

# Loyalty to Jesus, not to Judaism in Matthew 22,1-14

---

Guillaume Ingipay Migbisiegbe

K. U. LEUVEN

BÉLGICA

**RESUMEN** Este artículo analiza el tema de la expedición violenta y punitiva contra los invitados mientras el banquete se enfría en la mesa en Mt 22,1-14. Otro elemento sorprendente es que se espera que los invitados suplentes, recogidos en los caminos sin advertencia alguna, vengan con elegantes trajes de boda. El artículo sostiene que la imagen de furia es parte de la retórica de Mateo como un papel negativo para que su audiencia se vuelva al Judaísmo y pidiéndoles su lealtad total y únicamente a Dios (Jesús).

**PALABRAS CLAVE** Furia; papel negativo; lealtad.

**SUMMARY** *This article analyzes the motif of the violent and punitive expedition against the invited guests while the dinner grows cold on the table in Mt 22,1-14. Another surprising element is that the substitute guests gathered off roads without any warning are expected to wear elegant wedding garments. The article argues that the image of rage is part of Matthew's rhetoric of a negative foil intended to turn the audience's back upon Judaism and asking them for total loyalty solely to God (Jesus).*

**KEY WORDS** *Rage; Negative foil; Loyalty.*

## I. INTRODUCTION

This article studies the motif of the king's rage in v. 7 of Matthew's version of the Parable of the Great Supper in Mt 22,1-14. Most scholars see in the motif of the king's rage the concept of the Salvation History which indicates that God has definitely rejected the disobedient Israel and opened up the messianic banquet for those who would not even expect to get there. We shall argue that Matthew uses rhetoric of a negative foil which aims at turning the audience's back upon Judaism and asking them for total loyalty solely to God because, by sacking the Jewish city, God has turned his back on Judaism. In an attempt to sort out the origin and the function of the motif of

the rage in the Parable, we shall follow three steps. First, with the help of the *Critical Edition of Q*<sup>1</sup> (CrEd), we shall read the text of Q. This text represents what can be called the majority opinion<sup>2</sup>. Second, we shall examine Matthew's deviations from Q as a composition on the evangelist's part. A few scholars keep stressing that the extra material in Mt stems either from a special source known to the evangelist or from Q. Third, we shall explain the function of the king's rage as Matthew's reinforcement of the call for loyalty already found in Q (in view of his community).

## II. SOURCE

### 1. THE RECONSTRUCTION OF Q

The *Critical Edition of Q* reconstructs the Greek text of Q 14,16-23 as follows:

Q 14,16

ἄνθρωπός τις ἐποίησεν δεῖπνον μέγα,	A certain person prepared a large dinner,
καὶ ἐκάλεσεν πολλοὺς	and invited many.

Q 14,17

καὶ ἀπέστειλεν τὸν δοῦλον αὐτοῦ	And he sent his servant
τῇ ὥρᾳ τοῦ δεῖπνου	at the time of dinner
εἰπεῖν τοῖς κεκλημένοις· ἔρχεσθε,	to say to the invited: Come,
ὅτι ἤδη ἕτοιμά ἐστιν.	for it is now ready.

1 J. M. ROBINSON – P. HOFFMANN – J. S. KLOPPENBORG (eds.), *The Critical Edition of Q. Synopsis including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas with English, German, and French Translations of Q and Thomas* (Leuven 2000) 432-449.

2 Of course the attribution of the Parable of the Great Supper (Mt 22,1-10 // Lc 14,15-24) to Q constitutes a lasting problem. Not all scholars accept that it was in Q. Cf. U. LUZ, *Matthew 21-28* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis 2005) 47-48. B. H. GREGG, *The Historical Jesus and the Final Judgment Sayings in Q* (WUNT II/207; Tübingen 2006) 286. One objection mostly raised against its attribution to Q is that there are so little initial verbal agreements between Matthew and Luke. Against this, it may be said that one needs to take into account the redactional work of the evangelists. Impressive as the number (or percentage) of differences between Matthew and Luke might be, one should not underestimate the similarities that do exist after all.

Q 14,18.19-20?

ἀγρόν,

v.18 “One declined because of his” farm.

Q 14,21

καὶ ὁ δοῦλος τῷ κυρίῳ αὐτοῦ ταῦτα.  
τότε ὀργισθεὶς ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης  
εἶπεν τῷ δούλῳ αὐτοῦ·And the servant went away. He said these things to his master.  
Then the householder, enraged, said to his servant:

Q 14,23

ἔξελθε εἰς τὰς ὁδοὺς  
καὶ ὅσους ἐὰν εὔρησ καλέσουσ,  
ἵνα γεμισθῇ μου ὁ οἶκος.Go out on the roads,  
and whomever you find, invite,  
so that my house may be filled.

