

PETER AND THE KEYS:

An Exegetical Analysis of

Matthew 16:17-19

With Special Reference to

Isaiah 22:22

Presented to

Professor Richard Edwards

Marquette University

Milwaukee, Wisconsin

In Partial Fulfillment of

the Requirements for

The Gospel of Matthew

Scott Hahn

December 6, 1985

I. Introduction: History of Exegesis

Matthew 16:17-19 is an age-old exegetical battlefield. Conflicts waged over this text have generated more than a few ecclesiastical casualties, not to mention doctoral dissertations.¹ In recent years, however, a sort of ecumenical détente has served to blind the dogmatic spirit while loosing the spirit of openminded exegesis. Oscar Cullmann's major work, Peter: Disciple, Apostle and Martyr, published in 1952, marked the beginning of this contemporary rapprochement.²

Prior to Cullmann's study, three conflicting approaches dominated the interpretation of this passage. First, Roman Catholic scholars exhibited a notable coincidence of predictable conclusions dating back centuries.³ Second, Conservative Protestant scholars from various denominations, despite varied interpretations, tended toward an unvaried rejection of Roman Catholic conclusions.⁴ Third, Protestant Source and Form Critics, although late entries in the field, managed to offend the older groups, by affirming conclusions often similar to Roman Catholic ones, while denying that the text conveys the ipsissima verba of Jesus, thereby undermining one of the few views still shared

by Roman Catholic and Conservative Protestant scholars.⁵

On the basis of Cullmann's work, a partial consensus began to emerge among all three groups. This "majority report," which remains with us three decades later, includes both positive and negative features. Positively, most acknowledge that "this rock" (τῆς τῇ πέτρᾳ) in verse 18 refers to the person of Peter (Πέτρος) and not merely to his faith or confession.⁶ Moreover, Peter's unique status among the disciples is generally conceded, at least as their representative and exemplar.⁷ Negatively, any notion of succession implied in the rock-Peter identification is usually rejected.⁸ In addition, the text's authenticity as a Jesus-saying is no longer to be taken for granted.⁹ These features combine to form the point of departure for contemporary discussion.

Our treatment consists of four stages. First, a translation is given with lexical and grammatical notes. Second, a critical analysis is made on the basis of various methods. Third, recent work on Matthew's use of the Old Testament is reviewed to determine whether or not 16:19 is rightly considered a quotation of Isaiah 22:22. Finally, we briefly treat possible implications of our conclusion for the important question of Petrine succession.

II. Translation: Lexical Notes¹⁰

¹⁷And answering, Jesus said to him:

"Blessed are you, Simon Bar-Jonah

because flesh-and-blood did not reveal (this) to you
but my Father who is in the heavens."

¹⁸And I also say to you,

"You are Peter

and on this foundation-stone I will build my Church
and Hades' gates will not withstand it.

¹⁹ I will give you the keys of the kingdom of the heavens
and whatever you bind on the earth
shall have been bound in the heavens
and whatever you loose on the earth
shall have been loosed in the heavens."

A. Blessed (μακάριος)--Beyond parallel occurrences (5:3,6, 11; 11:6; 13:16), Matthew adds six other beatitudes (5:4,5,7,8, 9,10). Some consider it a "semitism," reminiscent of Old Testament patriarchal-priestly pronouncements (Genesis 9:26; 14:19), often accompanying significant name changes and royal promises (Genesis 17:1-8, 15-16; 35:9-15). In Matthew, the "macarism" sets an important theme for Jesus' ministry and the disciples' privileges (5:3-12; 13:6).

B. Bar-Jonah (βαρ-ιωνά)--Another distinct "semitism" and unusual rendering (cf. John 1:42) with a questionable link to "the sign of Jonah" (12:39) reintroduced by Matthew in context (16:4). Even less probable is a suggested link to an Akkadian loan-word in Aramaic meaning "terrorist" or "zealot."¹¹

C. Flesh-and-Blood (σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα)--A likely "semitism" and common expression in the Talmud and Midrashim (B. Berakhoth 28b, 1 QH 4:29-31) depicting human frailty and dependence on God, especially in matters requiring divine revelation (Matthew 1:20; 11:25-7; 13:11-7; Galatians 1:12,16; 1 QH 12:24-36; 13:13-6).

D. My Father (ὁ πατέρ μου)--A so-called "Mattheanism" commonly associated with the plural "heavens" (5:16, 45, 48;

6:1, 9, 14, 26, 32; 7:11, 21; 10:32, 33; 12:50; 15:13; 18:10, 14, 19, 35; 23:9) connoting Jesus' filial relation and dynastic inheritance of the Father's "kingdom," "house," etc. It harkens back to his earlier authoritative assertion of the intimate father-son relation being the basis for receiving divine revelation (11:25-7).

E. Peter-Foundation Stone (Πέτρος-πέτρα)-- This word-play is notoriously difficult to decipher; likely based on an Aramaic original (Κεφαῶ), diluted with the masculine-feminine distinction in Greek (probably due to Simon's gender). Interpretations vary from one extreme to the other:¹² 1) Nothing more than a double entendre attributing no title or significance; 2) Merely a nickname based on Simon's "hard" character, similar to the American "Rocky"; 3) A pun and/or name change referring to Simon's faith and confession; 4) Simon's name merely points to Christ (I Corinthians 10:4) or God (Deuteronomy 32:4, 30), the only true cornerstone; 5) Like Abraham (Isaiah 55:1), Simon becomes a "corporate personality" as a founding-father of the faithful; 6) As the exemplary disciple, Simon is portrayed as the first apostolic stone in the new Temple's foundation (Ephesians 2:20; I Peter 2:4-7; Revelations 21:14); 7) As the chief disciple and "first among equals," Simon is the apostolic cornerstone upon whom Jesus will build his temple-house, the Church (7:24-5); 8) Another instance of the early church's "stone testimonia," doubly based on Old Testament texts (Isaiah 28:14-6; Daniel 2:34-45; cf. Romans 9:33) and Hebrew words, "to build" (benah), "rock" ('ben), and "son" (ben), also present in Aramaic;

9) Drawing on the master-image of ancient Near Eastern and rabbinic symbolism, the "cosmic rock" is the divinely appointed site for the central sanctuary or temple (II Chronicles 3:1), at once the stone lid-gates at the top of the sacred hollow mountain which seal up the primordial serpent and flood waters in the abyss (Revelation 20:1-3) leading to Sheol-Hades (Jonah 2:1-7), as well as the altar-gate of heaven on which Abel, Noah, Shem-Melchizedek, Abraham, Jacob, Moses, David, and Solomon sacrificed atop Moriah-Golgotha in (Jeru)Salem (Genesis 14:18; 22:2; Psalms 76:2; 87:1; 88:3-12; Isaiah 28:16; 38:10-20; 44:28; Lamentations 4:11; Jub. 8:12-9; Gen. R. 39.8; Lev. R. 20.4; 1 QH 6:15-27; 8:4-5; 1 QS 8:4-5; 11:3-5). (This last option would not be mentioned except for its ancient ubiquity and modern advocacy by J. Jeremias, B. Meyer, T. Fawcett, L. Thornton and several others.) Somewhere between these extremes undoubtedly lies the meaning.

F. My Church (μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν)--Another difficult term to interpret; controversy has raged for decades¹³ as to whether this twice-used term in Matthew (cf. 18:17) can be part of an authentic saying of Jesus, or an early Palestinian tradition based on a post-resurrection appearance, or a later Matthean interpolation arising from Christian hellenization in opposition to the Jewish synagogue. Two strands of parallel meaning tend to confuse the matter: 1) an "ideal" aspect of the Church (16:18) as a worldwide monarchy with Peter as "supreme Rabbi" based on an assumed delay of the parousia; and 2) a "sectarian" aspect of the Church (18:7) as "the people of God," "household," "temple,"

"community," "congregation," etc., attested by the Old Testament (the LXX rendering of qahal as ἐκκλησία) and Qumran texts (4 Q Flor.; 1 QS 8:7; 11:7; cf. I Timothy 3:15; I Peter 2:3).

If we view Matthew as working within a Davidic-covenantal framework, following several recent suggestions,¹⁴ the meaning of "the church" may be determined so as to combine both aspects in a natural manner. Note the dual perspective of the David-Zion tradition evident in the ecclesial imagery throughout material unique to Matthew: "city on a hill" (5:14), "earth is his footstool...city of the great King" (5:35), "greater than the Temple" (12:5-7), "royal eunuchs" (19:10-2), "temple makes gold sacred" (23:17), "altar makes gifts sacred" (23:19), "God dwells in the temple" (23:21), "heaven is God's throne" (23:22), etc. Nevertheless, an element of tension between both aspects remains, and we will not attempt to resolve here the issue of covenantal (dis)continuity which lies behind it. May it suffice to highlight both aspects while connecting them to the previous logion about "the wise man who built his house upon the rock" (7:24), and to the emphasis in the immediate context on the Christ-centered future, "I will build my Church..." The larger question of authenticity also cannot be settled here.

