portends the temple's demise has become commonplace in recent years.[4] Here, I contend that Matthew construes the event as a double portent, signifying not only the sanctuary's destruction, but also its reconstruction in the forgiveness of sins achieved through Jesus's death.[5]

Those of the opinion that the *velum scissum* in Matt 27:51a signifies God's judgment on the temple usually offer the following arguments: (a) Early Christian writers often interpret the tearing of the veil in terms of divine judgment.[6] (b) Since the other portents in Matt 27:51b–53 are public, then the outer veil is probably the

---

3. Hengel, *Mark*, 142; see also idem, *Atonement*, 42. He writes with regards to Mark, but his comments are applicable to Matthew.

4. Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 2:1098–1118; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:631; Luz, *Matthew*, 3:566.

5. Scholars who argue or suggest such a double symbolism include Hill, *Matthew*, 355; Meier, *Matthew*, 3:351; Senior, *Passion*, 142; Daniel J. Harrington, *The Gospel of Matthew*, SP 2 (Collegesville, MN: Liturgical, 1991), 400; Leon Morris, *The Gospel according to Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 724; Hare, *Matthew*, 324; Keener, *Matthew*, 686. Gurtner makes a similar case in light of Matthew's discourse on Jesus's death as a whole and his positive attitude toward the Jerusalem temple (*Torn Veil*, 97–137, 199–201). Gospel scholars have long debated the referent and meaning of the rending of the veil in the Synoptic Gospels, proposing two major interpretations: (1) The veil's rending portends divine judgment on the temple, or (2) it signifies an act of atonement accomplished through Jesus's death. These views are not mutually exclusive. For a recent review of scholarship on these and less popular interpretations, see ibid., 1–28. Typically, proponents of the first view understand the outer veil to be the referent of καταπέτασμα, while advocates of the second view take the inner veil as the term's referent. According to Gurtner, the second interpretation of the veil's rending is "by far the most most common among modern and not a few ancient scholars" (ibid., 11).

6. Gos. Pet. 7.25–26 (though these verses are somewhat removed from the veil's rending in Gos. Pet. 5.20; cf. 8.28); T. Lev. 10.3; Ps. Clem. Recogn. 1.41.3. There is also a tradition that connects the rending of the veil with the departure of an angel(s) from the sanctuary and/or the rending of the angel's garments (Milito, *Pascha* 98; Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* 4.42; Cyprian, *Adv. Jud.* 4). This is sometimes enjoined with an interpretation of the veil's rending as indicating (God's) mourning over Jerusalem (Melito, *Pascha* 98; Ps. Clem. *Recogn.* 1.41.3). Additionally, Liv. Pro. 12.10–12 and several Christian sources documented by Jerome interpret the *velum scissum* in light of the omens of Jerusalem's doom (Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 2:1116–17). On the interpretation of Matt 27:51 in early Christianity, see Marinus de Jonge, "Matthew 27:51 in Early Christian Exegesis," *HTR* 79 (1986): 67–79.

referent of καταπέτασμα. Since the outer temple veil was very large (ninety feet high according to Joseph, *J.W.* 5.211–12), then the rending of that veil would have been very impressive, clearly portending Jerusalem's destruction.[7] (c) Advocates for an expiatory interpretation of the *velum scissum* often appeal to the Epistle to the Hebrews, where the author portrays Christ as a high priest presenting himself as a sacrifice in the heavenly Holies of Holies beyond the inner καταπέτασμα (Heb 7:27; 9:12, 14, 26).[8] The weakness of this reading in Matthew has been the lack of a clear designation of Jesus as the immolated goat or high priest in the Gospel. (d) The verb σχίζω carries a violent connotation.[9] (e) Ancient sources report the observation of omens spelling Jerusalem's destruction in the years leading to 70 CE.[10] (f) Jesus is twice reported to have said he could/would destroy the ναός.[11]

These arguments lose their force in light of the following counterarguments for a constructive interpretation of the *velum scissum*. (a′) Early Christians also interpreted the veil's rending as a positive symbol of the blessings achieved through Jesus's death.[12] Moreover, only Matthew explicitly attributes atoning value to Jesus's

---

7. Howard M. Jackson, "The Death of Jesus in Mark and the Miracle from the Cross," *NTS* (1987): 16–37; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:631.

8. Hengel, *Atonement*, 42; Beare, *Matthew*, 536; Hagner, *Matthew*, 849. According to Moffitt, the primary comparison in these passages is between the high priest who offers the blood of a bull and a goat in the tabernacle Holy of Holies on the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:3, 6, 11–19), and Jesus, who offers himself in the heavenly Holy of Holies once and for all (*Atonement*, 278–81). See Chapter Two.

9. Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 2:1108.

10. Josephus, *J.W.* 6.288–309; b. Yoma 39b; y. Yoma 6.43c; Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.13. Notably, Josephus reports that a heavy gate in the temple's inner court opened of its own accord, predicting the impending Roman invasion (*J.W.* 6.293–95). Writing about the same event, Tacitus remarks, "Of a sudden the doors of the shrine opened and a superhuman voice cried, 'The gods are departing'" (*Hist.* 5.13 [Moore]).

11. Mark 14:58 // Matt 26:61; Mark 15:29 // Matt 27:40. It is further noted that the second of these testimonies comes shortly before the veil's rending in Mark 15:38 // Matt 27:51a (Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 2:1109).

12. For example, the veil's rending signifies that (1) God's Spirit is now poured out upon all the nations (T. Ben. 9.3; Tertullian, *Adv. Jud.* 13.15), (2) the divine mysteries have been fully disclosed

death in his Last Supper account (Matt 26:28). Jesus's eucharistic words, which serve as an explicit interpretation of his death, possess a cultic flavor especially in Matthew (see below). In contrast to Luke (23:45–46), he retains the placement of the veil's rending immediately *after* Jesus's death (Matt 27:50–51).

(b′) While what he sees (ὁράω) indeed motivates the centurion's confession, the Synoptic report of what the centurion saw is quite vague.[13] It is speculative to suggest that the rending of the large outer curtain would be more impressive to an ancient Jew, especially since the smaller inner curtain was thought to lead to God's *very Presence*. More importantly, lexical data from the Septuagint favors the inner veil as the referent of καταπέτασμα, which lends itself to a constructive interpretation of the *velum scissum*.[14] The only other appearance of καταπέτασμα in the New Testament is in the Epistle to the Hebrews (6:19; 9:3; 10:20), where the term refers to the *inner veil* of the heavenly sanctuary, through which Jesus enters to make atonement as the high priest on Yom Kippur.

(c′) Having established Matthew's immolated goat typology in the trial

---

(Sib. Or. 8.305–9; Gos. Phil. 76, 125a), or (3) Christ has become our heavenly high priest (Hippolytus, *Pasch*. 55.2). Ephrem (*Comm. Diat.* 21.4–6) and the Gospel of Philip (Gos. Phil. 125a) interpret the rending of the veil as indicating both the temple's destruction and as granting revelation of the mysteries or acces to the divine presence. For further early Christian interpretations, see Gurtner, *Torn Veil*, 14.

13. In Mark 15:39, the centurion sees "how he expired" (οὕτως ἐξέπνευσεν). In Matt 27:54, he sees "the earthquake and the things that happened" (τὸν σεισμὸν καὶ τὰ γενόμενα). In Luke 23:47, he sees "what happened" (τὸ γενόμενον).

14. "Καταπέτασμα is the primary term for the inner veil, and each time it occurs alone, without a locative genitive, it refers to the inner veil (פרכת)... When the LXX translator wanted to make clear that a particular use of καταπέτασμα was not a reference to that veil, he did so by the use of a locative genitive clarifying to which part of the tabernacle the curtain belonged, as a means of distinguishing it from the primary καταπέτασμα. Since the synoptic locative genitive of καταπέτασμα (τοῦ ναοῦ) clearly does not make such distinction, we are left to suppose that the evangelists, like their LXX 'source,' are referring to the inner veil by their use of καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ" (Gurtner, *Torn Veil*, 46; see 214–15). Even Brown admits, "Vocabulary, then, slightly favors interpreting the Synoptic reference to the *katapetasma* as having the inner veil in mind (if specificity was intended)" (*Death of the Messiah*, 2:1111).

episode (Matt 27:15–26) and his allusion to Joshua the high priest (Zech 6:11) in the Roman-abuse scene (Matt 27:29), a cultic interpretation of the *velum scissum* becomes more than plausible.[15] Additionally, Matthew was probably aware that the Hebrew term "veil" (פרכת) closely resembles the word for the "atonement slate" (כפרת), upon which the high priest sprinkled the goat's blood in the Holy of Holies on the Day of Atonement.[16] For the Semitic speaker, the word "veil" (καταπέτασμα) may have evoked the mercy seat that played a paramount role in the Yom Kippur ritual.

(d′) While σχίζω implies violence, it does not necessarily imply judgment.[17] The violent connotation of σχίζω coheres well with the intense forms of self-abasement prescribed on the Day of Atonement.[18] One recalls Jubilees's account of Jacob's mourning for Joseph, a figure symbolizing both Yom Kippur goats in the pseudepigraphon: "Jacob's sons slaughtered a he-goat, stained Joseph's clothing by dipping it in its blood, and sent (it) to their father Jacob on the tenth of the seventh month... [And Jacob] continued mourning Joseph for one year and was not comforted but said: 'May I go down to the grave mourning for my son.'"[19] In this light, the *velum scissum* could possibly evoke God's mourning the death of his Beloved Son, who is offered as a sacrifice for sins.

(e′) Many Jews living in Jerusalem interpreted the temple omens *favorably*, as

---

15. See Chapters Three and Four.

16. "He shall slaughter the goat of the sin offering that is for the people and bring its blood inside the curtain (פרכת), and do with its blood as he did with the blood of the bull, sprinkling it upon the mercy seat (כפרת) and before the mercy seat (כפרת)" (Lev 16:15; cf. 16:2).

17. The rending of the rocks (ἐσχίσθησαν, Matt 27:51b) leading to the opening of tombs does not imply judgment (although the earthquake probably does, Matt 27:52–53), nor does the rending of the heavens at Jesus's baptism in the Second Gospel (σχιζομένους, Mark 1:10).

18. Lev 16:29, 31; 23:27–32; Num 29:7. See Chapter Two.

19. Jub. 34.12, 17 (VanderKam, *Jubilees*, 228–29).

signs of divine blessing. Tacitus notably reports that the majority of Jews interpreted the signs this way.[20] Further, Matthew holds a generally favorable attitude toward the Jerusalem temple, especially compared to Mark.[21] The First Evangelist seems to consider the ναός of Jesus's day still to be a dwelling place of God (Matt 23:21).

Additionally, in the symbolic events following the *velum scissum* (Matt 27:51–53), Matthew alludes to Ezek 37:12–13, a text concerning Israel's return from exile, which is a theme integrally linked to atonement in Second Temple thought.[22] Only Matthew places these cosmic events after the veil's tearing, indicating "God's judgment on the old age and the powerful breaking-in of his kingdom."[23] Scholars

---

20. Regarding the opening of the temple gate, Josephus writes, "This again to the uninitiated seemed the best of omens, as they supposed that God had opened to them the gate of blessings" (*J.W.* 6.295; cf. 6.291 [Thackeray]). Tacitus similarly writes, "Few interpreted these omens as fearful; the majority firmly believed that their ancient priestly writings contained the prophecy that this was the very time when the East should grow strong and that men starting from Judea should possess the world" (*Hist.* 5.13 [Moore]). While Josephus and Tacitus, living after 70 CE, had no apparent reason to interpret the portents favorably, this is not necessarily the case for the evangelists nor for the earliest Christian interpreters of the *velum scissum* (see note above).

21. Daniel M. Gurtner's analysis of Matthew's temple discourse demonstrates that the evangelist tends to mitigate Mark's harsh attitude toward the temple, "carefully walking a razor's edge between legitimacy on the one hand and judgment on the other" ("Matthew's Theology of the Temple and the 'Parting of the Ways': Christian Origins and the First Gospel," in *Built Upon the Rock: Studies in the Gospel of Matthew*, ed. Daniel M. Gurtner and John Nolland [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008], 128–53, at 53). The gospel writer affirms the sacred status of Israel's sanctuary, making clear that Israel's leadership, not its sacred space, is responsible for the temple's destruction. For example, Matthew's Jesus validates the temple by assuming that the disciples are still bringing gifts to the altar (Matt 5:23–24; see also Matt 8:4, 12:5, and 17:27; Gurtner, "Theology of the Temple," 133–37). His redaction of the cursed fig tree pericope mitigates the severe judgment of the temple in his Markan *Vorlage* (Matt 21:18–22; cf. Mark 11:12–25; Gurtner, "Theology of the Temple," 140–41). In Matthew's seven woes, Jesus upholds the temple's sacred status as God's dwelling place, asserting that the ναός makes the gold of the sanctuary holy (Matt 23:17), the θυσιαστήριον makes the gift on the altar sacred (Matt 23:19), and that God still dwells in the ναός (Matt 23:21). When Jerusalem and its temple's destruction come into focus (Matt 22:7; 23:38; 24:2), fault lies not with Israel's sacred space but with "the misuse and corruption of an otherwise perfectly legitimate Temple" (Matt 22:5–6; 23:29–37; Gurtner, "Theology of the Temple," 146).

22. See Chapter One.

23. Meier, *Matthew*, 352; similarly, Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 2:1121–26. Davies and Allison summarize, "Earthquakes—which ancients typically viewed not as whims of nature but responses to human wickedness—are sometimes linked with the advent of God or a supernatural being, with judgment, with the deaths of great persons, and with tragedy in general" (*Matthew*, 3:632). See Judg 5:4; Isa 5:25; 13:9–13; Jer 4:23–24; Ezek 38:19; Joel 2:10; 3:15–16; Hag 2:6, 21; T. Mos. 10.4–5; T. Lev. 3.9; 4.1; further references in Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:632.

generally agree that the evangelist's seemingly bizarre episode of resurrection alludes to Ezek 37:12–13,[24] which describes Israel's return from exile in terms of bodily resurrection.[25] The co-texts of Ezek 37:1–14 evince the connection between exilic return and the forgivenes of sins:

> I will take you from the nations, and gather you from all the countries, and bring you into your own land. I will *sprinkle clean water upon you*, and you shall *be clean from all your uncleannesses*, and from all your idols *I will cleanse you* ... I will *save you from all your uncleannesses* ... Thus says the Lord God: On the day that I *cleanse you from all your iniquities*, I will cause the towns to be inhabited, and the waste places shall be rebuilt ... They shall *never again defile themselves* with their idols and their detestable things, or with any of their transgressions. I will save them from all the apostasies into which they have fallen, and *will cleanse them*.[26]

One recalls the first two chapters of the gospel, where Israel's state of exile casts a

---

24. Dale C. Allison makes the compelling case that Matthew alludes to both Ezek 37:12–13 and Zech 14:4–5 ("The Scriptural Background of a Matthean Legend: Ezekiel 37, Zechariah 14, and Matthew 27," in *Life beyond Death in Matthew's Gospel: Religious Metaphor or Bodily Reality?*, ed. Wim Weren, Huub van de Sandt, and Joseph Verheyden [Leuven: Peeters, 2011], 153–88, at 158–77) (contra Luz, *Matthew*, 3:567): (1) The language of Matt 27:52 (τὰ μνημεῖα ἀνεῴχθησαν... ἐκ τῶν μνημείων) parallels that of Ezek 37:12 (ἀνοίγω ὑμῶν τὰ μνήματα... ἐκ τῶν μνημάτων), (2) only in Ezek 37:12 do the words ἀνοίγω and μνῆμα appear together in the LXX, (3) earthquakes occur in Ezek 37:7 (σεισμός) and Matt 27:51 (σείω) before the resurrection, and (4) in both texts people rise from the dead collectively. Regarding the allusion to Zechariah, (1) the Mount of Olives splits (σχίζω) in Zech 14:4 and rocks split (σχίζω) in Matt 27:51, (2) there are earthquakes in Zech 14:5 (σεισμός) and Matt 27:51 (σείω), (3) "holy ones" (οἱ ἅγιοι) arrive in Zech 14:5 and Matt 27:52, (4) and there is an absence of light in Zech 14:6 and Matt 27:45. For Isa 52:1–2 as a possible intertext, see Timothy Wardle, "Resurrection and the Holy City: Matthew's Use of Isaiah in 27:51–53," *CBQ* 78 (2016): 666–81. The NA28 also lists Isa 26:19 and Dan 12:2 as possible allusions.

25. See Ezek 37:11, 14, and 21 (in the following prophecy). Zech 14:2 also describes the exiling of half of Jerusalem's population, though the fate of these individuals is vague. Does Matthew understand these exiles to be "the holy ones" (Zech 14:5: "Then the Lord my God will come, and all the holy ones [οἱ ἅγιοι] with him")?

26. Ezek 36:24–25, 29, 33; 37:23.

dark shadow over the infancy narrative and Matthew introduces Jesus as the one who "will save his people from their sins" (Matt 1:21).[27] If Ezek 36:28–29 and 37:23 are the scriptural intertexts of Matt 1:21, as Nicholas Piotrowski argues,[28] then the evangelist's allusion to Ezek 37:12–13 in the resurrection scene forms an *inclusio* with the beginning of the Gospel, indicating that Jesus's death atones for the sins that are the very cause of Israel's exile.[29]

(f') Jesus's claims to destroy the temple are accompanied by claims to *rebuild it* as well.[30] If the veil's rending fulfills the first half of Jesus's ναός prophecy in Matt 26:61 and 27:40, as most commentators claim, then the fulfillment of the second half, which pertains to the construction of a new sanctuary, is probably also in view. The ναός accusations in Matt 26:61 and 27:40 already point in this direction.[31] In contrast

---

27. See Chapter One. Hays summarily remarks, "The opening chapter of Matthew's Gospel is strongly consonant with interpretations of Jesus's work as bringing about the end of Israel's exile" (*Scripture in the Gospels*, 111).

28. Nicholas G. Piotrowski, "'I Will Save my People from Their Sins': The Influence of Ezekiel 36:28B–29A; 37:23B on Matthew 1:21," *TynBul* 64 (2013): 33–54.

29. The catchword σῴζω in Matt 1:21 (αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν) and Matt 27:42 (ἄλλους ἔσωσεν, ἑαυτὸν οὐ δύναται σῶσαι; cf. Mark 15:31) highlights this inclusio.

30. Mark 14:58 // Matt 26:61; Mark 15:29 // Matt 27:40.

31. Scholars debate whether Matthew conceives these testimonies as (1) entirely false accusations of Jesus claiming (to be able) to destroy the Jerusalem sanctuary with no implied ironic meaning (Luz, *Matthew*, 3:427), (2) accusations that are false from the perspective of the accusers, who think Jesus is referring to the Jerusalem sanctuary, but that are true from the viewpoint of Matthew, who understands Jesus to be referring to the sanctuary of his own body (cf. John 2:21) (Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:526), or (3) entirely true accusations, indicating Jesus's destruction of the Jerusalem sanctuary (Matt 27:51a) and his plan to establish an eschatological temple (Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 1:435–36). This last option is likely correct, since there is no indication in Matt 26:61, as there is in Mark 14:58, that the accusations are false. Davies and Allison seem to contradict themselves by positing Jesus's body as the ναός in Matt 26:61 and the Jerusalem temple as the ναός in the identical saying of Matt 27:40 (*Matthew*, 3:526, 3:630–31). During his trial before the Jewish council, two individuals testify against Jesus, "This man said, 'I am able to destroy the sanctuary of God and in three days to build it'" (Matt 26:61). Matthew changes Mark's (14:58) ἐγὼ καταλύσω to δύναμαι καταλῦσαι. Senior (*Passion*, 93), Brown (*Death of the Messiah*, 1:435), and Davies and Allison (*Matthew*, 3:526) are right to take this as a statement of messianic power and authority (a Matthean emphasis; see Matt 26:53), not as an attempt to recast Jesus's threat against the temple as a mere potentiality (so Luz, *Matthew*, 3:427). Matthew also omits Mark's "sanctuary made with hands" (χειροποίητον) and "another not made with hands" (ἄλλον ἀχειροποίητον), replacing this with "the sanctuary of God" (τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ). As Jesus hangs on the cross, this claim resurfaces when

to Mark 15:57–58, Matthew does *not* introduce the first allegation as "false" but rather assumes its validity: Jesus will indeed destro*y* and rebuild the ναός within three days.[32] Again, the co-text of Ezek 37:12–13 speak to this theme: "I will set my sanctuary among them forevermore... My dwelling place shall be with them... Then the nations shall know that I the Lord sanctify Israel, when my sanctuary is among them forevermore" (Ezek 37:26–28).[33]

The ναός Jesus claims to build is probably not his own resurrected body, since *God* raises Jesus from the dead in Matthew (Jesus does not raise himself).[34] Nowhere in Matthew is there a saying to the effect of John 10:18, "No one takes my life from me, but I lay it down of my own accord. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it up again." An interpretation of Matt 26:61 and 27:40 along the lines of John 2:19–21 is therefore doubtful. Neither does the ναός refer chiefly to the church, since the evangelist apparently narrates the church's founding in Matt 28:16–

---

bystanders exclaim, "You who destroy the sanctuary and in three days build it, if you are the Son of God, come down from the cross" (Matt 27:40). The only redactional change is the bringing forward of ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις in word order (cf. Mark 15:29), which thereby stresses that the destruction and rebuilding will be accomplished within a three-day period. Luke omits both of these statements, so he has no need to demonstrate their fulfillment in the crucifixion narrative. He consequently moves the veil's rending to before Jesus's death as a sign not of God's immediate judgment on the temple but of Jerusalem's future demise (Luke 23:45–46) (Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 2:1103–4). Matthew retains not only the two temple accusations but also the Markan ordering of the veil's tearing immediately after Jesus's death, thereby demonstrating the fulfillment of Matt 26:61 and 27:40 as many scholars suggest (Meier, *Matthew*, 331–32; Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 2:1099–1102; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:630), though some fail to recognize that the second half of the prophecy must then also be fulfilled (e.g., Brown, and Davies and Allison).

32. Meier, *Matthew*, 331; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:525; Luz, *Matthew*, 3:427. BDF (119) takes διὰ τιῶν ἡμερῶν (Matt 26:61) to mean "within three days" (similarly, A. T. Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek New Testament in light of Historical Research*, 3rd ed [London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1919], 581). Robertson takes ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις (in John 2:19, but the same phrase occurs in Matt 27:40) to mean "within three days" as well (ibid., 586–87).

33. The term for "sanctuary" here is τὰ ἅγιά.

34. See the divine passives in Matt 16:21; 17:9, 23; 20:19; 26:32; 27:64; 28:6, 7. Matthew writes ἐγείρω in the middle voice only in Matt 27:63, placing it on the mouths of the unbelieving chief priests and Pharisees.

20.[35] Ναός, rather, must be metonymy for the sanctuary's chief function.[36] Jesus's atoning death fulfills (Matt 5:17) the *raison d'être* of the ναός and "robs the old cult of its force."[37] This fulfilment is evinced when the centurion and "those with him" (a Matthean redaction) proclaim, "Truly this man was God's son!" (Matt 27:54).[38] Whereas the preservation of God in the sanctuary was the chief purpose of the expiatory goat of Leviticus 16, Jesus's sacrifice unleashes the divine Presence to a cosmic extent, reconstructing the *raison d'être* of the sanctuary, "God with us" (Matt 1:23; cf. 28:20), and now, "God with the Gentiles."[39] According to André LaCocque, "As Matt 27 makes clear, the centripetal temple becomes centrifugal and extends itself to the ends of the earth."[40]

To conclude, the arguments for a constructive interpretation of the *velum scissum* are too forceful to posit only a destructive symbolism for the event in Matthew. It is more likely that, for Matthew, the *velum scissum* augurs both the temple's destruction *and* the construction of a new cultic program rooted in the death of Jesus. This conclusion is strengthened by the cultic language employed in Jesus's

---

35. Meier, *Matthew*, 156. Davies and Allison conceive Matt 16:18 as the church's founding (*Matthew*, 3:526).

36. Jesus's eschatological renewal of this function makes the church possible. One recalls that Matthew conceives Jesus as a new and greater temple in Matt 12:6 (Meier, *Matthew*, 129; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:314; Gundry, *Matthew*, 223). Michael Patrick Barber argues that, in another redactional passage (Matt 16:18–20), the evangelist portrays Jesus as a Davidic temple builder, who establishes the new sanctuary upon the rock of Peter and transfers the keys of the priesthood to his disciples ("Jesus as the Davidic Temple Builder and Peter's Priestly Role in Matthew 16:16–19," *JBL* 132 [2013]: 935–53). In Matt 21:42, Jesus predicts that he will become the chief stone of this new temple, having first been rejected by "the builders," that is, Israel's leaders (G. K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*, NSBT [Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2004], 183–85).

37. Hengel, *Atonement*, 42.

38. Hengel, *Atonement*, 42.

39. Beale, *Temple*, 190–92.

40. LaCocque, *Jesus the Central Jew*, 256.

eucharistic words.

