

Dr. David Turner, Matthew

Lecture 9B – Matthew 21-22: The Triumphal Entry and the Tragic Aftermath

Greetings once again, this is David Turner, and this is lecture 9b in our Matthew class. In this lecture, we're going to try to cover some of the high points in Matthew 21 and 22. Our Lord Jesus has arrived in Jerusalem, and the so-called triumphal entry occurs, but the results are tragic.

We have much to cover, so we'll be moving rather rapidly. As far as the triumphal entry goes, let's look at it this way. The scene played out at Jesus' entry into Jerusalem is a familiar one.

A conquering king parades triumphantly into a city with all the trappings of glory and power. But there's something very strange about this triumphal entry. The king is clothed simply, not in royal robes or in full military splendor.

He rides an unpretentious young donkey, not a dashing war horse. He's meek, not militaristic. His entry sends mixed signals, and it's no wonder that all Jerusalem is perplexed about his identity.

Paradoxically, Jesus' entry combines the trappings of power and glory with the imagery of humility. Throughout his ministry, his teaching is an example of exalted humility and downplayed pride. Check out those words in your concordance.

The so-called triumphal entry, therefore, epitomizes the upside-down values of Jesus' kingdom. Jesus radically shifts the world's paradigm of greatness, which is to be found in humble service, not arrogant rule. But for a very different picture, one of Jesus' return and judgment, see Revelation 19.11 and following.

There's much irony in the shouts of the crowd. They are, at the same time, correct and incorrect. They're correct in ascribing messianic language to Jesus, but incorrect in their understanding of the meaning of that messianic language.

They rightly quote messianic texts, but they wrongly model their Messiah after a conquering military hero. And this is not surprising, since even the disciples have not yet grasped that quote, among you it will be different, 2026. For this reason, the triumphal entry is also, as we've said, a tragic entry.

Now we move on quickly to the clearing or cleansing of the temple in 21:12-17. Unexpectedly, Jesus' first action upon entering Jerusalem is not to deliver it from the oppressive Roman occupying forces, but rather to deliver it from its own hypocrisy.

Instead of directly threatening the status quo, he confronts the temple, the religious center of Israel, and its established leadership. Instead of being a house of prayer, the temple has been perverted into a center of commercial activity.

It's not completely clear whether Jesus objected to commerce in the outer temple courts as a matter of principle, or whether his actions were directed against unscrupulous greed which capitalized upon the sincere religious motives of the religious pilgrims. At any rate, it is significant that his major activities in the temple are directed against hypocrisy and in behalf of the needy. As did the prophets before him, Jesus spoke and acted against the corruption of Israel's established worship and for those who are without status.

Therefore, Jesus' acts in the temple argue the eschatological reversal in which the meek will inherit the earth, while corrupt leaders will be brought low. The Christology implicit in this episode is impressive. Jesus' healing in the temple, as well as his earlier cleansing it, both demonstrate what he said earlier in 12.6, one greater than the temple is here.

When Jesus cites Psalm 8:2 to vindicate the children's praise, he implicitly claims to be worthy of the praise and worship which the psalm directs to God the creator. For Matthew, such insight is due to divine revelation, not human intellect or intuition, according to 11:25. So it's altogether fitting that mere children have a better grasp of Jesus' identity than the established hierarchy of Israel. Now the matter of whether the clearing of the temple is a renewal or a destruction.

It's been common to view Jesus' actions in the temple as an act of correction or purification. But some argue that Jesus was not so much reforming the temple as he was announcing its doom. Jesus did in fact predict the destruction of the temple in 24:2, but the activities portrayed in the gospels did not confront the sacrificial ministry of the temple, but the commercial enterprises which were parasitic to it.

Jesus did not interfere with the priests, but with those engaged in financial transactions. In the Old Testament, the prophets commonly denounced the corruption of the temple and its priests, but such oracles did not oppose the sacrificial system itself, but abuses of it. For example, look at 1 Samuel 22:18 and 19, Isaiah 28:7, Jeremiah 6:13, Ezekiel 8 through 10, Hosea 4:4 to 6, Micah 3:11, and Zephaniah 3:4. The corruption of Jerusalem in the temple is also cited in later Jewish texts of the intertestamental period.