G. Hades' Gates (πόλαι ᾗδου)--Our over-literal translation underlines the peculiar anarthrous form which allows, without requiring, the personification of death's power as "gatekeepers."¹⁵ Likewise "Hades" is a "semitism" with ample Old Testament attestation as the equivalent to Sheol (Psalms 9:13; 107:18; Isaiah 38:10; Sir. 51:9; Wis. 16:13; Ps. Sol. 16:2; 1 QH 5:20-6:26).

More likely, the usage of "gates" is pars pro toto, referring to the entire realm (or Kingdom?) of death. In like manner, "gates" frequently refer to the whole city in the Old Testament (Genesis 22:17; Psalms 87:2). Moreover, they are frequently linked with the pattern of cosmic mythology throughout the ancient Near East, as well as Homeric legend (Il. 5:646; 9:312; Odes 14:156). Interestingly John also associates "Hades" with "the key of David," "shutting and opening," "binding and loosing," "the abyss," "the great high mountain," "Jerusalem," "the temple," "gates," and "the church" (Revelation 1:18; 3:7; 20:1-22:16; cf. Isaiah 22:22). For our purposes, we would highlight Matthew's unique reference to two sets of "gates" to life and destruction (7:13-14).

H. Will not withstand (οὐ κατισχύουσιν)--If the picture here is of the Church being assaulted, the more common "will not prevail" is superior. However, Hades' gates appear to be under the future siege, without sufficient strength to resist either the rock or the Church. (The ambiguous αὐτῆς seems neither possible nor necessary to resolve with reference to πέτρα or ἐκκλησία; the meaning is the same in either case.) Note Matthew's earlier picture of the "strong man" (ἰσχυρός) whose "house" is plundered after being "bound," which Jesus uses to settle the Son of David-Beelzebul dispute over exorcism, by arguing that Satan's "city" and "kingdom" are not divided (12:23-9). This discussion must be balanced, however, with Matthew's other picture of the wise man's house built on a rock being assaulted by the wind, rain and flood. Nevertheless, the present context seems to depict

the impotence of Hades' gates in the face of attack.

I. The Keys of the Kingdom of the Heavens (τὰς κλεῖδας τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν)--This phrase also shares a semitic character, once again with the plural "heavens." A lengthy treatment of "the kingdom" will be omitted, except to suggest its consonance with the contextual complex of images, all of which seem to share a royal or dynastic dimension. (Cf. Daniel 2 for a suggested background/source for the connection between the "rock" and the "kingdom of heaven.")¹⁶ Although "the keys" are associated with "the kingdom of heaven," is there not a clearly implied connection with "Hades' gates?" Note, however, the scribes and Pharisees can already "shut" (κλείτε) the kingdom of heaven (23:13), along with the lawyers, who take away "the key" (τὴν κλεῖδα), thereby preventing entrance (Lk. 11:52). Nevertheless, these parallels do not rule out "the keys" from having a secondary reference to "Hades' gates," even if the primary reference points to the "kingdom of heaven."

By referring to the capacity of the Jewish leaders to shut the kingdom, Matthew implies that at least some of the "power of the keys" is in their possession at present. This contrasts with Jesus' saying "I will give you the keys...", implying that, at least in the near future, the keys will be at his disposal (cf. Rev. 1:18; 3:7). Moreover, there is the related question of how Jesus will give Peter "the keys of the kingdom" without relinquishing his own royal sovereignty. These apparent tensions stem from the classical problem of the relationship between the Church and the kingdom in Matthew.¹⁷ How is it that they are

distinct yet inseparable?

In the ancient world, keys were a graphic symbol of authority. Large and cumbersome, they had to be hung from the shoulder with a chain and entrusted only to persons in the highest office(s). Besides this conventional use (Judges 3:25; I Chronicles 27; Job 31:22), later Judaism associated keys with God's power over harvests, childbirth and quickening the dead.¹⁸ Within the Old Testament, however, no such mention is made of "keys," nor in connection with "the kingdom" and "binding and loosing," except in Isaiah 22:22. We will examine below the evidence to determine whether or not Matthew 16:19 should be considered a citation of Isaiah 22:22; a suggestion often made but rarely supported.

J. Bind-Loose (δέσσειν - λύσειν)--One of the most fluid expressions throughout all levels of Jewish sources, its meaning ranges from trivial acts to cosmic wonders. Context is the virtual sole determinant. Association of this function with "keys" is infrequent and distinctive (Rev. 20:1-L). While "keys" belong to one by special appointment, "binding-loosing" appears to be a power conferred more indiscriminately. However, no distinction between the two is absolute. Such a range is evident in Matthew, from the trivial (13:30; 21:2) to the cosmic (16:19; 18:18). Between these extremes, the usual meaning denotes acts or decisions performed in relation to power and authority (5:19; 12:29; 14:3; 22:13; 27:2). To deal with 16:19 and 18:18, outlining the broad spectrum of features associated with the action of humans "binding and loosing" in ancient sources would be helpful.¹⁹

1) Governmental (including executive, judicial, legislative and administrative functions); 2) Ecclesiastical (including liturgical, doctrinal and moral matters); 3) Therapeutic (including medical, magical and exorcistic acts). Scholars have linked various aspects of all three categories to verse 19.

K. Shall Have Been... (ἔσται...)--With future perfect verbs in periphrastic construction found in the apodosis, the translation should reflect past action in relation to the future conditional in the protasis. (Believe it or not, an entire doctoral dissertation was devoted to this issue!)²⁰

III. Critical Analysis

The Text Critic's task in Matthew 16:17-19 is minimal. Without any significant variant readings, the older suggestion of 16:17-19 as a second century anti-gnostic interpolation was discarded long ago. An interesting minor variant does appear in several uncials, however, with the singular "key" (κλεῖς) instead of "keys" (κλεῖδας) in verse 19. It is relevant for our later discussion to note that this variant probably represents an attempt to conform verse 19 more closely to Isaiah 22:22, which renders the plural form the lectio difficilior.

The Literary Critic's task is not much harder. As a proverbial type, this extended beatitude or "macarism" reflects a distinctively semitic and Matthean structure. With the three verses combining to form a triad, each verse has three lines consisting of an emphatic, affirmative theme-statement, followed and explained by an antithetically structured distich. Such

structuring, joined to textual integrity, creates a considerable presumption in favor of unity.

Source Critics are not faced with an overwhelming burden either. As with other Petrine sayings unique to Matthew (14:28-33; 17:24-27; 18:21-22), this Sondergut conspicuously appears in a larger section which adheres rather closely to the Markan sequence. Thus, Source Critics usually conclude that this text has been inserted into the Markan tradition by Matthew or someone earlier. Nevertheless, Mark's account of Peter's confession, devoid of any response by Jesus, may be considered fragmentary (Mark 3:27-30).²¹ But this already anticipates a form critical treatment.

It should be mentioned, at least in passing, that advocates of Matthean priority usually treat this text as supplementary evidence in their favor.²² Appealing to the elaborate literary pattern of 16:17-19 or else to the Markan priorists' strained speculations over alleged proto-Matthean M and K sources lying behind the text, this minority view stoutly defends Markan deletion of Jesus' response to Peter's confession/revelation. For practical purposes, however, the two-source theory will be largely assumed in our treatment below.

As Form Criticism developed earlier in the century, Matthew 16:17-19 received not a little attention. As a result, at least six distinct perspectives emerged.²³ The first perspective, represented by C.H. Dodd, T.W. Manson and especially V. Taylor, cautiously employs Form Critical tools in a manner limited to discerning form and structure primarily, more than the Sitz im Leben.

Therefore, for instance, Taylor is willing to treat the text as original and genuine, despite its "legendary" contextual background and the proleptic usage of "church" (ἐκκλησία) in verse 18. Indeed, Taylor actually considers the case for authenticity to be strengthened by the presence of this unique word, since it could have easily multiplied in a relatively late Gospel.²⁴ Nonetheless, this first perspective remains a minority view.

A second perspective, represented by R. Bultmann, treats the text as coming from a very early Palestinian tradition, reflected by a density of semitic expressions. Possibly arising from a reply by the Early Church to Paul's polemic in Galatians, this text is placed within the formal category of "Legal Sayings and Church Rules." Despite its origin in very primitive tradition, it cannot be considered as an authentic saying of Jesus. Placed as it is within Mark's account of Peter's Confession, a classic example of a "Legend of Faith," its genuineness is doubly voided by the decidedly anti-eschatological cast given to "the church" by Matthew. Although important elements of Bultmann's analysis are still influential, especially the post-resurrection origin, his overall Form Critical treatment is not generally followed.

A third perspective worth mentioning is G.D. Kilpatrick's. Although technically difficult to classify, Kilpatrick's work analyzes the text in a manner akin to Form Criticism, while anticipating later developments in Redaction and Lectionary Criticism. Arising from primitive oral tradition, "Petrine Stories" (14:28-31; 16:17-19; 17:14-17; 18:15-22) were collected early on, and

then utilized much later by Matthew as he revised an older lectionary in a quasi-rabbinic fashion. In addition, Kilpatrick suggests that these "Petrine Stories" reflect an early stage of the episcopate in the Levant in which Peter's relation to his fellow-apostles, as primus inter pares, serves as an ecclesial model for Matthew.²⁵ As with most of his other conclusions, Kilpatrick's view has failed to persuade many others.