## Cultic Background of Jesus's Death (Matt 26:28)

Only Matthew attributes an explicit atoning significance to Jesus's death at the Last Supper in his saying over the cup: "This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins" (Matt 26:28).[41] This is one of two passages in the Gospel that attributes clear meaning to Jesus's death. Unlike Matt 20:28, Matt 26:28 exhibits clear editorial activity. The evangelist retains the placement of the Last Supper as the first major event of the Passover, which is the day on which all the events of Jesus's passion occur in the Gospel (see Matt 26:2, 17–19).[42] Because the Markan-Matthean tradition lacks the Pauline-Lukan formula, "Do this in remembrance of me" (1 Cor 11:25; Luke 22:19), the eucharistic narrative in Matthew, as in Mark, does not function as a "'cult legend' but rather an anecdote that serves to

---

41. Jesus's eucharistic words take two forms in the New Testament: the Pauline-Lukan (1 Cor 11:23–25; Luke 22:19–20) and the Markan-Matthean (Mark 14:22–25; Matt 26:26–29) traditions. In the Pauline-Lukan tradition, the sayings over the bread and cup are separated by an entire meal, the cup is identified as the "new" covenant, and the exact parallelism found in the Markan-Matthew tradition ("This is my body / This is my blood") is lacking. The classic work on this subject is Jeremias's *Eucharistic Words*. Jeremias argues for the historicity of the Last Supper and sets it within the context of the Passover seder. On recent challenges to the historicity of the eucharistic traditions proffered by proponents of the Jesus seminar, see Jonathan Klawans, "Interpreting the Last Supper: Sacrifice, Spiritualization, and Anti-Sacrifice," *NTS* 48 (2002): 1–17, at 4 n. 11. The independent multiple attestation of Jesus's eucharistic words leads most scholars to accept the historicity of the core of the tradition, which Davies and Allison reconstruct as (1) an introductory word about the bread, (2) "this is my body," (3) an introductory word about the cup, (4) "this cup is the (new) covenant in my blood," (5) and Jesus's vow of abstinence (*Matthew*, 3:466–67). Responding to critics who posit the historical implausibility of the eucharistic words on the basis that the eating and drinking of flesh and blood would be too scandalous for first-century Jews (cf. John 6:52), Klawans argues that the phenomena of metaphor and (prophetic) symbolic action in early Jewish and gospel traditions allows one comfortably to situate the eucharistic words in a first-century Jewish context ("Last Supper," 3–7).

42. On the differences in the Synoptic and Johannine Passion chronologies, see Meier, *A Marginal Jew*, 386–401.

interpret Jesus's death beforehand in the context of the Gospel as a whole."[43] What Martin Hengel claims for Mark is equally, if not more, appropriate for Matthew: "No one can say that this theme [of atonement] is completely absent from the subsequent passion account."[44]

Jonathan Klawans's recent work on the Last Supper challenges the tendency in New Testament scholarship to find in Jesus's eucharistic words an implicit condemnation of the Jewish cult.[45] He notes that the earliest Christians did not separate themselves from temple worship but rather participated in it regularly.[46] Criticizing the tendency to identify the metaphorical use of cultic language in the New Testament as a "spiritualization" of a putatively flawed sacrificial system, Klawans remarks, "These metaphors are, rather, *borrowing from* sacrifice. Sacrificial metaphors operate on the assumption of the efficacy and meaning of sacrificial rituals, and hope to appropriate some of that meaning and apply it to something else."[47] Klawans notes that Matthew holds a particularly positive attitude toward the temple.[48] The cultic allusions in Matthew's Last Supper episode therefore assume the validity

---

43. Yarbro Collins, *Mark*, 654; contra Rudolf Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, trans. John Marsh (New York: Harper & Row, 1963 [1921]), 265–66.

44. Hengel, *Atonement*, 40.

45. Klawans, "Last Supper"; idem, *Purity, Sacrifice*, 214–22. Klawans's work on the Last Supper is part of his larger project of deconstructing a three-fold bias in scholarship toward the ancient Jewish temple: (1) Christian supersessionism, which presumes the inadequate nature of the Jewish sacrificial system on the basis of Jesus's "superior" sacrifice, (2) Jewish supersessionism, which views the temple as an outmoded institution intended merely to teach a monotheistic religion, and (3) and the contemporary association of animal sacrifice with human violence. According to Klawans, "All three of these views approach the ancient Jewish temple through the lens of presumption: it was a flawed institution, with an unspiritual, unjust, and even immoral ritual at its core" (ibid., 247).

46. Acts 2:46–47; 3:1; 5:42; Gal 1:18; 2:1; cf. 1 Cor 10:14–21; Did. 9–10; 1 Clem. 40–41; Klawans, "Last Supper," 9–13.

47. Ibid., 13. See, e.g., 1 Cor 3:16–17; 6:19; 9:13; 16:15; 2 Cor 2:15; 6:16; Rom 1:9; 12:1; 16:5; Phil 2:17; 4:18.

48. Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice*, 218. See note above and Gurtner, "Theology of the Temple," 128–53.

and potency of the sacrifices of the Hebrew Bible and temple rituals.

Scholars generally agree that the Last Supper tradition evokes sacrificial imagery.[49] In the Passover setting of the Synoptics, the broken body and shed blood of Jesus recall the immolated Passover lamb, whose blood was placed on the Israelite's doorposts and lintels to avert the destroying angel (Exod 12:1–13). According to Jeremias, Jesus speaks of himself as "the eschatological paschal lamb, representing the fulfilment of all that the Egyptian paschal lamb and all the subsequent sacrificial pascal lambs were the prototype."[50] That is, "Jesus's death will effect a new and definitive redemption."[51] By the phrase, "the blood of the covenant," Jesus also alludes to Exod 24:8,[52] where during the Sinai covenantal ceremony Moses dashes half of the blood of the burnt- and peace-offerings upon the altar (Exod 24:5–6), reads from the law with the congregation's avowal (Exod 24:7), dashes the other half of the blood upon the people (Exod 24:8), and then eats a meal with God (Exod 24:9–11).[53] At the Last Supper, "Jesus declares the wine in the cup he shares with his disciples to

---

49. Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 220–31; Moo, *Passon Narratives*, 301–11; Donald Senior, *The Passion of Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1985), 66; Xavier Léon-Dufour, *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread: The Witness of the New Testament* (New York: Paulist, 1987), 144–54; Hare, *Matthew*, 298; Bruce Chilton, *A Feast of Meanings: Eucharistic Theologies from Jesus through Johannine Circles* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 67–74 (though Chilton does not identify the sacrifice with Jesus's death but with the "pure meal" itself); Gundry, *Matthew*, 528; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 477; Yarbro Collins, *Mark*, 655–56; Luz, *Matthew*, 3:380; Huizenga, *New Isaac*, 242–48; Hamilton, *Death of Jesus*, 221–24.

50. Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 223.

51. Frank J. Matera, *Passion Narratives and Gospel Theologies: Interpreting the Synoptics through their Passion Stories* (New York: Paulist, 1986), 87.

52. The addition of the word "new" (ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη) in 1 Cor 11:25 and Luke 22:20 is likely an allusion to Jer 31:31.

53. Marcus notes, "In the OT passage the splashed blood signifies that the Israelites will incur blood guilt if they break God's covenant with them" (*Mark*, 2:966). According to Carol Meyers, "the people swear unto death, symbolized by the slaughtered sacrificial animals, that they will remain faithful to the covenant bond with God. At the same time, it may be that they are joined to God as 'blood brothers,' united in a ceremony in which the blood symbolically connects them" (*Exodus*, NCBD [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005], 206). Similarly, see Victor P. Hamilton, *Exodus: An Exegetical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011), 441.

be his blood, i.e., his life poured out in sacrifice to create a bond of life, a community

of life, a covenant between God and his new people."[54] In short, Matthew's inherited

eucharistic tradition presents Jesus as the paschal lamb and sacrifice of a new exodus

and covenant community.[55]

But these sacrifices were not expiatory in their original contexts. While Heb

9:19–22, Tg. Onq. Exod 24:8, and Tg. Ps.-J. Exod 24:8 construe the Sinai sacrifices

as atoning, this understanding does not seem to have been as widespread in the

Second Temple era as is often assumed.[56] Some scholars therefore suggest the

influence of Isaiah 53 or Leviticus 16 to explain the atoning aspect of Jesus's death in

Matthew's redaction. It is helpful to compare the First and Second Gospels:

Mark 14:23–24: καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ

<u>ἔπιον</u> ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς

διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον <u>ὑπὲρ πολλῶν</u>.

Matt 26:27–28: καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς

λέγων· <u>πίετε</u> ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες, τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς

διαθήκης τὸ <u>περὶ</u> <u>πολλῶν</u> ἐκχυννόμενον <u>εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν</u>.

Matthew notably (1) changes Mark's ὑπέρ to περί, (2) moves the πολλῶν phrase

ahead in word order, and (3) adds an entirely new phrase, εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.

By means of the first two redactions, Matthew highlights what may be an

---

54. Meier, *Matthew*, 319.

55. Scholars debate the influence of Zech 9:11 and Jer 31:33 on the saying over the cup in Matthew. See Michael Knowles, *Jeremiah in Matthew's Gospel: The Rejected-Prophet Motif in Matthean Redaction*, JSNTSup 68 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993), 207–9; Moss, *Zechariah Tradition*, 151–55. Interestingly, Zech 9:11 LXX employs a key term from Leviticus 16 used in relation to the scapegoat, ἐξαποστέλλω (cf. Lev 16:21, 22, 26): "And you by the blood of your covenant have sent forth [ἐξαπέστειλας] your prisoners out of the pit that has no water."

56. Davies and Allison only cites these three texts (*Matthew*, 3:475). Marcus only cites the targums (*Mark*, 2:966). Huizenga only cites Hebrews and Targum Pseudo-Jonathan (*New Isaac*, 244).

allusion to Isa 53:12.[57] As Jeremias notes, "the word *rabbim*/πολλοί is almost a *leit-motiv* in Isa 52:13–53:12."[58] According to Adela Yarbro Collins, in the phrase, "which is poured out for many" (Mark 14:24), the evangelist's material combines the two images of a sin-offering and the scapegoat, which she sees as evoked in Isa 53:12: "He poured out his soul to death... he bore the sins of many [πολλῶν]."[59] By changing ὑπέρ to περί, a word frequently used in reference to sacrifice in the LXX,[60] and by stylistically sandwiching περὶ πολλῶν between τό and ἐκχυννόμενον, "a sacrificial word which connotes a violent death,"[61] Matthew highlights the cultic flavor of the possible Isa 53:12 allusion.[62] By this alteration, the evangelist may be influenced by a

---

57. Scholars often claim that the ὑπὲρ πολλῶν phrase in Mark 14:24 (parr.) alludes to Isaiah 53 (Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 227–29; Hengel, *Atonement*, 72–73; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:474; Yarbro Collins, "Finding Meaning," 176–78). This view is not without its detractors (Hooker, "Isaiah 53," 94–95; Luz, *Matthew*, 3:381).

58. Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 227. Cf. Isa 52:14, 15; 53:11, 12.

59. Yarbro Collins, "Finding Meaning," 176–78. Though the verb "he poured out" is different in Isa 53:12 (ערה, παραδίδωμι) than in Mark 14:24 and parr. (ἐκχέω), Yarbro Collins remarks, "The conclusion that the phrase 'he poured out his life to death' in Isa. 53:12 is sacrificial is supported by a clear allusion to sacrifice in verse 10" (ibid., 177). The presence of אשם in Isa 53:10 makes this reading probable (see Lev 5:6–7, which uses אשם in the context of the sin-offering [Milgrom, Leviticus, 1:309–10; on the distinct "reparation offering" of Lev 5:14–26, also called אשם, see ibid., 1:319–78]), especially since the sin-offering involves the pouring out (ἐκχέω) of blood (Lev 4:7, 18, 25, 30, 34). Yarbro Collins also notes that both Isa 53:12 and Lev 16:22 appropriate the verb נשא (Isa 53:12: נשא חטא־רבים; Lev 16:21–22: ונשא ... כל־חטאת) and that עון appears in Isa 53:6 and 53:11 (עון כלנו ... עונתם) and Lev 16:21–22 (כל־עונת ... כל־עונתם) ("Finding Meaning," 177 n. 8).

60. According to Gundry, "Matthew's preposition reflects sacrificial terminology in the LXX. There, περί often occurs with ἁμαρτίας, 'sin'" (*Matthew*, 528) (Lev 5:5–7; 7:27; 9:2–3; 12:6, 8; 14:13, 22, 31; 15:15, 30; 16:3, 5, 9; 23:19). However, as Davies and Allison note, Matthew generally prefers περί to ὑπέρ, which the evangelist writes only 5 times in his gospel (once with the genitive in Matt 5:44), whereas he writes περί + genitive 20 times (*Matthew*, 3:474). Two other possible explanations for Matthew's change to περί are (1) the word's appearance in Isa 53:10 LXX ("If you give an offering for sin [περὶ ἁμαρτίας]") and (2) its occurrence in early Christian confessional material (Rom 8:3; Gal 1:4; Heb 5:3; 10:18, 26; 13:11; 1 Pet 3:18; 1 John 2:2).

61. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:474. Also, Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 222 n. 5, 226; Yarbro Collins, *Mark*, 656. Ἐκχύν(ν)ω is an Hellenistic form of ἐκχέω (BDAG, s.v. "ἐκχέω").

62. For the contrary view, that Isaiah 53 does not draw upon cultic imagery, see Bernd Janowski, "He Bore Our Sins: Isaiah 53 and the Drama of Taking Another's Place," in *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources*, ed. Bernd Janowski and Peter Stuhlmacher, trans. Daniel P. Bailey (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 48–74. In his doctoral dissertation, KyeSang Ha argues for the extensive use of Hebrew cultic allusions in Isa 52:13–53:12 ("Cultic Allusions in the Suffering Servant Poem [Isaiah 52:13–53:12]" [PhD diss., Andrews University, 2009]). Summarizing, Ha writes, "The Suffering Servant Poem does not have just one point of contact, but many points of

Jewish tradition that read the Servant's role in terms of the temple cult, though there is slender support for this claim. George Brooke argues that the portait of the suffering priestly figure who effects atonement in 4QApocryphonLevi draws upon Servant imagery.[63] This text might possibly portray that eschatological figure as the scapegoat of Leviticus 16, though this is by no means clear.[64] Jintae Kim contends that Tg. Isa. 53 utilizes the language of the Levitical sin-offering to describe the Servant's role of effecting divine forgiveness, although it is uncertain whether this tradition dates back to the first century CE.[65]

The third Matthean redaction is most striking. Davies and Allison write, "There is no parallel in the other Last Supper accounts to this clause [εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν] ... It appears only here in Matthew and never in the LXX (where ἄφεσις is

---

contact with the Hebrew cult... My lexical study on the allusions is carried out by lexicographical, text-critical, and contextual investigations, specifically for nine terms and two clauses. The nine terms are משחת, יזה, שה, אשם, יצדיק, יפגיע, and the three major sin terms חטא, עון, and פשע, and the two clauses are סבל עון and נשא חטא. They can be divided into two categories, cultic technical terms and terms that, although not technical cultic terms, can be similarly used in cultic contexts... Their cumulative weight, however, must be impressive, especially when all these terms and clauses appear in a single pericope of the Suffering Servant Poem" (ibid., 307–8).

63. E.g., the Hebraism מכאוביכה in 4Q541 6.3, which recalls Isa 53:3–4 (איש מכאבות ... ומכאבינו סבלם) (George J. Brooke, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005], 148–51). Brooke builds upon the insights of Émile Puech (*Qumran Grotte 4: XXII*, DJD 31 [Oxford: Clarendon, 2001], 213–56). Brooke summarizes, "All in all, this priest's activities are not only referred to with some of the phraseology associated with the Servant of Isaiah, but his career seems to mirror that of the Servant — a universal mission, light against darkness, vilification, violent suffering, sacrifice, benefits for others" (*Dead Sea Scrolls*, 150). Angel agrees with this conclusion ("Priestly Tradition," 299). Contra Collins, *Scepter and the Star*, 144.

64. Stökl Ben Ezra, "Fasting," 177–78; Angel, "Priestly Tradition," 299–300. See Chapter Four.

65. Jintae Kim, "Targum Isaiah 53 and the New Testament Concept of Atonement," *JGRChJ* 5 (2008): 81–98. Kim argues that the use of the passive form of שבק ("to forgive") in Tg. Isa. 53.4, 5, 12 makes probable the influence of the declaratory formula of Tg. Onq. Lev 4.20 (ibid., 85–87). Kim also posits that the language of "cleansing" in Tg. Isa 53.10 (רעוא למצרף ולדכאה ית שארא דעמיה) recalls Tg. Isa. Lev 16.30 (יכפר עליכון לדכאה יתכון), writing, "This agreement points to a tradition that interpreted Isaiah 53 in terms of the sin offering of the Day of Atonement" (ibid., 92–93). Admittedly, Kim's case for an allusion to the Yom Kippur ritual *in particular* is not very convincing. It is important to note that, in Tg. Isa. 53, the Servant, who is understood to be the messiah (Tg. Isa. 52.13), does not suffer redemptively. Rather, he effects divine forgiveness through prayer (Tg. Isa. 53.4–5, 12). Bruce Chilton proposes the Tannaitic period for the composition of Tg. Isa. 52–53 (*The Isaiah Targum: Introduction, Translation, Apparatus, and Notes*, ArBib 2 [Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1987], 103, 105).

linked only once to 'sin,' in Lev 16:26)."[66] Intriguingly, Lev 16:26 constitutes the only occurrence of εἰς ἄφεσιν in the Septuagint, which speaks of "the man who sends out the goat designated *for release/forgiveness* [εἰς ἄφεσιν]." The meaning of ἄφεσις here is quite literal: Israel's sins are physically "released" or "sent away on a trajectory," being conveyed onto the scapegoat and then sent into the wilderness (Lev 16:21–22).[67] Building on this insight, Hamilton notes the occurrence of περί in the instructions for Aaron's manipulation of the immolated goat's blood on the Day of Atonement "for all of their sins" (περὶ πασῶν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν, Lev 16:16), arguing that "Matthew uses the language of Leviticus 16 LXX—εἰς ἄφεσιν, περί, ἁμαρτιῶν—to express the sacrificial character of Jesus's blood poured out."[68] While it seems to me that the verbal parallels in Matt 26:28 are too general to posit an intentional allusion to Leviticus 16, Hamilton's interpretation cannot be ruled out.

In three of the four other occurrences of εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν in the New Testament, the referent is baptism (Mark 1:4; Luke 3:3; Acts 2:38; cf. Luke 24:7), which the earliest Christians likely conceived as an elimination ritual of atonement, whereby one's moral impurity was metaphorically washed or "released" down stream.[69] Only Matthew omits the statement that John's baptism was εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν (Matt 3:1; cf. Mark 1:4; Luke 3:3), applying the phrase instead to Jesus's

---

66. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:474 and n. 139.

67. Roitto, "Polyvalence of ἀφιημι," 144–47.

68. Hamilton, *Death of Jesus*, 221.

69. According to Klawans, John the Baptist steered a course between the Qumran sectarians, who held sin to be ritually defiling and therefore required sinners to undergo ritual purification, and the Tannaim, who kept moral and ritual impurity entirely separate (*Impurity and Sin*, 138–43). John's baptism was effective, not for ritual purification, but for moral purification; that is, it atoned for sins (ibid., 139). But since water rituals were generally not used for moral purification in the Hebrew Bible, John's baptism is best explained as a concretization of the metaphor one finds in passages such as Isa 1:16–17, Jer 2:22, Ezek 36:16–22, and Psa 51:7–9, which use the image of ritual purification in the context of atonement for moral impurity (ibid., 142–43).

death in the cup-saying (Matt 26:28). This application suggests that, for Matthew, Jesus's death entails a similar function of eliminating moral impurity. In either case, the ritual effect is the disposal or release (ἄφεσις) of sins.

To sum up, Matthew's inherited eucharistic tradition presents Jesus as the paschal lamb and sacrifice of a new exodus and covenant community. The First Evangelist is the only New Testament author to add εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν to the saying over the cup, explicitly attributing an atoning function to Jesus's death. While an expiatory conception of the Sinai sacrifice might explain this feature, the cultic language of Isaiah 53 and Leviticus 16 is more likely the influential factor. Though it may be impossible to locate the exact scriptural or cultic background for each tradition contained in Jesus's eucharistic words, one can confidently conclude that, of the Synoptics, the Gospel of Matthew most clearly presents Jesus's death as an atoning event in terms of the Jewish temple cult.

Matthew's Parody of Priestly Expiation (Matt 27:3–10)

Below I propose that the *velum scissum* in Matt 27:51a evokes the expiatory offering of the goat for Yahweh on Yom Kippur. This is not the first time the evangelist evokes the notion of expiation in chapter 27. As his first major insertion in the passion account, Matthew's Judas narrative (Matt 27:3–10) continues his discourse on the transference of the bloodguilt of Jesus's death.[70] When he learns that Jesus is condemned, Judas attempts to return the blood money to the chief priests and elders,

---

70. See the independent accounts of Judas's death in Acts 1:16–20 and in the two versions of a Papias fragment as quoted by Apollinarius of Laodicea (F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, eds., *The Beginnings of Christianity: Part 1: Volume 5* [London: Macmillan, 1933], 22–30).

who refuse to accept it (Matt 27:3–4). After he throws the thirty pieces of silver into

the ναός and hangs himself (Matt 27:5), the priests take the money and, deeming it

unfit for the temple treasury, purchase a field outside Jerusalem for the burial of

foreigners, naming it the "Field of Blood" (Matt 27:6–10). For Matthew, this

apparently takes place to fulfill Zech 11:13, Jer 18, 19, and 32:6–15.[71]

But it is strange that Matthew describes Judas as throwing the blood money

into the ναός (Matt 27:5)—a word that refers to the temple sanctuary in the gospel[72]—

since none of these biblical texts employ that term.[73] For Judas to throw the money

into the ναός would require him to stand at the Court of the Israelites and hurl the

coinage across the Court of the Priests, or for Judas to trespass into the shrine itself.[74]

Raymond Brown notes this oddity: "Matt's verb 'to cast' (*riptein*) implies a strong

action, but surely Matt does not mean that Judas threw the coins from a great

---

71. Matt 27:9–10 contains perhaps the most difficult scriptural citation in the Gospel. The bulk of the quotation comes from Zech 11:13 (apparently, the first part deriving from the LXX and the second part from the MT), although Matthew attributes the saying to the prophet Jeremiah. According to Brown (*Death of the Messiah*, 1:651) and Davies and Allison (*Matthew*, 3:568–69), the evangelist presents the scriptural citation as a conflation of the passages in Zechariah and Jeremiah (for reasons why Matthew names only Jeremiah, see ibid., 3:569). Davies and Allison aptly suggest, "The effect in any case is to prod us to read Zech 11:13 in the light of Jer 18:1ff. (the allegory of the potter) and 32:6–9 (Jeremiah's purchase of a field with silver)" (ibid., 3:569).

72. Ναός refers to the temple shrine in Matt 23:16, 17, 21, 35; 27:51 (its referent is ambiguous in Matt 26:61; 27:40). Ἱερόν refers to the temple complex in Matt 4:5; 21:12, 14, 15, 23; 24:1; 26:55 (its referent is ambiguous in Matt 12:5–6) (Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:564; France, *Matthew*, 1040, n. 17; Luz, *Matthew*, 3:471). Hamilton notes that the evangelist retains οἶκος in his quotation of Isa 56:7 in Matt 21:13 and uses οἶκος to describe the temple in Matt 23:38. She claims that Matthew intends ναός to refer to the "inner shrine" (*Death of Jesus*, 183 n. 6).

73. Matthew here echoes Zech 11:13, in which the prophet Zechariah, acting as "a shepherd of the flock doomed to slaughter" (Zech 11:4, 7), throws the insultingly low wage paid to him (thirty pieces of silver) to the "potter" (יוֹצֵר, MT) or "into the treasury in the house of the Lord" (τὸν οἶκον Κυρίου, Zech 11:13 LXX).

74. John M. Lundquist, *The Temple of Jerusalem: Past, Present, and Future* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2008), 118. Notice that Matthew here assumes that the ναός, into which Judas throws the money (Matt 27:5), is distinct from the κορβανᾶς (Matt 27:6). The treasury was in the Court of Women, which was accessible to all (Mark 12:41–44; John 8:20; Josephus, *J.W.* 5.200; Lundquist, *Temple*, 115).

distance."[75] Scribes tried to ameliorate this problem by modifying the text to read εν τω ναω, indicating that Judas had entered the shrine to return the money.[76] But, of course, because he was not a priest, Judas was not allowed to enter the ναός. Brown continues: "Did Matt not know the rules of the Temple, or was he deliberately exaggerating Judas's action to communicate the horror of profanation?"[77] Davies and Allison wonder whether Matthew would have "made such a mistake in the first place... Yet perhaps historical verisimilitude was not his object."[78]

In light of these oddities, it is reasonable to suggest that a theological agenda has motivated Matthew's blood-money scene.[79] Recall that nearly all the cast members of the Leviticus 16 ritual have hitherto possessed an inverted counterpart in Matthew 27: the Gentile Pilate performs as high priest, Barabbas plays the part of the scapegoat, the crowd acts as Azazel, the Roman soldiers are the scapegoat's handler, and Jerusalem becomes the stage of a new wilderness.[80] Here, the chief priests' removal of blood money from the sanctuary seems to parody the expiatory function of the immolated goat of Leviticus 16.

In a way that strikingly corresponds to the Priestly conception of sin's ability to penetrate the ναός from afar, Matthew has Judas throw the impure blood money into the temple's shrine from a distance:[81] "This is defilement, the bloodguilt of the

---

75. Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 1:642.

76. Witnesses to this variant include A, C, W, *f* 1, and the Majority Text.

77. Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 1:642.

78. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:564.