The above text is generally accepted here<sup>3</sup>, except in two instances: (i) the presence of the pronoun *τις* and the adjective *μέγα* in Q 14,16 and (ii) the absence of the individual excuses in Q 14,18-20. Before we consider Matthew's redactional work proper, we discuss these in the following.

a) Mt 22,2 and Lc 14,16 mention a man (ἄνθρωπος) holding a dinner. Matthew specifies this figure in the Parable as a king (βασιλεύς), whereas Luke's *τις* is redundant and remains generic on the identity of the man. There are no indications that Matthew's βασιλεῖ was in Q and Luke may have objected to it (22 12 11 + 20). The CrEd and the majority of scholars consider Matthew's qualification (βασιλεῖ) as redactional<sup>4</sup>. In the two occurrences of βασιλεύς in Q 7,25; 10,24, Luke retains βασιλεύς over from all those instances, while Matthew preserves the first (Q 7,25) and alters the second to δίκαιοι in Mt 13,17 (diff. Q 10,24: βασιλεῖς). Therefore, it is more likely that Matthew is to be held responsible for changing the connection of the Parable from a simple man holding a dinner to a king organizing a wedding banquet for the

3 Alternative reconstructions are W. J. C. WEREN, "From Q to Matthew 22,1-14. New Light on the Transmission and Meaning of the Parable of the Guests", en: A. LINDEMANN (ed.), *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus* (BETL 158; Leuven 2001) 661-679, p. 663-673. H. T. FLEDDERMANN, *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary* (BiTS 1; Leuven 2005) 722-735.

4 "Because of his introductory formula Matthew shifted to the dative ἀνθρώπῳ, and he added βασιλεῖ to begin his thematic transformation of a simple feast into a king's more elaborate celebration" (FLEDDERMANN, 723). Cf. A. POLAG, *Fragmenta Q. Texttheft zur Logienquelle* (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1982) 71.

king's son (γάμους τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ). On the other hand, the CrEd reconstructs τις (following Luke) as the qualifying word for ἄνθρωπος in Q 14,16 and in Q 19,12<sup>5</sup>. However, none of these cases is doubly attested<sup>6</sup>. Moreover, τις is characteristic of Luke (21 32 80 + 115). In particular, Luke likes using τις with ἄνθρωπος<sup>7</sup>. It is therefore most likely that the τις in 14,16 is from Luke<sup>8</sup>. Matthew is not averse against τις ἄνθρωπος because he once substitutes τινι ἀνθρώπῳ for Q's τίς ἄνθρωπος in the material taken over from Q 15,4. Matthew's lack of τίς cannot be explained as redactional. Thus, it may be that Luke is responsible for the addition of τις to ἄνθρωπος in Lc 14,16.

b) Lc 14,16 reads μέγα to specify the large volume of the dinner. Mt 22,2 has nothing like this description. The CrEd and some scholars restore Luke's μέγα over against Matthew's lack of this adjective<sup>9</sup>. But it remains unclear whether Matthew dropped the adjective here because of his marriage feast or Luke may have added it. Matthew would have had little reason to drop μέγας (20 15 26 + 31), had it stood here, since he has no problem in retaining it from Q 6,49. Moreover, the word creates no discomfort at all after γάμους so much so that it is difficult to see why Matthew would have left it out. It may be that Luke needs this additional material as an allegorization of the feast which "prepares for his καὶ ἔτι τόπος ἐστὶν in 14,22"<sup>10</sup>.

c) For the rejection of the invitation, there are a number of authors who attribute Lc 14,18-20 to Q<sup>11</sup>. Mt 22,5-6a has three individuals or groups (ὃς μὲν ... ὃς δὲ ... οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ) of whom the last group (οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ) do not just rudely reject the invitation (as do the first two individuals) but they even extend their wickedness to the murder of the envoys (servants) of the king.

5 For the view that there was something like τις in Q 14,16, cf. POLAG, 71.

6 There has been a persistent doubt on the existence of τις in Q 19,12. Cf. M. C. MORELAND – J. M. ROBINSON, "The International Q Project: Work Sessions 23-27 May, 22-26 August, 17-18 November 1994": *JBL* 114 (1995) 475-485, p. 483. The editors reconstructed ἄνθρωπος for Q 19,12 without τις.

7 ἄνθρωπός τις occurs seven other times in the material peculiar to Luke (10,30; 12,16; 14,2.16; 15,11; 16,1.19) and 2 times in Acts 9,33.

8 ἄνθρωπός τις occurs here with a modifier as in Lc 12,16; 16,1; 16,19; 19,12. Cf. J. A. FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke* (Anchor Bible 28; New York 1983) 1234.