A fourth perspective, represented by O. Cullmann, reflects a modified use of Form Criticism. Emphasizing sources and tradition history, Cullmann's hypothesis proposes the Passion story as the original setting, especially as developed in Luke 22:31-32. After attracting an initial following,²⁶ this hypothesis ended up being the least influential part of his important study.

A fifth perspective, developed through interaction with Cullmann's hypothesis, reflects a modification of Bultmann's view. As the ablest advocate of this approach, R.H. Fuller marshalls considerable evidence in favor of a post-resurrection tradition developed by a Palestinian, Aramaic-speaking community. Historical and social features of the Sitz im Leben remain underdeveloped in Fuller's argument, however, with perhaps excessive emphasis placed on redactional aspects. Nevertheless, his conclusions remain the most influential among more recent studies.

A sixth Form Critical perspective underlies G. Bornkamm's redactional approach to the text. Despite alleged "semitisms" and other early Palestinian traces, Bornkamm argues that a much later Hellenistic-Christian community, already set at odds with Judaism, represents the original setting for 16:17-19. Not only

is this text's implied picture of Peter as "supreme rabbi" unhistorical, Bornkamm also sees Matthew reflecting much later assumptions concerning a delayed parousia and the continuity of an established church.²⁷ Given the axiomatic nature of the assumed lateness of both assumptions among New Testament scholars, it may be somewhat surprising that Bornkamm's viewpoint is not more widely accepted. The chief obstacle is clearly the ineradicable semitic contours more foreign to later Hellenistic Christianity than to earlier Palestinian forms.

Additional Form Critical perspectives can be cited and explained. Moreover, ones already mentioned deserve closer scrutiny and evaluation. The demands of both tasks, however, extend beyond the focus of our study. Ultimately any thorough list and critique of the many options must include a critical examination of the fundamental hermeneutical and textual presuppositions of the Form Critical method itself. (Of course this is also true of every methodology, including Redaction Criticism and Narrative Analysis, both of which will be briefly treated below.) May it suffice to say that arguments used by Form Critics are so characteristically reversible, that the method may be employed to support both sides of virtually every issue, including authenticity.²⁸

For almost a generation, Redaction Criticism has set the agenda in Matthean studies. Its influence shows little sign of abetting. Thus, without the clear vision of hindsight, a brief summary-list of key figures and issues is rendered quite difficult. Nevertheless, the names of Bornkamm, Kingsbury, Meier, Schweizer, Strecker, and Suggs deserve mention for their general redactional

work on Matthew's main theological emphases, including christology, ecclesiology, the use of the Old Testament and the law of Moses. For our purposes, however, greater focus is needed. For instance, although 16:17-19 is prefaced by the confession of Peter, replete with Matthean distinctives, a study of Matthew's christology lies beyond the purview of our text. Likewise, Matthew's view of the law, though related to 16:17-19, is of secondary importance and must be omitted. Even the two remaining issues of ecclesiology and the use of the Old Testament must be greatly narrowed. Therefore, our review can only touch upon Matthew's redactional treatment of Peter's ecclesiological role, particularly as it is developed by the use of Old Testament material.

Long before C. Kahler called Matthew "Peter's Gospel," scholars noticed the dual centrality of this disciple and the Church. With the veritable explosion of redaction studies in the last twenty years, conflict over Peter's significance in Matthew ensued, with many scholars taking sides. G. Strecker represents the opposite extreme to Kahler by underplaying Peter's role among the disciples.²⁹ Echoing Cullmann, J. Kingsbury sees Peter as the "first" and archetype-disciple who is granted "salvation-historical primacy" as the "rock," but not any "office of the keys."³⁰

A stronger Petrine conclusion is reached in an excellent ecumenical study by R.E. Brown, K.P. Donfried and J. Reumann.³¹ They argue that in Matthew, Peter acquires both "ecclesiastical priority" and "the keys of the kingdom," although they leave

unsettled the burning question of whether this power is entirely shared by the other disciples (18:18). Their treatment of other Matthean texts distinctively involving Peter is perceptive and succinct, especially Peter's walking on the water (14:28-31) and the payment of the Temple tax (17:24-27).³² Conspicuously absent in their discussion of 16:17-19, however, is any close examination of Old Testament background material, most notably Isaiah 22:22. They do mention this verse in passing, even commenting on its relevance, but then, in the same breath, dispose of it as "only one suggestion for a possible background."³³ No evidence is considered, either pro or con. At this point, however, their approach is not representative of the majority. As previously stated, most commentators explicitly affirm verse 19 as a citation of Isaiah 22:22.³⁴ Nevertheless, virtually all of them follow Brown et al. by failing to adduce positive or negative evidence. There are a few notable exceptions.

Two outstanding examples of redactional studies which do take into account Matthew's use of the Old Testament in 16:17-19 are by B.M. Nolan and F.F. Ellis.³⁵ Nolan's argument is christologically grounded by several previous chapters in which cumulative evidence is gathered in favor of a larger Davidic-covenantal framework in Matthew. His converging lines of thought and imagery are primarily theological, however, not contextual or linguistic. Therefore, after describing "Peter-Eliakim, steward of the new Temple,"³⁶ some doubts remain.

In his commentary, Ellis alludes to similar Davidic messianism underlying Matthew's text. His approach differs from Nolan's

somewhat, by emphasizing converging lines of structural-redactional evidence for Matthew's high ecclesiology and "Petrine primacy."³⁷ His careful outline of the structure for the whole narrative section (13:34-17:27) highlights how each of the three parts (13:54-14:33; 14:34-16:20; 16:21-17:27) builds up to and climaxes with an episode where Peter's exemplary faith is prominent (14:28-31; 16:13-19; 17:24-27). Ellis also argues that the question with which the next section of the discourse begins in chapter 18, "Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?," "gives every appearance of being the kind of question the disciples would ask after such a disproportionate emphasis on one Apostle."³⁸

Indeed, Ellis probably could continue his argument by underlining Peter's perceptive inquiry (18:21) and bold request (19:27) in following sections which immediately elicit Jesus' responses about "490-fold forgiveness" (18:22) and "100-fold inheritance" (19:29). In addition, Ellis directs his multi-faceted redactional-compositional treatment towards Peter in other ways, dealing with Matthew's model of discipleship, antinomian opposition, etc. He is also more sensitive than Nolan to both Matthean and Isaianic contexts in arguing that 16:19 is "an indirect quotation" of Isaiah 22:22.³⁹ His skill and sensitivity notwithstanding, Ellis still neglects to explicate specific linguistic and contextual evidence for this presumed citation. After a briefer treatment of Narrative Analysis, we will return to this matter.

As a recent entry in Matthean studies, Narrative Analysis⁴⁰ provides a fresh perspective on the first Gospel. It also entails

terms, categories and criteria quite different from the historical-theological methods familiar to Matthean scholars, not to mention students. With fear and humility, therefore, do we venture into a Reader-Response Critical approach to 16:17-19.

We begin by positing the narrator as presenting the story from the quasi-divine perspective of Jesus' Father in heaven (1:1-2:23; 3:16-4:11; 8:5-13; 9:1-4; 11:25-27; 12:46-50; 13:53-58; 16:17). From this divinely arranged narrative, the implied reader is able to follow the plot through circumstances, events, sequences and especially characterization. The narrator's character-scheme is straightforward at the extremes: protagonist (Jesus) and antagonist (the Jewish leaders). The protagonist's goal is simple: the manifestation of his Father's kingdom (3:15-17). The antagonists' goal is less simple: the destruction of Jesus and the preservation of the status quo ante Christi (12:14-45). Caught in the middle of these conflicting goals are the disciples; less so the crowds. As "complex characters," the disciples are capable of continually surprising the reader. And this they do with their constant doubt, hesitation, and indecision. In the face of hostile Jewish leaders, fickle crowds and wavering disciples, the narrator presents Jesus manifesting the kingdom to all through teachings, miracles and ultimately by suffering and death. The suspense builds for the reader as the important role of the disciples unfolds alongside of their spasms between "faith" (πίστις) and "doubt" (ὀλιγόπιστις).⁴¹

The dramatic tension becomes more acute as the fate of the crowds hangs between death (i.e., remaining loyal to the Pharisees

and their scribes) and life (i.e., following Jesus and his scribes). In this regard, the narrator clarifies the decisive significance of the disciples' response for the crowds' sake (9:35-10:42). Their preparation as scribes climaxes with the private disclosure of the mysteries of the kingdom (13:10-52). The subsequent section subtly transposes Mark's emphasis upon the "messianic secret" and the disciples' (in)comprehension, yet without damaging his structure (13:53-17:27; Mark 6:1-9:32). For both Mark and Matthew, it is the dawning insight of faith in the disciples, climaxing with Peter's confession (16:13-19; Mark 8:27-30), that represents a decisive turning point.⁴² Likewise, both accounts immediately point out the disciples' weakness in the face of suffering through Jesus' rebuke of Peter (16:20-23; Mark 8:31-30). As Ellis shows, however, Matthew's readers receive additional information which render the disciples' positive outcome more sure, if not absolute.⁴³

By inserting the Petrine Sondergut at each important juncture, Matthew instills a growing sense of confidence in the disciples' capacity to carry on their master's work as faithful scribes and apostles (14:28-33; 16:13-19; 17:24-27; 18:21; 19:27). Nowhere is this capacity given a clearer manifestation and a stronger guarantee than in our text (16:17-19). Nevertheless, the tandem truth of kingdom and suffering remains a lesson progressively learned by the disciples, amidst faith and doubt unto the very end (28:17).⁴⁴

Our brief attempt to analyze 16:17-19 in light of Matthew's

narrative is not without gaps. Here is a method which requires considerable practice. While Reader-Response Criticism is being mastered, however, efforts to integrate its results with other methods are advisable. A good example of such an effort is the recent work of A.G. van Aarde. Much of our preceding treatment is dependent upon what he calls his "redaction-narrative approach."⁴⁵ It is illuminating to note what van Aarde judges to be one of the most important yet neglected aspects of Matthean "poetics,"⁴⁶ namely the function of Matthew's use of the Old Testament. In light of the central place of 16:17-19 for the narrative, we would do well to focus upon the Old Testament background with no further delay.