79. It should be noted that Tg. Zech. 11:13 reads "sanctuary" for יוצר.

80. See Chapter Three. The crowd's association with Azazel is part of Matthew's intra-Jewish polemic.

81. Milgrom, "Israel's Sanctuary," 393–94.

priests of Israel, reaching even into the holy place... The blood of Jesus, like the blood of Zechariah [Matt 23:35], touches the heart of the temple and even the chief priests and inner sanctuary are defiled."[82] This is similar to how the authors of Leviticus 16 imagined Israel's defiant sins as penetrating into the sanctuary and stubbornly adhering to its furniture from afar.[83] Interestingly, Matthew has the *chief priests* enter the ναός in order to remove the impurity from the shrine (Matt 27:6).[84] Since this money is defiling, they dispose of it by purchasing a field outside of Jerusalem. This movement recalls that of the high priest on Yom Kippur, who enters into the adytum with the blood of the immolated goat to expiate Israel's sins from the sanctuary (Lev 16:15–19) and disposes of those sins outside of the city by means of the scapegoat (Lev 16:20–22). Matthew mocks the chief priests, since by such scrupulous "manipulation" of the blood money, they in reality accomplish the opposite of the priestly rite of expiation and defile themselves, thereby fulfilling Jeremiah's prophecy.[85]

In summary, the chief priests' manipulation and removal of the blood money from the ναός parodies the high priest's expiation of sins from the sanctuary by means of the blood of the goat for Yahweh. The message seems to be that, due to the moral failure of Israel's priestly establishment, God is deconstructing the old sanctuary and establishing a new cultic order on the basis of the death of Jesus. This ironic reading of Matt 27:5–6 betrays a valuable insight into how the evangelist conceives the

---

82. Hamilton, *Death of Jesus*, 183.

83. See Chapter Two.

84. Eighteen of the twenty four occurrences of ἀρχιερεύς appear in Matthew 26–28.

85. "Because they have filled this place with the blood of the innocent... this place shall be called... the Valley of Slaughter... I am now bringing upon this city and upon all its towns all the distaster that I have pronounced against it" (Jer 19:4, 6, 15).

mechanism of Jesus's atoning sacrifice, namely, as the expiation (removal or purgation) of sin from sacred space.

## The Priestly Offering of Jesus's πνεῦμα (Lifeforce) beyond the Veil

The veil's rending functions as a dual apocalyptic portent, indicating God's judgment on the old temple older and his constructing a new one. As Donald Senior remarks, "The tearing of the veil not only signals the end of the Temple era—because of the infidelity of God's people—but the inauguration of a new and final age of grace... In this sense the tearing of the veil has a positive meaning as well: it is an opening of access [to God]."[86] In light of the sacrificial context of Jesus's saying over the cup (Matt 26:28), Matthew's parody of priestly expiation in the Judas story (Matt 27:6), his immolated goat typology (Matt 27:15–26), and allusion to Zech 6:11 (Matt 27:29), Matthew's *velum scissum* more specifically evokes the high priest's entrance through the καταπέτασμα into the Holy of Holies with the blood of the immolated goat on the Day of Atonement.[87]

---

86. Senior, *Passion*, 143.

87. Are we to imagine Jesus's sacrifice as purifying the *Jerusalem* temple doomed for destruction? Scholars often note that, according to Exodus (26:1, 31; 36:8, 35) and Josephus (*J.W.* 5.212–14; *Ant.* 3.132, 183), the sanctuary curtains, especially the outer veil, symbolized the heavens, and the Holy of Holies represented the divine cosmic sanctuary (Josephus, *Ant.* 3.123; cf. Sir 50.5–7) (Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 2:1112–13; C. T. R. Hayward, *The Jewish Temple: A Non-biblical Sourcebook* [London: Routledge, 1996], 8–10, 145; Beale, *Temple*, 36–38; Yarbro Collins, *Mark*, 759–60; Gurtner, *Torn Veil*, 72–96, 169–83). In light of this and the fact that Matthew situates the *velum scissum* as the first of several *cosmic* events (Matt 27:51–53), Gurtner takes the rending of the veil as symbolizing the rending of the heavens, a meaning already present in Mark 15:38. While Gurtner understands this cosmic symbolism to be revelatory, Matthew probably (also) intends it to be expiatory. Only in the First Gospel is God's throne, which is the object of expiation in Lev 16:15 (כפרת), said to be in the heavens: "Do not swear at all, either by heaven, for it is the throne of God" (Matt 5:34). "Whoever swears by heaven, swears by the throne of God and by the one who is seated upon it" (Matt 23:22). If the *velum scissum* evokes the tearing of the *cosmic* veil, then Matthew may conceive the expiatory effect of Jesus's death as extending to the divine throne of the heavenly sanctuary—the cosmic כפרת as it were.

But contrary to the expectation set forth in Matt 26:28, the evangelist never mentions Jesus's sacrificial blood in his crucifixion-death narrative. How then does he conceive Jesus's death as providing a sacrifice for sins? Immediately before the rending of the veil, which begins a series of cosmic phenomena, Matthew changes Mark's ἐξέπνευσεν (Mark 15:37) to ἀφῆκεν τὸ πνεῦμα (Matt 27:50), a phrase suggesting the voluntary nature of Jesus's death.[88] Yet R. T. France notes that this statement "is an unusual way to describe death. The ambiguity of the Greek πνεῦμα, 'breath' or 'spirit,' leaves some uncertainty as to why Matthew chose this phrase."[89] Following BDAG, France concludes that πνεῦμα here means "that which animates or gives life to the body."[90] This observation is significant, since πνεῦμα is tantamount to the animating lifeforce of sacrificial blood that has the power to atone by virtue of that lifeforce.[91] As Lev 17:11 states, "For the spirit of the flesh is in the blood, and I have placed it for you upon the altar to purge your spirits; for it is the blood that purges by means of the spirit" (כי נפש הבשר בדם הוא ואני נתתיו לכם על־המזבח לכפר על־נפשתיכם כי־הדם הוא בנפש יכפר).[92] In the Priestly theology, sacrificial blood has the potency to purge the

---

88. Gundry, *Matthew*, 575; Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 2:1081; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:628; Luz, *Matthew*, 3:552. Cf. Luke 23:46; John 19:30. According to Allison, "Matthew's Gospel does assume a dualism of soul and body... body and soul are separated at death and joined later for the last judgment" ("Scriptural Background," 180). Allison does not, however, address the role of πνεῦμα in Matthew's anthropology.

89. France, *Matthew*, 1078. He notes that ἀφίημι + ψυχή occurs in the LXX to describe death but not ἀφίημι + πνεῦμα. Luz claims that "'to give up the spirit'... is not an uncommon expression for 'to die'" (*Matthew*, 3:553), but only one of his seven prooftexts actually contains the combination ἀφίημι + πνεῦμα. For death as the departure of πνεῦμα, see Sir 38:23; Wis 16:14.

90. Ibid., 1078; BDAG, s.v. "πνεῦμα." For this sense of πνεῦμα, see Jas 2:26; Luke 8:55; 23:46; Acts 7:59; John 19:30; Rev 11:11; 13:15. For πνεῦμα as an independent entity that lives on after death, see 1 Pet 3:18–19; Heb 12:23.

91. See Chapter Two.

92. Translation by Vis, "Purification Offering," 205. Admittedly, Lev 17:11 LXX uses ψυχή, not πνεῦμα. In the Septuagint, πνεῦμα never renders נפש (Edwin Hatch and Henry A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books)*, 2 vols. [Oxford: Clarendon, 1897], 2:1151).

offerer's נפֶשׁ, since the blood contains the נפשׁ (or animating lifeforce) of the offering.

Luke follows Mark's use of ἐξέπνευσεν, narrating Jesus's last breath (Luke 23:46) only after the tearing of the sanctuary veil (Luke 23:45). However, Matthew narrates Jesus's release of the πνεῦμα immediately before the rending of the veil, which matches the precise sequence Lev 16:15: "[The high priest] shall slaughter the goat of the sin-offering that is for the people and bring its blood inside the veil [καταπετάσματος]." This raises the possibility that the evangelist conceives Jesus's πνεῦμα as functioning like the lifeforce of blood that is brought beyond the veil to atone for sins.

This notion of πνεῦμα as sacrificial lifeforce finds a parallel in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Here, Jesus's presentation of his resurrected "self" (ἑαυτόν) to God (Heb 7:27; 9:14) in the heavenly temple is effectively equivalent to the offering of his "blood" (αἷμα, Heb 9:14, 25) as the ultimate חטאת sacrifice.[93] That is, in the Epistle to the Hebrews Jesus's resurrected body functions as the animating lifeforce of sacrificial blood that has the power to atone by virtue of that lifeforce. A similar conception is found in the Apocalypse of Abraham, where the patriarch's *nefesh* functions as the animating blood of the goat for Yahweh.[94] Here, the angelic priest Yahoel brings Abraham's soul (not blood) into the heavenly adytum as an acceptable sacrifice to God (Apoc. Ab. 17.20). Additionally, the Epistle of Barnabas describes

---

93. Moffitt, *Atonement*, 278–81. Moffitt suggests that "the equation of blood and self works not because the writer conceives of the offering of Jesus at the moment of his death, but because he envisions Jesus's self in terms of his resurrected life" (ibid., 281). If my interpretation is correct, then the notion differs from Hebrews in that Matthew's Jesus expiates sins from the heavenly sanctuary at the crucifixion, whereas Hebrews's Jesus accomplishes this task at his ascension.

94. "The ascension of the angelic high priest with his apprentice's soul into the heavenly Holy of Holies might represent the counterpart to the entrance of the earthly high priest with the blood of the immolated goat into the adytum of the earthly temple, wherein the blood of the sacrificial animal symbolizes its soul—its nefesh" (Orlov, *Atoning Dyad*, 146).

Jesus as offering "the vessel of the spirit" (τὸ σκεῦος τοῦ πνεύματος) as a "sacrifice" (θυσία) to God (Barn. 7.3) in fulfillment of the Isaac typology.[95] For the author of Barnabas, Jesus's πνεῦμα was apparently a crucial component of his sacrifice for sins.

Matthew's priestly portrayal of Jesus in Matt 26:64 and 27:29 supports the notion that τὸ πνεῦμα functions as sacrificial lifeforce in Matt 27:50. In the latter passage, Jesus dons the antitype of the priestly diadem of Joshua the high priest (Zech 6:11) that was intended to remove Israel's iniquity on Yom Kippur (Zech 3:9).[96] Jesus receives the crown of thorns that symbolize the sins being transferred onto him as the scapegoat and messianic priest-king, demonstrating his willingness to bear Israel's iniquity as the high priest and scapegoat of a new Day of Atonement (Lev 16:10).[97] For Matthew, Jesus is not a helpless victim of an accidental sacrifice for sins carried out by the Roman soldiers. Rather, Jesus is fully involved in the cultic drama, fulfilling the role of the three major actors in the Leviticus 16 script: the high priest, the goat for Yahweh, and the goat for Azazel. Jesus voluntarily executes the eschatological sacrifice, returning to the Father "the gift of life that is symbolized in the life-breath."[98] Jesus's release of the lifeforce thus becomes functionally equivalent to his blood poured out for the forgiveness of sins (Matt 26:28). Once the sanctuary veil is invoked (Matt 27:51a), it becomes clearer that the sacrifice is modeled on that

---

95. The sacrifice of Barn. 7.3 more immediately pertains to the author's Isaac typology. Additionally, 2 En. 70.16 describes Methuselah's death in a peculiar way: "And while Methusalom was speaking to the people his spirit was convulsed, and, kneeling on his knees, he stretched out his hands to heaven, praying to the Lord. And, as he was praying to him, *his spirit went out*." This happens as Methuselah is standing at the altar, immediately having invested his son Nir with the priesthood.

96. See Chapter Four.

97. See Chapter Two.

98. Harrington, *Matthew*, 400.

of the goat for Yahweh (Lev 16:15–17).[99]

## Jesus as Goat for Azazel (Matt 27:51b–53)

So far I have argued that Matthew casts Jesus's death in terms of the immolated goat of Leviticus 16, whose blood the high priest brings beyond the inner veil to purge sins from the sanctuary and procure the divine Presence. The Day of Atonement, however, involves not only the presentation of the immolated goat's blood/lifeforce in the Holy of Holies to expiate sins but also the banishment of the scapegoat into the wilderness to dispose of those sins. Matthew seems to be aware of this, since he typologizes Jesus as both the immolated goat in the Barabbas episode (Matt 27:15–26) and as the scapegoat in the following abuse scene (Matt 27:27–31). This raises the question: If in his narrative of Jesus's death, Matthew (27:50–51a) suggests the presentation of Jesus's blood/lifeforce as the immolated goat in the heavenly sanctuary, then does he also conceive Jesus's three-day ordeal in terms of the scapegoat?

### Jesus's Death as Binary Movement of the Goats of Leviticus 16

Scholars are often puzzled by Matthew's awkward placement of the resurrection of the "holy ones" (Matt 27:52–53) immediately after the rending of the sanctuary veil

---

99. LaCocque posits that the Synoptics portray Jesus as having uttered the divine Name during the Sanhedrin trial (Mark 14:62 parr.) and during his "loud cry" on the cross (Mark 15:37), just as the high priest would have expressed the Name only on the Day of Atonement (m. Yoma 6:2; m. Sota 7:6; Tamid 3:8) (*Jesus the Central Jew*, 247–61; idem, "The Great Cry of Jesus on the Cross," in *Putting Body and Soul Together: Essays in Honor of Robin Scroggs*, ed. Virginia Wiles, Alexandra Brown, and Graydon F. Snyder [Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1977], 138–64). Though this thesis would support the present argument, I do not find it very convincing.

(Matt 27:51a), since he could have easily narrated this apocalyptic event in its proper sequence, namely, after Jesus's resurrection from the dead. Brown remarks, "were the whole action of v. 53 postresurrectional, it should more logically have been recounted in the next chapter of Matt that begins on Easter."[100] Davies and Allison write, "Would Matthew not have inserted the tradition later in the narrative if he were so sensitive to Jesus not being the first to rise from the dead?"[101] France comments, "Matthew might more appropriately have linked this occurrence with the second earthquake which will reveal Jesus's empty tomb in 28:2."[102] As Allison notices, the most common explanation is that the gospel writer wants to underscore the notion that Jesus's death makes possible the resurrection from the dead (Rom 8:29; 1 Cor 15:20–23; Col 1:18; Rev 1:5).[103] Others posit that he wants to emphasize the causative force of Jesus's death vis-à-vis the restoration of Israel.[104] But surely Matthew could have narrated the events of Matt 27:51b–53 in chapter 28 and conveyed these theological messages with as much force. The same cannot be said, however, if the cosmic events at Jesus's death find their full meaning in the evangelist's theology of atonement, as Matt 26:28 would lead us to suppose. But what would the events of Matt 27:51b–53 possibly have to do with the forgiveness of sins? The answer may lie in a descent to Sheol narrative.

The premise that Jesus's *descensus ad inferos* underlies the cosmic events described in Matt 27:51b–53 finds support in the fact that the overwhelming majority

---

100. Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 2:1130.

101. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:634.

102. France, *Matthew*, 1082.

103. Allison, "After his Resurrection," 348.

104. Gurtner, *Torn Veil*, 201; Hamilton, *Death of Jesus*, 224–26.

of earliest interpreters conceived Jesus's descent to Sheol as engendering the resurrection of the saints.[105] As Dale Allison remarks, "Indeed, this is the most common understanding of the passage [Matt 27:52–53] in the ancient church."[106] Brown also notices that "the two images [of Jesus's descent to Hades and the cosmic events of Matt 27:51–53] were intertwined by the early 2nd century, if not earlier."[107] In Günther Bornkamm's estimation, Jesus's descent to the underworld is original to the First Gospel: "[T]he relating of Jesus' death and the raising of the saints presupposes the idea of the descent into Hades and the vanquishing of death... indeed, even if only in rudimentary and undeveloped form, the thought is present in the incident."[108] Richard Bauckham reaches a similar conclusion: "Matthew 27:52–53 seems to be related to the widespread extra-canonical tradition that Christ released the Old Testament saints from Hades... The Matthean passage probably draws on that tradition, but makes no explicit reference to Christ's activity in Hades."[109] Allison's ultimately unconvincing proposal, that the clause μετὰ τὴν ἔγερσιν αὐτοῦ (Matt 27:53) is a secondary addition inserted on the basis of belief that Jesus descended to Hades, indirectly corroborates Bornkamm and Bauckham's conclusion.[110]

---

105. Gos. Pet. 10.41–42; Sib. Or. 8.305–312; T. Ben. 9.3; Odes Sol. 42.11; Justin, *Dial.* 72.4; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 4.22.1; *The Letter of Abgar of Edessa* in Eusebius, Hist. eccl. 1.13.20; Gk. Apoc. Ezra 7.1–2; Gos. Nic. 17–27. See further citations in Bauckham, *Fate of the Dead*, 40–44.

106. Dale C. Allison, "After his Resurrection [Matt 27:35] and the Descens ad inferos," in *Neutestamentliche Exegese im Dialog: Hermeneutik–Wirkungsgeschichte–Matthäusevangelium* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2008), 335–54, at 349.

107. Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 2:1128.

108. Günther Bornkamm, "σείω, σεισμός," *TDNT* 7:196–200, at 200.

109. Bauckham, *Fate of the Dead*, 39.

110. The clause μετὰ τὴν ἔγερσιν αὐτοῦ (Matt 27:53b) has caused great difficulty for Matthean scholars. There are four typical approaches: (1) The clause modifies ἐξελθόντες ἐκ τῶν μνημείων (Matt 27:53a) (e.g., Hamilton, *Death of Jesus*, 210 n. 68, apparently). The problem with this view is that it creates the very awkward scenario of the raised saints waiting in their opened tombs (Matt 27:52) until Jesus's resurrection. (2) The clause modifies εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν καὶ ἐνεφανίσθησαν πολλοῖς (Matt 27:53c) (e.g., Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 2:1131). The problem with

The presence of a *descensus ad inferos* narrative in Matt 27:51b–53 is supported by the fact that the sign of Jonah comprises the Son of Man's three-day journey to the underworld in the First Gospel (Matt 12:40).[111] George M. Landes and

<hr />

this approach is that there is no apparent reason why Jesus's resurrection would be the crux that enables the saints to enter into the holy city. More plausibly, Jesus's resurrection serves as the crux that enables the saints' own resurrection (e.g., Rom 8:29; 1 Cor 15:20–23; Col 1:18; Rev 1:5). (3) The clause is not original to Matthew and is a secondary addition (e.g., Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:634; Luz, *Matthew*, 3:569; Allison, "After his Resurrection," 335–54). Allison's ardent defense of this view merits comment. He argues four points: (a) Ἔγερσις is a hapax legomenon, and Matthew places every other occurrence of μετά + accusative at or near the beginning of its sentence in the gospel (ibid., 340). While Allison lists nine passages to prove this point (Matt 1:21; 17:1; 24:29; 25:19; 26:2, 32, 73; 27:62, 63), in three of these passages Matthew simply reproduces Mark (Matt 17:1; 26:32, 73; cf. Mark 9:2; 14:28, 70), and in only two of them is it certain that Matthew is modifying his *Vorlage* to place μετά + accusative ahead in word order (Matt 24:29; 26:2; cf. Mark 13:24; 14:1). This leaves a relatively small sample size. (b) Allison claims that, because Matthew narrates the chain of events in Matt 27:51b–53 in such a seamless fashion, it must be implied that "the things that happened" (τὰ γενόμενα), which the centurion and those with him sees (Matt 27:54), includes the opening of the tombs, the resurrection, and the appearance in Jerusalem, and the addition of μετά κτλ. interrupts this narrative logic (ibid., 340–41). But this is speculative. Certainly, it is possible that τὰ γενόμενα refers only to the splitting of the rocks, which accompanies the earthquake. Allison claims that the rending of the rocks (Matt 27:51b) cannot be separated from the opening of the tombs (Matt 27:52a). But Matthew forms an inclusio between the rending (ἐσχίσθη) of the veil and the rending (ἐσχίσθησαν) of the rocks with the verb σχίζω, thereby connecting the events in Matt 27:51 as a singular unit. (c) Allison argues that μετά κτλ. interfers with Matthew's "carefully-crafted parallelism between Good Friday and Easter morning," so that the events in Matt 27:52–53, now postponed until Sunday, no longer prefigure Easter (ibid., 342–43). But it is simply not the case that "episode A can foreshadow episode B only if A precedes B in time" (ibid., 343). In the art of narrative, an author can employ a "flash-forward" to foreshadow an event that lies in the future from the standpoint of plotline, though that foreshadowed event may be logically or, strictly speaking, temporally prior to the foreshadowing event. Thus, episode A (the resurrection of the saints) can foreshow episode B (Jesus's resurrection) even though B precedes A in time. (d) Allison cites the Diatessaron, Melito of Sardis, and several fourth-century or later witnesses as evidence that not all early manuscripts contained μετά κτλ. (ibid., 343–47). Despite Allison's valiant effort to garner textual support for his view, the external evidence he presents is very meager. The extant manuscript data overwhelmingly points to the authenticity of μετά κτλ. Finally, there is major weakness in the theory of Luz and Allison. Namely, if μετά κτλ. is a secondary addition, why did the scribe or editor choose to place the clause in a position that nearly all modern commentators agree is awkward and disruptive to the narrative flow of Matt 27:51b–53? Why would a scribe create an arguably greater problem than the one he intended to fix? If μετά κτλ. is a scribal addition, it is certainly a poor one. These points lead me to adopt the following and least problematic position. (4) The clause modifies all of Matt 27:52–53 (e.g., Senior, *Passion*, 147; France, *Matthew*, 1082; some woud have it modify Matt 27:51b–53). The problem with this view is that the placement of μετά κτλ. is awkward if it is intended to modify all the events of Matt 27:52–53. But opponents of this position exaggerate this awkwardness. It seems plausible that Matthew restrains the placement of μετά κτλ. at the beginning of Matt 27:52 because he wants to maintain the καί + aorist pattern, in order to highlight the logical (not temporal) sequence between the rending of the veil and the cosmic events. As such, Matthew's placement of μετά κτλ. after the first verb that breaks this pattern (i.e., ἐξελθόντες ἐκ τῶν μνημείων) seems as good a place as any for an author trying to maintain the continuity of Matt 27:51–53. It could also be that μετά κτλ. was simply written as a clarifying afterthought by an impassioned author.

111. Adolf von Harnack, *The Sayings of Jesus*, trans. J. R. Wilkinson (London: Williams & Norgate, 1908), 23; Richard Alan Edwards, *The Sign of Jonah: In the Theology of the Evangelists and Q*, SBT 18 (Naperville, IL: Alec R. Allenson, 1971), 99 (cf. ibid., 98); Joachim Jeremias, "Ἰωνᾶς,"

R. Timothy McLay make a solid case for why Matt 27:52–53, in part, fulfills the sign

of Jonah in the evangelist's literary imagination.[112] However, such discussions, while

important for understanding Matt 27:51b–53 in its entirety, should not sidetrack this

investigation. At the present moment, I want to propose that the binary movement of

the two goats of Leviticus 16 has influenced Matt 27:50–53 at a structural level. As

one recalls, each goat moves in antithetical directions on the Day of Atonement.[113]

The goat for Yahweh is taken into the inner shrine, and the goat for Azazel is sent into

the wilderness. It may be that Matthew conceives a bidirectional movement taking

place within the three-day timeframe of Matt 27:50–53 and the broader death-burial

narrative (Matt 27:50–66).

As one recalls, Lev 16:8 commands that Aaron "cast lots on the two goats, one

lot for the Lord, and the other lot for Azazel." The parallelism in the phrase גורל אחד

ליהוה וגורל אחד לעזאז, highlighted by the preposition ל, suggests the contrary

movements of the two goats: one goat will go "to the Lord" beyond the inner veil, and

the other goat will go "to Azazel" in the wilderness. Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra

---

*TDNT* 3:406–10, at 409–10; idem, "ᾅδης," *TDNT* 1:146–49, at 148 (for Jeremias, the sign is only made manifest when the Son of Man returns from the dead); Anthony Hanson, "The Scriptural Background to the Doctrine of the 'Descensus ad Inferos' in the New Testament," in *The New Testament Interpretation of Scripture* (London: SPCK, 1980), 122–56, at 148 (Hanson also cites Holtzmann, Seidelin, and Klostermann); Eugene H. Merrill, "The Sign of Jonah," *JETS* 23 (1980): 23–30, at 24; Meier, *Matthew*, 138; George M. Landes, "Matthew 12:40 as an Interpretation of 'The Sign of Jonah' Against its biblical Background," in *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth*, ed. C. L. Meyers and M. O'Connor (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1983), 665–84; John Woodhouse, "Jesus and Jonah," *RTR* 43 (1984): 33–41; Gundry, *Matthew*, 244–45; Simon Chow, *The Sign of Jonah Reconsidered: A Study of its Meaning in the Gospel Traditions*, CB 27 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1995), 88–91 (Chow emphasizes Jesus's resurrection as part of the sign); Bauckham, *Fate of the Dead*, 38–39; cf. 16–17; R. Timothy McLay, *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 159–62; R. Reed Lessing, *Jonah: A Theological Exposition of Sacred Scripture*, ConC (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 2007), 237; Michael W. Andrews, "The Sign of Jonah: Jesus in the Heart of the Earth," *JETS* 61 (2018): 105–19 (Andrews equivocates between a descent to "the realm of the dead" and a descent "into death" [ibid., 115–16]).

112. Landes, "Matthew 12:40," 674–78; McLay, *Septuagint*, 159–69.

113. See Chapter Two.

summarizes this phenomenon:

> This Temple ritual consisted of two antagonistic movements, which I call centripetal and centrifugal: the entrance of the High Priest into the Holy of Holies and the expulsion of the scapegoat. As the first movement, the holiest person, the High Priest, entered the most sacred place, the Holy of Holies of the Jerusalem Temple... As a second movement, the scapegoat burdened with the sins of the people was sent with an escort to the desert.[114]

The two goats experience an inward-outward opposition of movement in the ritual instruction of Leviticus 16. They also experience an upward-downward opposition of movement in the ritual praxis of Second Temple Judaism. Jewish tradition relates that the scapegoat was not only banished into the desert but also hurled down a cliff.[115] Thus, as the high priest ascended with the blood of the immolated goat into the adytum by means of a ramp or flight of stairs,[116] the scapegoat descended violently downward to its demise.