9 POLAG, 71.

10 FLEDDERMANN, 724.

11 Cf. WEREN, 673; FLEDDERMANN, 727-730.

In Lc 14,18-20, three invited guests ask to be excused (ὁ πρῶτος ... καὶ ἕτερος ... καὶ ἕτερος). It is difficult to decide between Matthew's and Luke's construction. The CrEd remains undecided and only restores ἀγρόν (Mt 22,5 // Lc 14,18) as the single word that can be ascribed with certitude to Q. This suggestion finds some support from the fact that Luke once takes the enumeration ὁ πρῶτος ... ὁ ἕτερος ... ὁ τρίτος over from Mc 12,20.21 (as does Matthew from this instance). On another occasion, Luke uses a similar enumeration but not identical to this instance in a material peculiar to him (16,5.7: τῷ πρώτῳ ... ἑτέρῳ). But this does not in itself explain whether in Lc 14,18-20 the enumeration is redactional or traditional. One other occurrence of a similar enumeration is found in Q 19,16.18.20. The CrEd reconstructs (ὁ πρῶτος ... ὁ δεύτερος ... ὁ ἕτερος ...) for Q in those instances but rejects a similar enumeration for Q 14,18-20. It may be that Matthew severely shortened the excuses in order to match his military campaign (22,7)<sup>12</sup>. In other words, Matthew may have dropped the enumeration ὁ πρῶτος/ καὶ ἕτερος/ καὶ ἕτερος because it appeared superfluous after his decision to transform some among the guests to murderers. The excuses (as in Lc) were no longer appropriate to Matthew since his intention was to contrast the king's generosity (v. 5) to the rudeness of the guests. Another element in favour of Luke is the kind of negligence observable in the Parable of the Great Supper. Many are invited (ἐκάλεσεν πολλούς, Q 14,16) but only three excuse themselves, something similar to the presentation of the servants in Q 19,12-26 where ten (δέκα) are called but only three are questioned at the reckoning scene. The only thing that seems to speak against Luke is the phrase ἀπὸ μιᾶς πάντες in 14,18a. As Fledermann notes "the expression reflects Luke's concern to remold the parable into an allegory of salvation history"<sup>13</sup>. Based on these observations, we judge it appropriate to follow those who find that Luke preserves the excuses of the invited guests better than Matthew<sup>14</sup>. First, the excuse (Lc 14,18) based on the acquisition of a field has its counterpart in Mt 22,5b: τὸν ἴδιον ἀγρόν. Even the second excuse based on an important purchase (Lc 14,19) seems to

---

12 Matthew drops the third excuse (so Lc 14,20) because he has already transformed his story to a marriage feast. He also transforms some among the guests (οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ) to murderers of the servants in 22,6 in view of the military confrontation in the following verse.

13 FLEDDERMANN, 728.

14 WEREN, 673; FLEDDERMANN, 727-728.

filter through Matthew's τὴν ἐμπορίαν αὐτοῦ (22,5b). Second, most of words used in the section (Lc 14,18-20) are Q words<sup>15</sup>.

When the results of these observations are brought together, two differences with the CrEd surface: in v. 16, the absence of τις / μέγα and vv. 18-20 are then restored. Thus, the reconstructed text of Q 14,16-23 (in the CrEd) can be amended as follows:

- 16 ἄνθρωπός ἐποίει δεῖπνον, καὶ ἐκάλεσεν πολλοὺς  
 17 καὶ ἀπέστειλεν τὸν δοῦλον αὐτοῦ τῇ ὥρᾳ τοῦ δεῖπνου  
 εἰπεῖν τοῖς κεκλημένοις· ἔρχεσθε, ὅτι ἤδη ἔτοιμά ἐστιν.  
 18 καὶ ἤρξαντο παραιτεῖσθαι.  
 ὁ πρῶτος εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἀγρόν ἠγόρασα καὶ ἔχω ἀνάγκην ἐξελθῶν ἰδεῖν αὐτόν·  
 ἐρωτῶ σε, ἔχε με παρητημένον.  
 19 καὶ ἕτερος εἶπεν· ζεύγη βοῶν ἠγόρασα πέντε  
 καὶ πορεύομαι δοκιμάσαι αὐτά· ἐρωτῶ σε,  
 ἐρωτῶ σε, ἔχε με παρητημένον.  
 20 καὶ ἕτερος εἶπεν, γυναῖκα ἔγημα  
 καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὐ δύναμαι ἐλθεῖν.  
 21 καὶ ὁ δοῦλος τῷ κυρίῳ αὐτοῦ ταῦτα.  
 τότε ὀργισθεὶς ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης  
 εἶπεν τῷ δούλῳ αὐτοῦ·  
 23 ἔξελθε εἰς τὰς ὁδοὺς καὶ ὅσους ἐὰν εὔρησθε καλέσον  
 ἵνα γεμισθῇ μου ὁ οἶκος

## 2. THE MEANING OF THE TEXT OF Q

a) Fleddermann argues that all three invited guests show that they remain caught up in this world. In this perspective, the Q Parable is a warning that “although the Christians must live in the present eon, the delay should never rob them of their eschatological orientation”<sup>16</sup>. Of course, human life

---

15 The conjunction καί, the adjectives ὁ πρῶτος ἕτερος and the verbs εἶπεν ἔχω are everywhere mentioned in Q. For ἄρχομαι see Q 7,24; 12,45; 13,25.26; for ἀνάγκη see Q 17,1; for ὀράω see Q 7,25.26; 10,24; 13,35; for πορεύομαι see Q 7,8bis; 7,22; 11,26; 15,4; for διὰ τοῦτο see Q 11,19.49; 12,22; for δύναμαι see Q 3,8; 6,39; 12,4.5; 12,25; 12,56; 14,26.27; 16,13bis; for γυνή see Q 7,28; 13,21; 15,8; 16,18; for γαμέω see Q 16,18; 17,27; παραιτέομαι (in the excuses) is used in the gospel of Luke only here (14,18bis.19). Either Luke has inserted the word to Q or Matthew may have dropped it. Since Matthew's story is build in view of a direct confrontation with the king, παραιτέομαι may have appeared unnecessary to him.