IV. Matthew and the Old Testament: Isaiah 22:22 and "the Keys"

No one disputes whether or not the Old Testament is important to Matthew. The real issue concerns the methods and reasons behind his usage. Nor is this issue a recent discovery. Long before B.W. Bacon's work at the turn of the century, extensive research had been conducted on Matthew's use of the Old Testament as well as other Jewish sources.⁴⁷ Not only has this research continued unabated into our century, it has greatly intensified in recent decades. Before an understanding of Matthew's methods and reasons could be refined, however, many preparatory studies had to be undertaken at a more general level.

In 1939, L. Goppelt published his doctoral dissertation, Tupos, in which he attempted to rehabilitate the typological use of the Old Testament by New Testament authors.⁴⁸ His effort was

received more warmly by German Old Testament scholars than by his New Testament peers. With the appearance of C.H. Dodd's work, According to the Scriptures,⁴⁹ more than a decade later, cautious New Testament study resumed in earnest. Dodd argues that commonly quoted Old Testament texts are not intended as isolated proof-texts, "but rather as pointers to their original contexts, knowledge of which is assumed."⁵⁰ As the basic interpretive method of the early Church's kerygma, it is "the substructure of New Testament theology."⁵¹ His conclusion became the subject of much debate, followed by subsequent refinements and qualifications by B. Lindars, E.E. Ellis, and others.⁵² It also had an immediate impact upon synoptic and Matthean studies.

K. Stendahl's dissertation The School of St. Matthew and its Use of the Old Testament⁵³ appeared right before the discussions of Dodd's thesis became prominent. As one of the first to study the Qumran scrolls, Stendahl concludes that Matthew's "school" displays an interpretive method similar to the refined peshet evident in the Habakkuk scroll.

Stendahl's conclusion comes under severe criticism in R.H. Gundry's dissertation The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel.⁵⁴ In this important study, Gundry gives the most detailed analysis of Matthew's formula quotations, direct and indirect citations, as well as allusions to the Old Testament. He concludes that in Matthew, Dodd's thesis "is remarkably confirmed and is found to hold true even in the allusive quotations."⁵⁵ Although many do not accept Gundry's conclusion, his thorough research remains unsurpassed.

Following Gundry's book, a steady stream of works appeared on other issues relating to Matthew's use of the Old Testament (e.g., Strecker, McConnell, Rothfuchs⁵⁶). Dodd's thesis, however, is not the primary concern or focus of these studies.

By the 1970's, the steady stream became a virtual torrent, with relevant research being published by L. Hartmann, F. Van Sebroeck, H. Frankemölle, L. Cope, G.M. Soares Prabhu, J.P. Meier and B.M. Nolan.⁵⁷ In order to achieve the purpose of our inquiry, however, we must sidestep all of these valuable studies, except for Hartmann's.

In his work, Hartmann attempts to clarify the differences between actual citations, casual allusions and common expressions. He argues that the prerequisite for communication at any of these three levels is the sharing of similar ideals and experiences. Without such commonality, even the most direct quotations will be missed apart from explicit references to sources. Moreover, explicit references will not suffice to avoid miscomprehension. On the other hand, to the degree a common background is shared among persons involved in communication, to that degree explicit references become unnecessary, even for allusions. A tradition, therefore, serves the hermeneutical purpose of enabling evocative expressions to be interpreted in a seemingly "natural" way. In such an environment, the explicit reference to a source is a signal that an important but elusive meaning is being conveyed. The relevance of this study for Matthew's use of the Old Testament is considerable.

Formula quotations with explicit references to their Old

Testament sources are both common and important in the first Gospel (1:22-23; 2:15, 17-18, 23, etc.). This is also true of explicit citations, devoid of fulfillment-formulas and references (4:4, 7, 10; 21:13, 16; 22:41-45; 24:15; etc.). Likewise, numerous implicit or indirect citations which lack the introductory expression "It is written" appear at crucial junctures (5:21, 27; 9:13; 21:9; 26: 23, 64; 27:46; etc.). Finally, various Old Testament allusions are everywhere common (5:34-35; 6:29; 12:39-42, etc.).

Can we not conclude, therefore, that Matthew wrote his Gospel assuming to some degree, at least, his readers shared similar ideals and experiences with him, especially related to Old Testament traditions? Does this imply, however, that those readers ignorant of Old Testament traditions could not comprehend Matthew's message? This only follows if traditions are exclusively understood in a narrow sense, apart from those ideals and experiences common to all.

Hartmann makes a basic distinction, therefore, between two⁵⁸ general levels of meaning. The "surface meaning" is for any intelligent reader who does not happen to share Matthew's ideals and experiences. In addition, there is that "bonus meaning" available to the "sharp-eyed" pupil who reads reflectively in terms of Matthew's common religious tradition.

In order to avoid subjectivism, however, external criteria are needed to discern between true and false "bonus meanings." By now, such criteria may be apparent. The most obvious criterion is the explicit reference to the source, as in the case of formula

quotations. A second criterion is an introductory formula, such as "It is written..." A third criterion is linguistic correspondence, usually consisting of an entire sentence or at least the major phrase within it. A fourth criterion is the lexical and grammatical parallelisms within the immediate contexts. A fifth criterion is the combination of linguistic and thematic parallelisms within the larger contexts of several verses or a chapter. Finally, significant parallels in the social and historical background should be examined (names, places, objects, events, etc.).

The criteria listed above are not exhaustive, nor do they remove the inescapable subjective element involved in all human judgement. They are only designed to reduce subjectivism and arbitrariness to an acceptable level. Therefore, these criteria and distinctions remain less than concrete. In order to apply them to the controllable data of Matthean texts, we do well to recognize that the need for an alleged citation to meet additional criteria varies according to the first criterion met. In other words, a formula quotation is finally confirmed by the first criterion in our list; nothing more is needed. On the other hand, an alleged quotation lacking an introductory formula is initially confirmed by the third criterion; but more is needed, especially with common words and expressions. Exactly how much more will vary according to word frequency. In this manner, we hope to avoid the extremes of fanciful speculation and critical minimalism as much as possible.

In our examination of the link between Matthew 16:19 and

Isaiah 22:22 which follows, we seek to apply these stated criteria. As will become obvious, however, there are other elements of circumstantial evidence not to be neglected.

Neither an explicit reference to a source nor an introductory formula is present to confirm Matthew's dependence on Isaiah 22:22 for verse 19. Nevertheless, noteworthy linguistic correspondence is evident which supports dependence, especially in the case of such an exceedingly rare complex of words and images:

Isaiah 22:22a (LXX) δῶσω αὐτῷ τὴν κλεῖδα οἴκου Δαυὶδ

Matthew 16:19a δῶσω σοι τὰς κλεῖδας τῆς βασιλείας

In addition, note the grammatical parallels. In both verses, the same verb expresses the same divine promise about the same symbolic object; both in the first person and future tense. The difference in number (singular-plural) is without significance, particularly when it involves the only instance of κλεῖδα in the law and the prophets. Recall also that Isaiah is the prophet most frequently quoted by Matthew and presumably most familiar to his audience (1:23; 2:11; 3:3; 4:14-16; 12:17-21; 13:14-15; 15:7-9, etc.). Interchanging "house of David" with "kingdom" is almost predictable for Matthew, given his unique predilection for Davidic themes (1:1, 6-7, 17, 20; 2:5; 9:27; 12:3-6, 23, 42; 15:22; 20:30; 21:9-16; 22:41-46). In addition, Isaiah 22:22 is the indisputable source for other New Testament citations in which virtually identical images are associated with "the key of David," as noted on page seven.

In a recent article,⁶⁰ J.A. Emerton takes the second and third lines of verse 19 and reconstructs a hypothetical Aramaic original.