The binary movement of the two goats is reflected in the apocalyptic *imaginaire* of Yom Kippur. One recalls that 1 Enoch 10 describes Asael's banishment as a primordial enactment of the scapegoat ritual: "Bind Azazel by his hands and his feet, and throw him into the darkness. And split open the desert which is in Dudael, and throw him there" (1 En. 10.4–5).[117] Here, the personified scapegoat is banished

---

114. Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, "The Biblical Yom Kippur: The Jewish Fast of the Day of Atonement and the Church Fathers," *SP* 34 (2002): 493–502, at 494.

115. Philo, *Plant.* 61; m. Yoma 6:6.

116. Lundquist, *Temple*, 119.

117. Knibb, *1 Enoch*, 87.

into the cosmic wilderness of the underworld. Enoch then experiences the opposite cosmic movement as he ascends into the heavenly sanctuary. Orlov summarizes:

> It is intriguing that, while the main antagonist of the Book of Watchers is envisioned as the eschatological scapegoat, the main protagonist of the story—the patriarch Enoch—appears to be understood as the high priestly figure who is destined to enter into the celestial Holy of Holies. This dynamic once again mimics the peculiar processions of the protagonist and the antagonist on the Day of Atonement, wherein the high priest enters the divine presence, and the scapegoat is exiled into the wilderness. The Book of Watchers reflects the same cultic pattern as its hero, Enoch, progresses in the opposite direction of his antagonistic counterpart Asael.[118]

Thus, the editor of the Enochic booklet applies the template of the bidirectional movement of the two goats to Asael and Enoch respectively.

This pattern is also reflected in the Animal Apocalypse. Enoch experiences an ascent into a high tower symbolic of the heavenly sanctuary:[119] "And those three who came after took hold of me by my hand and raised me from the generations of the earth, and lifted me onto a high place, and they showed me a tower high above the earth, and all the hills were smaller" (1 En. 87.3).[120] Immediately after this, Enoch witnesses the judgment of Azazel: "And I saw one of those four who had come before; he seized that first star that had fallen from heaven, and he bound it by its

---

118. Orlov, *Atoning Dyad*, 55.

119. VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*, 171.

120. Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch*, 121.

hands and feet and threw it into an abyss, and that abyss was narrow and deep and desolate and dark" (1 En. 88.1).[121]

The Apocalypse of Abraham employs the bidirectional paradigm of the Yom Kippur goats as well. One recalls that the authors of the work portray the angelic antagonist, Azazel, as a personified scapegoat. Abraham's corruption is transferred to Azazel (Apoc. Ab. 13.14), and he is to become "the firebrand of the furnace of the earth" (Apoc. Ab. 14.5), being banished "into the untrodden parts of the earth" (Apoc. Ab. 14.6). Azazel is to undergo a cosmic descent, but Abraham will ascend into the celestial sanctuary (Apoc. Ab. 15–32) and become a sacrifice to God.[122] Orlov remarks:

> In a manner similar to Enoch in the Book of Watchers, in the Abrahamic pseudepigraphon, the hero progresses in the opposite direction of his negative counterpart. Abraham ascends into heaven, while his infamous fallen counterpart descends into the lower realms. In both texts, then, there are mirroring themes of ascent and descent. The apocalyptic drama of the Slavonic pseudepigraphon can thus be seen as a reenactment of the two spatial dynamics which are also reflected in the Yom Kippur ritual: there is both an entrance into the upper realm and an exile into the underworld.[123]

In summary, Leviticus 16, the Second Temple ritual tradition, BW, the Animal Apocalypse, and the Apocalypse of Abraham display the trope of the antithetical

---

121. Ibid.

122. Orlov, *Atoning Dyad*, 128–157. See Chapter Two.

123. Orlov, *Atoning Dyad*, 145.

binary movement of the two goats of Yom Kippur. This trope exists in Philo of Alexandria, the halakhic material of *Barnabas*, and Origen as well.[124] While in Leviticus 16 the binary movement is merely horizontal, in early Jewish literature it also becomes vertical. Is there any evidence that this tradition has influenced Matt 27:50–53?

In the first place, the evangelist crafts an *inclusio* in Matt 27:51 by employing the word σχίζω first to describe the rending of the veil and then to describe the rending of the rocks: Καὶ ἰδοὺ τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ *ἐσχίσθη* ἀπ᾽ ἄνωθεν ἕως κάτω εἰς δύο καὶ ἡ γῆ ἐσείσθη καὶ αἱ πέτραι *ἐσχίσθησαν* (Matt 27:51). This arrangement evokes the dual image of the splitting of the sanctuary veil, leading to God's presence, and the splitting of the rocks of the earth, leading to the underworld. Commentators are apt to perceive an implied movement emanating *out of* these realms (i.e., God's presence from the sanctuary and the dead from Hades), but perhaps Matthew first implies an entrance *into* them.

Four verbal parallels between Matt 27:51b–53 and 27:59–60 suggest that the evangelist composed the former with Jesus's burial in mind. (a) In contrast to Luke, Matthew retains mention that Joseph's tomb was "hewn in the rock" (λατόμησεν ἐν τῇ πέτρᾳ, Matt 27:60; cf. Mark 15:46; Luke 23:53). The πέτρα of Jesus's tomb recalls

---

124. Philo, *Her.* 179: "I am deeply impressed, too, by the contrast made between the two he-goats offered for atonement, and the difference of fate assigned to them... We see two ways of thinking; one whose concern is with things of divine virtue is consecrated and dedicated to God; the other whose aspirations turn to poor miserable humanity is assigned to creation the exile" (Colson and Whitaker). Barn. 7.9: "The one they take to the altar, but the other is cursed" (Ehrman). Origen, *Hom. Lev.* 9.4.2: "Do you want me to show you clearly how these two lots always are operative and each of us becomes either 'the lot of the Lord' or 'the lot of the scapegoat' or of 'the wilderness'?... The end of each one is described. It says, 'Lazarus died and was carried by the angels into the bosom of Abraham. But likewise the rich man also died and was carried into the place of torment.' You notice clearly the difference places of each lot" (Barkley, *Homilies on Leviticus 1–16*, 182). Origen, *Hom. Lev.* 9.5.2: "That the one who confessed the Lord was made 'a lot of the Lord' and was taken without delay 'to paradise.' But that the other one who 'reviled' him was made 'the lot of the scapegoat' that was sent 'into the wilderness' of Hell" (Barkley, *Homilies on Leviticus 1–16*, 184).

the πέτραι that are split at Jesus's death (Matt 27:51b). (b) Whereas Luke changes Mark's dual use of μνημεῖον to a singular use of μνῆμα (Mark 15:46; Luke 23:53), Matthew reproduces both instances of μνημεῖον (Matt 27:60), thereby mirroring his dual use of μνημεῖον in Matt 27:52–53. (c) He also changes Mark's πτῶμα (15:45) to σῶμα (Matt 27:59) to match his own use of σῶμα in Matt 27:52.[125] (d) Finally, only Matthew notes that Jesus's linen shroud was "clean" (καθαρός, Matt 27:59), which parallels the sanctity of "the holy ones" (τὰ ἅγιοι, Matt 27:52) and "the holy city" (ἡ ἁγία πόλις, Matt 27:53). Thus, while the evangelist does not mention Jesus's burial explicitly in Matt 27:51b–53, it seems to be implicitly in view as a condition for the cosmic events in these verses.

According to Matthew, Jesus intends to rebuild the ναός "within three days" (Matt 26:61; 27:40).[126] But the phrase διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν/ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις implies that the construction of Jesus's new-temple program will be engendered not only by Jesus's death on Good Friday, but also by the events leading up to and including his resurrection on Easter Sunday. In other words, why exclude Holy Saturday from the three-day period in which Jesus purposes to rebuild the sanctuary of God?

Several shorter points of support for this interpretation may be added. (a) Because he already typologizes Jesus as both goats in the Barabbas and Roman-abuse scenes (Matt 27:15–26, 27–31),[127] it would be thematically coherent for the evangelist to recall this typology at Jesus's death. (b) Since Matthew is also fond of doublets, as is evinced in his proclivity to cast Jesus as both goats in the back-to-back scenes of

---

125. Luke 23:52 also reflects this change.

126. See above.

127. See Chapters Three and Four.

Matt 27:15–26 and 27:27–31,[128] it is more likely that he would have both Yom Kippur goats in mind at Matt 27:50–53, as opposed to only one goat. (c) The gospel writer's death-*velum scissum* narrative (Matt 27:50–51a) evokes the high priest's privileged access into the Holy of Holies with the blood of the immolated goat on Yom Kippur.[129] (d) There is precedent for the application of multiple Yom Kippur "characters" to a a single individual in Second Temple literature.[130] (e) Matthew 27 likely betrays a sustained scapegoat typology throughout its narrative.[131]

To conclude, the trope of the antithetical binary movement of the two goats of Yom Kippur has quite possibly influenced Matt 27:50–53. In turn, the evangelist plausibly conceives Jesus as descending to the underworld in his capacity as scapegoat in Matt 27:51b–53.[132] These verses present a compressed and telescoped vision of Jesus's three-day ordeal, and the picture is low rather than high resolution. However, one may ask why Matthew does not explicitly mention Jesus's burial or descent to Hades in these verses. Admittedly, that is a weakness in this reading. Perhaps to relay Jesus's entombment between Matt 27:51b and 27:52a would result in too clunky of a narrative. Before reaching a firmer conclusion on this question, we should examine the broader scapegoat typology in Matthew 27.

---

128. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:87.

129. See above.

130. See Chapter Two. Azazel is also scapegoat in BW. Joseph is both immolated goat and scapegoat in Jubilees. Abraham is both high priest and immolated goat in the Apocalypse of Abraham.

131. See below.

132. Hamilton argues that 1 Enoch 1 and 10 have influenced Matt 27:51b: "Not only do σείω and σχίζω (unusually) appear together in both 1 Enoch and Matthew 27, they occur both in the context of a cataclysm brought about by the shedding of innocent blood" (*Death of Jesus*, 214). Though I am skeptical that BW has influenced Matt 27:51b in this particular way, if Hamilton is correct, then one cannot exclude the possibility the scene of Asael's scapegoat-like punishment (1 En. 10.4–8) has influenced Matt 27:51b as well.

## The Broader Scapegoat Typology in Matthew 27

Earlier I argued that Matthew's Roman-abuse scene (Matt 27:27–31) evinces a scapegoat typology.[133] Summarizing the parallels between Jesus and the scapegoat from that argument and looking to the broader context of the PN, here I propose ten points of correspondence between Jesus and the scapegoat in Matthew 27. Half of these parallels are unique to the First Gospel.[134]

(1) The scapegoat is bound. Though this practice is not mentioned in Leviticus 16, it is a well attested extra-biblical tradition. According to m. Yoma 4:2 and 6:6, the scapegoat was bound at the beginning of the ritual with a scarlet ribbon and then re-bound with that material before being pushed down a ravine. Barn. 7.8 and 7.11 may also attest to the dual practice of binding. The apocalyptic scapegoat is also bound. In BW, Raphael is commanded to "bind Asael hands and feet" (1 En. 10.4), a trope reiterated in the Animal Apocalypse (1 En. 88.1), the Similitudes of Enoch (1 En. 54.3, 5), and Rev 20:1–3.[135] Matthew follows Mark 15:1 closely in narrating the Jewish leaders' binding of Jesus: "And, *having bound him*, they led him away and delivered him to Pilate the governor" (Matt 27:1–2). Luke (22:66) entirely omits the binding of Jesus, while John (18:12, 24) contains the tradition. Matthew, once more than Mark (15:6), writes the term δέσμιος (literally, "bound one") in his Barabbas episode (Matt 27:15, 16).[136] Again, Luke (22:18–23) omits the term.

---

133. See Chapter Four.

134. (1), (2), (4), (6), and (7) are already present in Mark. (3), (5), (8), (9), and (10) are unique to Matthew.

135. "He seized the dragon, that ancient serpent, who is the Devil and Satan, and bound him for a thousand years" (Rev 20:2). Andrei A. Orlov, "Apocalyptic Scapegoat Traditions in the Book of Revelation: Part I: The Dragon," forthcoming.

136. One may object that, in the Barabbas episode, only Jesus Barabbas should be bound,

(2) The scapegoat receives the sins of the community.[137] The ritual of sin-transference is described in Lev 16:21, but it is recontextualized, for example, in 1 En. 10.8, 4Q180, 4Q203, and Apoc. Ab. 13.14. Mark's (15:16–20) Roman mockery account (and possibly John 19:2–3) draws on the widespread ancient practice of curse-transmission rituals, whereby a community's evil is transferred onto a victim that carries away that evil. Unlike Luke (23:11), who omits any hint of a curse-transmission ritual in this scene, Matthew amplifies this ritual background.

(3) The scapegoat is adorned with a garment.[138] Only Matthew (27:28) changes Mark's πορφύρα (15:17) to a χλαμὺς κοκκίνη, drawing a correspondence between Jesus's robe and the scapegoat's scarlet attire (Barn. 7.8, 11; m. Yoma 4:2; 6:6; m. Šabb. 9:3; Apoc. Ab. 13.14; Tertullian, *Marc.* 3.7; Hippolytus, *Frag.* 75).

(4) The scapegoat is stripped of that garment before its final demise.[139] In the temple ritual, the scapegoat's handler reportedly removed the goat's scarlet garment before sending it to its death (m. Yoma 6.6; Barn. 7.8, 11). As opposed to Luke and John, Matthew has the soldiers remove Jesus's (scarlet) garment before leading him to be crucified.[140]

(5) A symbolic item is placed on the scapegoat's head.[141] In the case of the temple scapegoat ritual, this item was the aforementioned scarlet ribbon representing Israel's sins. In the case of Jesus, it is the crown of thorns (27:29). As opposed to

---

since he typologically corresponds to the scapegoat in this scene. But m. Yoma 4:2 reports that the immolated goat was also bound with a piece of wool around its throat.

137. See Chapter Four.

138. See Chapter Four.

139. See Chapter Four.

140. Mark 15:20 also reports that the soldiers stripped Jesus of his mock robe.

141. See Chapter Four.

Mark (15:17), Matthew's narrative verbally echoes the description of the high priest's transfer of sins onto the head of the scapegoat (Lev 16:21).

(6) The scapegoat is abused in early Jewish tradition.[142] Matthew (27:3) follows Mark (15:19) in having the Roman soldiers physically abuse Jesus (cf. John 19:3). Again, Luke (23:11; cf. 22:63–65) omits this instance of abuse.

(7) The scapegoat is escorted from the city by a handler. Leviticus 16:21–22 instructs Aaron to place Israel's sins "on the head of the goat and send it away into the wilderness by the hand of a ready man... And he shall let the goat go free in the wilderness."[143] In the apocalyptic tradition, an angel becomes the handler, namely, Raphael in the Book of Watchers and Yahoel in the Apocalypse of Abraham. Orlov argues that the same tradition underlies Rev 20:1–3.[144] Intriguingly, m. Yoma 6:3 reports that "the priests had established a custom not to suffer an Israelite to lead it away."[145] The Roman soldiers perform the primary role of Jesus's handler: "And they led him away to crucify him" (Matt 27:31; cf. Mark 15:20; Luke 23:26; John 19:16). But only Matthew adds this detail after the soldiers crucify Jesus: "And they sat down there and kept watch over him" (Matt 27:36). M. Yoma 6:6 reports that the scapegoat's handler, having sent the goat to its fate, "returned and sat down beneath the last booth until nightfall," probably to ensure that the goat did not return.[146]

---

142. See Chapter Four.

143. Milgrom notes that איש עתי (Lev 16:21) is indeterminate in meaning (*Leviticus*, 1:1045). Raymond Westbrook and Theodore J. Lewis argue that the phrase indicates a criminal man ("Who Led Out the Scapegoat in Leviticus 16:21," JBL 127 [2008]: 417–22). The LXX translates ἄνθρωπος ἕτοιμος.

144. "And I saw an angel coming down from heaven, holding in his hand the key to the bottomless pit and a great chain" (Rev 20:1). Orlov, "Revelation," forthcoming.

145. Danby, *Mishnah*, 169.

146. Ibid., 170. Simon of Cyrene could also be construed as the scapegoat's handler: "And as they came out, they found a man from Cyrene named Simon; they compelled this man to carry his

(8) The scapegoat undergoes a two-stage removal. While Lev 16:21–22 merely reports the scapegoat's exit from Jerusalem, early Jewish tradition maintains that the scapegoat was hurled off a cliff once it reached the desert.[147] Orlov notices that the scapegoat ritual, "as it is reflected in the Book of Watchers and the Animal Apocalypse, also appears to operate under this two-stage removal... the antagonist in these texts is not just banished to the wilderness, but is placed in a pit in the wilderness" (1 En. 10.4–5; also 1 En. 88.1).[148] In the Slavonic apocalypse, Azazel is banished "first to the earth itself and then to the fiery underworld" (Apoc. Ab. 13.3, 8; 14.5).[149] Only in Matthew does Jesus seem to experience a similar two-stage removal, first exiting the holy city (Matt 27:31), then descending to the underworld (Matt 27:51b–53).

(9) The scapegoat's exile engenders eschatological restoration. This trope only occurs in the apocalyptic *imaginaire*. Immediately after Asael's banishment, Raphael is commanded to "heal the earth, which the watchers have desolated; and announce the healing of the earth, that the plague may be healed."[150] In the vision of Zechariah that anticipates an eschatological Yom Kippur (Zech 3:9), Joshua's filthy garments are exchanged for "festal apparel" (Zech 3:4–5), symbolizing the cleansing and

---

cross" (Matt 27:32; also Mark 15:21; Luke 23:26).

147. Philo, *Plant.* 61; M. Yoma 6:6; Tg. Ps.-J. Lev 16:2. It is likely that Barnabas is familiar with this tradition, since he describes a similar rite of tying the scarlet band onto an object (Barn. 7.8, 11), which, in m. Yoma 6:6, immediately precedes pushing the scapegoat into a ravine. See Chapter Two.

148. Orlov, *Atoning Dyad*, 114.

149. Ibid.

150. 1 En. 10.7a (Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch*, 28). The eschatological Jubilee and Day of Atonement envisioned in 11QMelchizedek is preceded by the destruction of Belial, though it is uncertain whether this antagonist is conceived as a scapegoat.

restoration of Israel.[151] In the Apoc. Ab. 13.14, Abraham is endowed with new heavenly garments, signaling "an eschatological return to the protoplast's original condition."[152] The banishment of the dragon in Revelation ushers in the millennial reign (Rev 20.4–6).[153] Only in Matthew a potent display of restoration follows the atoning moment of Jesus's death, when the saints are raised (Matt 27:52–53). Hamilton argues that the paradigm evinced in 1 Enoch 6–11 has influenced Matthew's choice of the terms ἅγιοι and ἁγία πόλος: "Now at his death he announces the end of exile, and defines that end not only as return, but as purification... The cataclysm that destroys serves finally to render the land and the people clean once again."[154]

(10) The scapegoat is sealed in an abyss. Again, this trope only occurs in the apocalyptic tradition. Raphael is commanded to "throw on him [Asael] jagged and sharp stones, and cover him with darkness... and cover his face, that he may not see light" (1 En. 10.5).[155] The Book of Similitudes contains a similar tradition: "These [chains] are being prepared for the hosts of Azazel, that they may take them and throw them into the lowest part of Hell; and they will cover their jaws with rough stones, as the Lord of Spirits commanded" (1 En. 54.5).[156] According to Orlov, this tradition underlies Rev 20:3:[157] "He seized the dragon... and threw him into the pit, and locked and sealed it over him." Again, only Matthew records the sealing of Jesus's tomb

---

151. Tiemeyer, *Priestly Rites*, 249; Stead, *Zechariah 1–8*, 159. See Chapter Two.

152. Orlov, *Dark Mirrors*, 50.

153. Orlov, "Revelation," forthcoming.

154. Hamilton, *Death of Jesus*, 212–21. She draws a parallel to 1 En. 10.20, which verbally alludes to Lev 16:20 (ibid., 220). See Chapter Two.

155. Knibb, *Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2:87–88. Both Panopolitanus and Syncellus read ὑπόθες αὐτῷ λίθους (Black, *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece*, 25).

156. Knibb, *Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2:138.

157. Orlov, "Revelation," forthcoming.

(Matt 27:62–66). While Matthew includes this story for apologetic purposes (cf. Matt 28:15), one cannot dismiss the possibility of biblical influences in the story. For instance, NA28 notes an allusion to Dan 6:18 in Matt 27:66.[158] As I suggest below, the odd phraseology of Jesus's reported speech in Matt 27:63 (μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας) recalls the Son of Man's three-day journey to the heart of the earth as Jonah (Matt 12:40).[159] It is therefore possible that the scapegoat tradition has influenced Matthew's placement of the sealing-of-the-tomb narrative as the climax of his burial narrative.

To conclude, though each of these ten parallels vary in strength or weakness when evaluated individually, their accumulative weight suggests that Matthew's scapegoat typology extends across the wider landscape of his chapter 27 narrative. This in turn commends the bidirectional reading of Matt 27:50–53 and the influence of the antithetical movement of the two goats on these verses at a structural level.

### Matthew's Jonah Typology and Jesus's Descent to Hades

One further support for the bidirectional reading of Matt 27:50–53 is the influence of the evangelist's Jonah typology on Matt 27:52–53. As noted above, a growing number of scholars understand Matthew's version of the sign of Jonah as pointing to Jesus's three-day journey to the underworld: "For just as Jonah was *three days and three nights in the belly of the sea monster*, so the Son of Man will be *in the heart of the earth for three days and three nights*" (Matt 12:40, Matthean redaction italicized). In

---

158. Meier comments, "The sealing of the stone is reminiscent of the measures taken by the King when Daniel is thrown into the lions' den (Dan 6:17); Jesus can no more be held captive in death by the Jewish leaders than Daniel was by his enemies" (*Matthew*, 358). Cf. Dan 6:18 LXX and Matt 27:66.

159. Jewish tradition frequently associated the divine deliverances of Daniel and Jonah (3 Macc 6:7–8; Hel. Syn. Pr. 6.11; Syb. Or. 2.245).

recent years, McLay has convincingly argued that "the raising of the saints in 27:51b–53 is Matthew's proof that Jesus descended into the earth (12:40) and that the gates of death (16:18) have been overcome."[160] Thus, Matthew's Jonah typology seems to be lurking in the background of Matt 27:52–53.

The influence of the Jonah typology on Matt 27:52–53 is significant for two reasons. First, it supports the thesis that Matthew assumes Jesus's descent to the realm of the dead in these verses. Second, it indirectly corroborates the impact of the gospel writer's Day of Atonement typology on these verses, since there are three noteworthy points of contact between Jonah and Yom Kippur traditions in early Judaism. The first two of these connections are the most important.

First of all, the Book of Jonah was probably read on Yom Kippur in the diaspora synagogues in the first century CE. According to rabbinic tradition, the Book of Jonah comprised the afternoon Minḥah reading on the Day of Atonement.[161] This practice likely dates to the time of Matthew, given the probable Alexandrian provenance and first-century CE date for Pseudo-Philo's *On Jonah*, a Jewish homily originally written in Greek and later translated into Armenian.[162] Étan Levine remarks, "Thus the liturgy of the Day of Atonement, like that of the Palestinian fast days

---

160. McLay, *Septuagint*, 165. Similarly, yet with a different emphasis, see Landes, "Matthew 12:40," 674–78.

161. Ps.-Philo, *On Jonah*; b. Megilah 31a; Pirke R. El. 10. See Gerald Friedlander, ed., *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer* (London: 1916; repr., New York: Hermon, 1970), xxi, 66 n. 5; Stökl Ben Ezra, *Yom Kippur*, 57–58. For English translation, see Gohar Muradyan and Aram Topchyan, "Pseudo-Philo, On Samson and On Jonah," in *Outside the Bible: Ancient Jewish Writings Related to Scripture*, ed. Louis H. Feldman, James L. Kugel, and Lawrence H. Schiffman (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2013), 753–803.

162. Folker Siegert, *Drei hellenistich-jüdische Predigten: Ps.-Philon, „Über Jona", „Über Jona" (Fragment) und „Über Jona"*, WUNT 61 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 39–52. Siegert concludes, "Wir belassen sie *im 1. vorchristlichen bis 2. christlichen Jahrhundert*, mit Schwerpunkt in der Mitte dieser Zeit" (ibid., 48). The widest possible dates for *On Jonah* span the second century BCE to the fourth century CE (Muradyan and Topchyan, "On Jonah," 750).

emphasized the central ideas of the Book of Jonah: that God is the God of all mankind; that it is impossible to flee from his presence; that he pities his creatures and forgives those who turn to him in truth."[163]

In the second place, Jonah's expulsion from the ship (Jonah 1:4–16) is modeled on the same type of ritual as that of the scapegoat, namely, the curse-transmission ritual.[164] Jonah provokes the wrath of the diety by defying his commission to Nineveh, and so a curse befalls the ship and its sailors. McLean writes, "In order to achieve safety, this curse had to be transferred to a victim, who would then be thrown overboard. Lots were cast in order to determine who should be the substitutionary victim (cf. Lev 16.8). The lot fell to Jonah (Jonah 1.7), and he accepted the outcome and volunteered himself, requesting that he be thrown into the sea so that the others might be saved (Jonah 1.12)."[165] Matthew's Roman-abuse episode (Matt 27:27–31) draws on a similar curse-transmission tradition.[166] As Jonah and the scapegoat, Jesus inherits the pollution of the community and is ejected, in order to carry away that pollution for the benefit of others.