The cleansing of the temple was an act that symbolized both the reformation of abuses of the temple and the judgment to come if the abuses continued. Protests against the corruption of the temple and the prediction of its future destruction are not mutually exclusive, especially when there was hope for repentance, according to 23:39, and hope for the rise of an eschatological temple, Ezekiel 40 to 48. Genuine

prophetic activity in the Old Testament not only predicts judgment and hope, but also confronts present abandonment of Israel's covenant obligations.

It may be that Matthew saw in Jesus' acts a fulfillment of the Lord suddenly coming into his temple in Malachi 3:1 and following. Another possibility is stated as the most likely translation of Zechariah 14:21, which envisions a day in which there will be no more merchants in the house of the Lord. Now, the cursing of the fig tree in Matthew 21:18 to 22.

The cursing of the fig tree is the third symbolic act of Jesus in this context. Jesus has ridden a donkey's colt into the city and cleared its temple of commercial activity. These acts respectively convey Jesus' kingly and prophetic roles.

The prophetic role continues in the cursing of the fig tree, which by all accounts is seemingly one of the strangest things Jesus ever did. But if one consults the Old Testament passages cited above in the notes on, well, excuse me, if one consults the Old Testament passages we've talked about previously, one will recognize that such prophetic acted parables were often strange. The rebuke or cursing of the fig tree conveys two theological lessons.

First, the barren fig tree pictures the fruitless Jewish leaders whose temple was so recently cleared. The readers have less appreciation for Jesus than the children do, 21:15, and 16. They look at Jesus' undeniable miracles and question Jesus' authority instead of praising God for his blessings.

The fruitlessness of the leaders has been stressed all along in Matthew. It's pointed out very strongly again here, but Jesus' full and final denunciation is yet to come in chapter 23. The rejection of God's messengers will have consequences.

Second, the weak disciples still need to develop faith in the power of God to answer their prayers. Their little faith has been rebuked by Jesus several times before, and once again, they're acknowledged to grow in this faith. They're challenged to grow in their faith.

It's appropriate that this lesson occurs in a context connected with the temple, since it's called a house of prayer for all nations in 21:13 and compared to Isaiah 56:7. Perhaps the reason these two seemingly unrelated lessons are put together here is to contrast the fruitlessness of the unbelieving Jewish leaders with the potential fruitfulness of Jesus' believing disciples. And now, as we quickly go along here, the authority of Jesus and John, the issue that comes up in chapter 21, verses 23 to 32. The question put to Jesus about the source of his authority is not an innocent one.

Matthew's narrative of Jesus' powerful words and works has repeatedly made plain to Jewish leaders that Jesus' authority is from heaven. For example, 7:28, 29, 9:1

through 8:12, 6:8, 28, 38, 41 and 42, chapter 15:1 through 12 and 16:1. But the leaders are less perceptive than the crowd they presume to lead, since even the crowd regards John and Jesus as prophets. The leader's question here is motivated by animosity and probably by the desire to trap Jesus into saying something that could be construed as blasphemy.

But Jesus turns the tables, so to speak, on this line of questioning by asking the leaders a question they dare not answer, the question about the source of John's authority, 21:25. Then he asked them to respond to a parable about two sons, and this time they do answer with devastating consequences, 21:28 to 31. Their sin is not only refusing to perform what they promised, like the second son, it's also refusing to follow the example of the first son, who stands for the tax collectors and prostitutes whose repentance ought to have influenced the leaders to repent, 21:32.

Jesus' actions in the temple demonstrate his authority over it. There is one here who is even greater than the temple, according to 12:6. It's clear from this passage that being a disciple of the kingdom involves deeds, not mere words. One's initial words may be reversed by one's subsequent deeds, and deeds are what matters.

It is nothing less than astonishing to think that the temple officials, despite their knowledge of the law and their religious occupation, do not perform the will of the Father. Even more so astonishing to contemplate the grace of God in drawing notorious sinners in repentance into the kingdom. Go back and check out 9:10 to 13.

This passage warns Christians today not to assume upon their own supposed righteous standing before God and not to assume that the unrighteous status of notorious sinners can't change. One dare not be complacent about one's own supposed righteousness any more than the supposed unrighteousness of another. The call of the Father into the kingdom is still powerful today, but entrance into the kingdom is promised not to those who merely say, Lord, Lord, but to those who actually do the will of the Father.

