Chapter 8

The narrator's perspective on the temporal and topographic levels in Matthew's story

8.1 INTRODUCTION

Time and space are elements of the plot of a narrative, just as character delineation and point of view are a part. The actions and attitudes of characters are simultaneously determined through the 'time' and 'space' in which they move in a narrative. Nevertheless it is not true that the chronological passage of time, in the pure linear sense, or topographical detail, constitutes the plot of a story as mere stage-room. It is as Brooks & Warren (1970:319) have stated: 'Action is what narration presents....Action is motion, and narration gives us this motion in time (and space). But mere sequence [and space – my addition] do not constitute an action .'

The study of the concept of 'time' in narrative material can take a number of directions. For example, it can take the form of an investigation into *verbal aspect and tempus* in a story by taking note of the variation of, for example, the present tense with the aorist. With this type of investigation, aspects such as the 'narrative point of view' (in the technical sense of the word) – that is, the narrator's 'angle of vision' – can be studied from a particular angle (see i a Uspensky 1973:69-75, 137-167; Vandermoere 1976:52-59).

The study of the concept of 'time' in narrative material usually comprises an investigation into the two 'temporal levels' according to which a narration can be read, namely *narrated time* and *narrating time*. 'Narrated time' is, broadly speaking, the duration of the narrated events (cf Blok 1960:125f). By 'narrating time' is meant 'the time needed to tell the story, or to read it. This time can be measured in minutes or hours, it can more conveniently be measured in pages, lines or words' (Vandermoere 1976:76). An example of an investigation of 'narrating time' is that into the narrator's *change of tempo* between the episodes in the narration. As far as

the Gospel of Matthew is concerned, the large number of pages over which the passion and resurrection of Jesus (Mt 26:1-28:20) is narrated – while the spatial and chronological movement is particularly concentrated, in comparison with the rest of the narration – indicates that the narrator lingers over these events to give them greater emphasis.

In this study I will not attend to verbal aspect and tempus, or to 'narrating time' as such, but to 'narrated time'. When we investigate the narrator's *ideological perspective on the temporal level*, we study the principle according to which the linear-sequential course of the 'narrated time' is organized. An investigation such as this is inextricably linked to the concepts of plot, 'character delineation' and 'space', since the plot of any narrative somehow comprises a sequence of actions of characters who move in a particular structure of *time* and *space*.

As far as *space* is concerned: Spatial order in narrative material is linked to the sequential course of time in a narrative. A painting can be viewed and evaluated from left to right and from right to left without the topography losing its focus. A narrative cannot be viewed in this way. Unlike pictorial art, narrative material is only observed with regard to its linear sequence, after which its topography is viewed in inextricable relation to the former (cf Uspensky 1973:76ff).

With regard to *plot* and *characterization*: The plot of a narrative is the structure of events or episodes of events. The plot is, however, not simply a synopsis (summation) of the linear course of events or episodes of events in a narrative. It is only when we say how these elements in a narrative relate to other elements in the same narrative, and how they function together in an organized way for the sake of a particular communicative effect, that a synopsis equals the plot of the narrative (cf Abrams 1971:128). The concepts plot and 'character delineation' are interdependent, since the events or actions in a narrative are determined by the reciprocal relations between characters. According to Aristotle's theory of literature (ΠΕΡΙ ΠΟΙΗΤΙΚΗΣ), a well-constructed plot consists of the linear sequence of a *beginning*, leading to a *middle* and *a conclusion* (cf Butcher 1951:275-282; as well as i a Brooks & Warren 1970:323-325). The beginning of the plot introduces the action and creates expectations; in the middle the initial action is developed, and a dénouement is anticipated, which is worked out in the conclusion. As the plot develops, and expectations are aroused in the reader, there is a suggestion of reader-association with the narrated characters – that is, sympathy or antipathy.

An anxious uncertainty about what is going to happen, especially to those characters whose moral qualities are such that we have established a bond of sympathy with them, is known as 'suspense'. If what in fact happens violates our expectations, it is known as 'surprise'. The interplay of suspense and surprise is a prime source of the magnetic power and vitality of an on-going plot.

(Abrams 1971:128)

When the successful execution (or otherwise) of the protagonist's 'mission' becomes dependent on the contributions of other characters in the narrative, tension-filled *intrigue* is created in the plot. This could happen as a result of the role of the antagonist, or of the roles of characters who are intended as 'helpers' for the protagonist, but whose perspective perhaps coincides with that of the antagonist. In other words, intrigue is identified when, in the *linear sequence* of narrated events, a *causality* can be shown between the events or episodes of events.

What is the structural principle according to which the events or episodes of events in a narrative are linked in a particular way, chronologically and causatively? It is clear that it cannot only be the linear sequence of the events. By the expression 'linear sequence of events' we mean, according to the Aristotlean paradigm, the sequence of 'beginning', 'middle' and 'conclusion'. Russian Formalism refers to this as *fable*, the material of which a narrative consists (cf Scholes 1974:80). Petersen (1978b:47ff) calls it *story-time*. He distinguishes it from *plotted time*. The latter is called *sujet* by Russian Formalism (cf Scholes 1974:80).

The study of 'story-time' can, besides investigating the chronological causality between the *beginning, middle* and *conclusion* of a narrative, consist of an investigation into the different ways in which a narrator has 'deviated' from the linear passage of time. Examples of such 'deviation' are *prospection, retrospection* and *commentary*. A narrator may deviate from the linear course of time because he wants to acquire additional information about his narrated characters and events, or because he wants to get the reader more involved in the narrated events (see i a Vandermoere 1976:62-76). Such an investigation involves what is known as *besprochene Welt*, as opposed to the 'linear course of events' and *erzählte Welt*.

The study of 'plotted time' differs from that of 'story-time' in that it studies the *structure-creating principle* that has determined the chronology and causality between the different sequences in a narrative, as well as the deviation from this sequential course of time. By 'plotted time' is thus meant what Wellek & Warren call *plot as mediated through point of view'* (see Petersen 1978a:47f).