16 FLEDDERMANN, 740.

cannot be reduced to buying a field or oxen, or even to marrying a wife but we have some reservation whether Q's Parable simply warns Christians against being involved in worldly affairs or the Parable presents here the all history of salvation. Two elements make it probable that Fleddermann's suggestion is not precise enough. First, admitting that Q records the word of the historical Jesus, one would expect the Parable to be about Jewish leaders. This implies that the Parable specifically presents God's abundant gift versus Jewish (or their leaders') stubbornness of heart. The Parable is an exhortation to Christians to remain faithful and committed to their Lord. They will bear the dreadful consequences similar to that of Jewish leaders (in case where they reject his invitation). Second, if the Christian community represents the invited guests, we are left untold who the substitute guests represent.

b) Weren observes, on the one hand, that the guests let their own interests prevail over the wish of the host to see them appear at his table and, on the other hand, that the host with a damaged reputation surrounds himself with strangers for whom the feast was not originally intended<sup>17</sup>. In this perspective, Weren follows Scott in suggesting that "the parable is a parody of the conventions about honour and shame that govern social life"<sup>18</sup>. The Parable is about God's manifestation in Jesus' ministry. Despite all failures, God has succeeded in his sovereign way to realize his plans<sup>19</sup>. It may be observed that the lower social position of the substitute guests (in Lc and in Mt) provides some support to this view. However, the point is on the rejection of the invitation but not on the master doing every thing to regain his honour. The householder's rage that prompts him to replace the invited by the substitute guests portrays his sovereign image rather than his shameful personality with a damaged reputation. If the Parable is a parody of shame and honour, one may think first of the invited guests who by their rude act have shown not to be worthy (cf. Mt 22,8c; Lc 14,24a) of the invitation.

c) M. Reiser makes a valuable suggestion which, to our judgement, corresponds to the meaning the Parable carried in Q. To him, the Parable with its polemical tone through provocative contrast between Jews and Gentiles,

---

17 WEREN, 673.

18 *Ibid.*, 673; B. B. SCOTT, *Hear Then the Parable. A Commentary on the Parables of Jesus* (Minneapolis 1989) 173-174.

19 WEREN, 673.

is a warning directed to Israel, to bring it to a sense of seriousness of the situation, with a decision now to be made<sup>20</sup>. In this perspective, the Parable would say that Jesus first addressed his message solely to the pious in Israel, its proper audience, and only turned to the toll collectors, sinners, and uneducated people when the first group rejected him<sup>21</sup>. The initial invitation was replaced because Israel carried out judgement on itself by its declination of the invitation.

A further issue to be addressed is the origin and the explanation of the extra material in Mt. It is to this that we now turn.

### III. FROM Q TO MATTHEW

There is a very wide agreement that Mt 22,1-14 has an incoherent and composite character<sup>22</sup>. The internal tensions<sup>23</sup> indicate that the text has followed a complex process of redaction. Mt 22,2-7 has some literary and thematic contacts with the first half of Q (14,16-20) dealing principally with the preparation of the banquet (v. 16a), the invitation (v. 16b), the reminder (v. 17) and the excuses (vv. 18-20). But the section (Mt 22,2-7) also differs from Q with its military campaign. The last section (Mt 22,8-10) shares some common elements with Q on the host's modification of the former invitation to the guests but with the additional story of the guest with no wedding garment (22,11-14), Matthew's version greatly deviates from Q<sup>24</sup>. In our discussion on the redactional work of Matthew, we shall first concentrate on 22,2-7 and subsequently on 22,8-14.

---

20 M. REISER, *Jesus and Judgment. The Eschatological Proclamation in Its Jewish Context* (Minneapolis 1997) 243.

21 *Ibid.*, 242.

22 S. SCHULZ, *Q: Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten* (Zürich 1972) 391-398. D. MARGUERAT, *Le Jugement dans l'Évangile de Matthieu* (Le Monde de la Bible 6; Genève 1981) 329.

23 For example, Mt 22,3-10 mentions δοῦλοι as the king's envoys, whereas Mt 22,11-13 mentions δῆκονοι. Furthermore, there is a tension between the free invitation without condition for anyone in Mt 22,8-10 and the sudden requirement for proper wedding garment in Mt 22,11-13.

## 1. MT 22,2-7

The extra material in Mt 22,2-7 can now be examined. This part of the story narrates a king holding a marriage feast for his son. It contains a double address of invitation. The messengers are shamefully maltreated and killed by some among the invited guests. This act provokes the king's anger and it leads to the liquidation of the murderers and the sacking of their city. This part of the Parable has such inner consistency that it has raised some discussion whether it originally constituted an independent Parable or it is the result of Matthew's creativity. a) Some scholars suggest that Matthew has conflated an independent Parable taken over from a source known to him (M) with Q. b) The possibility of the Q source for this material is a peculiar case which has recently been speculated on based on the connection between Mt 22,2-7 and the story of the king punishing his rebel citizens in Lc 19,12-27. c) Most scholars simply attribute all deviations from Q to Matthew's redaction. We discuss these positions in the following.

a) The second group of messengers (servants) in Mt 22,6 are not only rejected but are shamefully maltreated and even killed by the *λοιποὶ*, of the invited guests. To T. W. Manson, v. 6 recalls Mark's Parable of the Wicked Tenants, and the sending of the servants in Mt 22,3f tells of two commands like in Mc 12,1-12<sup>25</sup>. In this perspective, "the true solution of the problem may be that Mt. has here combined the Q parable of the great feast with another parable, now lost, which was originally a companion parable to Mk. 12,1-12"<sup>26</sup>. It is not impossible that Matthew may have conflated two independent parables in this instance but we are not told how the process of the fusion took place from two to one Parable. Furthermore, although Mt 21,34.36 conforms

---

24 Cf. J. A. OVERMAN, *Church and Community in Crisis: The Gospel According to Matthew* (Valley Forge 1996) 300: "This theme [i.e., God will give the kingdom to those tenants who work the land and pay their fruits to the lord in timely fashion] is emphasized again in the next parable of the great supper (22:1-14). This appears to have been a parable from Q (Luke 14:15-24), but Matthew has made some significant additions".