Finally, "the belly of the sea-monster" (Jonah 2:1–2), synonymous with "the belly of Sheol/Hades" (Jonah 2:3), finds an intriguing parallel in Apoc. Ab. 31.5, where the fate of the wicked are destined to punishment in the "belly of Azazel": "And those who followed after idols and after their murderers will rot in the womb of the Evil One—the belly of Azazel, and they will be burned by the fire of Azazel's

---

163. Étan Levine, *The Aramaic Version of Jonah* (New York: Sepher-Hermon, 1978), 9.

164. McLean, *Cursed Christ*, 101. From a different perspective, the similarity is also noted by Phillip Cary, *Jonah: Brazos Theological Commentary on the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2008), 56.

165. McLean, *Cursed Christ*, 101.

166. See Chapter Four.

tongue."[167] The notion that hell resides in the stomach of a dark power is also found in *3 Baruch* (ca. first or second century CE; *3 Bar.* 4.3–6 [G]; 5.3 [S]), where Hades is likened or identified with the belly of the serpent.[168]

In sum, Matthew's Jonah and scapegoat typologies are mutually reinforcing. Since he would have likely been familiar with the practice of reading the story of Jonah on the Day of Atonement, the evangelist would have been apt to understand Jonah as a kind of sin-bearing scapegoat, cast into the nether regions of the earth, in order to remove the curse that was threatening the prophet's community.[169] Therefore, if he conceives the resurrection of the holy ones (Matt 27:52–53) as fulfilling the sign of Jonah (Matt 12:40), thereby demonstrating that the Son of Man journeyed to the heart of the earth for three days like the biblical prophet, than Matthew probably understands Jesus's role as Jonah in terms of the scapegoat. The righteous dead are released from captivity in Hades, since their sins have been sunk to the depth of the cosmos by means of Jesus.

Jesus as both Goats at His Baptism and Temptation (Matt 3:13–4:11)

I have maintained the plausibility that the compressed scene of Jesus's death (Matt

---

167. Kulik, *Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*, 35.

168. See also Pist. Soph. 4:126; Bauckham, *Fate of the Dead*, 121.

169. The same may be the case for the Suffering Servant, whose role appears to be modeled on that of Near Eastern substitute-king rituals (Walton, "Substitute King"). The Servant bears the infirmity and iniquity of others (Isa 53:4–6, 11–12) and is "cut off from the land of the living" (Isa 53:8), thereby possibly eliminating the community's curses in the underworld through burial. According to Bottéro, "It was doubtless at the moment when the corpse of the substitute king disappeared into the grave, i.e., the entrance to the kingdom of the dead... that they ordered his ghost (?) to 'Take down with you in the Land of No Return the evils that you (have taken upon yourself)'" ("Substitute King," 152).

27:50–53) evokes a typology of Jesus as the two goats of Leviticus 16 moving in antithetical directions, first as the goat for Yahweh offering his blood/lifeforce in the heavenly sanctuary (Matt 27:50–51a), and then as the goat for Azazel sent into the underworld (Matt 27:51b–53). If it can be shown that Matthew narrates Jesus's ministry in terms of this two-fold schema elsewhere in his Gospel, then this reading becomes more probable.

Hannah An has recently argued that "the ritual prescriptions of the Day of Atonement, particularly those found in Leviticus 16:20–22, decisively inform our interpretation of the Matthean witness of Jesus's baptism and temptation (Matt 3:5– 4:1)."[170] While I do not agree with all of her conclusions, An's interpretive intuition may be correct.[171]

First, there is a formal correspondence between the ritual of the two goats and the baptism-temptation in Matthew's Gospel.[172] The heavens are opened and Jesus is affirmed as God's Son (Matt 3:16–17), recalling the goat for Yahweh (Lev 16:15–19). Immediately after this, Jesus is lead into the desert to be tempted by the Devil (Matt 4:1), recalling the goat for Azazel (Lev 16:20–22). Matthew preserves this tight sequence derived from his Markan *Vorlage* (Mark 1:10–12), whereas Luke disrupts it by sandwiching Jesus's genealogy between his baptism and temptation (Luke 3:23– 38).

Second, a chief purpose of John's baptism of Jesus in Matthew is to identify

---

170. An, "Baptism and Temptation," 5–31.

171. For instance, that the word πᾶς ("all righteousness," Matt 3:15) recalls the repeated occurrence of πᾶς in Lev 16:16, 21–22 LXX seems quite dubious to me (An, "Baptism and Temptation," 11–13).

172. Ibid., 15–17.

Jesus with sinful Israel.[173] By means of John's baptism, Matthew foreshadows Jesus's

redemptive role of "bearing infirmities" (Matt 8:17) and giving his life as a "ransom

for many" (Matt 20:28) for the "forgiveness of sins" (Matt 26:28).[174] The baptism of

John, who is from a priestly lineage (Luke 1:5), functions in a similar way to Aaron's

hand-leaning rite, whereby the sins of Israel are transferred onto the scapegoat before

the goat's banishment into the wilderness (Lev 16:21–22).[175] Having symbolically

associated with *sinful* Israel, Jesus is immediately led εἰς τὴν ἔρημον (cf. Lev 16:21–

22 LXX), not unlike the goat for Azazel.

Third, Yom Kippur was popularly known as "The Fast" (ἡ νηστεία) and was

characterized by the practice of prolonged fasting in the Second Temple period.[176]

Only Matthew explicitly states that Jesus proactively "fasted" (νηστεύω) in his

temptation narrative (Matt 4:2; cf. Luke 4:2), recalling the hallmark abstinence from

food and other forms of self-denial performed on Yom Kippur.

Fourth, the Day of Atonement was also associated with Israel's wilderness

afflictions, specifically Deuteronomy 8:3 and the tradition concerning manna. Having

cited Deut 8:3, Philo writes, "This affliction is propitiation; for on the tenth day also

---

173. Meier, *Matthew*, 26; Hagner, *Matthew*, 1:57; Jeffrey A. Gibbs, "Israel Standing with Israel: The Baptism of Jesus in Matthew's Gospel (Matt 3:13–17)," *CBQ* 64 (2002): 511–26, at 521; France, *Matthew*, 120. This purpose is evident, given the evangelist's sustained Israel typology: Jesus goes to Egypt like Israel (Matt 2:13–15), Jesus passes through the Jordan waters like Israel (Matt 3:13–17), and Jesus is tempted in the wilderness for forty days like Israel, who was tempted in the wilderness for forty years (Matt 4:1–11) (Gibbs, "Israel Standing," 525–26). Many commentators also understand Matt 3:16–17 parr. as evoking Isa 42:1 and the Isaianic Servant, who is frequently identified as "Israel" (Isa 41:8; 42:1 LXX [!]; 44:1; 44:2 LXX; 44:21; 45:4). Also, only in Matthew does John acknowledge the redundancy of his own baptism of Jesus (Matt 3:13), pointing to the larger purpose of "fulfilling all righteousness" (Matt 3:14).

174. France, *Matthew*, 120.

175. Ibid., 13.

176. Philo, *Spec.* 1.186; 2.194; *Mos.* 2.23; Pss. Sol. 3.8; Josephus, *J.W.* 5.236; Justin, *Dial.* 40.5; Tertullian, *Marc.* 3.7; cf. Isa 1:13–14 LXX. See further in Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 15–16, 34 n. 92, 70–73, 100.

by afflicting our souls He makes propitiation [cf. Lev 16:30]."[177] This connection is striking, given that Matthew (4:4) quotes the entirety of Deut 8:3b LXX, whereas Luke (4:4) only quotes half of this passage. Deuteronomy 8:3 also speaks about manna, which Philo, 1QWordsOfMoses (1Q22), and the Festival Prayers relate to the fasting performed on the Day of Atonement.[178] Jesus's reliance on God's heavenly sustenance (Matt 4:3–4; cf. Luke 4:3–4) evokes the anticipation of divine mercy on Yom Kippur.

In light of these points, the Day of Atonement has probably influenced Matthew's baptism-temptation narrative. The evangelist foreshadows Jesus as the goat for Yahweh at his baptism and the goat for Azazel at his temptation. In the context of an elimination ritual, the priestly baptizer symbolically identifies Jesus with sinful Israel, which leads to Jesus's immediate expulsion into the wilderness. There, Jesus fasts for forty days and nights and suffers Israel's wilderness afflictions, recalling the great "Fast" of Yom Kippur performed in anticipation of God's forgiveness. This association of Jesus with both goats of Leviticus 16 mirrors the Barabbas and Roman-abuse episodes (Matt 27:15–26, 27–31), where Jesus is respectively designated as goat for Yahweh and goat for Azazel. It parallels the death-resurrection scene (Matt 27:50–53), where Jesus's identity as both goats is apparently also assumed. The link between Matthew's temptation and passion narratives is strengthened by the fact that, in his crucifixion account, Matthew uniquely has the passersby utter the phrase, εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ (Matt 27:40), the same phrase by which the Devil tempts Jesus in the wilderness (Matt 4:3, 6).

---

177. *Leg.* 1.174 (Colson).

178. Philo, *Spec.* 2.199; 1Q22 3.7–12; 1Q34 3.1 // 4Q508 1.1–3 (see Stökl Ben Ezra, *Impact of Yom Kippur*, 41, 47, 97).

The parallel between Jesus's temptation and descent to Hades narratives suggests a connection between the underworld and the Devil/Satan/Azazel in Matthew's thought (cf. Matt 4:1, 5, 8, 10, 11). But does the Gospel betray this connection elsewhere? The following perhaps suggest it does: (1) The Devil subsumes Azazel's role in Matt 25:41.[179] (2) There is an intriguing association between Hades and the Azazel tradition in the evangelist's Caesarea-Philippi narrative (Matt 16:13–28).[180] (3) According to Fletcher-Louis, Jesus's rebuke, ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου σατανᾶ (Matt 16:23; also Mark 8:33), "may put Peter in the position not just of Satan, but of the demon Azazel," as the apocalyptic scapegoat is verbally banished in m. Yoma 6:4 and Apoc. Ab. 13.12; 14.5.[181] Only Matthew has Jesus repeat a nearly identical phrase at the end of his temptation narrative (ὕπαγε, σατανᾶ, Matt 4:10), which again recalls the expulsion of the demonic scapegoat Azazel.

---

179. Walck, *Son of Man*, 219. See Chapter Three.

180. (1) Caesarea Philippi is located at the southern slope of Mount Hermon, where the Watchers bound themselves by an oath to corrupt humankind (*1 En.* 6.1–8). Whereas Mark (8:27) places Peter's confession "on the way" to the villages of Caesarea Philippi, "Matthew [16:13] states that the incident occurred when Jesus and his disciples had come into the district of Caesarea Philippi, thus associating the event more closely with the setting of our tradition [i.e., Mount Hermon]" (Nickelsburg, "Enoch, Levi, and Peter," 591). (2) Caesarea Philippi was the locale of a grotto to the *half-goat god* Pan (ibid., 583, 590–91). Fletcher-Louis remarks, "Given the veneration of the half-goat and half-human god Pan from the beginning of the second century BC onwards, Jews must have seen a connection with the binding of Azazel, a goat-like demon at the same place" ("Sacral Son of Man," 280). (3) Nickelsburg notes that, at Caesarea Philippi, "the eastmost headwaters of the Jordan welled up from a bottomless cave sacred to the god Pan" (Nickelsburg, "Enoch, Levi, and Peter," 590). The dark abyss reminds of the place of Asael's infamous punishment (1 En. 10.4–6). Josephus describes the abyss at Caesarea Philippi as "a horrible precipice that descends abruptly to a vast depth" (*J.W.* 1.405), as a "cave in a mountain, under which there is a great cavity in the earth, and the cavern is abrupt, and prodigiously deep, and full of still water" (*Ant.* 15.3640). According to Nickelsburg, Matthew's unique "reference to the gates of Hades finds a counterpart in the subterranean waters of the grotto" ("Enoch, Levi, and Peter," 598). (4) Fletcher-Louis observes that the Hebrew equivalent of πύλαι ᾅδου, שערי שאול (cf. Isa 38:10), may be a pun on the word שעיר, the Hebrew term for "goat-demon" (Lev 17:7; Isa 13:21; 34:14; 2 Chr 11:15) ("Sacral Son of Man," 281). (5) He also posits that Jesus's rebuke, "Depart from me, Satan" (Matt 16:23; also Mark 8:33) evokes the figure Azazel. This allusion is strengthened by the clause, "For you are setting your mind not on divine things but on human things," since this accurately describes the Watchers' transgression.

181. Fletcher-Louis, "Sacral Son of Man," 282

Jesus's *descensus ad inferos* may therefore plausibly be conceived as a journey "to the Devil/Satan/Azazel," who apparently holds captive the righteous-dead in the underworld (Matt 12:29; 16:18; 27:52–53).[182] Here, divergent "models" of the atonement may converge in the evangelist's thought, either intentionally or coincidentally. On the one hand, Matthew's scapegoat typology would lead one to understand Jesus as bearing the world's sins to the realm of the cosmos that is furthest away from God's heavenly dwelling, thereby eliminating iniquity from God's sight. On the other hand, Matthew's descent narrative seems to be connected to Jesus's release of prisoners from Sheol and usurping cosmic authority from the Devil (Matt 4:8–10; 28:16–20). Unfortunately, the evangelist does not tell the reader how these strands relate. One is left to speculate that, in Matthew's thinking, Satan's authority over the kingdoms of the world is linked to the world's burden of sins that Jesus effectively eliminates, thereby destroying the means of Satan's authority in the cosmos.

## Conclusion

For Matthew, Jesus's death is about the forgiveness of sins. Despite attempts to make it chiefly about other related phenomenon, for example, judgment on the Jerusalem temple or Jesus's preaching to the dead in Sheol, the evangelist speaks clearly: "This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many, *for the release of sins*" (Matt 26:28). How does Jesus's death release sins? For Matthew this question is

---

182. The Q tradition of Matt 11:23 (cf. Luke 10:15) might conceive ᾅδης as a place of punishment. Only Matthew states that the ψυχή and σῶμα can be destroyed in γέενα (Matt 10:28; cf. Luke 12:5), suggesting some possible overlap between Hades and Gehenna in the evangelist's thought.

bound up with the dilemma of Israel's exile and the expectation for a new exodus (Matt 1:17, 21; 2:13–15). For the gospel writer, Jesus's death is the new Passover sacrifice that redeems Israel from the house of Pharaoh and the new covenant sacrifice that reconstitutes the people of God (Matt 26:17–29), now including the Gentiles (Matt 21:43; 27:54; 28:19). But Matthew believes that, unlike the Israel of Moses's day, the Jewish nation of Jesus's time was in captivity because of its own moral impurity. Thus, the evangelist articulates Jesus's identity in terms of this dilemma: "You are to name him Jesus, for he will save his people from their sins" (Matt 1:21). For there to be a new exodus, there must be a new Day of Atonement. For there to be a new Day of Atonement, Jesus must fulfill the destiny of both goats of Leviticus 16. This, in brief, is the logic of atonement in Matthew's passion narrative.

Particularly in Matthew (26:26–29), Jesus's eucharistic words portray his death in language and imagery derived from the temple cult. While Exodus 12 and 24 remain the traditional and primary background of the Last Supper, Matthew embellishes the account with echoes from Isaiah 53 and Leviticus 16. As one recalls, εἰς ἄφεσιν occurs only once in the Septuagint, in Lev 16:26 to describe the "release" of the scapegoat and (consequently) the sins it bore into the desert. By moving the phrase εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν from John's baptism (Matt 3:1; cf. Mark 1:4; Luke 3:3) to the interpretation of Jesus's death (Matt 26:28), Matthew betrays his conception of the latter as a means of removing and eliminating moral impurity. While Matthew typologically designates Jesus as the immolated goat of Leviticus 16 in his Barabbas episode (Matt 27:15–26), the focus there is not the expiatory death of Jesus but the transference of bloodguilt to the crowd. The evangelist whets the reader's appetite for

the hour when Jesus's blood, as that of the immolated goat, will finally remove sins. The evangelist depicts the transference of moral impurity onto Jesus as the scapegoat in the scene of his mockery (Matt 27:27–31), but the story of sin's final elimination awaits the crucifixion and burial for its climax.

The two threads of Matthew's immolated goat and scapegoat typology come together in the apocalyptic event of Jesus's death (Matt 27:50–54). The first of several cosmic signs, the *velum scissum* signals the destruction of the sanctuary and of heaven and earth itself (Matt 5:18), but it also betokens the beginning of a new age and a new temple order founded on Jesus's eschatological sacrifice, whose expiatory effect reaches beyond the heavenly veil and unleashes the divine Presence to a cosmic extent, procuring "God with us" (Matt 1:23)—the *raison d'être* of the Day of Atonement and of the sanctuary. The chief priests' removal of the blood money from the ναός (Matt 27:5–6) is a cheap imitation of what Jesus's priestly offering accomplishes. The moral impurity that Jesus's blood, or πνεῦμα as "lifeforce," removes is apparently eliminated in the underworld, when Jesus as the scapegoat (but also as Jonah and the Servant) is banished into the cosmic wilderness (Lev 16:21–22), hurled into the belly of the sea-monster (Jonah 2:1–3), and cut off from the land of the living (Isa 53:8), presumably bearing the burden of human iniquity down into the furthest reaches of the earth, far away from God's abode in the heavens. This cosmic Day of Atonement paradoxically initiates the new Passover, when Jesus overcomes the gates of Hades, rescues the captives of Egypt, and leads them into the holy land, bringing Israel's long exile to a close. The disgorgement of the righteous dead becomes a sign of judgment on the city that murders the prophets, forecasting that, at the turn of the ages, God has established a new covenant and has leased his vineyard

to new tenants, who will yield his fruits in due season.

Modeled on the antagonist binary movement of the two goats in Leviticus 16 and Second Temple tradition, Matthew's death-burial narrative suggests Jesus's typological identity as both the goat "for Yahweh" and the goat "for Azazel." In a way, this picture is strikingly similar to that of Saint Paul, who wrote, "For our sake, he made him who knew no sin *to be a sin-offering*" (2 Cor 5:21), and, "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law by *becoming a curse* for us" (Gal 3:13). Matthew marries the seemingly contradictory images of Christ as the eschatological sin-offering and scapegoat of Yom Kippur in a single narrative.

CONCLUSION

The principal task of this dissertation has been to examine Matthew's passion narrative in light of Leviticus 16 and its associated traditions, and to determine whether the First Evangelist has constructed a sustained Yom Kippur typology in the twenty-seventh chapter of his Gospel. In light of the foregoing evidence and analysis, it is highly probable that Matthew has composed a sustained Day of Atonement typology in his passion narrative.

## Gauging the Strength of the Yom Kippur Typology in Matthew 27

It will be helpful to recapitulate the primary data of this investigation in terms of the seven-fold criteria outlined in the Introduction, in order to make explicit some of the judgments made throughout this study. The criteria are availability, volume, reoccurrence, thematic coherence, historical plausibility, history of interpretation, and satisfaction.[1] This summary does not, of course, cover all of the secondary evidence and argumentation in my analysis.

Matthew clearly had available to him the Pentateuch and "Leviticus," as is evident from the number of quotations and allusions he makes to this body of literature.[2] It is more difficult to determine whether the gospel writer was familiar with the extra-biblical traditions surrounding the Day of Atonement. Thankfully, scholars are relatively confident that Matthew knew some traditions from the Book of

---

1. See Introduction.

2. The NA28 (841–42) lists Matthew as quoting Leviticus four times and alluding to Leviticus seventeen times.

Watchers, as he appears to quote from 1 En. 10.4 in Matt 22:13, 1 En. 9.1 in Matt 23:35, and allude to Enochic material throughout Matthew 22–25. That the tradition of Asael/Azazel's punishment has probably influenced Matt 25:41 is also significant. Strikingly, two of the clearest allusions to the Enochic tradition in the Gospel of Matthew (i.e., Matt 22:13; 25:41) relate to the figure Asael/Azazel. It seems likely, therefore, that Matthew had available to him the tropes of the apocalyptic Yom Kippur *imaginaire.* As a distinctively Jewish author, the evangelist is likely to have been familiar with the extra-biblical halakhic rituals of the Jewish holy day as well.

While the number of parallels between Matthew's PN and Yom Kippur traditions vary on a case-by-case basis, the aggregate volume of correspondences in Matthew 27 alone seems large enough to make a Day of Atonement typology highly probable. The parallels are strongest in the Barabbas (Matt 27:15–26) and Roman-abuse narratives (Matt 27:27–31). While one may wish for more verbal allusions, the volume of unique conceptual and structural parallels is impressive. In the Barabbas episode, a governing figure presents two identical figures (vv. 16–17) in lottery-type fashion (vv. 17, 21), which results in the two figures acquiring opposing designations: one will be slaughtered and one will be released living (vv. 20, 26). The one who is released is sent to an entity (v. 26) that itself is a sin-bearing scapegoat in Second Temple tradition, namely, "Azazel." By means of ritual hand-action and verbal confession (v. 24), the presiding officer tranfers iniquity from his hands onto this figure, which bears that iniquity and is destined to suffer exile from Jerusalem and inhabit a wilderness (v. 25). The redactional phrase ἕνα τῷ ὄχλῳ (v. 15) echoes Lev 16:8 LXX (ἕνα τῷ κυρίῳ... ἕνα τῷ ἀποπομπαίῳ).

In the Roman-abuse episode, the editorial phrase ἐπέθηκαν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς

αὐτοῦ (Matt 27:29a) verbally echoes Lev 16:21 (ἐπιθήσει... ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλήν) and Zech 6:11 (ἐπιθήσεις ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἰησοῦ), a passage related to the Yom Kippur setting of Zechariah 3. The redactional phrase "in his right hand" (ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ, Matt 27:29) echoes the phrase "at the right hand" (ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ, Zech 6:13). Matthew's odd choice of a scarlet robe (χλαμὺς κοκκίνη) alludes to the scarlet garment of the scapegoat. These editorial glosses occur in the unique setting of a curse-transmission or elimination ritual. When one steps back from the scene of mockery and considers the wider context of Matthew 27, the following parallels emerge, half of which are redactional: Jesus is bound (vv. 2, 15, 16, 28), he receives the sins of the community (vv. 27–31), he is adorned with a garment (v. 28), he is stripped of that garment before his final demise (v. 31), a symbolic item is placed on his head (v. 29), he is abused (v. 30), he is escorted from the city by a handler (vv. 31, 36), he undergoes a two-stage removal (vv. 31, 51b–52), his exile engenders eschatological restoration (vv. 52–53), and he is sealed in an abyss (vv. 64–66). The scapegoat experiences all these things in Leviticus 16 or Second Temple tradition.

When it comes to Matthew's crucifixion, death, and burial narratives, there is an admittedly smaller volume of correspondences with Leviticus 16 and the Day of Atonement. The parallels are primarily structural. In contrast to Mark, Matthew has Jesus voluntarily release his lifeforce, that is, his πνεῦμα (Matt 27:50). Immediately, the veil of the sanctuary is torn in two (v. 51a). In light of the cosmic events of vv. 51b–53, the heavenly descent of the πνεῦμα at Jesus's baptism, and several other factors, one is prompted here to conceive Jesus as offering his lifeforce back to God in the heavenly sanctuary, as the high priest who offers the blood of the goat for Yahweh beyond the veil on Yom Kippur. Matthew then jumps ahead to the third day *after*

Jesus's resurrection to narrate the resurrection of the holy ones in vv. 52–53, which assumes Jesus's descent into the underworld. This bidirectional movement of Jesus in vv. 50–53 structurally corresponds to the antithetical movements of the two goats of Yom Kippur. One is prompted to imagine Jesus as the goat for Azazel in his burial.

The Yom Kippur typology reoccurs throughout Matthew's Gospel. The evangelist most clearly develops it in the back-to-back Barabbas (Matt 27:15–26) and Roman-abuse (Matt 27:27–31) episodes. However, the gospel writer anticipates the typology in his baptism (Matt 3:13–17) and temptation (Matt 4:1–11) narratives, foreshadowing Jesus as the goat for Yahweh and the goat for Azazel. Yom Kippur traditions also seem to have influenced the Parable of the Sheep and the Goats (esp. Matt 25:41), as well as Matthew's death narrative (Matt 27:50–53). In Chapter Two we saw the reoccurrence of Jewish authors applying multiple Yom Kippur "actors" to single individuals. We also saw these authors employ numerous (extra-biblical) tropes, such as the antithetical movement of the two goats, the abuse of the scapegoat, the clothing of the scapegoat, the two-stage removal of the scapegoat, the downward movement of the scapegoat, etc.

Matthew's Yom Kippur typology is thematically coherent with his Gospel in numerous ways. As is well known, the First Gospel programmatically sets out to demonstrate that Jesus's life and ministry fulfill the Hebrew Scriptures.[3] Only in Matthew is Jesus's death specifically εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν (Matt 26:28). How does Jesus's death release sins? Not only does the phrase εἰς ἄφεσιν occur in the LXX only in Lev 16:26, but Matthew's cup-saying especially evokes sacrificial imagery. The First Evangelist attaches saving significance to the name Ἰησοῦς (Mat 1:21),

---

3. Matt 1:22; 2:15, 17, 23; 3:15; 4:14; 5:17; 8:17; 12:17; 13:35; 21:4; 26:54, 56; 27:9.

anticipating his play on the name Ἰησοῦς in the Barabbas episode, where Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος χριστός (Matt 27:17, 22), not Ἰησοῦς Βαραββᾶς (Matt 27:16–17), emerges as the goat for Yahweh. The typology of Jesus as Jesus/Joshua (Ἰησοῦς) the high priest (Zechariah 3 and 6), the one who bears and removes Israel's sin on an eschatological Yom Kippur, evokes the saving import of the name Ἰησοῦς for Matthew. The chief purpose of the atoning sacrifice of the goat for Yahweh was to procure the divine Presence in the sanctuary. Only the First Evangelist emphasizes the theme of God's presence with his people, made possible through Jesus (Matt 1:23; 28:20).