'Plotted time' assumes at least one 'line of action' which runs through a 'beginning', 'middle' and 'end'. This 'line of action' (hereafter called 'sequence') consists of a protagonist's 'mission' to an object. There can, however, also be a second sequence (or more) in a narrative which then forms a 'secondary' (or subsequent) sequence (cf Lämmert 1972:112-139). A separate independent line of action has its own 'story' with its own 'story-time', which may or may not coincide with the 'primary sequence'. Although a 'secondary sequence' must differ from the 'primary sequence' in regard, at least, to 'time' or 'space' or 'characters', there is naturally a certain association of meaning between the 'primary sequence' and the 'secondary sequence'. This association of meaning can be correlative, or analogical, in nature in that one either runs completely parallel to the other or it is repeated in the other in a symbolic-allegorical manner (cf Lämmert 1972:52-56). These two sequences can also be continually alternated in a narrative. In such narratives the narrator has obviously organized his story according to a deeper-lying principle than the strictly chronological. The study of this principle is the study of the narrator's ideological perspective on the *temporal* and *topographical* levels.

The Gospel of Matthew is a narrative written from a 'hindsight' narrative perspective. This *hindsight perspective* enables the third-person narrator to include two sequences in the 'plotted time' of his narrative, namely the *Jesus-commission* and the *disciple-commission*. The meaning of the disciple-commission is analogically related to the Jesus-commission. The analogy sometimes takes the form of parallelism and sometimes the form of a symbolic-allegorical reflection (cf, in particular, certain parables). Although the sequential course of the disciple-commission only begins with the conclusion of the Jesus-commission, the former alternates with the latter by means of correlative and symbolic-allegorical anticipation. 'Plotted time' in the Gospel of Matthew embraces both missions' sequential course and this extends over the 'beginning' (Abraham, David and Old Testament prophets), the 'middle' (life and work of Jesus) and the 'conclusion' (parousia).

My purpose is to show that the organizing principle that links the analogic pre-paschal Jesus-commission with the post-paschal disciple-commission, in the 'plotted time' of the Gospel of Matthew, is the *God-with-us* theme. In short: The *God-with-us* theme is the core of the *ideological* perspective of the narrator of the Gospel of Matthew, from which he constituted his entire narration (plot) – phraseologically, psychologically, temporally and spatially.

As far as the investigation of the narrator's perspective as manifested on the *phraseological* level is concerned, I have mainly given attention to *character delineation*. I will round off our study by investigating certain aspects of *time* and

space in the Gospel of Matthew. I will do this in two subsections: (1) I will overview the alternation of 'narrated time' with 'direct time', in narrator's commentary, narrative technique, and the alternation of 'narrated discourse' with 'direct discourse'. (2) I will discuss the two sequential temporal levels in the Gospel of Matthew, the function of the topography and the function of the use of the Old Testament on these two levels.

8.2 'INDIRECT TIME' AND 'DIRECT TIME'

8.2.1 Introduction

Stated simplistically, from the perspective of 'narrative point of view', 'indirect time' can be distinguished from 'direct time' in that the former is narrative material in which the narrator wishes to give mere *information* and the latter narrative material in which he wishes to evaluate. Since aspects of the narrator's *ideological* point of view are manifested in 'direct time' in particular, 'direct time' serves the reader as an important indicator of how the narrative should be read.

Both 'indirect time' and 'direct time' are in other words narrative material within the context of narrative texts. Both can take the form of aphoristic phrases or they can take the form of extensive discourses. In this subsection I will discuss, for the sake of illustration, individual examples of short phraseological sayings, as well as the well-known phenomenon in the Gospel of Matthew that 'indirect discourses' alternate with 'direct discourses'.

8.2.2 Narrator's commentary

I have pointed out above (section 8.2.1) that 'direct time' can consist of *narrator's commentary*, through which additional information is supplied regarding characters and events. In this way the following (underlined) expressions serve to indicate character delineation.

Matthew 1:16 – ᾿Ιακὼβ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν ᾿Ιωσὴφ τὸν ἄνδρα Μαρίας, ἐξ ἧς ἐγεννήθη ᾿Ιησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός

Using the Χριστός name, the narrator qualifies the person of Jesus at his birth. By so doing, he emphasizes the continuity between the person Jesus and the 'messianic' proclamation by the Old Testament prophets (refer to section 8.2.3).

Matthew 10:4 – Σίμων ὁ Καναναῖος καὶ Ἰούδας ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης <u>ὁ καὶ παραδοὺς αὐτόν</u> (cf Mt 27:3).

Matthew 26:14 – Τότε πορειθεὶς <u>εἰς τῶν δώδεκα, ὁ λεγόμενος</u> Ἰούδας Ἰσκαριώτης, πρὸς τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς....

The character of Judas Iscariot is qualified on the one hand by his being part of the circle of disciples (Mt 26:14a) and on the other by mentioning – as early as at his call to discipleship – his role as the betrayer (Mt 10:4); it is precisely as 'one of the Twelve' that he is the betrayer (Mt 26:14b). With this narrator's commentary, the 'double' role of the disciples in the Gospel of Matthew is brought strongly to the fore. The negative role of Judas Iscariot, who functions to emphasize the negative side of Matthew's picture of the disciple, comes to light clearly in the story of Judas Iscariot's suicide (Mt 27:3-10). Van Unnik (1974:47f) rightly points out that the participle μεταμεληθείς (redaction material) in Matthew 27:3, which functions as circumstantial depiction ('narrator's commentary') with respect to the motif of his suicide, is not used as a synonym for the verb μετανοέω. The discriminating component of meaning of μετανοέω is 'total about-face', while μεταμέλομαι reflects the thought of 'be in two minds': '...first one did a thing, later one decided to do something else, which of course for some reason or another one thought was the better course. And in that way it [μεταμέλεσθαι] may imply the notion of "regret"' (Van Unnik 1974:48; cf Meier 1980b:338). This use of the verb μεταμέλομαι is also implied by the contexts of the other two places in the Gospel of Matthew (Mt 21:29, 32) where the term occurs (in Matthew's redactions as well). From the context of Matthew 27:3-10 (as well as Ac 1:1ff) it is clear that Judas Iscariot's change of perspective came about too late. Unlike the view of Van Unnik, who considers that Judas Iscariot ultimately accepted the gospel and neutralized his curse by his death, in the Judaic religious sense of the word, Judas' suicide is an anticipation of the fate that will meet the godless at the parousia (cf also Gärtner 1971:37).

Matthew 16:12 – <u>τότε συνῆκαν</u> ὅτι οὐκ εἶπεν προσέχειν ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν ἄρτων ἀλλὰ ἀπὸ τῆς διδαχῆς τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων.