25 T. W. MANSON, *The Sayings of Jesus as Recorded in the Gospels according to St. Matthew and St. Luke arranged with Introduction and commentary* (London 1954) 129.

26 MANSON, 129. LUZ, 48 also thinks that with some exceptions, "what remains [i.e., the extra-material in Mt 22,1-7] is a relatively compact pre-Matthean parable about a king who prepares a wedding feast for his son".

to the double sending of a servant (in Mc 12,2.4), the first evangelist distances himself from his source by sending more servants than the private envoy as in Mark. This feature is again transparent in Mt 22,3.4 (compared to Mt 21,34.36)<sup>27</sup>. From these observations, we are to infer that Matthew is responsible for adapting the Parable of the Great Supper to that of the Wicked Tenants.

b) For Weren, the king punishing his rebel guests in Mt 22,2-7 comes from Q<sup>28</sup>. He draws a parallel between the βασιλεύς of the Parable of the Great Dinner (Mt 22,2.7.11.13) and the master who is enthroned king abroad in the Parable of the Pounds (Lc 19,12.14.15a.27) and finds an inner consistency and literal similarities between the two texts<sup>29</sup>:

βασιλείαˆ βασιλεύωˆ βασιλεύς	Lc 19,12.14.15.29	Mt 22,2.7.11.13
ἀποστέλλω	19,14	22,3.4
negation + θέλω	19,14.27	22,3
πόλις	19,17.19	22,7

In both cases, the story is about a king or an aspiring king (cf. the crown prince in Mt 22,2); his position is challenged by the citizens of his country; they openly rebel; they are liquidated by the king; the king puts loyal citizens in charge of his cities<sup>30</sup>. It seems that for this last motif of a king liquidating his rebel citizens in Lc 19, 12.14.15a.27, Luke's characteristic vocabulary is missing in the story<sup>31</sup>. For this reason Weren concludes, "since the story on a king with rebellious subjects itself is also found in Mt and in Lk and is missing in Mk, it meets the criterion that is used to establish whether a passage belongs to Q. It therefore cannot be excluded that this story, too, once be-

---

27 Mt 21,34  
ἀπέστειλεν τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ  
πρὸς τοὺς γεωργοὺς  
λαβεῖν τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτοῦ.

Mt 21,36  
πάλιν ἀπέστειλεν ἄλλους δούλους

28 WEREN, 677.

29 *Ibid.*, 676.

30 *Ibid.*, 676.

31 *Ibid.*, 676.

Mt 22,3  
καὶ ἀπέστειλεν τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ  
καλέσαι τοὺς κεκλημένους  
εἰς τοὺς γάμους

Mt 22,4  
πάλιν ἀπέστειλεν ἄλλους δούλους

longed to Q”<sup>32</sup>. The variants between them and the different placement in Mt 22,3-7 and in Lc 19,11-27 are due to the performances of the respective evangelists.

It may be observed that Weren’s contribution no doubt is to be credited for having seen the possible parallel between the figure of the king dealing with his rebel guests in Mt 22,2-7 and the king punishing his rebel subjects in Lc 19,11-27. However, we are not told of the location of this material in Q<sup>33</sup>. The location of this material would have helped to test whether Luke or Matthew is responsible for moving it from its original context. Moreover, even if the model of a king dealing with his rebel citizens occurs in Lc and in Mt, this does not in itself adequately explain its existence in Q. On a literary level, we find it hard to claim the existence of such a material in Q simply based on a connection of few words and from two texts with no clear common structure. First, the βασιλεύς in Lc 19,12.14.15a.27 is not a sovereign king and he can hardly be equated to the one in Mt 22,2.7.11.13. Second, the delegation in Lc 19,14 differs in genre and for its motif from the royal command in Mt 22,3.4. Third, the city (πόλις) in Lc 19,17.19 is an object of distribution (or reward), while that of Mt 22,7 is subjected to destruction. From these observations, we may infer that Matthew still had some reminiscence of the Parable of the Wicked Tenants (21,33-46) when reworking the Parable of the Great Supper.

c) Most scholars correctly argue that the extra material in Mt 22,2-7 is of a secondary character and it stems from Matthew’s redaction of the Parable<sup>34</sup>. The parallel of a king punishing rebels can hardly be original but a quite secondary allegory created by Matthew and then merged with the Great Supper for eschatological effects<sup>35</sup>. To Marguerat, Matthew is here guided by a theological interest. The evangelist considers the allegory of the invitation to the Guest as an illustration of God’s eschatological verdict<sup>36</sup>.

---

32 *Ibid.*, 677.

33 *Ibid.*, 677 simply states, “a) Q contained a parable about a king and disloyal subject; b) Luke merged this old parable with the Q parable of the Pounds; c) Matthew assimilated this parable into the Q parable of the guests.”