From this he shows how the difference between Matthew's "bind/loose" (δέσσης/λύσης) and "open/shut" (ἄνοιξει/κλείσει) in Isaiah 22:22 (LXX) could be easily accounted for by directly translating into Greek an Aramaic rendering of the Hebrew text, as it may have been originally written and spoken. (The same maneuver is quite common with Peter's name in verse 18, as previously noted.) Emerton concludes "that the whole of Matthew 16:19 and not merely the first line is dependent on Isaiah 22:22."⁶¹ Indeed, this conclusion now seems very likely.

The plausibility of this conclusion is supplemented by various linguistic and thematic parallels in the larger context of Isaiah 22:16-23 (LXX). For instance, in verse 16, work is being done on the "rock" (πέτρα) of Jerusalem in order to build a "tomb" (geber is often found in synonymous parallelism with Sheol=ἄδης; e.g. Psalms 88:3-5, 11). In his commentary, E.J. Young considers it "interesting" how "the tomb was conceived as a house (cf. 14:18)."⁶² In verses 17-23, the "strong man" is "cast out" (ἐκβαλλω; cf. Matthew 12:28-29), and his authority over the "house" (οἴκου) is given to Eliakim, the faithful "servant," along with "a glorious throne" (θρόνου δόξης) for his "father's house" (τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ πατρὸς; cf. Matthew 19:27-28). In his new capacity, Eliakim serves as a "father" to all who dwell in Jerusalem (cf. Matthew 24:45-51). For Isaiah, all of this is a portent of Jerusalem's destruction to occur within that generation of Hezekiah (cf. Matthew 24:1-2, 34). These secondary parallels are cited to indicate notable linguistic and thematic resonances between Isaiah 22:16-23 and Matthew 16:17-19, as well as the other indicated

portions of Matthew.

On the basis of this evidence, along with the arguments advanced by Nolan and Ellis, summarized earlier, we conclude that Matthew 16:19 is indeed an indirect quotation of Isaiah 22:22. Recall that this conclusion is affirmed by the majority of commentators, only without satisfactory support. Now that a probable case has finally been made, let us proceed to suggest possible implications of this conclusion for the important question of Petrine succession.

V. Postscript: Possible Implications of the "Keys" for
Petrine Succession

Cullmann closes his study of Peter with two equally strong
63 conclusions. First, the rock on which Jesus will build his church is Peter and not merely his faith or confession. Second, the notion of Petrine succession is without any exegetical warrant. As a Presbyterian, I am challenged by the first conclusion and relieved by the second. As a student of exegesis, however, the second conclusion strikes me as inadequately grounded.

If Isaiah 22:22 is the primary source for Matthew 16:19, as Cullmann suggests and we have argued, then the next step should be to examine it closely to discern how it affects the meaning of "the keys" given to Peter. Cullmann begins the process himself:

In Matthew 16:19 it is presupposed that Christ is the master of the house, who has the keys to the Kingdom of Heaven, with which to open to those who come in. Just as in Isaiah 22:22 the Lord lays the keys of the house of David on the shoulders of his servant Eliakim, so Jesus commits to Peter the keys of his house, the Kingdom of Heaven, and thereby installs him as administrator of the house. 64

Nothing more is said of Isaiah 22:22 and the keys by Cullmann.

The question of an implied succession in the keys merits further study. This is particularly true if Dodd, Gundry and others are correct in viewing an Old Testament quotation as pointing back to its original context for the explication of its meaning in the new context. For there are at least ten lines of evidence which indicate that certain basic features in Isaiah's description of Eliakim's investiture imply hereditary/dynastic succession, knowledge of which may have relevance for Matthew 16:19.

First, the fact that "the key" is of "David's house" suggests a dynastic association, since David's death many years before did not alter the Davidic designation for the royal family. Does this not presuppose the ongoing succession of David's sons as dynastic heirs, a commonplace in the ancient world?

Second, even if the office of chief steward is not filled by his own offspring after the wicked Shebna is expelled (for obvious reasons), does not Eliakim's immediate appointment suggest some sort of succession as an assumed practice?

Third, does not Eliakim's "priestly robe" (kiton; 22:21)⁶⁵ suggest sacerdotal authority which is normally passed down according to hereditary succession in ancient Israel?

Fourth, the designation of Eliakim as "a father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem and to the house of Judah" (22:21) also suggests paternal authority which is characteristically hereditary and successive in ancient Israel.

Fifth, the reference to a "throne" established in the house of Eliakim's father (Isaiah 22:23) may also be a tacit acknowledgement that the transfer of an office devolves upon the entire household and not merely the individual, once more suggesting hereditary authority or succession.

Sixth, in his commentary on this passage, O. Kaiser affirms that "it is probable that what according to our other sources was the highest office in the royal court of Jerusalem was to some extent hereditary."⁶⁶

Seventh, in his authoritative study, Solomonic State Officials: A Study of the Civil Government Officials of the Israelite Monarchy,⁶⁷ T.N.D. Mettinger discusses at length the vicarious use of authority in the king's name by the chief steward and concludes that the office appears to be hereditary.

Eighth, in his commentary on Matthew 16:17-19, W.F. Albright refers to the recent discovery of "the seal of Eliakim," which contains evidence of the chief steward's office as a perpetual authority requiring succession to maintain.⁶⁸

Ninth, it is interesting to note possible clues that Matthew's text reflects a certain familiarity with governmental positions and functions virtually identical with the royal family and stewards of Isaiah's context in several passages (10:25; 17:25-26; 18:23-34; 21:33-41; 22:1-13; 25: 14-30). Also note the saying about how "the faithful servant, whom his master has set over his household to give them their food," is favorably rewarded in contrast to "the wicked servant" who is punished (24:45-51; cf. Luke 12:42-46).

Tenth, Matthew seems to reflect the common rabbinic assumption of succession implied in ecclesiastical offices by his Son-
69
dergut:

The Scribes and the Pharisees sit on Moses' seat;
so practice and observe whatever they tell you...
They bind heavy burdens hard to bear... (23:2-4)

Admittedly these lines of evidence do not establish Petrine succession with absolute certainty or probability. Nor is that the plan of this study. What can we conclude from these considerations? First, Cullmann's rejection of any exegetical warrant for Petrine succession may have been premature. Second, further study needs to be conducted in order to determine the reasons and methods lying behind the use of the Old Testament in the New, especially by Matthew. Third, if Matthew's citation of Isaiah 22:22 is designed to evoke the original meaning of "the keys" in context, it may be appropriate to re-open the question of Petrine succession.⁷⁰

ENDNOTES

1. For the best summary of the history of interpretation, see O. Cullmann's Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr (2nd Ed.), Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962, pp. 164-176. Dissertations include the recently published one by J.A. Burgess, A History of the Exegesis of Matthew 16:17-19 from 1781-1965, Ann Arbor: Edwards Brothers, 1967; T.T. Taheny, The History of the Exegesis of Matthew 16:18-19 in Commentaries of the Early Middle Ages (Ph.D. diss., Woodstock College), 1960; and G.F. Hambleton, A Sketch of the Interpretation of "Church" in Matthew 16:18 Since the Reformation (Ph. D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary), 1899; and J. Bigane, "Tu Es Petrus, Et Super Hanc Petram Aedificabo Ecclesiam Meam": The "Rock" in Sixteenth Century Roman Catholic Exegesis (Ph.D. diss., Marquette University), 1979.
2. Op. Cit. (English translation, 1953).
3. Ibid., pp. 164-176.
4. Ibid.
5. For example, R. Bultmann, History of the Synoptic Tradition, New York: Harner and Row, 1963 (1931), pp. 138-141; T.W. Manson, The Savings of Jesus, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979 (1937), pp. 201-205; and H. von Camrenhausen, Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries, Stanford, University Press, 1979 (1953), pp. 126-136.
6. For example, G. Maier, "The Church in the Gospel of Matthew," in Biblical Interpretation and the Church, D.A. Carson (ed.), New York: Nelson, p. 60.
7. For a balanced statement, see J.D. Kingsbury, "The Figure of Peter in Matthew's Gospel as a Theological Problem," JBL 98 (1979), pp. 67-83.
8. See R.E. Brown, K.P. Donfried, J. Reumann (eds.), Peter in the New Testament, Minn.: Augsburg, 1973, pp. 105-107.
9. Ibid., pp. 83-101.
10. For the following summaries, lexical data has been absorbed from innumerable biblical and theological lexicons, dictionaries and encyclopedias, most notably the relevant articles in the reference works edited by G.W. Bromiley, C. Brown, G.A. Buttrick, J. Hastings, G. Kittel, J. Lightfoot, J. Orr, H.L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, and M. Tenney.

Let me also use this opportunity to cite a fascinating geographical background study of Caesarea Philippi and the possible scene of 16:13-20 at the wall of rock where the Jordan River begins, by Stanley L. Jaki, And On This Rock, Notre Dame: Ave Maria, 1978, pp. 21-54.