Matthew 28:17 – καὶ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν <u>προσκύνησαν, οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν</u>

Although the disciples function as a homogeneous character with a 'double personality' in the Gospel of Matthew, it appears that there are two groups among them, representing the two 'faces': Judas Iscariot represents the 'hypocrites' as

against the true 'sons of God'. (Peter represents both groups – refer back to section 8.2.2.) Matthew 16:12 is an example of where the disciples together act as a single character. In Matthew 28:17 there is an indication of two groups: Those that προσκυνέω and those that διστάζω. In Matthew 16:12 the narrator delivers a commentary and says that the disciples, after receiving an explanation from Jesus, gained 'insight' into the true role of the Jewish leaders. Matthew 28:17 is, however, an example in which the 'double personality' of the disciples is indicated by the narrator's commentary.

8.2.3 Translation technique

I refer to only one example of translating technique on the direct level, namely Matthew 1:22f.

Matthew 1:21 is parallel to Matthew 1:23, with an Old Testament fulfillment-citation between them, in Matthew 1:22.

Matthew 1:21 – τέξεται δὲ υἱόν, καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν· αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν.

Matthew 1:22 – Τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον γέγονεν ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντες....

Matthew 1:23 – Ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἕξει καὶ τέξεται υἱόν, καὶ καλέσουσιν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουήλ, <u>ὅ ἐστιν μεθερ-μηνευόμενον Μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ θεός</u>

The expression μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ θεός is the *theologische Leitidee* (Frankemölle 1974:7) of the Gospel of Matthew. In other words: This expression is the dominant perspective from which the narrative is presented; this is the *ideological* point of view of the narrator which is here explicitly expressed on the direct level of the Gospel of Matthew by means of translation-commentary. The fact that the translator translates into Greek the well-known Hebrew name Ἐμμανουήλ in the citation from Isaiah 7:14 using the 'translation formula' ὅ ἐστιν μεθερμηνευόμενον, namely μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ θεός, emphasizes the importance that he attaches to the expression Μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ θεός. The citation as such functions as a type of narrator's commentary (see section 8.2.2) and when the Hebrew name Ἐμμανουήλ in the citation is, moreover, translated into Greek, this Greek translation μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ θεός gains further emphasis. The citation's (Mt 1:23)

parallel (Mt 1:21) describes the function of Jesus as that of forgiveness of the sin of the λαός, that is the Jewish multitude – the 'underprivileged'. This 'functional christology', or indeed 'soteriological christology' (cf Balz 1967), continues God's fellowship with his people (= μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ θεός) from the 'time' of the Old Testament 'prophets' (where it has been manifested in the royal messianic idea and liturgy), up to the 'time' of the 'prophets' – John the Baptist, Jesus and the disciples (see especially section 7.1). This does not however constitute the fellowship between God and the nation (the manifestation of forgiveness of sin), but it also carries this fellowship to a climax in that God himself, in the person of Jesus, illustrates the βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν in the world of mankind: As Jesus is the Saviour from sins, he is also the Emmanuel, that is, God in our midst. Jesus is God's epiphany on earth, God's personal historical reality (Frankemölle 1974:18f).

8.2.4 The alternation of 'indirect discourse' with 'direct discourse'

A third-person narrator can also allow the 's/he' characters in his narrative to speak in the first person. In this case we have 'direct speech' (*besprochene Welt*) amid 'indirect speech' (*erzählte Welt*). The former is however nothing more than quasi-direct speech, because it is *narrated* characters that do the speaking. The third-person narrator's point of view is thus expressed in an evaluative manner. 'Direct discourse [*besprochene Welt*]...strengthens its [the discourse's] evaluative and not only its informative function....Direct discourse characterizes the narrated figures' (Vorster 1985b:23).

The narrator of the Gospel of Matthew has used this narrative technique in the form of five expanded Jesus discourses. This phenomenon in the Gospel of Matthew has long – since the days of Bacon ([1918] 1980) – been recognized as a special characteristic of the formal construction of the Gospel of Matthew. Each of these Jesus discourses concludes with a stereotyped phrase, namely καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς... (Mt 7:28; 11:1; 13:53; 19:1; 26:1).

Although the so-called 'New Moses' theology that Bacon wished to see behind the fivefold division (the Pentateuch motif) of the Gospel of Matthew has little support today, the intentional importance of the presence of this 'direct discourse' for the theology of the Gospel of Matthew cannot be argued away (as was the case for i a Schmid 1956, Lohmeyer 1967, Gaechter [1965]:60-65). The presence of these five discourses should however not be seen either as an indication of a 'New Moses theology' (cf i a Davies 1966:23) or as a Pentateuch analogy (cf i a Stendahl 1968:24f; Glasswell 1981:43f) – nor as an analogy with the Moses valediction in Deuteronomistic theology, with the 'covenant' as its central theme (cf Kline 1975;

Senior 1976:673). On the one hand the five 'direct discourses' (Mt 4:23-7:29; 9:36-11:1; 13:1-52; 18:1-19:1; 23:1-25:46) should be seen in relation to the 'indirect discourses' (Mt 1:1-4:22; 8:1-9:35; 11:2-12:50; 13:53-17:27; 19:2-22:46; 26:1-28:20) which appear alongside and between them in the Gospel of Matthew. According to Schniewind (1968:8) the Gospel consists of clear groups of narrative and conversation/dialogue. The message of Matthew strongly builds on the alteration of narrative and dialogue, which is rounded off with the final words 'I am with you always'. On the other hand the alternation of 'indirect discourses' with 'direct discourses' (I–D–I) must be brought into a relationship of meaning with the analogy that the narrator of the Gospel of Matthew has created between the two sequences in his story – the pre-paschal Jesus-commission and the post-paschal disciple-commission (see section 7.3.2.5). Marxsen (1959:64) recognized the essence of this at an early stage when he said that one will have to distinguish between the frame (indirect discourse) and the conversational complexes (direct discourse). The historicization of the Marcan sketch finds its reflection in the frame, and into this frame are built the Jesus-discourses which reflects Matthew's time.