34 J. JEREMIAS, *The Parables of Jesus* (London 1963) 68; SCOTT, 162.

35 JEREMIAS, 68 ; MARGUERAT, 331-336.

36 MARGUERAT, 333.

MT 22,8-14

This section of Matthew's version (especially vv. 8-10) has some contact with the second half in Q (14,21-23) dealing particularly with the decision of the master to replace the invited by the substitute guests. But it largely deviates from Q with the story of the guest with no wedding garment (22,11-13). The story of the guest with no wedding garment is connected to vv. 8-10 in two ways. First, the substitute guests are invited in (22,11-13) because those to whom the invitation was addressed have demonstrated that they are not worthy (οὐκ ἦσαν ἄξιοι, v. 8b). Second, there is no restriction and no distinction (or criteria) for the substitute guests (v. 10) to enter the wedding banquet.

Since the story of the guest with no wedding garment has no counterpart in Q, scholars generally regard it as redactional<sup>37</sup>. An exception to this consensus is maintained by those who keep stressing that the story of the guest with no wedding garment bound hand and foot and expelled into the outer darkness (Mt 22,13) is directly depended on 1 Henoc 10,4a<sup>38</sup>. They specifically argue that the agreements between Mt 22,13a and 1 Hen. 10,4a in content, structure and wording can hardly be attributed to coincidence<sup>39</sup>. However, we have some reservation on the "dependence" (or "citation") hypothesis<sup>40</sup>. First, the verbal resemblance (between Mt 22,13a and 1 Hen. 10,4a) is hardly sufficient. It is difficult to argue for Matthew's dependence on 1 Hen. 10,4 simply on the bases of βάλλω occurring in the preserved version of 1 Hen. 10,4

37 SCHULZ, 398 ; MARGUERAT, 327 ; LUZ, 48: "Verses 11-14 have no parallels in Luke and for the most part are linguistically Matthean"; FLEDDERMANN, 734.

38 D. C. SIM, "Matthew 22,13a and Enoch 10.4a; a case of literary dependence?": *JSNT* 47 (1992) 3-19, p. 6.13. A. H. M'NEILE, *The Gospel according to St. Matthew* (London 1915; reimpr. New York 1965) 317: "It [i.e., the man with no wedding garment in Mt 22,13] may be influenced by [1] Enoch x. 4, δῆσον τὸν Ἀζαήλ ποσὶν καὶ χερσίῳ καὶ βάλε αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ σκότος". W. D. DAVIES – D. C. ALLISON, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew II* (ICC; Edinburgh 1991) 206: "Given the possibility that Matthew knew 1 Enoch (see 2, p. 52, n. 155) and that 1 En. 9-10 was otherwise well known in early Christian circles, we deem literary influence likely"; D. A. HAGNER, *Matthew 14-28* (WBC 33B; Dallas 1995) 631.

39 SIM, "Matthew 22,13a and Enoch 10.4a", 6.

40 1 Hen. 10,4a reads "And to Raphael he said, 'Go, Raphael, and bind Asael; fetter him hand and foot and cast him into darkness". M. BLACK, *The Book of Enoch or I Enoch. A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes* (Leiden 1985) 30.

in the Codex Panopolitanus (compared to the emphatic ἐκβάλλω in Mt 22,13) and εἶπεν occurring in both versions<sup>41</sup>. Second, Matthew's Parable in 22,1-14 contains nothing similar to the Enochic account of the binding of Asael and there is nothing in the Enochic account that is similar to the Matthean element of the wedding guest with no wedding garment. Third, J. Verheyden rightly argues that the possible parallel between Mt 22,13 and 1 Hen. 10,4a perhaps would be proof of the influence of Matthew's gospel on the textual tradition of 1 Henoc as it was transmitted and preserved in a Christian milieu<sup>42</sup>. This suggests that 1 Henoc has not influenced Matthew's text. Hence, the possibility of Matthew's dependence on 1 Hen. 10,4 has little to recommend it other than the reference to "binding and throwing into darkness". Finally, the punishment expressed in the image of expelling the wicked into the outer darkness where there is 'weeping and gnashing of teeth' (v. 13) is part of Matthew's apocalyptic punishment which he often uses to link various themes and sections in the First Gospel, inter-relates them and binds them into a coherent semantic world (cf. Mt 8,12; 13,42.50; 24,51; 25,30). To our judgement there are no compelling reasons for assuming a pre-Matthean Parable of the wedding garment<sup>43</sup>. On a literary level, the punishment of the guest with no wed-

---

41 It may further be said that "the dependence" or "citation hypothesis" is shaky because 1 *Hen.* 10,4 is known to be part of a secondary material (i.e., 1 *Hen.* 8,1-2; 9,6 and 10,4-8) comparable to the earliest material recoverable from the first book of the Enochic corpus, namely, 'the Rebellion of the Watchers' (1 *Hen.* 6-11); G. W. E. NICKELSBURG, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1-3; 81-108* (Minneapolis 2001) 165. P. D. HANSON earlier made a similar remark on the growth of the narrative core of 1 *Hen.* 6-11. He suggested that in order to recover the traditional elements of 1 *Hen.* 6-11, one should remove the following verses 7,1de; 8,1-3; 9,6.8c; 10,4-10. ("Rebellion in Heaven, Azazel, and Euhemeristic Heroes in I Enoch 6-11": *JBL* 96 [1977] 195-233, p. 197).