The Day of Atonement typology in Matthew is historically plausible on several levels. The evangelist assumes from his readers a high level of skill in deciphering scriptural allusions. That he apparently expects the reader to pick up on the echoes of Jeremiah 18, 19, 32, and Zechariah 11 in his short Judas narrative (Matt 27:3–10) demonstrates the point.[4] Matthew's typology of the crowd as Azazel is historically plausible, given that his community was probably entrenched in intra-Jewish conflict in the near past. This demonic portrait of the crowd coheres with Matthew's general attitude toward his disbelieving peers (Matt 12:27, 43–45; 23:33). The evangelist polemically, and perhaps comically, jabs at the high priests when he has them effectively expiate the defiling blood money from the ναός and when the Gentile governor performs the high priestly lottery over the two Jesuses. Admittedly, Matthew's association of Jesus with the scapegoat seems implausible on the grounds that the scapegoat acquired a demonic connotation in early Judaism. It is difficult to

---

4. The fulfillment formula in Matt 2:23 similarly demands a high level of scriptural knowledge.

imagine the evangelist applying tropes associated with Azazel to Jesus. Yet such an application would not be entirely without precedent in Jewish thought. As Orlov remarks, "In the case of Abraham and Enoch, the protagonists inversely mirror their respective negative counterparts, as both stories portray their characters exchanging attributes and roles with each other. Just as Enoch takes the celestial offices of Asael, and the fallen angel assumes some of Enoch's human roles, so also in the Apocalypse of Abraham, Azazel surrenders his angelic garment to Abraham. In this way, both parties accept certain duties of their counterparts as they enter into their opponents' realms."[5]

The history of interpretation attests that, by the end of the first century CE, Christians understood Jesus as fulfilling the destiny of the goat for Yahweh and the goat for Azazel. They apparently had little difficulty conceiving Jesus as both goats simultaneously. In fact, Barnabas seems to combine the roles of the immolated goat, scapegoat, and high priest in his Yom Kippur typology. However, while there are early Christian interpretations of Jesus as the goats of Leviticus 16, based upon the Barabbas and Roman-abuse episodes (Matt 27:15–26, 27–31), I have yet to find an interpretation that perfectly resembles my proposed reading of Matthew's death narrative (Matt 27:50–54). The nearest match is Origen's typology of Jesus as the scapegoat's *handler*, who leads away the evil powers into the wilderness of the underworld (*Hom. Lev.* 9.5.3).

I find Matthew 27 better illumined with the Yom Kippur typology than without it. Therefore, the reading is satisfying. Without the Day of Atonement typology, the reader wonders how Jesus's death brings about forgiveness of sins.

---

5. Orlov, *Atoning Dyad*, 145.

What does Jesus's new Passover have to do with forgiveness? Matthew ingeniously answers this by marrying Yom Kippur with Passover in the Barabbas narrative: "Now at the festival [of Passover] the governor was accustomed to release one prisoner to the crowd, whom they wanted" (Matt 27:15). The gospel author leads the reader to understand that the new Passover accomplished by Jesus's death, burial, and resurrection also engenders atonement. The Yom Kippur typology allows for a concrete understanding of ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν (Matt 26:28), in that Jesus literally bears sins upon himself and releases them in a symbolic wilderness. It also allows for multiple nuances of λύτρον (Matt 20:28), since, while the function of the Leviticus 16 goats is primarily purgative, in the apocalyptic *imaginaire*, from which Matthew draws, the scapegoat was also subject to God's punitive judgment.

While my thesis primarily relies upon redaction and literary criticism, Hays's criteria aids as a helpful, albeit imperfect, metric by which to gauge its strength. Evaluated on these grounds, a sustained Yom Kippur typology in Matthew 27 is highly probable. The typology is strongest in the Barabbas and Roman-abuse scenes. Had Matthew not clearly established his goat typology in these scenes, I would find an allusion to Yom Kippur in Matt 27:50–53 only possible but not probable. Yet the criteria of reoccurrence and thematic coherence tip the scale in favor of "probability" in my view.

### New Insights into Matthew's Yom Kippur Typology

While scholars had previously suggested a Yom Kippur typology in Matthew 27, they had not attempted to see the full vision of the First Evangelist's scriptural imagination

with regards to the Day of Atonement in this chapter. I have sought to illumine that vision in an exegetically responsible manner.

As the reader recalls, I identified seven problems with prior interpretations of Matthew's Yom Kippur typology.[6] These problems have been rectified in the course of this investigation: (1) I have taken into account not only Leviticus 16 but the full range of Second Temple Yom Kippur traditions in my analysis of Matthew 27. (2) I demonstrated that Yom Kippur was often associated with the theme of bloodguilt in early Judaism, and that Matthew's Day of Atonement typology is linked to his innocent-blood discourse, in that the contaminant of *bloodguilt* is placed upon the sin-bearing figure in the typology. (3) I explained why Matthew does not portray Jesus Barabbas, the scapegoat, as bearing sin. Namely, the crowd, who functions as Azazel by receiving the "scapegoat" to itself, adopts the role of sin-bearer, as Azazel becomes the archetypal sin-bearing scapegoat in Second Temple tradition. (4) I have therefore shown that the typology extends into Matt 27:24–25. The governor, acting as high priest, transfers the iniquity from his hands onto the demon-possessed sin-bearing crowd. (5) I determined that Matthew's Roman-abuse narrative follows Mark in drawing upon curse-transmission or elimination ritual traditions, which strengthens the case for a Yom Kippur typology in this scene. (6) I explicated why Matthew conceives multiple scapegoats. Namely, from the evangelist's perspective, the Jews of Jesus's generation who defiled Jerusalem with the blood of the messiah were obliged to bear their own guilt and that of previous generations in the cataclysmic event of 70 CE. This purgatory event, however, is merely provisional for Matthew. Jesus must also become a scapegoat, in order to bear all forgivable sins (cf. Matt 12:32). (7) I

---

6. See Chapter One.

advanced the Yom Kippur typology beyond the Barabbas and Roman-abuse scenes, finding evidence of its impact on Matthew's death-burial narrative.

Matthew's Yom Kippur typology may now be apprehended as cogent and thematically in sync with the remainder of the Gospel. In turn, the broader question of the contribution of this Day of Atonement typology to the First Evangelist's interpretation of Jesus's death and theology of atonement may be addressed.

## Matthew's Theology of Atonement in Light of His Yom Kippur Typology

This investigation into Matthew's Yom Kippur typology contributes to a better understanding of the meaning of Jesus's death in the First Gospel. In Chapter One, I traced six weaknesses in the current state of scholarship regarding Matthew's theology of atonement. This study brings insight to these areas of weakness.

Matthew's Yom Kippur typology sheds new light on the mechanism of atonement operative in the Gospel. To reiterate Huizenga's observation, "relatively little of a comprehensive character seems to have been written pertaining to the mechanics of Jesus's sacrificial death in the Gospel of Matthew; the issue is not a central concern of major Matthean scholars."[7] This study concludes that the atonement theology of the Priestly literature has shaped Matthew's theology of atonement. The First Evangelist conceives Jesus's death as effecting the purgation of sins by means of Jesus offering his blood/lifeforce to God and bearing those sins to the heart of the earth. Yet Jesus's death also ransoms God's people from exile, sin, and the Devil. It therefore appears that the two notions of כפר in the Pentateuch, namely,

---

7. Huizenga, *New Isaac*, 268.

"to purge" (*kippēr*) and "ransom payment" (*kōper*), are closely related in the evangelist's thought. He seems to interpret both meanings of כפר in light of each other, as Sklar does: "The end point of sin and impurity is the same: both endanger (requiring ransom) and both pollute (requiring purgation). As a result, it is not simply *kōper* that is needed in some instances and purgation that is needed in others, but *kōper*-purgation that is needed in both."[8] Such is what we might expect from a first-century author who reads the Pentateuch not through the lens of source criticism but as a singular document.

The vision of atonement set forth in this investigation coheres quite well with a prevailing concept of sin in the Gospel, namely, sin as a concrete object requiring physical removal. Does Matthew also conceive sin as a debt to be remitted? Absolutely. But the evangelist's editorial additions repeatedly point to an understanding of sin as a burden, stain, stumbling stone, or object in need of physical elimination. Matthew's Yom Kippur typology corresponds nicely to this vision of sin in the Gospel.

The Day of Atonement typology in Matthew's Barabbas episode (Matt 27:15–26) provides textual support for Wright's claim that, in the case of Matthew, the evangelist's agenda was to fuse together Passover with the forgiveness of sins in writing his Gospel. Only Matthew clearly remodels the amnesty trial, which is identified specifically as a Passover custom (Matt 27:15), as a lottery between the two goats of Leviticus 16. This appears to be the gospel writer's creative solution to the problem of how Jesus's new Passover, exodus, and covenant would include the antidote to Israel's long history of sin and exile.

---

8. Sklar, *Sin, Impurity*, 182

Matthew's scapegoat typology explains the abscondence of the Suffering Servant figure in his PN, which is an anomalous phenomenon, given the Servant's prominence elsewhere in the Gospel (Matt 8:17; 12:18–21). The evangelist utilizes the Servant and scapegoat typologies respectively in the parallel scenes of Jesus's abuse by the Sanhedrin (Matt 26:67–68) and the Roman soldiers (Matt 27:27–31). This use of corresponding typologies in parallel scenes indicates that the two scriptural figurers are conceptual linked in Matthew's thought. In light of this correspondence and the fact that the Servant and scapegoat possess the remarkably unique trait of bearing others' sins, the evangelist's employment of one of these typologies in one narrative segment mitigates his felt need to employ the other typology in the same narrative segment.

Scholars have rarely reflected on whether Matthew's vision of eschatological judgment intersects with his theology of atonement. I supported Hamilton's thesis that, for the gospel author, the destruction of Jerusalem is a purgatory event. Matthew thereby reflects the theology of the Pentateuch: "For blood pollutes the land, and no expiation [לֹא־יְכֻפַּר] can be made for the land, for the blood that is shed in it, except by the blood of the one who shed it" (Num 35:33). This notion explains why Matthew casts not only Jesus the messiah as scapegoat but also Jesus Barabbas. Both scapegoats bear a distinctive burden of iniquity in the evangelist's thought. In choosing Jesus Barabbas and condemning Jesus the messiah to death, the crowd commits the unpardonable sin (Matt 12:31–32) and so bears this iniquity upon themselves and are destined to suffer expulsion in 70 CE, according to Matthew. All other sin is pardonable for the evangelist (Matt 12:31), and so the reader assumes that Jesus bears this iniquity and thereby suffers his own cosmic expulsion. For Matthew,

then, atonement and judgment are closely associated phenomena. The former involves the removal and elimination of iniquity on behalf of others. The latter involves the removal and elimination of iniquity by bearing that iniquity oneself. Again, this notion closely resembles the Priestly theology of the Pentateuch.[9]

By failing to consider Jesus's role as goat for Azazel in the First Gospel, recent attempts to revive a *Christus Victor* notion of the atonement have missed what may be a crucial link between the Matthean themes of Jesus's triumph over the Devil and Jesus's death for the forgiveness of sins. Apparently, by descending "to Azazel," Jesus both eliminates iniquity *and* usurps the Devil's authority over the dead. The evangelist seems to foreshadow this event in Jesus's temptation (Matt 4:1–11), where, having identified with sinful Israel through baptism (Matt 3:13–17), Jesus is immediately led into the desert, as the scapegoat, to confront the demonic ruler of the world (Matt 4:8). More remains to be explored regarding the relationship of these two themes in the Gospel.

A final word must be said about Matthew's attitude toward his disbelieving Jewish brethren. Though it is true that the evangelist "expresses a great deal of hostility toward Jews outside of his church community,"[10] one should not misread his Yom Kippur typology as implying God's rejection of the Jews as his covenant people. While in his view God has expanded his covenant to include the Gentiles through the messiah (Matt 1:1; 12:18–21; 21:43; 28:19), Matthew does not blanketly designate the Jewish people as a scapegoat, but only those Jews whom he deems responsible for the death of the messiah and their immediate children who suffered the cataclysm of

---

9. It is also congruent with the great judgment of the sheep and the goats (Matt 25:31–46; esp. vv. 31–34, 41, 46), a scene that bears the influence of the Azazel tradition.

10. Burns, *Christian Schism*, 138.

70 CE.

In light of the foregoing analysis, the Gospel of Matthew emerges as containing the most developed scapegoat typology in New Testament theology. Whereas the Epistle to the Hebrews portrays Jesus as the high priest and immolated goat of Yom Kippur, Matthew portrays Jesus as both goats (and high priest, though this is not emphasized) of Yom Kippur. Matthew's scapegoat typology can be read as a narrative expansion on Paul's statement that "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law by becoming a curse for us" (Gal 3:13). For the First Evangelist, Jesus's apocalyptic three-day ordeal fulfills Ezekiel 37 and redeems Israel from exile by dealing with its root cause, sin. By purging iniquity through offering his blood/ lifeforce on the cross as the goat for Yahweh, and by suffering Israel's exile and bearing the world's iniquity as the goat for Azazel, Jesus "saves his people from their sins" (Matt 1:21) and establishes the *raison d'etre* of the sanctuary for Jesus's new Passover community, namely, "God with us" (Matt 1:23; cf. 28:20). While this portrait is more "impressionistic" than "realistic"—that is, low rather than high resolution—Matthew clearly parts ways from the author of Hebrews and aligns himself with Paul by highlighting Good Friday as the key moment of Jesus's sacrifice. But among the New Testament writers, the First Evangelist is exceptional in suggesting the atoning function of Jesus as the goat for Azazel on Holy Saturday.

WORKS CITED

Albright, W. F. and C. S. Mann, *Matthew: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. AB 26. Doubleday & Company, 1971.

Alexander, Philip S. "From Son of Adam to Second God: Trasformations of the Biblical Enoch." Pages 87–122 in *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*. Edited by Michael E. Stone and Theodore A. Bergren. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity International, 1998.

Alfaro, María Jesús Martínez. "Intertextuality: Origins and Development of the Concept." *Atlantis* 18 (1996): 268–85.

Allison, Dale C. "After his Resurrection (Matt 27:35) and the Descens ad inferos." Pages 335–54 in N*eutestamentliche Exegese im Dialog: Hermeneutik—Wirkungsgeschichte—Matthäusevangelium*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2008.

———. *The End of the Ages has Come: An Early Interpretation of the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.

———. *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.

———. "The Scriptural Background of a Matthean Legend: Ezekiel 37, Zechariah 14, and Matthew 27." Pages 153–88 in *Life beyond Death in Matthew's Gospel: Religious Metaphor or Bodily Reality?* Edited by Wim Weren, Huub van de Sandt, and Joseph Verheyden. Leuven: Peeters, 2011, 153–88.

Alon, Gedaliah. "Halakha in the Epistle of Barnabas." *Tarbiz* 12 (1940–1941): 23–38.

An, Hannah S. "Reading Matthew's Account of the Baptism and Temptation of Jesus (Matt 3:5–4:1) with the Scapegoat Rite on the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:20–22)." *Canon & Culture* 12 (2018): 5–31.

Anderson, Gary A. *Sin: A History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.

Andrews, Michael W. "The Sign of Jonah: Jesus in the Heart of the Earth." *JETS* 61 (2018): 105–19.

Angel, Joseph. "The Traditional Roots of Priestly Messianism at Qumran." Pages 27–54 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at 60: Scholarly Contributions of New York University Faculty and Alumni*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and Shani Tzoref. Ledien Brill, 2010.

Bailey, Daniel P. "Concepts of Stellvertretung in the Interpretation of Isaiah 53." Pages 223–59 in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins*. Edited by William H. Bellinger and William R. Farmer. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1998.

———. "Jesus as the Mercy Seat: The Semantics and Theology of Paul's Use of *Hilasterion* in Romans 3:25." PhD diss., University of Cambridge, 1999.

———. "Jesus as the Mercy Seat: The Semantics and Theology of Paul's Use of *Hilasterion* in Romans 3:25." *TynBul* 51 (2000): 155–58.

Bajsić, Alois. "Pilatus, Jesus und Barabbas." *Bib* 48 (1967): 7–28.

Barber, Michael Patrick. "Jesus as the Davidic Temple Builder and Peter's Priestly Role in Matthew 16:16–19." *JBL* 132 (2013): 935–53.

Barkley, Gary Wayne. *Homilies on Leviticus 1–16*. FC 83. Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1990.

Barnard, Leslie W. *Studies in Church History and Patristics*. Thessalonike: Patriarchikon, 1978.

———. "The Date of the Epistle of Barnabas – A Document of Early Egyptian Christianity." *JEA* 44 (1958): 101–7.

———. "The Epistle of Barnabas and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Some Observations." *SJT* 13 (1960): 45–59.

Barrett, C. K. "The Background of Mark 10:45." Pages 1–18 in *New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson*. Edited by A. J. B. Higgins. Manchester: University Press, 1959.

Barry IV, Rick J. *The Two Goats: A Christian Yom Kippur Soteriology*. PhD diss., Marquette University, 2017.

Bauckham, Richard. *The Fate of the Dead: Studies on the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. NovTSup 93. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Baumgarten, Joseph M. "Yom Kippur in the Qumran Scrolls and Second Temple Sources." *DSD* 6 (1999): 184–91.

Beale, G. K. *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: BakerAcademic, 2012.

———. *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*. NSBT. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2004.

Beare, Francis Wright. *The Gospel According to Matthew: Translation, Introduction, and Commentary*. Cambridge: Harper & Row, 1981.

Beaton, Richard. *Isaiah's Christ in Matthew's Gospel*. SNTSMS 123. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Beavis, Mary Ann. *Mark*. PCNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011.

Beetham, Christopher A. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul to the Corinthians*. BibInt 9. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Betz, Hans Dieter. *The "Mithras Liturgy."* STAC 18. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

Betz, Otto. "Jesus and Isaiah 53." Pages 70–87 in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins*. Edited by William H. Bellinger and William R. Farmer. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1998.

Birt, Theodor. "Zum Königsmimus." *Phil* 77 (1921): 427–28.

Black, C. Clifton. Review of *The Cross that Spoke*, by John Dominic Crossan. *JR* 69 (1989): 398–99.

Blass, Friedrich, Albert Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Blatz, Beate. "The Coptic Gospel of Thomas." Pages 110–33 in *New Testament Apocrypha: Volume I*. Edited by Wilhelm Schneemelcher. Revised ed. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1990.

Blocher, Henri. "Zacharie 3: Josué et le Grand Jour des Expiations." *ETR* 54 (1979): 264–70.

Boda, Mark J. *Haggai, Zechariah*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2004.

———. "Oil, Crowns and Thrones: Prophet, Priest and King in Zechariah 1:7–6:15." *JHebS* 3 (2001): Article 10.

Bokedal, Tomas. Review of *Bridging the Gap: Ritual and Ritual Texts in the Bible*, by Gerald A. Klingbeil, and *The New Testament in its Ritual World*, by Richard E. DeMaris. *BibInt* 19 (2011): 511–16.

Bond, Helen K. "Barabbas Remembered." Pages 59–71 in *Jesus and Paul: Global Perspectives in Honor of James D. G. Dunn for his 70th Birthday*. Edited by B. J. Oropeza, C. K. Robertson, and Douglas C. Mohrmann. LNTS 414. London: T&T Clark International, 2009.

———. "Praetorium." Pages 460–61 in *Encyclopedia of the Historical Jesus*. Edited by Craig A. Evans. New York: Routledge: 2008.

Bonner, Campbell. "The Crown of Thorns." *HTR* 46 (1953): 47–48.

Bornkamm, Günther. "Die Sturmstillung im Matthäusevangelium." *WD*. Jahrbuch der

Theologischen Schule Bethel 1 (1948): 49–54.

Bottéro, Jean. "The Substitute King and His Fate." Pages 138–55 in *Mesopotamia: Writing, Reasoning, and the Gods*. Translated by Zainab Bahrani and Marc van de Mieroop. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Botterweck, Johannes, and Helmer Ringgren, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament.* Translated by John. T. Wills et al. 8 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974–2006.

Box, Herbert. *Philonis Alexandrini: In Flaccum*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1939.

Box, G. Herbert, and J. I. Landsman. *The Apocalypse of Abraham*. London: SPCK, 1918.

Burns, Joshua Ezra. "Rabbinic Literature: New Testament." Pages 2:247–56 in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Books of the Bible.* Edited by Michael D. Coogan. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

———. *The Christian Schism in Jewish History and Jewish Memory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

Bradshaw, Paul F. Review of *The New Testament in its Ritual World*, by Richard E. DeMaris. *BTB* 39 (2009): 167–68.

Brawley, Robert L. *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1995.

Bremmer, Jan N. *Greek Religion and Culture, the Bible and the Ancient Near East*. JSRC 8. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

———. "Scapegoat Rituals in Ancient Greece." *HSCP* 87 (1983): 299–320.

———. "Scapegoat Rituals in Ancient Greece." Pages 271–93 in *Oxford Readings in Greek Religion*. Edited by Richard Buxton. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

———. "The Scapegoat between Northern Syria, Hittites, Israelites, Greeks and Early Christians." Pages 169–214 in *Greek Religion and Culture, the Bible and the Ancient Near East*. By Jan. N. Bremmer. JSRC 8. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Broer, I. "Der Prozess gegen Jesus nach Matthäus." *Der Prozess gegen Jesus*. Edited by K. Kertelge. QD 112. Freiburg: Herder, 1988.

Brooke, George J. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005.

———. "The Ten Temples in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 417–34 in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*. Edited by John Day. LHBOTS 422. London: T&T Clark, 2005.

Brown, Colin, ed. *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology.* 4 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975–1978.

Brown, Raymond E. *The Birth of the Messiah*. New York: Doubleday, 1993.

———. *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave*. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1994.

———. *The Gospel according to John (I–XII)*. AB. New York: Doubleday, 1966.

———. "The Gospel of Peter and Canonical Gospel Priority." *NTS* (1987): 321–43.

Bultmann, Rudolf. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Translated by John Marsh. New York: Harper & Row, 1963 (1921).

Buol, Justin. *Martyred for the Church: Memorializations of the Effective Death of Bishop Martyrs in the Second Century CE*. WUNT 471. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018.

Burkert, Walter. "Transformations of the Scapegoat." Pages 59–77 in *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual*. By idem. Berkley: University of California Press, 1979.

Cahill, Michael. *The First Commentary on Mark: An Annoted Translation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Cargal, Timothy. "'His Blood Be upon Us and upon Our Children': A Matthean Double-Entendre?" *NTS* 37 (1991): 101–12.

Carmichael, Calum. *Illuminating Leviticus: A Study of Its Laws and Institutions in Light of Biblical Narratives*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2006.

———. "The Origin of the Scapegoat Ritual." *VT* 50 (2000): 167–82.

Carson, Donald A. "Matthew." Pages 3–599 in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*. Edited by F. E. Gaebelein. Vol. 8. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984.

Cary, Phillip. *Jonah: Brazos Theological Commentary on the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2008.

Casey, Maurice. "Where Wright is Wrong: A Critical Review of N. T. Wright's *Jesus and the Victory of God*." *JSNT* 69 (1998): 95–103.

Catchpole, David R. "The Poor on Earth and the Son of Man in Heaven: A Re-

appraisal of Matthew 12:31–46." *BJRL* 61 (1979): 378–83.

Chadwick, Henry. *Origen: Contra Celsum.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953.

Chae, Young S. *Jesus as the Eschatological Davidic Shepherd: Studies in the Old Testament, Second Temple Judaism, and in the Gospel of Matthew*. WUNT 2:216. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.

Charette, Blaine. *The Theme of Recompense in Matthew's Gospel*. JSNTSup 79. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1992.

Charles, R. H. *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch: Translated from the Editor's Ethiopic Text*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1912.

Charlesworth, James H., ed. *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983, 1985.

———. "The Date and Provenience of the *Parables of Enoch*." Pages 37–57 in *Parables of Enoch: A Paradigm Shift*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth and Darrell L. Bock. London: Bloomsberry, 2013.

Cheyne, T. K. "The Date and Origin of the Ritual of the Scapegoat." *ZAW* 15 (1895): 153–56.

Chilton, Bruce. *A Feast of Meanings: Eucharistic Theologies from Jesus through Johannine Circles*. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

———. *The Isaiah Targum: Introduction, Translation, Apparatus, and Notes*. ArBib 2. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1987.

Chow, Simon. *The Sign of Jonah Reconsidered: A Study of its Meaning in the Gospel Traditions*. CB 27. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1995.

Cleland, Liza, Glenys Davies, and Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones, eds. *Greek and Roman Dress from A to Z*. London: Routledge 2007.

Cockerill, Gareth Lee. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012.

Colautti, Federico M. *Passover in the Works of Josephus*. JSJSup 75. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Collins, Adela Yarbro. "Finding Meaning in the Death of Jesus." *JR* 78 (1998): 175–96.

———. *Mark: A Commentary*. Hermeneia.Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.

———. "Mark's Interpretation of the Death of Jesus." *JBL* 128 (2009): 545–54.

———. "The Signification of Mark 10:45 among Gentile Christians." *HTR* 90 (1997): 371–82.

Collins, John J. "Methodological Issues in the Study of *1 Enoch*: Reflections on the Articles of P. D. Hanson and G. W. Nickelsburg." *SBLSP* (1978): 315–22.

———. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

———. "The Apocalyptic Technique: Setting and Function in the Book of Watchers." *CBQ* 44 (1982): 91–111.

———. *The Scepter and the Star: Messianism in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.

Couchoud, P. L., and R. Stahl. "Jesus Barabbas." *HibJ* 25 (1926–1927): 26–42.