The five 'direct discourses' in the Gospel of Matthew should therefore not be seen as fractions. On the contrary, in an associative way they link up with the former and subsequent 'direct discourses'. The two separate sequences (the pre-paschal Jesus-commission and the post-paschal disciple-commission) should not be taken as being watertight compartments, as though the interrelations of characters on the sequential level of the pre-paschal Jesus-commission find expression exclusively in the 'indirect discourse', and those on the sequential level of the post-paschal disciple-commission, find it exclusively in the 'direct discourse'. The fact that one 'indirect discourse' links up ahead with the following 'direct discourse' in an associative manner, which in its turn continues the spiral to the following 'indirect discourse', results in the seemingly mutual integration of the pre-paschal Jesus-commission and the post-paschal disciple-commission. This is by means of thematic parallelisms (cf Mt 4:23; 9:35 with Mt 10:6ff), cross-references (cf Mt 16:19 with Mt 18:18; 23:13), prospection (cf Mt 5:12 with Mt 23:34ff) and retrospection (cf Mt 14:13-21; cf 15:32-39 with Mt 16:9ff). In this connection the significant remark - already referred to in my overview of Matthean research - by Aguirre (1981:152), in addition to the earlier one by Marxsen above, is important:

> Matthew contains a level of narration, grounded in tradition and embodying an historical perspective on the past – though seen through faith and hence idealized. But there is also a second level that makes this past narrative relevant to the present needs of

Matthew's community. Though neither level of discourse is ever totally absent, in some contexts one level may take precedence over the other, and the gospel will slip imperceptibly from one to the other.

(Aguirre 1981:152)

The analogy thus created between the pre-paschal Jesus-commission and the post-paschal disciple-commission, which has been formulated in the alternation of 'indirect discourse' and 'direct discourse', can be seen as the most important element in the constitution of the plot of the Gospel of Matthew. As far as I know, only D L Barr has considered this alternation of 'indirect' and 'direct' portions in Matthew's story in analyzing plot:

Adopting this arrangement [two narratives connected by a discourse] ...suggests a procedure for determining Matthew's plot: The plot ought to be found in the relationship between the series of narratives, with the discourses providing a means for Matthew to focus our attention on the significance of the action

(D L Barr 1976:357)

Although Barr did not approach this alternation from the perspective of 'narrative point of view' analysis, he nevertheless saw that alternation of 'indirect discourse' with 'direct discourse' was an exceptionally effective formal means for the narrator to focus his 'implied reader' on the narrator's *ideological* point of view. Barr, however, here misunderstands the core of Matthew's 'theology'. In our opinion the narrator's ideological point of view consists in seeing Jesus as *God-with-us* in the ἐκκλησία, in the post-paschal period of the 'universal' mission, in that the disciples ('church leaders?') obediently attend to the 'underprivileged' in the community, just as the earthly Jesus as *God-with-us* and the Twelve as his assumed 'helpers' took care of the Jewish multitude).

An important indication of the analogy that was thus created between the pre-paschal Jesus-commission and the post-paschal disciple-commission, is the striking presence at the beginning of every 'direct discourse' of both the disciples (cf Mt 5:1; 9:37; 10:1; 13:10; 18:1; 23:1) and the Jewish multitude (cf Mt 4:23-51b; 9:35ff; 13:2f; 18:2; 23:1).

The 'direct discourses' are Jesus' direct speeches directed at the disciples, while they inherently relate essentially to the relationship between the disciples and the Jewish multitude.

What Vorster (1982c) noticed in the Gospel of Mark as a whole, and in the parable discourse in Mark 4:1-34, applies in an increasing degree to the Gospel of Matthew, since Matthew developed the narrative technique of alternating 'indirect time' with 'direct time' more explicitly and artistically than Mark did:

> In terms of the structure of Mark's narrative in which narrative discourse and direct discourse are continually alternated and where the sayings of Jesus, as we have seen, often serve the function of presenting norms for the reader, this is not without significance. It gives an indication of how the author wished his readers/hearers to interpret the...story.
>
> (Vorster 1985b:20)

> In Mark 4:1-34, the focus is like elsewhere in the gospel when Jesus speaks...on...what he says and why he says it. The function of the speech is first of all, as with all the other sayings of Jesus in Mark, to create a context of evaluation for the reader. Besides the information it offers...it also provides the reader with norms to evaluate the actions of other characters in the story. These include the disciples, those outside, the crowd and others who partake in the development of the story of Jesus....
>
> (Vorster 1985b:15)

To illustrate how 'indirect discourse' and 'direct discourse' function in the Gospel of Matthew, let us make a general reference to the first 'indirect discourse' (Mt 1:1-4:22) and the first 'direct discourse' (Mt 5:3–7:27) in the gospel. We would point out that Matthew 1:1-4:22 functions as the beginning of the 'narrated events' (the sequential course of the plot) in Matthew's story. In this 'indirect discourse' the narrator offers initial information with regard to the rest of the narrated events that are consummated in the *middle* (Mt 4:23–25:46) and come to a close in the *conclusion* (Mt 26:1-28:20). With 'direct discourses' such as the so-called Sermon on the Mount (Mt 5:3-7:27), he supplies *norms* according to which this information should be judged.

The first 'indirect discourse' relates that Jesus came into the world of mankind as *God-with-us*, to begin his mission. The theme of the mission and the *dramatis personae* are announced, as well as expectations that the reader can nurture regarding their later behavior and attitudes: Jesus' mission as *God-with-us* serves the purpose of 'forgiveness of sin' for the Jewish multitude and the Gentiles (Mt

1:21; 2:1-12; 4:12-17). This mission is fulfilled in accordance with the will of the Father in heaven, because in the Moses typology (Mt 2:13-23) Jesus is introduced as the obedient Son of God (Mt 3:13-4:11) who came 'to fulfill all righteousness' (Mt 3:15). He is opposed by Satan (Mt 4:1-11) and the Jewish leaders who seek his death (Mt 2:1-18). He is supported by the disciples who are called to be 'fishers of men' (Mt 4:18-22). The Jesus-commission is a continuation of that of the Old Testament prophets (Mt 1:1-17; see section 7.1) and it is in turn continued by that of the disciples (Mt 4:18-22).

The Sermon on the Mount serves the purpose of interpreting the preceding 'indirect discourse' and preparing the following one (Mt 8:1-9:35). Matthew 4:23-5:2 provides the setting for the Sermon on the Mount: The outline in Matthew 4:23 (cf Mt 9:35) depicts the backdrop against which the discourse is acted out, namely Jesus' mission to the Jewish multitude. This mission comprises the proclaiming of the gospel of the kingdom, instruction concerning the Father's will and the healing of the sick; Jesus adopts a sitting position, as a 'teacher' would, to teach the will of the Father; the disciples encircle him and form the addressees of the teaching; seated in a wider circle about them is the Jewish multitude, to whom the discourse essentially applies (Mt 5:2). The 'ethics' being taught to the disciples relate mainly to their behavior with regard to the Jewish multitude. The relationship between the disciples and the Jewish multitude must reflect in behavior and a disposition that differs from that of the Jewish leaders. The actual 'direct discourse' only begins in Matthew 5:3. Jeremias (1972:23) rightly points out that Matthew 5:20 – in a certain sense – introduces the theme of the Sermon on the Mount: 'For I tell you that unless your righteousness surpasses that of the Pharisees and the teachers of the law, you will certainly not enter the kingdom of heaven.' The command for surpassing righteousness implies that the disciples, like Jesus as *God-with-us*, must be radically obedient to the will of the Father in heaven, by *doing* it (cf Mt 5:16; 6:10; 7:21). This command is concretely summarized in the concluding words of the Sermon on the Mount, namely the so-called 'golden rule' (Mt 7:12): 'In everything, do to others what you would have them do to you, for this sums up the Law and the Prophets.' This logion concretizes in the subsequent 'indirect discourse', the Jesus-commission (Mt 8:1-9:35). The Jesus-commission functions in its turn as a 'transparency' for the next 'direct discourse', the 'disciple-commission' (Mt 9:36-11:1). S Brown (1980:90) put it as follows:

Jesus instructs the Matthean community through the transparency of the twelve missionary disciples. There is a striking tension between the temporal open-endedness of the community's mission, which is limited only by the coming of the Son of man, and its ethnic restriction to 'the lost sheep of the house of Israel.

(S Brown 1980:90)

8.3 THE 'TIME' AND 'PLACE' ON THE SEQUENTIAL LEVEL OF THE JESUS-COMMISSION AND THAT ON THE SEQUENTIAL LEVEL OF THE DISCIPLE-COMMISSION

8.3.1 Introduction

Marxsen (1959:33-76), in the footsteps of Lohmeyer's work *Galiläa und Jerusalem* (1936), has shown that the place names Galilee and Jerusalem in the Gospel of Mark do not merely have *geographic* functions, but rather *theological*. According to Lohmeyer (1942:106-107) the first Christians believed that Galilee was the chosen place for the eschatological fulfillment. As such, Galilee is opposed to Jerusalem, the place of the cult.

On the basis of, inter alia, Mark 14:28 and Mark 16:7 where the place name of Galilee is associated with the parousia of Jesus, Marxsen considers that Mark wrote his gospel on the one hand from the viewpoint of a strong expectation of a nearby parousia, and on the other from the viewpoint that the parousia was expected in Galilee. To Marxsen the place name of Galilee thus reflects something of the *Sitz im Leben Ecclesiae* of the Marcan community, namely the strong expectation of the parousia. He speaks of the congregation in Galilee waiting for and looking forward to the parousia (Marxsen 1959:71). Vorster (1980a:137), however, shows that Marxsen's thesis – that Mark (unlike Luke) did not experience the failure of the parousia to arrive as a theological problem – cannot be accepted without question. In the light of such passages as Mark 13 it seems, rather, that Mark himself began to take the problem of the parousia's failure to arrive into account. The possibility that Mark also began to take into account the problem of the delay of the parousia does not diminish the fact that the place name of Galilee in the story of Mark, apart from providing a mere 'stage', has the function of being a 'theological place'. Vorster (1980a:137) states that it is clear that Galilee plays an important role in Mark, and it is probable that Galilee is over stressed in order to contrast it with Jerusalem, the seat of Judaic religion and the place where Jesus died.

Petersen (1978b) re-examined this delay of the parousia in the Gospel of Mark in the light of an investigation into so-called 'plotted time'. He confirmed the connection between the function of the place name Galilee in Mark and the parousia, and convincingly pointed out the theological implications of this correlation for the temporal and topographic details in Mark. He made the following concluding remarks and on closer inspection it would appear that Matthew used these temporal and topographic details and developed them artistically:

> We have seen that Mark's narrative world is temporally bounded on the one hand by an indeterminate past and on the other by a future moment that becomes increasingly determinate in the course of the narrative's plotting. The future moment – the parousia of the Son of Man – is in every sense the end of Mark's narrative world, because it signals the termination of that world's previous social order and the goal toward which that world's history was directed...the plot of the narrative is oriented to the suspense attending the disciples' ignorance of Jesus' identity and therefore of his role in the end-time process; this plot is resolved not in the narrative itself but outside of it in connection with a projected post-resurrection meeting between Jesus and his disciples in Galilee.
>
> (Petersen 1978a:78f)

In other words, what Petersen is indicating is that the plot of the Gospel of Mark is continued after the apparent end of the gospel, and is in fact only resolved in its non-explicitly stated continuation. Petersen recognized that Marxsen was on the one hand correct in saying that the post-paschal events are not explicitly developed in the Gospel of Mark, but that this gospel contents itself with references to Galilee (cf Marxsen 1959:62). On the other hand, Marxsen (1959:63) was incorrect in thinking that Mark did not after all in some way make tendentious use of the post-paschal events in the plot of his gospel.

Marxsen (1959:62-64), in his comparative study of Matthew and Mark, recognized three things which, by investigating the narrative point of view on the *temporal* and *topographic* levels of the Gospel of Matthew, can be shown to be of particular importance in the above connection. Marxsen's insights relate to the correlation between the commission of the *earthly* Jesus and the presence of the *risen* Jesus in the (post-paschal) disciple-commission until the coming of the parousia; the theological functionality of the place-name *Galilee*, as a 'sphere of

interest' on both of these sequential levels, and the functionality of the *Old Testament* on both of these sequential levels. In the subsections of our study that follow we will give attention to these three matters individually.

8.3.2 The first sequence and the second sequence

In his comparison of Mark and Matthew with regard to the parousia, Marxsen (1959:63f) noted the following difference: If Mark lived in a time where the parousia was expected very soon, then the time for Matthew has now begun. Matthew brings an interim solution, so to speak, when he slips in the mission. The time up to the parousia Matthew, therefore, fills responsibly: πάντα τά ἔθνη should be made into disciples. In Matthew 28:16-20 the 'life of Jesus' is brought to and end. Jesus' time is followed by that of the mission. It lasts at least from Easter until Matthew's time. It can also last longer - actually it lasts to this day. The ending of Matthew is therefore practically timeless, since he lets a new era start, which lasts until the end of the world.