42 J. VERHEYDEN, "Evidence of 1 Enoch 10:4 in Matthew 22:13?"; en: A. HILHORST – E. PUECH – E. TIGCHELAAR (eds.), *Flores Florentino. Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (Leiden – Boston 2007) 449-466.

43 Parts of the targeted verse 13 are linguistically Matthean 1) The adverb τότε (90 6 15 + 21) is characteristic of Matthew. Cf. J. C. HAWKINS, *Horae Synopticae. Contribution to the Study of the Synoptic Problem* (Oxford 1899) 7. 2) Matthew likes to portray his main characters as βασιλεύς, cf. 2,3; 21,5; 22,2.7; 25,34. 3) To "bind" (δέω) is a common term either for neutralizing the demon (cf. Rev. 20,2) or the utter privation of power (cf. Mt 12,29 // Mk 3,27). For the latter meaning, cf. DAVIES – ALLISON, 205.

ding garment (22,13) was already anticipated by the insertion of *πονηρούς τε καὶ ἀγαθούς* in v. 10<sup>44</sup>.

Having now established that the story of the enraged king crushing his rebel guests and latter on blaming the guest with no wedding garment forms part of Matthew's embellishment, a further issue to be addressed is the function of this extra material.

#### IV. THE FUNCTION OF THE KING'S RAGE IN MT 22,1-14

In Q, the king's rage served only to replace the invited by substitute guests. This, in turn, highlights the crucial role that the motif of rage (to the invited guests and to the guest with no wedding garment) plays in Mt 22,1-14. What is the function of this element in Matthew's version?

a) According to Weren, the rage indicates that the Parable is a polemical narrative which reinforces the demands of strict allegiance to the king<sup>45</sup>. In this perspective, the invited guests would then refer to Jesus' discussion partners (chief priests and Pharisees) and the second group does not only include the tax collectors and prostitutes (21,31-32), but also the followers of Jesus from Israel and from the gentiles and perhaps even all humanity (cf. "the evil and the good" in 5,45)<sup>46</sup>. It may be observed that the demand for strict loyalty is certainly implied in the brutal rage of the king. But Weren's suggestion does not properly explain why the destruction of the city in v. 7 is reinterpreted here (see below).

b) Marguerat notes that the rage in Mt 22,1-14 primarily refers to the eschatological rage<sup>47</sup>. If the king gets enraged and punishes, it is because the invited guests with their rude and outrageous behaviours have demonstrated their unworthiness (*οὐκ ἦσαν ἄξιοί* v. 8b)<sup>48</sup>. This last element emphasizes the

---

44 FLEDDERMANN, 734 n. 171: "The addition of *πονηρούς τε καὶ ἀγαθούς* prepares for Matthew's further addition of the Man without a Wedding Garment (Matt 22,11-14)". Luz, 48: "Bad and good' (*πονηρούς τε καὶ ἀγαθούς*) in v. 10. This expression anticipates vv. 11-13"

45 WEREN, 678.

46 *Ibid.*, 678.

47 MARGUERAT, 330.

48 *Ibid.*, 333.

anti-Jewish polemic (vv. 3-7) and simultaneously announces a similar threat to the church. The image of the punitive expeditions in v. 7 was probably prompted by the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 CE<sup>49</sup>. The Matthean Jesus would proceed in the manner of the OT prophets and sharply declare the definite and final rejection of the disobedient Israel by her God. This according to Marguerat is “une interprétation théologique de l’histoire d’une rare audace”<sup>50</sup>. Though this is not wholly impossible, we have, however, some reservation. First, it is difficult to imagine that with an incisive language such as the one in v. 7, Matthew would call Israel to adhere to Jesus and expect a positive and immediate response. Second, to imagine similar threat of replacement directed to Matthew’s church is the weakest suggestion since the criteria for partaking in the banquet has changed and the substitute guests are already in.

c) What is then the evangelist’s agenda in using such a trenchant statement as v. 7?

J. A. Overman takes Matthew’s community as one among the many sectarian groups of Judaism in the first century CE which is getting weaker (or loosing) in its battle with the formative Judaism<sup>51</sup>. He interprets Mt 22,7 as “a thinly veiled reference to the first revolt against Rome, the destruction of Jerusalem, and the anger of the foreign rulers. Matthew connects the revolt, the destruction of Jerusalem, and the wickedness of local leaders with the death of Jesus”<sup>52</sup>. These same Jewish leaders who killed Jesus and who brought about Jerusalem destruction are now opposing Matthean Judaism<sup>53</sup>. It is possible that

---

49 *Ibid.*, 337. SCOTT, 163 makes a similar point when noting, “the destruction of the city, Jerusalem, signifies the final turning away from Israel and toward the Gentiles”. But Matthew simply states that the substitute guests are invited off the roads ‘good and bad’. There is no mention of ἔθνος in this instance.

50 MARGUERAT, 337.

51 J. A. OVERMAN, *Matthew’s Gospel and Formative Judaism: The Social World of the Matthean Community* (Minneapolis 1990) 2.

52 OVERMAN, *Church and Community*, 300.

53 *Ibid.*, 300-301. For such a positive construction of the relation between Matthew’s community and first century Judaism, cf. A. J. SالدARINI, *Matthew’s Christian-Jewish Community* (Chicago 1994) 49-50. To him, Matthew is probably responding to the leaders of an early form of rabbinic Judaism who are competing with him for the loyalties of the local Jewish community.

with the image in the destruction of the city (πόλις, v. 7), Matthew restricts his punitive expeditions to the leaders of the Jews only. However, this generalized suggestion fails to cover up the full image in Matthew's story (see below).