11. See H. Hirschberg, "Simon Barjona and the Ebionites," JBL 61 (1942), p. 281; Cullmann, op. cit., pp. 23-24; R. Brown et al., op. cit., p. 88.
12. Representatives of the following views include: 1) H. Burton, "The Stone and the Rock. St. Matthew 16:13-19," The Expositor 6 (1883), p. 434; 2) R. Brown, et al., op. cit., p. 90, fn. 210; 3) R.H. Gundry, Matthew, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982, p. 334; 4) W.C. Allen, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew, New York: Scribners, 1907, pp. 176-80; 5) J.P. Meier, The Vision of Matthew, Cambridge: University Press, 1963, p. 126; 6) O. Cullmann, op. cit., pp. 192-217; 7) M. Wilcox, "Peter and the Rock: A Fresh Look at Matthew XVI. 17-19," NTS 22 (1975-76), pp. 84-87; and 8) J. Jeremias, Golgotha, Leipzig: Pfeiffer, 1926, pp. 66-68; R. Meyer, The Aims of Jesus, London: SCM, 1979, pp. 185; T. Pawcett, Hebrew Myth and Christian Gospel, London: SCM, 1973, pp. 195-200, 238-250; and L. Thornton, The Dominion of Christ, Westminster, Dacre, 1952, pp. 175-180.
13. See G. Maier, op. cit.; G. Bornkamm, "The Authority to 'Bind' and 'Loose' in the Church in Matthew's Gospel," The Interpretation of Matthew, G. Stanton (ed.), Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983, pp. 92-95; and Cullmann, op. cit., pp. 192-217.
14. Most notably, H. Frankemölle, Jahwebund und Kirche Christi, Munster: Verlag Aschendorff, 1974; B.M. Nolan, The Royal Son of God, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1970; and also D.J. Duling, "The Therapeutic Son of David: An Element in Matthew's Christological Apologetic," NTS 24 (1978), pp. 392-409.
15. See R. Brown, et al., op. cit., p. 90, fn. 208.
16. See P.F. Ellis, Matthew: His Mind and His Message, Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1974, p. 132; and E.F. Siegman, "The Stone Hewn from the Mountain in Daniel 2," CEQ 18 (1956), pp. 364-79.
17. For a good discussion of the issues involved, see R.T. France, "The Church and the Kingdom of God: Some Hermeneutical Considerations," in D.A. Carson (ed.), op. cit., pp. 30-44.
18. For a host of extra-biblical references, see H.L. Strack and

P. Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch (Vol. 1), Munich: Beck, 1922, pp. 736-38.

19. Controversy over this particular issue has been re-heated recently; for a treatment of the various features, see R.H. Hiers, "'Binding' and 'Loosing': The Matthean Authorizations," JBL 104 (1985), pp. 233-50; J.D.M. Derrett, "Binding and Loosing," JBL 102 (1983), pp. 112-17; and D.C. Duling, "Solomon, Exorcism and the Son of David," HTR 68 (1975), pp. 235-52.
20. W.T. Dayton, The Greek Perfect Tense in Relation to John 20:23, Matthew 16:19 and Matthew 18:18 (Ph.D. diss., Northern Baptist Theological Seminary), 1945.
21. See Bultmann, op. cit., p. 258.
22. See W.R. Farmer, The Synoptic Problem, Macon, GA: Mercer, 1976, pp. 244-45; and E.C. Butler, The Originality of St. Matthew, Cambridge: University Press, 1951, pp. 131-32.
23. Representatives of the following perspectives include:
1) C.W. Manson, op. cit., pp. 201-5; 2) R. Bultmann, op. cit., pp. 138-41; 3) G.D. Kilpatrick, The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew, Oxford: Clarendon, 1946, pp. 30-77; 4) O. Cullmann, op. cit., pp. 192-217; 5) R.H. Fuller, "The 'Thou Art Peter' Pericope and the Easter Appearances," McCormick Quarterly 20 (1967), pp. 309-15; 6) G. Bornkamm, op. cit., pp. 85-97.
24. The Gospels, London: MacMillan, 1945, p. 81.
25. G.D. Kilpatrick, op. cit., p. 126.
26. See, for example, P. Benoit, "La primauté de saint Pierre selon le N.T.," Istina 18 (1955), pp. 318-19; also a follow-up study by Cullmann, "L'apôtre Pierre, instrument du Diable et instrument de Dieu," New Testament Essays, A.J.B. Higgins (ed.), Manchester: University Press, 1959, pp. 94-105. Subsequently, Cullmann's view was strongly criticized by R.H. Gundry, "The Narrative Framework of Matthew XVI. 17-19," NovT (1964-65), pp. 1-9; and then by R.H. Fuller, op. cit.
27. See G. Bornkamm, op. cit., pp. 94-5.
28. Although still a minority view, the placement and authenticity of this logion is defended by F.M. Braun, F. Filson, R.H. Gundry, W. Hendriksen, S. Jaki, M. Meinertz, B.F. Meyer, B. Rigaux, E.P. Sanders, W. Schwadewaldt, and others. For thoughtful interaction with the hermeneutical pre-suppositions underlying arguments against authenticity, see G. Maier, op. cit.

29. G. Strecker, Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit (2nd Ed.), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1966. (The third edition of 1971 was unavailable to me.)
30. See J.D. Kingsbury, op. cit.
31. Ibid., pp. 105-107.
32. Ibid., pp. 80-83, 101-105.
33. Ibid., p. 97.
34. Of the commentaries I examined, F. Filson and R.H. Gundry make no mention of the possible allusion, while E. Schweizer considers it "insufficient," op. cit., p. 343.
35. B.M. Nolan, op. cit.; P.F. Ellis, op. cit.
36. Ibid., p. 180.
37. P.F. Ellis, op. cit., pp. 59-67, 113-34.
38. Ibid., p. 132.
39. Ibid., pp. 129-34.
40. The following treatment is almost entirely dependent upon A.G. van Aarde, "Matthew's Portrayal of the Disciples and the Structure of Matthew 13:53-17:27," Nestestamentica 16 (1982), pp. 21-34; an abstract of his Ph.D. dissertation in Afrikaans, God With Us: The Dominant Perspective of Matthew's Theology. A Narrative Analysis, Pretoria: University of Pretoria, 1983; R.E. Edwards, Matthew's Story of Jesus, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985; and, of course, this seminar's lectures, papers and discussions. None of the above should be held responsible, however, for what follows.
41. Van Aarde, op. cit., pp. 21-23.
42. Ibid., p. 28
43. P.F. Ellis, op. cit., p. 121-34; in M.J. Suggs, Wisdom, Christology and Law in Matthew's Gospel, Cambridge, MA: Harvard, 1970, pp. 122-27, the suggestion is made that 16:17-19 represents a mid-point at which the pattern, benediction-symbolic name-commission, reappears after being introduced in 5:11-16, thereby setting the stage for the finale in 28:18-20.
44. See R.E. Edwards, "Uncertain Faith: Matthew's Portrait of the Disciples," Discipleship in the New Testament, F.F. Segovia (ed.), Phil.: Fortress, 1985, pp. 47-61, for his discussion of 28:17 (on page 21 of the original manuscript,

which is all that is available to me); likewise van Aarde, op. cit., p. 32.

45. Ibid., p. 21.

46. This point is stressed in the abstract of his dissertation, op. cit.

47. Parallel to recent Matthean studies, at least three aspects of the influence of the Old Testament on Matthew were considered: 1) General citations and allusions, as discussed in the commentaries, for example, H.A.W. Meyer, The Gospel According to Matthew, Winona Lake, IN: Alpha, 1979 (1883), pp. 294-99; 2) Quotes in their original contexts, which culminated in the massive (and rare) J.R. Harris, Testimonies (2 vols.), Cambridge: University Press, 1916; 3) Structure and style, which gave rise to much of the work by B.W. Bacon, Studies in Matthew, London: MacMillan, 1930.

48. Subtitled The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1982.

49. London: Nisbet, 1952.

50. Ibid., p. 126-33; also see D.M. Smith, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New," The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays, J. Eiford (ed.), Durham: Duke, 1972, p. 28.

51. This subtitle of Dodd's book may overstate his actual conclusions.

52. B. Lindars, New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations, Phil.: Westminster, 1961; E.E. Ellis, Paul's Use of the Old Testament, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957.

53. Phil.: Fortress, 1954.

54. Leiden: Brill, 1967.

55. Ibid., p. 208.

56. G. Strecker, op. cit.; R.S. McConnell, Law and Prophecy in Matthew's Gospel: The Authority and Use of the Old Testament in Matthew, Basel: FRK, 1969; and W. Rothfuchs, Die Erfüllungszitate des Matthäus-Evangelium, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1969.

57. L. Hartmann, "Scriptural Exegesis in the Gospel of St. Matthew and the Problem of Communication," and F. van Segbroeck, "Les Citations d'accomplissement dans l'Évangile selon

Matthieu d'après trois ouvrages recents," L'Évangile selon Matthieu Rédaction et Théologie, M. Didier (ed.), Gembloux: Duculot, 1971, pp. 131-52, 107-30; H. Frankemölle, op. cit.; L. Cope, Matthew: A Scribe Trained for the Kingdom of Heaven, Washington: CBA, 1976; G.M. Soares Prabhu, The Formula Quotations in the Infancy Narrative of Matthew, Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976; J.P. Meier, Law and History in Matthew's Gospel, Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976; and B.M. Nolan, op. cit.