Back to 7:21. Now, a few comments here in this passage on Israel and the church. It's been common for Christian exegetes to view the parable of the two sons in terms of redemptive history, with the first son, who initially refused but later obeyed, representing the Gentiles, and the second son, who initially promised but later refused, representing Israel.

However, this interpretation posits something not found in the context, the relation of Jews and Gentiles in God's overall plan. The contextual focus is on the response of the Jews to John, so it's much preferable to see the parties contrasted by this parable as groups within Israel, not as Jews versus Gentiles. The messages of both John and Jesus confront the Jews with an eschatological reversal in which unrepentant folks in

the establishment are replaced by repentant people of no status, but the enfranchised replacements are just as Jewish as the disenfranchised former leaders.

And the lesson to today's predominantly Gentile church is to avoid repeating the error of the Jewish establishment, just as Paul taught in Romans 11:19 through 22. And now as we move along into the parable of the evil tenant farmers in chapter 21 verses 33 to 46, this parable joins two Old Testament themes, Israel's God's vineyard and its rejection of the prophets, with the new theme of Jesus as the culmination of God's revelation and his rejection as the culmination of Israel's rebellion. This parable continues Jesus' answer to the Jewish leaders' question as to the source of Jesus' authority in 21:23.

His authority comes from God, the owner of the vineyard, Israel. God is amazingly patient with the leaders of His people who have regularly rejected His messengers throughout their history. Fruit or right living according to the law has not been produced by these leaders of God's people.

Now they are about to destroy the owner's son, Jesus, thinking that this will clear the way for their ongoing authority over the people. But the owner of the vineyard will yet have the last word, destroying those leaders and replacing them with new ones, the disciples of Jesus. Ultimately, God will have fruit from His people.

Thus, the parable of the evil farmers is a miniature history of redemption. It is just as much a prediction of Jesus' death and resurrection as the passion predictions Jesus has been making. Now Matthew's background here clearly comes from Isaiah's song of the vineyard in Isaiah chapter 5 verses 1 through 7. Isaiah 5:1 through 7 clearly decries the unfaithfulness of Israel, and it does so with the imagery of a well-cultivated vineyard which inexplicably fails to produce good fruit.

The beloved's transformation of a fertile hill into a promising vineyard is described in six steps in Isaiah 5:1 and 2. These steps bear much resemblance to the six steps in Matthew 21:33 and 34, although Matthew 21 does not put the steps in the same order. Now let's speak briefly about the way in which Matthew speaks of the kingdom being taken and the kingdom being given in 21:43. Christian exegesis has often viewed Matthew 21:43 as predicting the demise of national Israel as the people of God and its replacement by the predominantly Gentile church.

But what group is represented by the recalcitrant farmers from whom authority over the vineyard is to be taken? In terms of the parable proper, Israel is represented by the vineyard, not by the farmers, who ostensibly stand for the leaders of Israel. This is made clear in the response of Israel's leaders to the parable and its application to Jesus 21:45. They recognize he has been talking about them.

They are the recalcitrant farmers in 21:35-39. They are the builders who reject the stone in 21:42, and they are the ones broken to pieces and ground into powder by the stone in 21:44. The identification of the recalcitrant farmers of the parable with the current Jewish religious leaders seems rather clear.

But if 21:43 speaks of the kingdom authority being taken away from these Jewish leaders, to whom does the text say the kingdom authority will be given? Some scholars take this phrase as conclusive evidence that a new nation, the church, has replaced the nation of Israel in God's plan. But this view is unconvincing in view of the previous discussion of the entity from whom the kingdom is taken. The pronoun you in 21:43 has as its parabolic antecedent the recalcitrant farmers, not the fruitful vineyard.

In the following context, it's clear that the Jewish leaders believed Jesus was talking about them, not Israel as a whole, 21:46. Thus, it's reading far too much into this verse to view it as indicating the replacement of Israel by the Gentile church. Nor does Matthew's use of the word nation, which in Greek is *ethnos*, in 21:43 clearly support this view.

If you study the way he has used the word nation in his gospel. Rather, Matthew is teaching us that those who produce fruit, that is, those who practice kingdom ethics, will replace the recalcitrant farmers who refuse to render the harvest to the landowner. These folks, this entity which does God's will and produces his fruit, is an ethical entity, not an ethnic entity.