K. W. Clarke's suggestion on the judgement in Mt is the more correct one but it is not precise enough. He writes:

“The Matthean picture of judgment and rejection is not presented as a warning to Judaism to repent. The author believes that the warning has already been sufficient, and penitence is no longer to be expected. Judaism as such has definitely rejected Jesus as God's Messiah, and God has finally rejected Judaism”<sup>54</sup>.

In our opinion, the image of the enraged king liquidating his rebel guests and sacking ‘their city’ in v. 7 can allegorically be interpreted as Matthew's negative campaign to help his community divorce from Jewish institutional and geographical symbols (τὴν πόλιν αὐτῶν, 22,7b) because, according to the first evangelist, God himself has done so. No follower of Jesus (God's envoy killed by the Jewish leaders in Jerusalem, cf. 21,39) should have a tie with Judaism which has been reduced by God to ruins (22,7)<sup>55</sup>. Matthew deliberately locates God (the crusher) in the narrator's side and classifies his opponents as losers crushed by the power (armies) of God. Four elements within the text point to Matthew's negative spot. First, the abrupt intrusion of the issue of worthiness (ἄξιος) in v. 8b. According to Matthew, the rudeness of the invited guests has turned them from the privileged to the unworthy guests. Second, the surprising charge of crime<sup>56</sup> mounted against the invited guests (“murderers”, v. 6). Apparently, there was nothing in the invitations (vv. 3.4) that could lead to such an irresponsible act of murdering the king's envoys. Third, the specific mention of the city (πόλις, v. 7) excludes the possibility that Matthew thinks primarily of Israel at large. Finally, the contrast between

---

54 K. W. CLARKE, “The Gentile Bias in Matthew”: *JBL* 66 (1947) 165-172, p. 167-168.

55 Cf. LUZ, 54-55. He mentions that after 70 the long history of God's approach to Israel is definitively brought to a close.

56 In Mt, the Parable is related during the temple debate and in Mt 12,6 Jesus was already declared greater than the Temple.

the image of liquidation of all the rebel guests and the immense number of the substitute guests filling the wedding hall is part of his bias<sup>57</sup>. The question of worthiness for salvation (ἄξιος, v. 8b) is no longer defined in terms of 'election' as a privilege linked to Judaism (see the contrast κλητός - ἐκλεκτός in 22,14)<sup>58</sup>. It is now the new codes (ἔνδυμα γάμου, v. 11) within the community, totally unexpected and different from the ruined Jewish criterion of "election", which defines who is worthy of partaking in the eschatological banquet.

In turn, the community is asked to pay total allegiance to God (or to His Heir who is with the substitute guests in the hall for the banquet, cf. v. 11) and remain worthy of the invitation. The image of the wedding hall out of which the guest with no wedding garment is thrown into the darkness is particularly telling of this (cf. Mt 8,12). The allegorical punishment implied in "the expulsion into the outer darkness" where there is "weeping and gnashing of teeth" (22,13) is a stark apocalyptic punishment in Matthew's gospel connected with the eschatological wrath (8,12; 13,42.50; 24,51; 25,30). This supports our proposed hypothesis that the destruction of the city in Mt 22,7 may not simply have been an allegory for the final judgement (since Israel is also said to have been thrown out in Mt 8,12) but we should read it as a warning against the attempt to build one's expectations on what has been reduced by God to smoking ruins. In other words, the strong demands for loyalty and worthiness of the substitute guests (cf. vv.8-14) are expected from within the community (which has already parted its way with Judaism) as the only way to escape from God's eschatological rage.

## V. CONCLUSION

In this article, attention was focused on the image of the enraged king (v. 7) in Matthew's version of the Parable of the Great Supper (22,1-14). The

---

57 According to Matthew, Jews have been shut out of the kingdom (cf. 'the kingdom will be taken away from you', 21,43; 'I say to you, the tax collectors and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you', 21,31c; 'Truly, I say to you, I do not know you', 25,12).

58 Of course, the substitute guests were gathered off road without any warning and without selection (πονηρούς τε καὶ ἀγαθοὺς, 22,10).

insertion of the motif of the king's rage sacking a city for not responding to his invitation is often explained as an interpretation of Salvation history in which God has definitely rejected Israel and has turned towards Gentiles. While this is not wrong, we have argued that Matthew uses the image of the destruction of the city (v. 7) as rhetoric to call his community to distance itself from what God has already rejected and left in ruins. To reach this goal, we have made some examinations. First, the CrEd helped us separate what can be considered as stemming from Q prior to Matthew's own rearrangement of the Parable. We have argued that the traditional wording of the Parable ran closer to Luke's version with three excuses which may have been diluted by Matthew in view of his contrast between a generous king organizing a delicious banquet and the rude behaviour of the guests who outrageously reject the king's invitation. Second, contrary to some modern scholarly attempts to ascribe the story of the sacking of the city by the enraged king (22,2-7) and the attack on the guest with no wedding garment (22,11-14) to a pre-Matthean source, we have argued that Matthew is to be held responsible for presenting God as an enraged king who, in an unexpected way, has built a new network of friendship on the ruins of those who formerly belonged to or by privilege should have belonged to his courtyard.