Although Marxsen demonstrated the most important insight that there were two temporal phases built into in the Gospel of Matthew, strictly speaking there are three. These three phases are the sequence of the pre-paschal events, the sequence of the post-paschal events up to the parousia and the sequence in the Gospel of Matthew known as ἡ ζωή (= 'the Life' – cf Mt 7:14; 18:8, 9; 19:17) or ἡ ζωὴ αἰώνιος (= 'the Eternal Life' – cf Mt 25:46). Two 'places' are mentioned in the Gospel of Matthew as the 'stage' for the third sequence, namely ἡ βασιλεία (Mt 25:34), βασιλεία τοῦ πατρός (Mt 26:28), ὁ γάμος (Mt 25:10), ἡ χαρά τοῦ κυρίου (Mt 25:23) and τὸ πῦρ ἀσβέτον (Mt 3:12), ἡ ἀπώλεια (Mt 7:13), ἡ γέεννα (Mt 10:28), ἡ γέεννα τοῦ πυρός (Mt 5:22; 18:9), ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων (Mt 24:51), τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐχώτερον (Mt 25:30), τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον (Mt 18:8; 25:41), ἡ κόλασις (Mt 25:46). However, this third sequence is only mentioned in the Gospel of Matthew (mainly in parables) and not developed.

For this reason the poetics of the Gospel of Matthew displays only two basic sequential and topographic levels, namely the *sequence of the pre-paschal events and the sequence of the post-paschal events*. Temporal phrases such as ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ (cf Mt 11:25; 12:1; 14:1), ἐν τῇ ὥρα ἐκείνη (cf Mt 8:13; 10:19; 18:1; 26:55), ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας ἐκείνης (cf Mt 9:22; 15:28; 17:18), ἐν τη ἡμέρα ἐκείνη (cf Mt 3:1; 7:22; 13:1; 22:23), ἀπ' ἐκείνης τῆς ἡμέρας (cf Mt 22:46), τότε (cf Mt 2:16; 3:13; 4:1), and participles depicting 'time' and circumstance (cf Mt 2:1, 13, 19; 4:12) mark the 'indirect time' that ends with Jesus' resurrection from the dead and his appearance to and instruction of the disciples. Temporal phrases, such as τέλος (cf

Mt 10:22; 24:6, 13-14), ἡ συντελεία τοῦ αἰῶνος (cf Mt 13:39-40, 49; 24:3; 28:20), ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις (cf Mt 24:19, 22, 29) and τότε (cf Mt 7:23), again mark the *end* of the time of the ἐκκλησία. This is the 'period' that begins with the parousia or at someone's death (cf Mt 22:23-33).

There is a parallel relationship, or analogy, between the 'events' of the first sequence and those of the second. The analogy in short lies in the fact that the 'drama', which is played out around the reciprocal relationship between the 'earthly' Jesus Emmanuel and the Jewish crowd, is continued in the relationship between the 'disciples' (whoever they would be in the context of the historical *Sitz im Leben Ecclesiae* – the 'church leadership'? [cf e g Bornkamm 1961; Hummel 1966; Kähler 1976]) and the 'underprivileged' in the community. What this amounts to is that the first level of narration has the second level of narration in view.

This analogy between the two temporal levels can be compared with that which is also present in 'parables', since a gospel as a whole does not essentially differ from that which we normally call 'parables'. From the perspective of Fuchs's 'new hermeneutics', Linnemann (1975:27-31) showed that the communication and ability of a 'parable' to persuade depends on the literary-aesthetic success with which the narrator fuses his horizon with that of his conversational partner (the so-called *Sprachereigniss* that brings about an *Einverständniss* – cf Linnemann 1975:38-41). The persuasive power is thus not dependent on the historical accuracy of the material in the narrative (that is, the 'real world'). It is dependent on the narrator's success in integrating the 'world' of the reader with the 'world' of the narrative in such a literary manner that the analogy thus created between the narrator and the reader would draw the reader into the 'narrated world' without the former making his covert manipulative position as narrator too obvious, and thus lose the position. Research into parables since Jülicher (cf i a Kissinger 1979:71-77, 113-230) has shown us that the *tertium comparationis* in a parable is the point about which the analogy is built. The 'persuasive power' of the parable as narrative lies hidden within this 'point of analogy'.

There is no essential difference between what we called the narrative point of view on the *ideological* level, and what is known as the 'reality part' (*Sachehälfte*) in parable research (cf Linnemann 1975:31-38). The 'reality part' is connected to the 'picture part' (*Bildhälfte*) by means of the *tertium comparationis*. The description and analysis of the phraseological, psychological, temporal and topographical levels in a narrative are thus essentially the same as the description and analysis of the so-called 'picture part'. The reader's association is with the picture (*Bild*) and he is thus confronted with the *Sache*, the *ideology*, of the narrator (the 'reality part') as a result of the 'point of analogy'. In this regard Linnemann (1975:35) states that the

choice of material and the point of analogy depend in the first place on the narrator. The judgment of the listener however is also reflected in the narrative. The narrator orders his material in such a manner that the reader can recognize the point the narrator wants to stress. However, the judgment of the narrator always gains the upper hand. This relationship between the 'narrator' and 'reader'/'hearer' manifests itself in the Gospel of Matthew in the analogy that the narrator has created between the two sequences in his narrative.

Seen thus, the analogy between the first sequence and the second sequence in the Gospel of Matthew must be defined from the *ideological/theological perspective* of the narrator. And it is certainly true that the *analogy* between the first sequence and the second in the Gospel of Matthew is based on the narrator's image of Jesus as *Emmanuel*. Jesus is *God-with-us* in the first sequence and he is *God-with-us* in the second sequence. Kingsbury (1973:471) describes this analogy as follows: '...the coalescence of the time of Jesus and the "time of the church" in the theology of Mt is, ultimately, christologically motivated and has its roots in the pre-Easter/post-Easter continuity of the person of Jesus: The earthly Messiah is the exalted Lord.' We can expand upon this and formulate the *analogy* between the two sequential levels as follows: God came from his domain, the kingdom of heaven, to the world of mankind. Instead of coming solely through the cult, the temple as 'God's home', which had become degraded as a result of the formalism and particularism of the Jewish leaders (cf i a Mt 21:12-17), he became *God-with-us* (cf Mt 1:23) in Jesus the Christ, who 'is greater than the temple' (Mt 12:6).

This 'period' extended up until his resurrection from the dead when he appeared to the disciples on a mountain in Galilee, and gave them a command (Mt 28:16-20). From that time, in Kingsbury's words (see Kingsbury 1975a:37), he is the 'earthly and cosmic Immanuel'. This 'period' represents the second sequence in the Gospel of Matthew.

Of what does the 'continuity' between the 'earthly' and 'cosmic' Jesus Emmanuel consist? We can also formulate the question as follows: In what respect does the 'Emmanuelship' of the 'earthly' Jesus continue in the life of the post-paschal community?