58. L. Hartmann, op. cit., pp. 132-47; also see R.T. France, "The Formula Quotations in Matthew 2 and the Problems of Communication," NTS 27 (1980-81), pp. 233-51.
59. For an interesting and important study which draws the Synoptic correlation between "kingdom" and "house," see S. Aalen, "'Reign' and 'House' in the Kingdom of God in the Gospels," NTS 8 (1961-62), pp. 215-40.
60. "Binding and Loosing--Forgiving and Retaining," JTS 13 (1962), pp. 325-31.
61. Ibid., p. 326.
62. The Book of Isaiah (Vol. 2), Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1959, p. 109.
63. O. Cullmann, op. cit., pp. 218-42.
64. Ibid., pp. 209-210.
65. E.J. Young, op. cit., p. 113; although this tentative conclusion is based upon more than mere lexical usage, since kiton is sometimes used with a non-cultic association. However, in the present context, a sacerdotal connotation seems likely. First, the incident involves an authoritative investiture symbolized by the "robe," along with other items such as the "throne" and "house." Second, as urged by T.N.D. Mettinger in Solomonic State Officials: A Study of the Civil Government Officials of the Israelite Monarchy, Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1971, p. 72ff, throughout the ancient Near East, the office of the "grand vizier," "chief steward," "prime minister," (or whatever the closest English equivalent might be), is usually identified in close association with the same complex of images as found in the present context (e.g., "key," "house," "throne," "robe," etc.); images which Mettinger considers to be quasi-priestly in their various cultural settings. Thus, this suggestion of a hereditary connotation to kiton appears to be very reasonable in light of lexical, contextual and extra-biblical considerations.
66. Isaiah 13-39, Phil.: Westminster, 1974, p. 155.

67. Op. cit., p. 72; see also R. deVaux, Ancient Israel: Social Institutions (Volume 2), New York: Mc Graw - Hill, 1965, p.130:

The master of the palace had similar functions at the court of Judah. Announcing the promotion of Elyaqim, Is 22:22 says: 'I lay the key of the house of David upon his shoulder; If he opens, none will shut; If he shuts, none will open.' The Egyptian vizier's instructions are described in a very similar fashion. Every morning 'the vizier will send someone to open the gates of the king's house, to admit those who have to enter, and to send out those who have to go out.' One is reminded of our Lord's words to Peter, the vizier of the Kingdom of Heaven (Mt. 16:19).

68. W.F. Albright and C.S. Mann, Matthew, Garden City: Doubleday, 1971, pp. 196-97; in this section of the commentary, only the results of the discovery are actually referred to. For the background and details, see W.F. Albright, "The Seal of Eliakim," JBL 51 (1932), p. 84.
69. See P.F. Ellis, op. cit., pp. 121-37; here again we see a notable convergence of images (e.g., "seat-throne," "binding," and "lock-close" -- with "keys" in the Lukan parallel) associated with cultic authoritative figures whose power is more to be associated with some sort of office or receptacle of authority, rather than their own charismatic or ethical personalities -- at least for Matthew.
70. From the outset, the goals of this study have been restricted. This is primarily due to the lack of consensus surrounding virtually every aspect of alleged reasons and methods in Matthew's use of the Old Testament. I have attempted to proceed with due caution, highlighting those persons, positions and approaches which seem to be most plausible in explaining the data. At the same time, I have tried to consider, at least in passing, alternative theories and hypotheses. The result is a synthetic study which tends to "stack theory upon theory," a procedure otherwise unavoidable for those wishing to develop an integrated picture of Matthew's thought. The only consolation I would offer to someone in disagreement with some or all of my steps is this strong confession of my self-conscious limitations and hypothetical conclusions.

WORKS CONSULTED

- Albright, W.F. "The Seal of Eliakim," Journal of Biblical Literature 51 (1932), pp. 77-106.
- Albright, W.F. and Mann, C.S. Matthew. Garden City: Doubleday, 1971.
- Allen, E.L. "On This Rock," Journal of Theological Studies 5, (1954), pp. 59-62.
- Allen, W.C. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew. New York: Scribners, 1907.
- Argyle, A.W. The Gospel According to Matthew. Cambridge: University Press, 1963.
- Blank, J. "The Person and Office of Peter in the New Testament", Concilium 83 (1973), pp. 42-55.
- Black, M. An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts (2nd Ed.). Oxford: Clarendon, 1954.
- Bornkamm, G. "The Authority to 'Bind' and 'Loose' in the Church in Matthew's Gospel: The Problem of Sources in Matthew's Gospel," The Interpretation of Matthew, G. Stanton (ed.). Philadelphia: Fortress, 1953, pp. 85-97.
- Bornkamm, G., Barth, G., and Held, H.J. Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963.
- Bourke, M.M. "The Petrine Office in the New Testament," Proceedings of CTSA (1970), pp. 1-12.
- Brown, R.E., Donfried, K.P., and Reumann, J. (eds.) Peter in the New Testament. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1973.
- Bultmann, R. History of the Synoptic Tradition. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.
- Burgess, J.A. A History of the Exegesis of Matthew 16:17-19 from 1781 to 1965. Ann Arbor: Edwards Brothers, 1976.
- Butler, B.C. The Church and Infallibility. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1954.
- _____. The Idea of the Church. Baltimore: Helicon, 1962.
- _____. The Originality of St. Matthew. Cambridge: University Press, 1951.
- Carroll, K.L. "Thou Art Peter," Novum Testamentum 6 (1963), pp. 268-76.

- Chilton, B.D. A Galilean Rabbi and His Bible: Jesus' Use of the Interpreted Scripture of His Time. Wilmington, DE: Glazier, 1984.
- Clements, R.E. Isaiah and the Deliverance of Jerusalem: A Study in the Interpretation of Prophecy in the Old Testament. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980.
- Cope, O.L. Matthew: A Scribe Trained for the Kingdom of Heaven. Washington: CBA, 1976.
- Cullmann, O. Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr. A Historical and Theological Essay. (2nd Ed.) Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962.
- Dahlberg, B.T. "The Typological Use of Jeremiah 1:4-19 in Matthew 16:13-23," Journal of Biblical Literature 94 (1975), pp. 73-80.
- Derrett, J.D.M. "Binding and Loosing (Matthew 16:19; 18:18; John 21:23)," Journal of Biblical Literature 102 (1983), pp. 112-17.
- de Vaux, R. Ancient Israel: Social Institutions. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.
- Dodd, C.H. According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology. London: Nisbet, 1952.
- Doeve, J.W. Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1954.
- Donaldson, T.L. Jesus on the Mountain: A Study of Matthean Theology. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985.
- Dreyfus, P. "Le primauté de Pierre à la lumière de la théologie biblique du reste d'Israel," Istina 2 (1955), pp. 338-46.
- Duberle, A.-M. "La primauté de Pierre dans Matthieu 16, 17-19. Quelques références à l'Ancien Testament," Istina 2 (1955), pp. 335-38.
- Duling, D.C. "Solomon, Exorcism and the Son of David," Harvard Theological Review 68 (1975), pp. 235-52.
- _____. "The Therapeutic Son of David: An Element in Matthew's Christological Apologetic," New Testament Studies 24 (1978), pp. 392-409.
- Edgar, S.L. "Respect for Context in Old Testament Quotations," New Testament Studies 9 (1962-63), pp. 55-62.

- Edwards, R.E. "Uncertain Faith: Matthew's Portrait of the Disciples," Discipleship in the New Testament (F.F. Segovia, ed.). Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985, pp. 47-61.
- _____. Matthew's Story of Jesus. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
- Ellis, P.F. Matthew: His Mind and His Message. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1974.
- Emerton, J.A. "Binding and Loosing--Forgiving and Retaining," Journal of Theological Studies 13 (1962), pp. 325-31.
- Falk, Z.W. "Binding and Loosing," Journal of Jewish Studies 25 (1974), pp. 92-100.
- Farrer, A.M. St. Matthew and St. Mark (2nd Ed.). Westminster: Dacre, 1966.
- Pawcett, T. Hebrew Myth and Christian Gospel. London: SCM, 1973.
- Penton, J.C. The Gospel of St. Matthew. London: Black, 1960.
- Wilson, F.V. The Gospel According to St. Matthew. London: Black, 1960.
- Planagan, J.W. "Succession and Genealogy in the Davidic Dynasty," in The Quest for the Kingdom of God (H.B. Huffman, A.R.W. Green, and F.A. Spina, eds.). Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1983, pp. 35-55.
- Flew, R.N. Jesus and His Church: A Study of the Idea of Ecclesia in the New Testament. London: Epworth, 1943.
- Ford, J.M. "Thou Art Abraham and Upon This Rock..." Heythrop Journal 6 (1965), pp. 289-301.
- France, R.T. "The Formula Quotations in Matthew 2 and the Problems of Communication," New Testament Studies, 27 (1980-81), pp. 233-51.
- _____. Jesus and the Old Testament. London: Tyndale, 1971.
- Frankemölle, H. "Amtskritik im Matthäus-Evangelium?" Biblica 54 (1973), pp. 247-62.
- _____. Jahwebund und Kirche Christi. Munster: Verlag Aschen-dorff, 1974.
- Puller, R.H. "The 'Thou Art Peter' Pericope and the Easter Appearances," McCormick Quarterly 20 (1967), pp. 309-15.