In Matthew's view, his kingdom and others like it, which view Jesus as the ultimate teacher of the Torah, practice kingdom ethics. It is they, whether Jew or Gentile, who replace the Jerusalem religious establishment as the leaders of Israel. Further, the matter of Israel and the church here.

Matthew 21:33 to 46 is part of Matthew's indictment of the Jewish religious establishment, whose franchise to lead Israel will be forfeited to Matthew's Christian Jewish community. The nation of Matthew 21:43 speaks of the Mithian community as an eschatological messianic remnant whose leaders will replace the current religious establishment in Jerusalem and lead Israel in bearing fruit, bearing the fruit of righteousness to God. Matthew 21:33 to 46, then, should be interpreted not in a supersessionistic way, that is to say, in a way in which Gentiles succeed Jews who have no further franchise in God's plan.

This type of exegesis really has been in the history of the church something which has sadly supported anti-semitism, and it's about time for us to reconsider such an exegesis which supports a theology which is often complicit in the practice of anti-semitism and the holocaust and the unspeakable things happening to the Jews. Rather Matthew 21:33 to 46 should be interpreted as an intramural transfer of

leadership in the kingdom from the fruitless Jerusalem religious establishment to the fruitful Mithian Christian Jewish community led by the apostles of Jesus. This community amounts to the eschatological remnant of Israel, which continues its mission to Israel while expanding its horizons to all the nations.

It's in the larger scheme of New Testament biblical theology. This eschatological Jewish remnant becomes the nucleus of the nascent church. Although the church expands primarily by winning Gentiles to the Messiah Jesus, its roots in the promises of God to the seed of Abraham must not be forgotten.

What Jesus said to the Samaritan woman warrants repeating here quote salvation comes through the Jews. John 4:22, and many other passages. Now we need to move ahead, well, we need to, I guess, summarize what we saw in Matthew 22.

After earlier predictions of his death in Jerusalem, and after Matthew has set the scene geographically, Jesus' momentous triumphal entry to Jerusalem has occurred. Matthew then describes Jesus' activities in the temple, including the casting out of the money changers, healing the blind and lame, and confronting the chief priests and scribes. Next, the cursing of the fig tree becomes an object lesson for prayer.

Re-entering the temple, Jesus answers the chief priests' and elders' question regarding his authority. This answer comes in three stages, the first of which he poses a question to the Jewish leaders, which they refuse to answer. Then he tells a brief story about a man who had two sons, and then he tells another story about a landowner in his vineyard.

The chapter concludes with the Pharisees understanding that Jesus' stories condemn them, and they're seeking to seize him, though they fear the multitude. Chapter 22 continues in the same vein, with Jesus continuing his parables to the Pharisees, who escalate their plot against him. Moving then, as I said in chapter 22.

First, the parable of the wedding feast. Matthew 22:1 through 14 comprises a narrative introduction in 22:1. The parable itself, properly speaking, is in 22:2 to 13, and then a general conclusion in 22:14. The parable itself contains four cycles of activity by a king.

First cycle in verse 2, second in verse 4, third in verse 7, and fourth in verse 11. As noted above, the parable of the wedding feast is the third in a set of three parables which share many themes and together make a case against the leaders of Israel. All three parables, the parable of the two sons, the parable of the wicked tenant farmers, and finally this parable about the wedding feast originally speak about how the leaders of Israel have rejected God's Messiah and have missed God.

All three of these parables are about failure, whether that of the second son, that of the tenant farmers, or that of those originally invited to the wedding feast, or even the man without wedding clothes at the end of this parable. According to the common view of this parable, the king God sends his servants to the prophets to invite his subject Israel to a wedding feast for his son Jesus. The subject refused to come and kill the king's servants, so the king sent his armies to Rome and destroyed the city of Jerusalem.

Then the guests are secured from the main highways, that is, the Gentiles. A wedding guest without garments, that is to say, a hypocrite, is punished. Now, there's truth in this common interpretation, but it's doubtful that the parable intended to convey a redemptive historical transition from Jews to Gentiles.

Those who seized, mocked, and killed God's messengers are not Israel as a whole but the leaders of Israel. Theologically speaking, then, as it regards the parable of this wedding feast, the conclusion of the parable is that many are called but few are chosen in 22:14. This must be understood as summarizing the point of the whole parable.