Jesus' 'Emmanuelship' comprised what we can call the 'course of his life on earth', which had the purpose of forgiving the sins of all people (the Jewish crowd in particular, but the Gentiles as well) (cf Mt 1:21; 3:6; 9:13), because God did not want a single 'stray sheep', 'any of these little ones', to be lost (cf Mt 9:36; 10:6; 18:12-14). This call to 'repent' (cf Mt 4:17) remained valid even after he was rejected in Nazareth (Mt 13:53-58) and in Jerusalem at the time of his crucifixion (Mt 29:39). Any word against Jesus can be forgiven (Mt 12:32); yes – according to

Matthew 18:22 – seventy times seven times. This act of forgiveness Jesus did by 'fulfilling all righteousness' (Mt 3:15) which was obedience to the 'will of the Father' (cf Mt 4:4; 6:10b; 7:21 with Mt 9:13; 11:26; 18:14; 25:31-46). Theoretically, the 'will of the Father' is the 'law and the prophets' (Mt 5:17) and, practically, this concretizes in the radical command to 'love' without boundaries (Mt 19:19b, 21; 22:37-40). Jesus' fulfillment of the πᾶσα δικαιοσύνη (Mt 3:15) related to his compassion towards the 'little ones', the 'lost sheep of the house of Israel', the Jewish crowd and the Gentiles, all the socio-religious ostracized people. The following remark of Ernst Lohmeyer (1942:109-110), already made in 1942 about the episode of the cleansing of the temple (Mt 21:12-17), focuses on what the Son of God's obedience to the will of his Father amounts to: The 'new' house of God is in the strictest sense a deconstruction and a reconstruction. The true eschatological congregation of God reaches beyond the inner and outer boundaries of the Jewish nation. It reaches out to 'the lost sheep of the house of Israel', as well as to the lost people from the non-Jewish world. 'many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven (Mt 8:11). Thus God's real community emerge from and embrace all nations, all as guests and children in his house.

Jesus' obedience and loyalty to God included compassion to 'destitute' people, when they were, for example, sick (cf Mt 15:21-28, 29-31) or hungry (cf Mt 12:13-21; 15:32-39). It also included a willingness (cf Mt 26:39) to even give his life as 'ransom' (Mt 20:28; 27:50) for many.

On this first sequential level, at the commencement of his work among the Jewish crowd (and the Gentiles), Jesus called disciples and made them ἀλεεῖς ἀνθρώπων (Mt 4:19). It is through the disciples that he showed his love for mankind, and it is through one of the disciples that he was killed on the cross by the Jewish leaders and the Jewish crowd (Mt 26:47). After his resurrection from the dead, the beginning of the second sequence, the Jewish leaders remained his opponents (Mt 28:11-15) and the disciples' worldly mission to 'all the people' (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη) began.

It has so far become apparent, by implication, that the analogy between Jesus' 'Emmanuelship' on the first and second sequential levels consists in the continuity between the course of Jesus' life and the disciples' worldly mission, respectively. Just as the course of Jesus' life illustrates the way in which one is obedient to the will of the Father – as it is in the 'kingdom of heaven' – the worldly mission of the disciples continues, in the context of the ἐκκλησία, the manifestation of *God-with-us*. In the first sequence the disciples, John the Baptist and Jesus all announced the arrival of the kingdom of heaven. Jesus as Emmanuel embodied in

himself what had been announced. This can be labelled the *indicative*. The twelve disciples were to help him in the task and continue the function after the resurrection. This can be labelled the *imperative*.

The disciples' worldly mission during the second sequence consists, according to Matthew 28:19-20a of 'making disciples of all nations' (= πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη). These events are qualified by two participial clauses. (The participle πορευθέντες does not function as an independent imperative, but rather as an auxiliary verb which should be read together with the imperative μαθητεύσατε – cf Schlatter 1963:23.) This participle implies that the disciples should go, like Jesus as Emmanuel went and made disciples. There is the *baptizing* (βαπτίζοντες) of all nations to make them part of God's domain (cf Wilckens 1980:11). This way they could begin to follow the 'path of righteousness', just as the baptism of Jesus as Emmanuel introduced his way of πᾶσα δικαιοσύνη. It is therefore also an *instruction* (διδάσκοντες) to the baptized to do everything that Jesus as Emmanuel did himself, and taught. Both 'disciples' and 'the baptized' are subjected to the radical command of absolute obedience to the will of the Father, as is the case in the βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, and as illustrated by Jesus Emmanuel as the incarnate βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν on the first sequential level. The positional function of Matthew 28:16-20 can thus, in the light of the foregoing argument, be described as that of a *transparency*. 'Transparency' is, to our mind, more correct than 'synopsis' by which Hubbard (1974:135), inter alia, refers to the function of Matthew 28:16-20.

8.3.3 The first topographic level and the second topographic level

The topographic details in Matthew's gospel are inextricably associated with the facts mentioned in the previous section. Marxsen observed that Matthew took over from Mark the global space against which the Gospel of Mark was played out, namely *Galilee against Jerusalem* (cf Lightfoot 1938; Kelber 1974; Malbon 1982; Van Iersel 1982; Van Eck 1988), but not without theologically tendentious variation. Although the function of topography as mere 'stage-room' remained the same in the Gospel of Matthew as in the Gospel of Mark, it changed as 'interest space'. (For an explanation of the terminology, see Vandermoere 1976:32-33; Van Eck 1990:57-61.) Marxsen (1952:62) formulates this 'change', according to the insights of his time by stating that, from the viewpoint of Mark, because the decisive actions of Jesus takes place in Galilee, Galilee becomes the place where the believing community is waiting in the light of the nearby parousia. In Matthew it is exactly the opposite. Because Jesus worked in Galilee, *Galilee of the Gentiles* is 'ennobled'.

It is against this background that the 'theological place' (*teologische Ort*) in which the first sequence is played out in the Gospel of Matthew, should be seen as *analogous* to the 'theological place' of the second sequence. In the Gospel of Matthew, Galilee, set against Jerusalem, functions just as the protagonist Jesus, set against the Jewish leaders on the level of the first sequence, and as the disciples (the 'church leaders'?), set against the Jewish leaders on the level of the second sequence.