Cousland, J. R. C. *The Crowds in the Gospel of Matthew*. NovTSup 102. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Crossan, John Dominic. *Four Other Gospels: Shadows on the Contours of the Canon*. Minneapolis: Winston, 1985.

———. *The Cross that Spoke: The Origins of the Passion Narrative*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988.

———. *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant.* San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991.

Cullmann, Oscar. *The Christology of the New Testament*. Translated by Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall. London: SCM, 1959.

Curtis, Byron G. *Up the Steep and Stony Road: The Book of Zechariah in Social Location Trajectory Analysis*. AcBib 25. Atlanta: SBL, 2006.

Dahl, Nils A. "The Passion Narrative in Matthew's Gospel." Pages 42–55 in *The Interpretation of Matthew*. Edited by Graham Stanton. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.

Danby, Herbert. *The Mishnah: Translated from the Hebrew with Introduction and Brief Explanatory Notes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933.

Danker, Frederick W., Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Davies, Steven L. "Who is Called Bar Abbas?" *NTS* 27 (1980–1981): 260–62.

Davies, W. D. and Dale C. Allison. *The Gospel According to Matthew.* 3 vols. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988–1997.

Davis, W. Hersey. "Origen's Comment on Matthew 27:17." *RevExp* 39 (1942): 65–67.

Jonge, Marinus de. "Matthew 27:51 in Early Christian Exegesis." *HTR* 79 (1986): 67–79.

DeConick, April D. *The Original Gospel of Thomas in Translation*. London: T&T Clark, 2006.

Delbrueck, Richard. "Antiquarisches zu den Verspottungen Jesu." *ZNW* 41 (1942): 124–45.

DeMaris, Richard E. "Jesus Jettisoned." Pages 91–111 in *The New Testament in its Ritual World.* By idem. London: Routledge, 2008.

———. *The New Testament in its Ritual World.* London: Routledge, 2008.

Dibelius, Martin. *From Tradition to Gospel*. Translated by Bertram Lee Woolf. New York: Scribner, 1965 (1919).

Dimant, Devorah. "*1 Enoch* 6–11: A Methodological Perspective." *SBLSP* (1978): 323–39.

———. "The Fallen Angels in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Related Apocryphes and Pseudepigrapha" (in Hebrew). PhD diss., The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1974.

———. "The 'Pesher of the Periods' (4Q180 and 4Q181)." *IOS* 9 (1979): 77–102.

Dindorfius, Guiliemus. *Julii Pollucis, Onomasticon: Vol. 1*. Leipzig: Kuehniana, 1924.

Donahue, John R., and Daniel J. Harrington. *The Gospel of Mark*. SP 2. Collegesville, MN: Liturgical, 2002.

Dorman, Anke. "'Commit Injustice and Shed Innocent Blood': Motives Behind the Institution of the Day of Atonement in the Book of Jubilees." Pages 49–62 in *The Day of Atonement: Its Interpretation in Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*. Edited by Thomas Hieke and Tobias Nicklas. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Douglas, Mary. *Jacob's Tears: The Priestly Work of Reconciliation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

———. *Leviticus as Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

———. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concept of Pollution and Taboo*. London: Routledge, 1966.

———. "The Go-Away Goat." Pages 121–41 in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception*. Edited by Rolf Rendtorff and Robert A. Kugler. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Dowd, Sharyn, and Elizabeth Struthers Malbon. "The Significance of Jesus's Death in Mark: Narrative Context and Authorial Audience." *JBL* 125 (2006): 271–97.

Driver, G. R. "Three Technical Terms in the Pentateuch." *JSS* 1 (1956): 97–105.

Dunkerley, Roderic. "Was Barabbas also Called Jesus?" *ExpTim* 74 (1962–1963): 126–27.

Duran, Nicole Wilkinson. *The Power of Disorder: Ritual Elements in Mark's Passion Narrative*. LNTS 378. London: T&T Clark, 2008.

Eberhart, Christian A. "To Atone or Not to Atone: Remarks on the Day of Atonement Rituals According to Leviticus 16 and the Meaning of Atonement." Pages 197–231 in *Sacrifice, Cult, and Atonement in Early Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by Henrietta L. Wiley and Christian A. Eberhart. Atlanta: SBL, 2017.

Edwards, J. Christopher. *The Ransom Logion in Mark and Matthew: Its Reception and Its Significance for the Study of the Gospels*. WUNT 2:327. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

Edwards, Richard Alan, *The Sign of Jonah: In the Theology of the Evangelists and Q*. SBT 18. Naperville, IL: Alec R. Allenson, 1971.

Ehrman, Bart D. *The Apostolic Fathers. Volume 2*. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Eloff, Mervyn. "Exile, Restoration, and Matthew's Genealogy of Jesus Ὁ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ." *Neot* 38 (2004): 75–87.

Emadi, Samuel. "Intertextuality in New Testament Scholarship: Significance, Criteria, and the Art of Intertextual Reading." *CurBR* (2015): 8–23.

Epstein, Isidore. *The Babylonian Talmud*. London: Soncino, 1935–1952.

Eubank, Nathan. *Wages of Cross-Bearing and Debt of Sin: The Economy of Heaven in Matthew's Gospel*. BZNW 196. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013.

Evans, Craig A. "Jesus and the Continuing Exile of Israel." Pages 77–100 in *Jesus and the Restoration of Israel: A Critical Assessment of N. T. Wright's* Jesus

and the Victory of God. Edited by Carey C. Newman. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1999.

———. *Mark 8:27–16:20*. WBC. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2001.

Evans, Ernest. *Tertullian: Adversus Marcionem: Books 1–3*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1972.

Ewald, Marie Liguori. *The Homilies of St. Jerome: Volume 2 (Homilies 60–96)*. FC 57. Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1996.

Falls, Thomas B. *St. Justin Martyr: Dialogue with Trypho*. Revised by Thomas P. Halton. Edited by Michael Slusser. SFC 3. Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2003.

Fantham, Elaine, and Costas Panayotakis. "Mime." Pages 955–56 in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Edited by Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Finlan, Stephen. "Curse Transmission Rituals and Paul's Imagery." Pages 73–121 in *The Background and Content of Paul's Cultic Atonement Metaphors*. By idem. Atlanta: SBL, 2004.

———. *Problems with Atonement: The Origins of, and Controversy About, the Atonement Doctrine*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 2005.

———. *The Background and Content of Paul's Cultic Atonement Metaphors*. Atlanta: SBL, 2004.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "Anti-semitism and the Cry of 'All the People' (Mt. 27:25)." *TS* 26 (1965): 667–71.

Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H.T. *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. STDJ 42. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

———. "Jesus as the High Priestly Messiah: Part 1." *JSHJ* 4 (2006): 155–75.

———. "Jesus as the High Priestly Messiah: Part 2." *JSHJ* 5 (2007): 57–79.

———. "The High Priest as Divine Mediator in the Hebrew Bible: Dan 7:13 as a Test Case." *SBLSP* 36 (1997): 161–93.

———. "The Revelation of the Sacral Son of Man: The Genre, History of Religions Context and the Meaning of the Transfiguration." Pages 247–98 in *Auferstehung – Resurrection*. Edited by Friedrich Avemarie and Hermann Lichtenberger. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.

Foster, Paul. *Community, Law and Misson in Matthew's Gospel*. WUNT 2:177. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.

———. Review of *The Death of Jesus in Matthew*, by Catherine Sider Hamilton. *ExpTim* 129 (2017): 230–31.

———. Review of *The New Isaac*, by Leroy Huizenga, *JSNT* 33 (2011): 51–52.

———. *The Gospel of Peter: Introduction, Critical Edition, and Commentary*. TENTS 4. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

———. "The Use of Zechariah in Matthew's Gospel." Pages 65–86 in *The Book of Zechariah and its Influence*. Edited by Christopher Tuckett. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2003.

France, R. T. *The Gospel of Matthew*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.

Frankemölle, Hubert. *Matthäus.* 2 vols. Düsseldorf: Patmos. 1994, 1997.

Frazer, James George. *The Golden Bough: A Study of Magic and Religion*. New York: The Floating Press: 2009 (1890).

Freedman, David Noel, ed. *Anchor Bible Dictionary.* 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Friedlander, Gerald, ed. *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer.* London: 1916. Reprinted. New York: Hermon, 1970.

Fuller, Reginald H. Review of *The Cross that Spoke*, by John Dominic Crossan. *Int* 45 (1991): 71–72.

Gelardini, Gabriella. "The Inauguration of Yom Kippur according to the LXX and its Cessation or Perpetuation according to the Book of Hebrews: A Systematic Comparison." Pages 225–54 in *The Day of Atonement: Its Interpretation in Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*. Edited by Thomas Hieke and Tobias Nicklas. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Gane, Roy. *Cult and Character: Purification Offerings, Day of Atonement, and Theodicy.* Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005.

Geffcken, J. "Die Verhöhnung Christi durch die Kriegsknechte." *Hermes* 41 (1906): 220–29.

Geiger, A. "Zu den Apokryphen." *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben* 3 (1864): 196–204.

Gese, Hartmut. "The Atonement." Pages 93–116 in *Essays on Biblical Theology*. Translated by Keith Crim. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1981.

Gibbs, Jeffery A. "Israel Standing with Israel: The Baptism of Jesus in Matthew's

Gospel (Matt 3:13–17).” *CBQ* 64 (2002): 511–26.

———. “The Son of God and the Father’s Wrath: Atonement and Salvation in Matthew’s Gospel.” *CTQ* 72 (2008): 211–25.

Gilders, William K. *Blood Ritual in the Hebrew Bible: Meaning and Power.* Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2004.

———.“The Day of Atonement in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” Pages 63–73 in *The Day of Atonement: Its Interpretation in Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*. Edited by Thomas Hieke and Tobias Nicklas. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Ginzberg, Louis. “Apocalypse of Abraham.” Pages 91–92 in *The Jewish Encyclopedia.* New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1906.

Goodacre, Mark. “Prophecy Historicized or Tradition Scripturalized? Reflections on the Origins of the Passion Narrative.” Pages 37–51 in *The New Testament and the Church: Essays in Honour of John Muddiman*. Edited by John Barton and Peter Groves. LNTS 532. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016.

Goodenough, E. R., and C. B. Welles. “The Crown of Acanthus (?).” *HTR* 46 (1953): 241–42.

Gorman, Frank H. “Ritual Studies and Biblical Studies: Assessment of the Past, Prospects for the Future.” *Semeia* 67 (1994): 13–36.

Grabbe, Lester L. “The Scapegoat Tradition: A Study in early Jewish Interpretation.” *JSJ* 18 (1987): 152–67.

Gradwohl, Roland. *Die Farben im alten Testament: Eine terminologische Studie*. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1963.

Grappe, Christian. Review of *The Impact of Yom Kippur on Early Christianity*, by Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. *RHPR* 84 (2004): 230–32.

Green, H. Benedict. *The Gospel According to Matthew: Introduction and Commentary.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Green, Joel B. “The Gospel of Peter: Source for a Pre-canonical Passion Narrative?” *ZNW* 78 (1987): 293–301.

———. Review of *The Cross that Spoke*, by John Dominic Crossan. *JBL* 109 (1990): 356—58.

Green, William Scott. “Doing the Text’s Work for It: Richard Hays on Paul’s Use of Scripture.” Pages 58–63 in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. JSNTSup 83. Sheffield: JSOT, 1993.

Grenfell, Bernard P., and Arthur S. Hunt. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri: Part III*. Oxford: Horace Hart, 1898.

Gruenwald, Ithamar. Review of *The New Testament in its Ritual World*, by Richard E. DeMaris. *CBQ* 71 (2009): 399–401.

Guggenheimer, Heinrich W, ed. *The Jerusalem Talmud. Tractates Pesahim and Yoma. Edition, Translation, and Commentary*. SJ 74. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013.

Gundry, Robert H. *Matthew: A Commentary on His Handbook for a Mixed Church under Persecution*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.

Gurtner, Daniel M. "Matthew's Theology of the Temple and the 'Parting of the Ways': Christian Origins and the First Gospel." Pages 128–53 in *Built Upon the Rock: Studies in the Gospel of Matthew*. Edited by Daniel M. Gurtner and John Nolland. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.

———. *The Torn Veil: Matthew's Exposition of the Death of Jesus*. SNTSMS 139. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Ha, KyeSang. "Cultic Allusions in the Suffering Servant Poem (Isaiah 52:13–53:12)." PhD diss., Andrews University, 2009.

Hagner, Donald A. *Matthew.* 2 vols. WBC 33A–B. Dallas: Thomas Nelson, 1995.

———. "Matthew: Apostate, Reformer, Revolutionary?" *NTS* 49 (2003): 193–209.

———. "Matthew: Christian Judaism or Jewish Christianity?" Pages 263–82 in *The Face of New Testament Studies: A Survey of Recent Research*. Edited by S. McKnight and G. Osborne. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004.

Halperin, David J. *The Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Response to Ezekiel's Vision*. TSAJ 16. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988.

Ha-Reubéni, E. "Recherches sur les plantes de l'Évangile: l'épine de la couronne de Jésus." *RB* 42 (1933): 230–34.

Hamilton, Catherine Sider. "'His Blood Be upon Us': Innocent Blood and the Death of Jesus in Matthew." *CBQ* 70 (2008): 82–100.

———. *The Death of Jesus in Matthew: Innocent Blood*. SNTSMS 167. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

Hamilton, Victor P. *Exodus: An Exegetical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011.

Hanson, Anthony. "The Scriptural Background to the Doctrine of the 'Descensus ad Inferos' in the New Testament." Pages 122–56 in *The New Testament*

*Interpretation of Scripture*. London: SPCK, 1980.

Hanson, Paul D. "Rebellion in Heaven, Azazel and Euhemeristic Heroes in *1 Enoch* 6–11." *JBL* 96 (1977): 195–223.

Hare, Douglas R. A. *Matthew*. IBC. Louisville: John Knox, 1993.

———. *The Theme of Persecution of Christians in the Gospel According to St. Matthew*. SNTSMS 6. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.

Harrington, Daniel J. *The Gospel of Matthew*. SP 2. Collegesville, MN: Liturgical, 1991.

Hart, H. St. J. "The Crown of Thorns in John 19.2–5." *JTSNS* 3 (1952): 66–75.

Hatina, Thomas R. "Intertextuality and Historical Criticism in New Testament Studies: Is there a Relationship?" *BibInt* 7 (1999): 28–43.

Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels.* Waco: Baylor University, 2016.

———. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul.* New Haven: Yale University, 1989.

———. *Reading Backwards: Figural Christology and the Fourfold Gospel Witness.* Waco: Baylor University Press, 2014.

———. *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.

———. "The Gospel of Matthew: Reconfigured Torah." *HTS* 61 (2005): 165–90.

Hayward, C. T. R. *The Jewish Temple: A Non-biblical Sourcebook.* London: Routledge, 1996.

Heen, Erik M. Review of *The Cross that Spoke*, by John Dominic Crossan. *HDB* 20 (1990): 16.

Heil, John Paul. "The Blood of Jesus in Matthew: A Narrative-Critical Perspective." *PRSt* 18 (1991): 117–24.

Helm, Robert. "Azazel in Early Jewish Tradition." *AUSS* 32 (1994): 217–26.

Hengel, Martin. *The Atonement: The Origins and the Doctrine in the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981.

Hengel, Martin, James H. Charlesworth, and Doron Mendels. "The Polemical Character of 'On Kingship' in the Temple Scroll: An Attempt at Dating 11Q Temple." *JJS* 37 (1986): 28–38.

Hill, David. *The Gospel of Matthew*. London: Oliphants, 1972.

Himmelfarb, Martha. "Apocalyptic Ascent and the Heavenly Temple." *SBLSP* 26 (1987): 210–17.

———. *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

———. "The Temple and the Garden of Eden in Ezekiel, the Book of Watchers, and the Wisdom of ben Sira." Pages 63–78 in *Sacred Places and Profane Spaces*, ed. Jamie Scott and Paul Simpson-Housley. New York: Greenwood, 1991.

Hoenig, Sidney B. "The New Qumran Pesher on Azazel." *JQR* 56 (1966): 248–53.

Holmes, Michael W. *The Apostolic Fathers*. 3rd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.

Hood, Jason B. *The Messiah, His Brothers, and the Nations*. LNTS 441. London: T&T Clark, 2011.

Hooker, Morna. "Did the Use of Isaiah 53 to Interpret his Mission Begin with Jesus?" Pages 88–103 in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins*. Edited by W. H. Bellinger and William R. Farmer. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1998.

———. *Jesus and the Servant: Influence of the Servant Concept of Deutero-Isaiah in the New Testament.* London: SPCK, 1959.

———. "Response to Mikael Parsons." Pages 120–24 in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins*. Edited by W. H. Bellinger and William R. Farmer. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1998.

Horbury, William. "Jewish-Christian Relations in *Barnabas* and Justin Martyr." Pages 315–45 in *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135*. Edited by J. D. G. Dunn. WUNT 1:66. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992.

Hornblower, Simon, and Antony Spawforth. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Horton, Fred L. *The Melchizedek Tradition*. SNTSMS 30. Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Hughes, Dennis D. "The Pharmakos and Related Rites." Pages 97–114 in *Human Sacrifice in Ancient Greece*. By idem. Repr. London: Routledge, 2010.

Huizenga, Leroy A. *The New Isaac: Tradition and Intertextuality in the Gospel of Matthew*. NovTSup 131. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Hvalvik, Reidar. *The Struggle for Scripture and Covenant: The Purpose of the Epistle of Barnabas and Jewish-Christian Competition in the Second Century*. WUNT 2:82. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996.

Jackson, F. J. Foakes, and Kirsopp Lake, eds. *The Beginnings of Christianity: Part 1: Volume 5*. London: Macmillan, 1933.

Jackson, Howard M. "The Death of Jesus in Mark and the Miracle from the Cross." *NTS* (1987): 16–37.

Janowski, Bernd. "Azazel." Pages 128–31 in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. Edited by Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking, and Pieter W. van der Horst. 2nd ed. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

———."He Bore Our Sins: Isaiah 53 and the Drama of Taking Another's Place." Pages 48–74 in *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources*. Edited by Bernd Janowski and Peter Stuhlmacher. Translated by Daniel P. Bailey. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.

———. *Sühne als Heilsgeschehen: Studien zur Sühnetheologie der Priesterschrift und zur Wurzel KPR im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament*. WMANT 55. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, l982.

Janowski, Bernd and Gernot Wilhelm. "Der Bock, der die Sünden hinausträgt." Pages 109–69 in *Religionsgeschichtliche Beziehungen zwischen Kleinasien, Nordsyrien und dem Alten Testament*. Edited by Bernd Janowski et al. OBO 129. Freiburg: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993.

Jastrow, Marcus. *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Tamud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*. London: Luzac, 1903.

Jauhiainen, Marko. "Turban and Crown Lost and Regained: Ezekiel 21:29–32 and Zechariah's Zemah." *JBL* 127 (2008): 501–11.

Jeremias, Joachim. *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*. 3rd ed. Translated by Norman Perrin. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1966.

Kastner, Karl. "Christi Dornenkrönung und Verspottung durch die römische Soldateska." *BZ* 6 (1908): 378–92.

Keener, Craig S. *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

———. *The IVP Bible Background Commentary*. 2nd ed. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2014.

Kennedy, Joel. *The Recapitulation of Israel: Use of Israel's History in Matthew 1:1–*

*4:11*. WUNT 2:257. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Kim, Jintae. "Targum Isaiah 53 and the New Testament Concept of Atonement." *JGRChJ* 5 (2008): 81–98.

Kittel, Gerhard, and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.* Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1976.

Kiuchi, N. *The Purification Offering in the Priestly Literature: Its Meaning and Function*. JSOTSup 56. Sheffield: Sheffield, 1987.

Klawans, Jonathan. *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

———. "Interpreting the Last Supper: Sacrifice, Spiritualization, and Anti-Sacrifice." *NTS* 48 (2002): 1–17.

———. *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Kloppenborg, John S. *Q: The Earliest Gospel: An Introduction to the Original Stories and Sayings of Jesus.* Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2008.

———. Review of *The New Testament in its Ritual World*, by Richard E. DeMaris. *SR* 39 (2010): 306–7.

Knibb, Michael A. *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*. Vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon, 1978.

Knöppler, Thomas. Review of *The Impact of Yom Kippur on Early Christianity*, by Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. *TLZ* 131 (2006): 1288–90.

Knowles, Michael. *Jeremiah in Matthew's Gospel: The Rejected-Prophet Motif in Matthean Redaction*. JSNTSup 68. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993.

Kobelski, Paul J. *Melchizedek and Melchiresa*. CBQMS 10. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981.

Koester, Helmut. *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development*. London: SCM, 1990.

———. "Apocryphal and Canonical Gospels." *HTR* 73 (1980): 105–30.

Konradt, Matthias. *Israel, Church, and the Gentiles in the Gospel of Matthew*. Translated by Kathleen Ess. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2014.

Koster, W. J. W. *Scholia in Aristophanem: Pars V*. Groningen, Netherlands: Wolters

Noordhoff N.V., 1969.

———. *Scholia in Aristophanem: Pars IV.* Groningen, Netherlands: Bouma's Boekuis B.V., 1969.

Kottek, Samuel. "Medicinal Drugs in the Works of Flavius Josephus." Pages 95–106 in *The Healing Past: Pharmaceuticals in the Biblical and Rabbinic World.* Edited by Irene and Walter Jacob. Leiden: Brill, 1993.

Klostermann, Erich. *Origenes Werke: Elfter Band: Origenes Matthäuserklärung.* GCS 38. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich'sche Buchhandlung, 1933.

Kraft, Robert. *The Epistle of Barnabas: its Quotations and their Sources.* PhD diss., Harvard University, 1961.

Küchler, Max. *Jerusalem: Ein Handbuch und Studienreiseführer zur Heiligen Stadt.* OLB 4.2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014.

Kümmel, Hans Martin. "Ersatzkönig und Sündenbock." *ZAW* 80 (1986): 289–318.

Kvanvig, Helge S. *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man.* WMANT 61. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988.

LaCocque, André. *Jesus the Central Jew: His Time and his People.* Atlanta: SBL, 2015.

———. "The Great Cry of Jesus on the Cross." Pages 138–64 in *Putting Body and Soul Together: Essays in Honor of Robin Scroggs.* Edited by Virginia Wiles, Alexandra Brown, and Graydon F. Snyder. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1977.

Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

Landes, George M. "Matthew 12:40 as an Interpretation of 'The Sign of Jonah' Against its biblical Background." Pages 665–84 in *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth.* Edited by C. L. Meyers and M. O'Connor. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1983.

Larsson, Göran. Review of *The Impact of Yom Kippur on Early Christianity*, by Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. *STK* 80 (2004): 134–35.

Lambert, W. G. "A Part of the Ritual for the Substitute King." *AfO* 18 (1957–1958): 109–12.

Lawrence, Louise J. Review of *The New Testament in its Ritual World*, by Richard E. DeMaris. *Theo* 113 (2010): 58–59.

Léon-Dufour, Xavier. *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread: The Witness of the New Testament.* New York: Paulist, 1987.

Leske, Adrian M. "Isaiah and Matthew." Pages 152–69 in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant:Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins*. Edited by William H. Bellinger and William R. Farmer. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1998.

———. "The Influence of Isaiah 40–66 on Christology in Matthew and Luke: A Comparison." Pages 897–916 in *Society of Biblical Literature 1994 Seminar Papers*. Edited by Eugene H. Lovering Jr. *SBLSP* 33. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.

Lessing, R. Reed. *Jonah: A Theological Exposition of Sacred Scripture*. ConC. Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 2007.

Levine, Baruch. A. *In the Presence of the Lord: A Study of Cult and Some Terms in Ancient Israel*. Leiden: Brill, 1974.

———. *Leviticus*. JPSTC. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1989.

Levine, Étan. *The Aramaic Version of Jonah*. New York: Sepher-Hermon, 1978.

Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, and Henry Stuart Jones. *A Greek-English Lexicon.* 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.

Lightfoot, J. B. *The Apostolic Fathers*. Edited by J. R. Harmer. London: Macmillan, 1907.

Lindars, Barnabas. *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations.* Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961.

Loader, William R. G. *Sohn und Hoherpriester: Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur Christologie des Hebräerbriefes*. WMANT 53. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchen, 1981.

Lundquist, John M. *The Temple of Jerusalem: Past, Present, and Future*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2008.

Luz, Ulrich. *Matthew: A Commentary.* Translated by James E. Crouch. 3 vols. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001–2007.

Maccoby, Hyam Z. *Ritual and Morality: The Ritual Purity System and its Place in Judaism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

———. "Jesus and Barabbas." *NTS* 16 (1969–1970): 55–60.

Maclean, Jennifer K. Berenson. "Barabbas, the Scapegoat Ritual, and the

Development of the Passion Narrative." *HTR* 100 (2007): 309–34.

Maier, Johann. *The Temple Scroll: An Introduction, Translation & Commentary*. JSOTSup 34. Sheffield: University of Sheffield, 1985.

Malina, Bruce J., and Jerome H. Neyrey. *Calling Jesus Names: The Social Value of Labels in Matthew*. Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1988.

Mason, Eric F. *You Are a Priest Forever: Second Temple Jewish Messianism and the Priestly Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. STDJ 74. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Marcovich, Miroslav. *Iustini Martyris: Dialogus cum Tryphone*. PTS 47. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997.

Marcus, Joel. *Mark: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 27A–B. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000, 2009.

———. *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark.* Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1992.

Marsh, Clive. "Theological History? N. T. Wright's *Jesus and the Victory of God*." *JSNT* 69 (1998): 77–94.

Martínez, Florentino García, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1997, 1998.

Martínez, Florentino García, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and Adam S. van der Woude, eds. *Qumran Cave 11. Vol. II: 11Q2–18, 11Q20–31*. DJD 23. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.