The parable then stresses the contempt with which the Jewish leaders have treated God's rule and Jesus the Messiah. Some have merely been indifferent, 22:5, but others are growing more and more hostile. The invitation has gone out to many but only relatively few have responded.

The disastrous end of the man without a wedding garment adds a dimension not found in the previous two parables. The fate of this man vividly pictures the horrific end of those who finally reject Jesus in the kingdom, whether they appear to be righteous or not. In this respect, 22:11-13 portrays the final judgment, but this man has evidently responded to the invitation to the wedding feast and has assembled in the banquet hall.

Yet his garment shows he did not truly belong there. His fate reminds the readers of the false prophets in 7:15-23 and of the lawless ones in 13:42. Through this part of the parable, Jesus warns his disciples that their troubles will not come merely from outside opponents.

They cannot become complacent and assume a notion of divine approval that overrides the necessity of obedience to all that Jesus has commanded. Now we move on to the matter of paying the taxes in 22:15-22. Jesus has been speaking all the way from 21:24 through 22:14 in answer to the Jewish leader's question about the source of his authority.

Here in 22:15 begins a series of three confrontations where the Jewish leaders attempt to challenge Jesus' wisdom. However, Jesus proves that his teaching far

surpasses that of the Pharisees, 22:15-34, the Sadducees, 22:23, and the Herodians in 22:16. In the end, he answers all their questions, but they cannot answer one of his, 22:46.

Jesus' masterful answer to the question about the propriety of paying taxes to the emperor confounds both the Herodians and the Pharisees. The simple positive answer might have been expected from someone who befriended tax collectors, but it would have alienated the Pharisees and those who were even more nationalistic. A simple negative answer might have been expected from the one who had recently been praised in messianic terms in 22:11, but it would have left Jesus open to the charge of sedition.

Most likely, the Pharisees were looking for a negative answer, but they're astounded by what they hear. The anti-Herod Pharisees are told that they should pay taxes to the Roman government, evidently because the providence of God has placed the Romans over the Jews. The Herodians are reminded that their allegiance to the emperor cannot supersede their allegiance to God.

Render to Caesar what is Caesar's, to God what is God's. The inscription on the emperor's coin is wrong. He is neither God nor high priest.

But Jesus' hypocritical questioners have brought the blasphemous coin into the temple complex. So, to conclude, Jesus does not comfort the Pharisees by denying the validity of the tax, but neither does he comfort the Herodians by affirming blind loyalty to the Romans. Jesus has indeed taught the way of God faithfully despite the insincere flattery of his questioners.

Now we move on to the matter of the marriage and the resurrection, a very puzzling pericope in many ways. This encounter with the Sadducees is similar to the previous episode with the Pharisees. In both instances, Jesus is asked a different question by people who wish to trap or discredit him, but his answer discredits them and results in their amazement.

In this case, however, the question revolves not around a hot political issue, taxation, but around the interpretation of scripture. The Sadducees ask Jesus to deal with the notion of an afterlife in view of the command for levirate marriage in Deuteronomy 5:5. They evidently believe that Torah-based levirate marriage cannot be squared with the Pharisees' notion of an afterlife. Or perhaps they just wish to get Jesus to come over to their side against the Pharisees.

Whatever their agenda, Jesus tells them that their denial of the resurrection is an error caused by ignorance. Their view of the resurrection and of the afterlife is evidently one of a mere reanimation to life as before. They're ignorant of the power

of God to transform people at their resurrection so that they are no longer sexually active beings.

Check out here as well 1 Corinthians 15:35 and following. Sexuality is part of the goodness of the initial creation, but life in the regeneration of Matthew 19:28, or the resurrection spoken of in 22:30, will transcend this aspect of the original creation. This transformation renders the Sadducees' citation of the levirate law irrelevant.

The Sadducees are also ignorant of the scriptures, specifically Exodus 3.6. Jesus argues from this verse that God's covenantal loyalty to the patriarchs implies their eventual resurrection, along with that of all God's people. In sum, Jesus treats his opponents' cunning objection as the product of culpable ignorance and bad theology. That's what Davies and Allison say about this passage.

Now we move on to the matter of the great commandment in 22:34.40. This third story concerning Jesus' interaction with the Jewish leaders is the least controversial. In the exchange, reminiscent of the teaching in 7:12, Jesus succinctly synthesizes the ethical teaching of the Old Testament. A prominent part of Jesus' teaching has been his relationship to the law, as we began to notice way back in 5:17-48. The legal experts' question here indicates how Jesus' view of the law compares with that of his contemporaries.