Apart from the fatal journey to Jerusalem (cf Mt 19:1), Galilee was the place in which Jesus' activities took place (cf Mt 4:12, 18, 23) – particulariy in the vicinity of Capernaum (cf Mt 8-9; 11:23; 17:24). In the Gospel of Matthew Capernaum is called 'his own town' (Mt 9:1), where he 'lived' (Mt 4:13) and perhaps had a 'house' (Mt 9:10, 28; 12:46; 13:1; 13:36; 17:25). *From Galilee* the news about Jesus spread all over Syria (Mt 4:24) and it was *to Galilee* that the Jewish crowd came from the Decapolis, Jerusalem, Judea and the region across the Jordan, to be with Jesus (Mt 4:25). When Jesus left Galilee, it was only for a short period (cf, e g, Mt 3:13-4:13; 8:23-9:1; 16:13-20). On one occasion, when Jesus went to the area of Tyre and Sidon, it seemed that he had only just crossed the border, because the narrator says that the Canaanite woman *from* that vicinity came *to* him (Mt 15:21-28).

Galilee is therefore on the one hand the place where the 'earthly' Jesus came as *Emmanuel* to offer the Jewish crowd and the Gentiles forgiveness for sin. This act of forgiving sin concretized in preaching, teaching and healing. The nature of Jesus' actions was in sharp contrast to that of the Jewish leaders. In Matthew 4:23, for example, the expression ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν, and the personal pronoun αὐτῶν, in particular, expresses the distance and opposition between Jesus and the Jewish leaders (cf Walker 1967:35). Galilee was also the place where the 'risen' Jesus commanded his disciples to begin their mission among all the people, the Gentiles and the Jewish crowd (Mt 28:16-20).

On the other hand, Galilee, as represented by the Galilean towns of Nazareth (Mt 13:53-58), Capernaum, Gorazin and Bethsaida (Mt 11:20-24), rejected Jesus and thus became one with Jerusalem, the 'theological place' of the antagonist, the Jewish leaders. Wolfgang Trilling (1964:132) formulates this phenomenon with great insight by stating that for Matthew Capernaum is the paradigm of the blessed, but an unrepentant and therefore rejected city. In this sense it serves as the Galilean counterpart of Jerusalem.

Jerusalem is the dwelling place of the Jewish leaders (cf Mt 2:4; 21:23; 26:3, 47; 27:1). Jerusalem is the 'place where Jesus must die' (Mt 16:21). When the narrator refers to 'Jerusalem', he refers to those who 'kill the prophets' (Mt 23:37). And this is ironic, because in ancient Zionist theology Jerusalem and the temple

(inseparably linked to Jerusalem) are the 'place' where God is Emmanuel for his people (cf i a Is 7:14; 8:6). In the intellectual climate of the pre-exilic prophets and Deuteronomistic theology Jerusalem was branded as the symbol of formalism, and in Matthew's view, also the symbol of particularism. In short, *Jerusalem and the temple* were an anomaly, because as *Moses' seat* (Mt 23:2) – the *center of the Torah* – it was in reality a σκάνδαλον.

In Matthew 13:41, the expression τὸ σκάνδαλον is identified with someone who commits ἀνομία and must therefore be removed from the βασιλεία. In Matthew 21:43, in a parable with a frame of reference that does not differ much from that of the parable in Matthew 13:24-30, 36-43, it is said that the βασιλεία will be given to a ἔθνει ποιοῦντι τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτῆς. Lohmeyer (1942:107) sees here a reference to the logion regarding the 'breaking down' and the 'building up' of the temple as well as the motivation for Jesus' leaving Galilee and going to Jerusalem. Jesus' work would have been incomplete had he not *profaned* the Jerusalem cult as 'the holy midst of nation and country', *that* is, *sanctified* it 'for all nations'. Jesus Emmanuel replaces in his person as such the Jerusalem cult and puts a dynamic cult in its place – purified from formalism and particularism.

It is ironic that it was the Jewish leaders who put Jesus to death, and that it was precisely as a result of his death that the Jerusalem cult was indirectly set aside by the Jewish leaders. According to Lohmeyer (1942:107) the Jewish temple and priesthood, to whom the eschatological downfall is announced, and who even under the cross jeered: 'You, who said you can destroy the temple and rebuild it in three days, save yourself', mustered all outward resistance, took Jesus prisoner and handed him over to be crucified. But Jesus' death also destroyed the Jewish cult, since the veil of the temple teared, and the Holy of holies was profaned.

The topographic opposition between Galilee and Jerusalem – which in the first place serves as the 'place' within which the opposition between the protagonist and the antagonist on the level of the first sequence is played out – therefore serves in the second place as the essential analogy for the opposition that the ἐκκλησία, on the level of the second sequence, experience from the side of the post-paschal Jewish leaders. 'Εκκλησία (a word used only by Matthew in the gospels – see Mt 16:18; 18:17) is the 'place' where the disciples (the 'church leaders'?) and the socioreligious ostracized people among the Jewish community come together (συμφωνήσωσιν – Mt 18:19) as ἀδελφοί and where the 'risen' Jesus as *God-with-us* is conditionally ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν.

Seyne Freyne, however, makes no distinction between the different roles that the Jewish leaders and the Jewish crowd fulfill in the Gospel of Matthew. He therefore does not see the function of 'Galilee of the Gentiles' as 'interest space'.

He thus formulates his view about Galilee and Jerusalem in the Gospel of Matthew in a somewhat inadequate way:

> Galilee as the place of Jesus' ministry, which had to be vindicated by an appeal to Scripture, has receded somewhat from the Evangelist's perspective and instead the 'lost sheep of the house of Israel' or all the 'cities of Israel' are theological expressions for all the Jewish territory where the mission of Jesus and subsequently that of the church was conducted. The rejection of this mission by Israel is consciously linked to the judgment of God on Jerusalem whose destruction is seen as the punishment of an unfaithful people and its city (23:29-39).
>
> (Freyne 1980:363)

Against the background of the results of our own study, Galilee, as the 'place of the Gentiles', the 'place' where Jesus encountered the destitute Jewish crowd and Gentiles, functions as the essential analogy with regard to the second sequence, in that the disciples, in their execution of the mission to the Gentiles, amid the opposition, run the danger of neglecting the 'underprivileged'. The Jewish crowd (= the 'lost sheep of the house of Israel') may not be spurned during the post-paschal universal mission; even if they have declared that they and their children are responsible for the blood of Jesus (cf Mt 27:25). Just as the Jewish multitude's 'straying' during the first sequence is the direct result of the sort of 'leadership' that they experience from the Jewish leaders as 'blind leaders', they can also stray during the second sequence, if the disciples (the 'church leaders'?) show the same attitude as the Jewish leaders. According to Matthew 18:1-35 such a 'straying' would take place if the disciples did not recognize that in God's kingdom nobody is 'greater' than another, but that all were 'brothers', forgiving one another's sins.