Matera, Frank J. *Passion Narratives and Gospel Theologies: Interpreting the Synoptics through their Passion Stories*. New York: Paulist, 1986.

———. Review of *The Cross that Spoke*, by John Dominic Crossan. *Worsh* 63 (1989): 269–70.

Maxwell, Robert L. "The Documentary Evidence for Ancient Mime." PhD diss., University of Toronto, 1993.

McKnight, Scot. *Jesus and His Death: Historiography, the Historical Jesus, and Atonement Theory.* Waco: Baylor University Press, 2005.

McLay, R. Timothy. *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.

McLean, Bradley H. "Apotropaeic Rituals." Pages 65–104 in *The Cursed Christ: Mediterranean Expulsion Rituals and Pauline Soteriology*. By idem. JSNTSup

126. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996.

———. *The Cursed Christ: Mediterranean Expulsion Rituals and Pauline Soteriology*. JSNTSup 126. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996.

McNamara, Martin, Robert Hayward, and Michael Maher, trans. *Targum Neofiti 1: Leviticus. Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Leviticus*. ArBib 3. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1994.

Meier, John P. *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus: Volume 1*. New York: Doubleday, 1991.

———. *Matthew*. NTM 3. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1980.

———. Review of *The Cross that Spoke*, by John Dominic Crossan. *Hor* 16 (1989): 378–79.

———. *The Vision of Matthew: Christ, Church, and Morality in the First Gospel*. New York: Paulist, 1979.

Merkel, Johannes. "Die Begnadigung am Passahfeste." *ZNW* 6 (1905): 293–316.

Merrill, Eugene H. "The Sign of Jonah." *JETS* 23 (1980): 23–30.

Merrit, R. L. "Jesus Barabbas and the Paschal Pardon." *JBL* 104 (1985): 57–68.

Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament (Fourth Revised Edition)*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.

Meyers, Carol. *Exodus*, NCBD. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Meyers, Carol L., and Eric M. Meyers. *Haggai, Zechariah 1–8*. AB 25B. New York: Doubleday, 1987.

Milgrom, Jacob. "Impurity is Miasma: A Response to Hyam Maccoby." *JBL* 119 (2000): 729–46.

———. "Israel's Sanctuary: The Priestly 'Picture of Dorian Gray.'" *RB* 83 (1976): 390–99.

———. *Leviticus: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB. 3 vols. New York: Doubleday: 1991–2001.

———. "Sin-Offering or Purification Offering." *VT* 21 (1971): 237–39.

Milik, J. T. *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1976.

Mimouni, Simon C. Review of *The Impact of Yom Kippur on Early Christianity*, by Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. *REJ* 165 (2006): 299–300.

Mitchell, H. G. *Haggai, Zechariah*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1912.

Moffitt, David M. *Atonement and the Logic of Resurrection in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. NovTSup. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

———. "Blood, Life, and Atonement: Reassessing Hebrews' Christological Appropriation of Yom Kippur." Pages 211–24 in *The Day of Atonement: Its Interpretation in Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*. Edited by Thomas Hieke and Tobias Nicklas. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

———. "Righteous Bloodshed, Matthew's Passion Narrative, and the Temple's Destruction: Lamentations as a Matthean Intertext." *JBL* 125 (2006): 299–320.

Molenberg, Corrie. "A Study of the Roles of Shemihaza and Asael in *1 Enoch* 6–11." *JJS* 35 (1984): 136–46.

Moo, Douglas J. *The Epistle to the Romans*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.

———. *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*. Sheffield: Almond, 1983.

Morris, Leon. *The Gospel according to Matthew*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.

Moscicke, Hans M. "Jesus as Goat of the Day of Atonement in Recent Synoptic Gospels Research." *CurBR* 17 (2018): 59–85.

———. "The Gerasene Exorcism and Jesus's Eschatological Expulsion of Cosmic Powers: Echoes of Second Temple Scapegoat Traditions in Mark 5:1–10." *JSNT* 41 (2019): 363–83.

Moses, Robert E. "Jesus Barabbas, a Nominal Messiah? Text and History in Matthew 27:16–17." *NTS* 58 (2011): 43–56.

Moss, Candida R. *The Other Christs: Imitating Jesus in Ancient Christian Ideologies of Martyrdom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Moss, Charlene McAfee. *The Zechariah Tradition and the Gospel of Matthew*. BZNW 156. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Mounce, Robert H. *Matthew*. GNC. Cambridge: Harper & Row, 1985.

Muradyan, Gohar, and Aram Topchyan. "Pseudo-Philo, On Samson and On Jonah." Pages 750–803 in *Outside the Bible: Ancient Jewish Writings Related to Scripture*. Edited by Louis H. Feldman, James L. Kugel, and Lawrence H.

Schiffman. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2013.

Musurillo, Herbert A. *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 197.

———. *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs: Acta Alexandrinorum*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1954.

Neirynck, F. "The Apocryphal Gospels and the Gospel of Mark." Pages 123–75 in *The New Testament in Early Christianity: La réception des écrits néotestamentaires dans le christianisme primitif*. Edited by J.-M. Sevrin. BETL 86. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989.

Nel, Marius J. "The Conceptualisation of Sin in the Gospel of Matthew." *In die Skriflig/In LuceVerbi* 51 (2017): 1–8.

Nevius, Richard C. "Reply to Dr. Dunkerley." *ExpTim* 74 (1962–1963): 255.

Newsom, Carol. "The Development of *1 Enoch* 6–19: Cosmology and Judgment." *CBQ* 42 (1980): 310–29.

Nickelsburg, George W. E. *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.

———. "Apocalyptic and Myth in *1 Enoch* 6–11." *JBL* 96 (1977): 383–405.

———. "Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee." *JBL* 100 (1981): 575–600.

———. *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction*. 2nd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005.

———. Review of *The Cross that Spoke*, by John Dominic Crossan. *JAAR* 59 (1991): 159–62.

Nielsen, Jesper T. "The Lamb of God: The Cognitive Structure of a Johannine Metaphor." Pages 233–39 in *Imagery in the Gospel of John: Terms, Forms, Themes, and Theology of John*. WUNT 2:200. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.

Nodet, Étienne. Review of *The Impact of Yom Kippur on Early Christianity*, by Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. *RB* 112 (2005): 280–85.

Nolland, John. *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.

Olson, Daniel. *Enoch. A New Translation: The Ethiopic Book of Enoch, or 1 Enoch*. NorthRichland Hills: Bibal, 2004.

Orlov, Andrei A. "Apocalyptic Scapegoat Traditions in the Book of Revelation: Part I: The Dragon." Forthcoming.

———. *Dark Mirrors: Azazel and Satanael in Early Jewish Demonology*. Albany, NY: State University of New York, 2011.

———. *Divine Scapegoats: Demonic Mimesis in Early Jewish Mysticism.* Albany, NY: Suny Press, 2015.

———. *Heavenly Priesthood in the Apocalypse of Abraham*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

———. *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*. TSAJ 107. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

———. *The Atoning Dyad: The Two Goats of Yom Kippur in the Apocalypse of Abraham.* Studia Judaeoslavica 8. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

———. "The Demise of the Antagonist in the Apocalyptic Scapegoat Tradition." Pages 201–23 in *The Open Mind: Essays in Honour of Christopher Rowland*. Edited by Jonathan Knight and Kevin Sullivan. London: Bloomsbury, 2015.

Overman, J. Andrew. *Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism: The Social World of the Matthean Community*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1990.

Paget, James Carleton. "The Epistle of Barnabas." *ET* 117 (2006): 441–46.

———. *The Epistle of Barnabas: Outlook and Background*. WUNT 2:62. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994.

Panayotakis, Costas. "Hellenistic Mime and its Reception in Rome." Pages 378–96 in *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Comedy*. Edited by Michael Fontaine and Adele C. Scafuro. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Parpola, Simo. *Letters from Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars*. SAA 10. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2014.

Paulsen-Reed, Amy. "The Origins of the Apocalypse of Abraham." PhD diss., Harvard University, 2016.

Pearson, Birger A. "Melchizedek in Early Judaism, Christianity, and Gnosticism." Pages 176–202 in *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*. Edited by Michael Stone and Theodore Bergen. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity International, 1998.

Pennington, A. "The Apocalypse of Abraham." Pages 363–92 in *The Apocryphal Old Testament*. Edited by H. F. D. Sparks. Oxford: Clarendon, 1984.

Perrin, Nicholas. *Jesus the Temple*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2010.

Perry, Peter S. "Disputing Enoch: Reading Matt 24:36–44 with Enochic Judaism." *Currents in Theology and Mission* 37 (2010): 451–59

Petersen, David L. *Haggai and Zechariah 1–8: A Commentary*. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1984.

Petterson, Anthony R. *Behold Your King: The Hope of the House of David in the Book of Zechariah*. LHBOTS 513. London: T&T Clark, 2009.

———. *Haggai, Zechariah, & Malachi.* ApOTC 25. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2015.

Philonenko-Sayar, Belkis, and Marc Philonenko. *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham*. Semitica 31. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1981.

Pinker, Aron. "A Goat to Go to Azazel." *JHebS* 7 (2007): 2–25.

Piotrowski, Nicholas. "'I Will Save my People from Their Sins': The Influence of Ezekiel 36:28B–29A; 37:23B on Matthew 1:21." *TynBul* 64 (2013): 33–54.

———. *Matthew's New David at the End of Exile: A Socio-Rhetorical Study of Scriptural Quotations*. NovTSup 170. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

Pitre, Brant. *Jesus, the Tribulation and the End of Exile: Restoration Eschatology and the Origin of the Atonement*. WUNT 2:204. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

Poirier, John C. "On a Wing and a Prayer: The Soteriology of the Apocalypse of Abraham." Pages 87–97 in *This World and the World to Come*. Edited by Daniel M. Gurtner. LSTS 74. London: T&T Clark, 2011.

Pola, Thomas. *Das Priestertum bei Sacharja: Historische und traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur frühnachexilischen Herrschererwartung*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

Poorthuis, Marcel. "Enoch and Melchizedek in Judaism and Christianity: A Study in Intermediaries." Pages 97–120 in *Saints and Role Models in Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by Marcel Poorthuis and Joshua Schwartz. JCPS 7. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Prigent, Pierre. *Épître de Barnabé*. Edited by Robert A. Kraft. SC 172. Paris: Cerf: 1971.

———. *Les Testimonia dans le Christianisme Primitif: L'Épître de Barnabé I–XVI et ses Sources*. EBib. Paris: Gabalda, 1961.

Pritchard, James B. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts: Relating to the Old Testament*. 3rd ed. with supp. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969.

Prosic, Tamara. *The Development and Symbolism of Passover until 70 CE*. JSOTSup 414. London: T&T Clark International, 2004.

Puech, Émile. *Qumran Grotte 4: XXII*. DJD 31. Oxford: Clarendon, 2001.

Quasten, Johannes. *Patrology I: The Beginnings of Patristic Literature*. Repr. ed. Westminster, MD: Christian Classics, 1950, 1983.

Ramsay, William and W. C. F. Anderson. "Paludamentum." Pages 2:322–23 in *A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*. Edited by William Smith, William Wayte, and G. E. Marindin. 2 vol. 3rd ed. London: John Murray, 1901.

Reed, Annette Yoshiko. *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Reeve, Teresa L. Review of *The New Testament in its Ritual World*, by Richard E. DeMaris. *AUSS* 48 (2010): 126–28.

Reich, Hermann. "Der König mit der Dornenkrone." *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Alterum, Geschichte und Deutsche Literatur* 7 (1904): 705–33.

———. *Der Mimus: Ein litterar-entwickelungsgeschichtlicher Versuch*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1903.

Reinhold, Meyer. *History of Purple as a Status Symbol in Antiquity*. Bruxelles: Latomus, 1970.

Repschinski, Boris. *The Controversy Stories in the Gospel of Matthew: Their Redaction, Form and Relevance for the Relationship Between the Matthean Community and Formative Judaism*. FRLANT 189. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.

Richard, M. "Les fragments du commentaire de S. Hippolyte sur les Proverbes de Salomon." *Mus* 79 (1966): 65–94.

Ricoeur, Paul. *The Symbolism of Evil*. Translated by Emerson Buchanan. Boston: Beacon, 1969.

Rigg, Horace Abram. "Barabbas." *JBL* 64 (1945): 417–56.

Roberts, J. J. M. "Wicked and Holy (4Q180–181)." Pages 204–13 in *Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Volume 2: Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995.

Robertson, A. T. *Grammar of the Greek New Testament in light of Historical*

*Research*. 3rd ed. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1919.

Robinson, William C. "The Exegesis of the Soul." Pages 190–98 in *The Nag Hammadi Library.* Edited by James M. Robinson. 3rd ed. Leiden: Brill, 1990.

Roitto, Rikard. "The Two Cognitive Frames of Forgiveness in the Synoptic Gospels." *NovT* 57 (2015): 136–58.

Rubinkiewicz, Ryszard. *Die Eschatologie von Henoch 9–11 und das Neue Testament*. Translated by Herbert Ulrich. ÖBS 6. Klosterneuburg: Österreichisches Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1984.

———. *L'Apocalypse d'Abraham en vieux slave: Introduction, text critique, traduction et commentaire*. Lublin: Société des Lettres et des Sciences de l'Université Catholique, 1987.

Runesson, Anders. *Divine Wrath and Salvation in Matthew: The Narrative World of the First Gospel.* Minneapolis: Fortress, 2016.

———. "Rethinking Early Jewish-Christian Relations: Matthean Community History as Pharisaic Intragroup Conflict." *JBL* 127 (2008): 95–132.

Sacchi, Paolo. "The 2005 Camaldoli Seminar on the Parables of Enoch." Pages 499–512 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.

Saldarini, Anthony J. *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.

———. "The Gospel of Matthew and Jewish-Christian Conflict." Pages 38–61 in *Social History of the Matthean Community*. Edited by David L. Balch. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.

Sanders, E. P. *Jesus and Judaism.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.

Schiffman, Lawrence H. *The Courtyards of the House of the Lord: Studies on the Temple Scroll*. Edited by García Martínez. STDJ 75. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Schmidt, Thomas E. "Mark 15.16–32: The Crucifixion Narrative and the Roman Triumphal Procession." *NTS* (1995): 1–18.

Schuller, Eileen. Review of *The Impact of Yom Kippur on Early Christianity*, by Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. *CBQ* 68 (2006): 782–84.

Schürer, Emil. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ: Volume 1*. Revised and edited by Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar, and Matthew Black. London: Bloomsbury, 1973.

Schwartz, Baruch. "The Bearing of Sin in the Priestly Literature." Pages 3–22 in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom*. Edited by David P. Wright, David Noel Freedman, and Avi Hurvitz. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1995.

———. "The Prohibitions Concerning the 'Eating' of Blood in Leviticus 17." Pages 34–66 in *Priesthood and Cult in Ancient Israel*. Edited by Gary A. Anderson and Saul M. Olyan. JSOTSup 125. Sheffield: Sheffield, 1991.

Schwartz, Daniel R. "Two Pauline Allusions to the Redemptive Mechanism of the Crucifixion." *JBL* 102 (1983): 259–83.

Scullion, James P. "A Traditio-Historical Study of the Day of Atonement." PhD diss., Catholic University of America, 1990.

Sebesta, Judith Lynn. "Tunica Ralla, Tunica Spissa: The Colors and Textiles of Roman Costume." Pages 65–100 in *The World of Roman Costume*. Edited by Judith Lynn Sebesta and Larissa Bonfante. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1994.

Segal, Alan F. "Matthew's Jewish Voice." Pages 3–37 in *Social History of the Matthean Community*. Edited by David L. Balch. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.

Senior, Donald. *Matthew*. ANTC. Nashville: Abingdon, 1998.

———. *The Passion of Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew*. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1985.

Shaw, David A. "Converted Imaginations? The Reception of Richard Hays's Intertextual Method." *CurBR* 11 (2013): 234–45.

Shukster, Martin B., and Peter Richardson. "Barnabas, Nerva, and the Yavnean Rabbis." *JTS* 34 (1983): 31–55.

———. "Temple and *Bet Ha-midrash* in the Epistle of Barnabas." Pages 17–31 in *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity. Volume 2: Separation and Polemic*. Edited by Stephen G. Wilson. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1986.

Sim, David C. *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew*. SNTMS 88. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

———. "Matthew 22.13a and 1 Enoch 10.4a: A Case of Literary Dependence?" *JSNT* 47 (1992): 3–19.

———. *The Gospel of Matthew and Christian Judaism*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.

Simmonds, Andrew. "Mark's and Matthew's Sub Rosa Message in the Scene of Pilate and the Crowd." *JBL* 131 (2012): 733–54.

Sklar, Jay. "Sin and Impurity: Atoned and Purified? Yes!" Pages 18–31 in *Perspectives on Purity and Purification in the Bible*. Edited by Baruch J. Schwartz, David P. Wright, Jeffrey Stackert, and Naphtali S. Meshel. New York: T&T Clark, 2008.

———. *Sin, Impurity, Sacrifice, Atonement: Priestly Conceptions*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2005.

Smith, William Robertson. *The Religion of the Semites: The Fundamental Institutions*. 3rd ed. New York: Macmillan, 1927 (1889).

Smith, William, William Wayte, and G. E. Marindin. *A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*. 2 vol. 3rd ed. London: John Murray, 1901.

Stanton, Graham. *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew.* Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992.

Stead, Michael R. *The Intertextuality of Zechariah 1–8*. LHBOTS 506. London: T&T Clark, 2009.

Stökl Ben Ezra, Daniel. "Fasting with Jews, Thinking with Scapegoats: Some Remarks on Yom Kippur in Early Judaism and Christianity, in Particular, 4Q541, *Barnabas* 7, Matthew 27 and Acts 27." Pages 165–88 in *The Day of Atonement: Its Interpretation in Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*. Edited by Thomas Hieke and Tobias Nicklas. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

———. "The Biblical Yom Kippur: The Jewish Fast of the Day of Atonement and the Church Fathers." *SP* 34 (2002): 493–502.

———. *The Impact of Yom Kippur on Early Christianity: The Day of Atonement from Second Temple Judaism to the Fifth Century.* WUNT 163. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

———. "Yom Kippur in the Apocalyptic Imaginaire and the Roots of Jesus's High Priesthood." Pages 349–66 in *Transformations of the Inner Self in Ancient Religions.* Edited by Jan Assmann and Guy Stroumsa. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Strecker, Georg. *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit: Untersuchung zur Theologie des Matthäus*. 3rd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1971.

Streeter, Burnett Hillman. *The Four Gospels: A Study in Origins*. Edinburgh: R. & R. Clark, 1924.

Stuckenbruck, Loren T. *The Book of Giants from Qumran: Texts, Translation, and Commentary*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.

Sumner, Graham. *Roman Military Dress*. Stroud, ENG: The History Press, 2009.

Sweeney, M. A. *The Twelve Prophets: Volume 2*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 2000.

Tawil, Hayim. "Azazel, the Prince of the Steepe: A Comparative Study." *ZAW* 92 (1980): 43–59.

Taylor, Nicholas H. Review of *The New Testament in its Ritual World*, by Richard E. DeMaris. *JSNT* 31 (2009): 21–22.

Tcherikover, Victor A., and Alexander Fuks. *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum: Volume 2*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960.

Thompson, Michael B. *Clothed with Christ: The Example and Teaching of Jesus in Romans 12:1–15:13*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1991.

Tiemeyer, Lena-Sofia. *Priestly Rites and Prophetic Rage: Post-Exilic Prophetic Critique of the Priesthood*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.

———."The Guilty Priesthood (Zech 3)." Pages 1–19 in *The Book of Zechariah and its Influence*. Edited by Christopher Tuckett. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2003.

Tigchelaar, Eibert J. C. *Prophets of Old and the Day of the End: Zechariah, the Book of Watchers and Apocalyptic*. OtSt 35. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

Tiwald, Markus. "Christ as Hilasterion (Rom 3:25): Pauline Theology on the Day of Atonement in the Mirror of Early Jewish Thought." Pages 189–209 in *The Day of Atonement: Its Interpretation in Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*. Edited by Thomas Hieke and Tobias Nicklas. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Tränkle, Hermann. *Q. S. F. Tertullian, "Adversus Iudaeos." Mit Einleitung und kritischem Kommentar*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1964.

Trevaskis, Leigh M. *Holiness, Ethics, and Ritual in Leviticus*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2011.

Trilling, Wolfgang. *Das wahre Israel: Studien zur Theologie des Matthäus-Evangeliums*. SANT 10. München: Kösel, 1964.

Van der Horst, Pieter Willem. *Philo's Flaccus: The First Pogrom: Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. PACS 2. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

VanderKam, James C. *Enoch: A Man for all Generations*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1995.

———. *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition.* CBQMS 16. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984.

———. *From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests After Exile*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004.

———. "Joshua the High Priest and the Interpretation of Zechariah 3." *CBQ* 53 (1991): 553–70.

———. *The Book of Jubilees*. GAP 9. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001.

———. *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text*. CSCO 510. Louvain: Peeters, 1989.

———. *The Book of Jubilees: Translated*. CSCO 511. Louvain: Peeters, 1989.

Vis, Joshua M. "The Purification Offering of Leviticus and the Sacrificial Offering of Jesus." PhD diss., Duke University, 2012.

Volgger, David. "The Day of Atonement according to the Temple Scroll." *Bib* 87 (2006): 251–60.

Vollmer, Hans. "Der König mit der Dornenkrone." *ZNW* 6 (1905): 194–98.

Von Gemünden, Petra. Review of *The Impact of Yom Kippur on Early Christianity*, by Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. *Numen* 33 (2006): 223–77.

Von Harnack, Adolf. *The Sayings of Jesus*. Translated by J. R. Wilkinson. London: Williams & Norgate, 1908.

Walck, Leslie W. *The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and in Matthew*. London: T&T Clark, 2011.

———. "The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and the Gospels." Pages 299–337 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.

Waldstein, W. *Untersuchungen zum römischen Begnadigungsrecht: Abolitio-Indulgentia-Venia.* Commentations Aenipontanae 18. Innsbruck: Universitätsverlag Wagner, 1964.

Wardle, Timothy. "Resurrection and the Holy City: Matthew's Use of Isaiah in 27:51–53." *CBQ* 78 (2016): 666–81.

Watts, James W. *Ritual and Rhetoric in Leviticus: From Sacrifice to Scripture.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Watts, Rikki E. "Jesus's Death, Isaiah 53, and Mark 10:45." Pages 125–51 in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins*. Edited by William H. Bellinger and William R. Farmer. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1998.

———. *Isaiah's New Exodus and Mark*. WUNT 2:88. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.

Wendland, Paul. "Jesus als Saturnalien-Koenig." *Hermes* 33 (1989): 175–79.

Wengst, Klaus. *Tradition und Theologie des Barnabasbriefes*. AK 42. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1971.

Westbrook, Raymond, and Theodore J. Lewis. "Who Led Out the Scapegoat in Leviticus 16:21." *JBL* 127 (2008): 417–22.

Wevers, John William, ed. *Genesis*. Septuaginta. VTG 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974.

———. *Leviticus*. Septuaginta. VTG 2:2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.

Wheaton, Gary. *The Role of Jewish Feasts in John's Gospel*. SNTSMS 162. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

White, L. Michael. "Crisis Management and Boundary Maintenance: The Social Location of the Matthean Community." Pages 211–47 in *Social History of the Matthean Community*. Edited by David L. Balch. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.

Willitts, Joel. *Matthew's Messianic Shepherd-King: In Search of "The Lost Sheep of the House of Israel."* BZNW 147. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007.

Wills, Lawrence M. *The Quest for the Historical Gospel: Mark, John, and the Origins of the Gospel Genre*. London: Routledge, 1997.

Wink, Walter. Review of *The Cross that Spoke*, by John Dominic Crossan. *ChrCent* 105 (1988): 1159–60.

Winter, Paul. *Trial of Jesus*, SJ 1. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1974.

Wiseman, T. P. "'Mime' and 'Pantomine': Some Problematic Texts." Pages 146–53 in *New Directions in Ancient Pantomime*. Edited by Edith Hall and Rosie Wyles. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Woodhouse, John. "Jesus and Jonah." *RTR* 43 (1984): 33–41.

Wratislaw, Albert Henry. "The Scapegoat-Barabbas." *ExpTim* 3 (1891–1892): 400–403.

———. *Notes and Dissertations: Principally on Difficulties in the Scriptures of the New Covenant*. London: Bell and Daldy, 1863.

Wright, Archie T. *The Origin of Evil Spirits: The Reception of Genesis 6:1–4 in Early Jewish Literature*. WUNT 2:198. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

Wright, D. R. "*Four Other Gospels*: Review Article." *Them* 12 (1987): 56–60.

Wright, David P. "Deuteronomy 21:1–9 as a Rite of Elimination." *CBQ* 49 (1987): 387–403.

———. *The Disposal of Impurity: Elimination Rites in the Bible and in Hittite and Mesopotamian Literature.* SBLDS 101. Atlanta: Scholars, 1987.

Wright, N. T. *Jesus and the Victory of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996.

———. *The Day the Revolution Began: Reconsidering the Meaning of Jesus's Crucifixion.* New York: HarperOne, 2016.

———. *The New Testament and the People of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

Yadin, Yigael. *The Temple Scroll: The Hidden Law of the Dead Sea Sect*. New York: Random House, 1985.

Yoon, David I. "The Ideological Inception of Intertextuality and its Dissonance in Current Biblical Studies." *CurBR* 12 (2012): 58–76.

Zachariah, Daniel. *Matthew's Presentation of the Son of David: Davidic Tradition and Typology in the Gospel of Matthew.* London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017.

Ziegler, Joseph, ed. *Duodecim prophetae*. 2nd ed. Septuaginta. VTG 13. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967.

———. *Isaias*. 3rd ed. Septuaginta. VTG 14. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983.