- Gale, H.M. "A Suggestion Regarding Matthew 16," Journal of Biblical Literature 60 (1941), pp. 255-60.
- Gero, S. "The Gates or the Bars of Hades? A Note on Matthew 16.18," New Testament Studies 27 (1980-81), pp. 411-14.
- Goulder, M.D. Midrash and Lection in Matthew. London: SPCK, 1974.
- Green, H.B. The Gospel According to Matthew. Oxford: University Press, 1975.
- Gundry, R.H. "A Critique of Cullmann on Matthew 16:17-19," Novum Testamentum 7 (1964), pp. 1-9.
- . Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- . The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel. Leiden: Brill, 1967.
- Hartman, L. "Scriptural Exegesis in the Gospel of St. Matthew and the Problem of Communication," L'Evangile selon Matthieu Rédaction et Théologie, M. Midier (ed.). Gembloux: Duculot, 1971, pp. 131-52.
- Hiers, R.H. "'Binding' and 'Loosing': The Matthean Authorizations," Journal of Biblical Literature 104 (1985), pp. 233-50.
- Hill, D. The Gospel of Matthew. London: Oliphants, 1972.
- Jaki, S.L. And On This Rock. Notre Dame: Ave Maria Press, 1978.
- Jeremias, J. Golgotha und der Heilige Fels. Leipzig: Pfeiffer, 1926.
- Johnson, A.R. "The Role of the King in the Jerusalem Cultus," The Labyrinth: Further Studies in the Relation between Myth and Ritual in the Ancient World (S.H. Hooke, ed.). London: SPCK, 1953, pp. 73-111.
- Kahler, C. "Zur Form- und Traditions-geschichte von Matthäus xvi. 17-19," New Testament Studies 23 (1976-77), pp. 36-58.
- Kahmann, J. "Die Verheissung an Petrus: Mt. 16, 18-19 im Zusammenhang des Matthäus evangeliums," L'Evangile selon Matthieu. Rédaction et Théologie, M. Didier (ed.). Gembloux: Duculot, 1972, pp. 261-80.
- Kaiser, O. Isaiah 13-39. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974.

- Karrer, O. Peter and the Church: An Examination of Cullmann's Thesis. New York: Herder, 1963.
- Katzenstein, H.J. "The Royal Steward," Israel Exploration Journal 10 (1960), pp. 149-54.
- Kilpatrick, G.D. The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew. Oxford: Clarendon, 1946.
- Kingsbury, J.D. "The Figure of Peter in Matthew's Gospel as a Theological Problem," Journal of Biblical Literature '98 (1979), pp. 67-83.
- _____. "The Title 'Son of David' in Matthew's Gospel," Journal of Biblical Literature 95 (1976), pp. 591-602.
- Kittel, G. (ed.) Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. (10 volumes). Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979.
- Knight, G.A.F. "Thou Art Peter," Theology Today 17 (1960), pp. 168-80.
- Lagrange, M.-J. L'Evangile selon saint Matthieu (8th ed.). Paris: Gabalda, 1948.
- Lightfoot, J. A Commentary on the New Testament from the Talmud and Hebraica: Matthew-I. Corinthians (Vol. 2). Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979. (reprint of 1859 edition published by Oxford University Press--formerly titled Horae Hebraicae Et Talmudicae)
- Lindars, B. New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961.
- Lohmeyer, E. Lord of the Temple: A Study of the Relation between Cult and Gospel. Richmond: John Knox, 1962.
- Longenecker, R. Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.
- Luz, U. "The Disciples in the Gospel according to Matthew," The Interpretation of Matthew, G. Stanton (ed.), Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983, pp. 98-128.
- Maier, G. "The Church in the Gospel of Matthew: Hermeneutical Analysis of the Current Debate," Biblical Interpretation and the Church, D.A. Carson (ed.). New York: Nelson, 1984, pp. 45-63.
- Malamat, A. "Organs of Statecraft in the Israelite Monarchy," in The Biblical Archaeologist 28 (1965), pp. 34-65.

- Manson, T.W. "The Old Testament in the Teaching of Jesus," in Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 34 (1951-52), pp. 312-32.
- _____. The Sayings of Jesus. London: SCM, 1949.
- Martin, J.P. "The Church in Matthew," Interpretation 29 (1975), pp. 41-56.
- McCasland, S.V. "Matthew Twists the Scriptures," Journal of Biblical Literature 80 (1961), pp. 143-8.
- McConnell, R.S. Law and Prophecy in Matthew's Gospel: The Authority and Use of the Old Testament in Matthew. Basel: F.R. Kommissionsverlag, 1969.
- McKelvey, R.J. The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament. London: Oxford, 1969.
- McNeile, A.H. The Gospel According to St. Matthew. London: MacMillan, 1938.
- Mead, R.T. "A Dissenting Opinion About Respect for Context in Old Testament Quotations," New Testament Studies 10 (1963-64), pp. 279-89.
- Meier, J.P. Law and History in Matthew's Gospel. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1976.
- _____. Matthew. Wilmington, DE: Glazier, 1980.
- _____. The Vision of Matthew. New York: Paulist, 1979.
- Mettinger, T.N.D. Solomonic State Officials: A Study of the Civil Government Officials of the Israelite Monarchy. Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1971.
- Meyer, B.F. The Aims of Jesus. London: SCM, 1979.
- Moule, C.F.D. "Some Reflections on the 'Stone' Test monia in Relation to the Name 'Peter'," New Testament Studies 2 (1955-56), pp. 56-8.
- Murphy-O'Connor, J. "The Structure of Matthew XIV-XVII," Revue Biblique 82 (1975), pp. 360-84.
- Nolan, B.M. The Royal Son of God: The Christology of Matthew 1-2 in the Setting of the Gospel. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1979.
- Patai, R. Man and Temple in Ancient Jewish Myth and Ritual (2nd Ed.). New York: KTAV, 1967.
- Pesch, R. "The Position and Significance of Peter in the Church

- of the New Testament," Concilium 64 (1971), pp. 21-35.
- Rigaux, B. "Saint Peter in Contemporary Exegesis," Concilium 27 (1967), pp. 147-79.
- Rothfuchs, W. Die Erfüllungszitate des Matthäus-Evangeliums. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1969.
- Sanders, E.P. Jesus and Judaism. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
- Schnackenburg, R. "The Petrine Office: Peter's Relationship to the Other Apostles," Theology Digest 20 (1972), pp. 148-52.
- Schweizer, E. The Good News According to Matthew. Atlanta: John Knox, 1975.
- "Matthew's Church," The Interpretation of Matthew, G. Stanton (ed.). Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983, pp. 129-55.
- Seitz, O.J.F. "Upon This Rock: A Critical Re-examination of Matthew 16:17-19," Journal of Biblical Literature 69 (1950), pp. 329-40.
- Senior, D. "The Ministry of Continuity: Matthew's Gospel and the Interpretation of History," Bible Today 82 (1976), pp. 670-76.
- Smith, D.M. "The Use of the Old Testament in the New," in The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays, J. Mird (ed.). Durham: Duke, 1972.
- Soares Prabhu, G.M. The Formula Quotations in the Infancy Narrative of Matthew. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976.
- Sperber, D. "On Sealing the Abysses," Journal of Semitic Studies 11 (1966), pp. 168-74.
- Stendahl, K. The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1954.
- Strack, H.L. and Billerbeck, P. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch (Vol. 1). Munich: Beck, 1922.
- Strecker, G. Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit (2nd Ed.). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1966.
- Sutcliffe, E.F. "St. Peter's Double Confession in Matthew 16:16-19," Heythrop Journal 3 (1962), pp. 31-4.
- Swallow, R. "The Keys of God's Household," Scripture 11 (1959), pp. 118-23.
- Tagawa, K. "People and Community in the Gospel of Matthew,"

New Testament Studies 16 (1969-70), pp. 149-62.

van Aarde, A.G. God With Us: The Dominant Perspective of Matthew's Theology. A Narrative Analysis (Ph.D. dissertation). Pretoria: University of Pretoria, 1983.

_____. "Matthew's Portrayal of the Disciples and the Structure of Matthew 13:53-17:27," Neotestamentica 16 (1982), pp. 21-34.

Van Segbroeck, F. "Les Citations d'accomplissement dans l'Évangile selon Matthieu d'après trois ouvrages récents," L'Évangile selon Matthieu Rédaction et Théologie (M. Didier, ed.). Gembloux: Duculot, 1971, pp. 107-130.

Via, D.O. "The Church as the Body of Christ in the Gospel of Matthew," Scottish Journal of Theology 11 (1958), pp. 271-86.

Vilnay, Z. Legends of Jerusalem. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1973.

Von Campenhausen, H. Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries. Stanford: University Press, 1969.

Walker, W. "The Kingdom of the Son of Man and the Kingdom of the Father," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 30 (1968), pp. 573-9.

Westerholm, S. Jesus and Scribal Authority. Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1978.

Wilcox, M. "Peter and the Rock: A Fresh Look at Matthew XVI. 17-19," New Testament Studies 22 (1975-76), pp. 73-88.

Young, E.J. The Book of Isaiah (3 vols.). Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969.