Jesus does not set love over against the law, but as usual, he gets to the heart of what obedience to the law entails, namely, love for God and for those who are created in God's image. If one truly loves God, one will love his image-bearers, according to James 3:9 and 10. When one loves human beings, one indirectly expresses love to their Creator.

This basic principle is the basis of the specific stipulations of the Mosaic Code and of the message of the prophets who sought to call Israel back to obedience to Moses. Other New Testament texts echo this theme in affirming that love is the root obligation of the law. Romans 13:9 and 10, Galatians 5:14, Colossians 3:14, James 2:8. As far as the theology of this passage goes, we need to recall that by labeling Deuteronomy 6:5 as the first and greatest commandment, Jesus intended it to be viewed as foundational for Leviticus 19:18. Can fallen humans begin to love their neighbors as themselves if they have not first acknowledged God's grace to them and their prior obligation to love God? Divine love to humans enables them to respond in love to God and their fellow humans.

It would appear that the theocentric or vertical obligation is the basis of the anthropocentric or horizontal obligation. This is the reason why the statement, I am the Lord your God, appears at the very beginning of the Ten Commandments in Exodus 20:2 and Deuteronomy 5.6. While Leviticus 19:18 may be equally important as Deuteronomy 6:5, it cannot stand apart from the foundation of Deuteronomy 6:5.

Without Leviticus 19:18, one can't practice Deuteronomy 6.5 since one expresses love to God by obeying his commandments, many of which concern relationships with people. Leviticus 19:18 in his New Testament echoes assume one will instinctively love oneself.

Modern psychological jargon about the necessity of learning to love oneself as a prerequisite for loving God and one's neighbor seems to turn the biblical pattern on its head. Compare Ephesians 5:28 and 29. Now, the concluding pericope about David's son is also about David's Lord.

In this passage, Jesus takes the initiative to question the Pharisees, but he's not merely attempting to trap them as though they were him. He's not involved in trying to win a debate, but in trying to win their hearts with his teaching. 23.37 makes that clear.

The issues they have raised, the validity of Rome's taxes, eschatological speculation, and even fundamental ethical obligations, are not the paramount consideration at this decisive point in Israel's history. The paramount issue is that Jesus is the Messiah and they are in the process of rejecting him. His relationship to King David is worthy of their consideration at this critical moment.

The Jewish leaders and Jesus agree in affirming that the Messiah is David's son, 22:42, but the real question is what is the meaning of this affirmation of Messianic identity? Jesus' second and third questions unpack the matter. The second question in 22:43 seems to assume the humanity of the Messiah as David's descendant. Assuming the Messiah is the human descendant of David, how come David calls him Lord in Psalm 110:1? The third question puts it the opposite way.

If the Messiah is David's Lord, how can he be David's son? In Matthew's theology, Jesus' humble Davidic roots are not the whole story. Jesus is also the miraculously born, divinely attested son of God. Matthew has previously implied that Jesus is greater than David, and now he explains why.

The son of David is also the son of God. Much more needs to be said on that, but we need to make a transition to what is to come. Matthew 22 continues to describe the heated controversies between Jesus and the Jewish leaders in Jerusalem, which began soon after the triumphal entry.

The parable of the wedding feast, 22:1-14, is the third in the series of parables begun in 21:28. All three parables stress the fact that the leaders have rejected the rule of God and the Messiah Jesus using images of a disobedient son, wicked tenant farmers, and now the rebellious subjects who refuse the king's invitation. Following the parable sequence, there are three controversial stories that we've just discussed.

All in all, Matthew 22 takes the verbal hostilities between Jesus and the Jewish leaders to their sorry end.

Jesus' parables magnify Israel's rebellion and guilt in not submitting to the rule of God in Christ. The questions of the Jewish leaders attempt to trap Jesus and discredit his teaching. If there was ever any doubt, it is now abundantly clear that there can be no rapprochement between Jesus and the leaders of Israel.

His final answer to them is unanswerable. The only way that David can call his Messiah son Lord is if his son is divine. The Pharisees who wished to trap Jesus by challenging his identity are now themselves trapped by Jesus, who has identified himself as David's descendant and his exalted Lord.

But all dialogue has ceased with ominous implications.