

Chapter 3

The names of Jesus in Matthew's story

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Petersen (1978a:111) realized the challenge of describing the functions of the names of Jesus from a narrative point of view. However, he did not do so himself. In his article he introduced Boris Uspensky's (1973) theory of literature and applied it to a pericope in the Gospel of Mark. Petersen's article pioneered the application of narratology in researching the gospels. A number of publications on the Gospel stories have since been published in South Africa, and especially in North America. To my knowledge, Uspensky's theory on the function of the names in narrative texts has not yet been applied to researching the gospels. The study that comes closest is the very useful chapter III of Dawsey's (1983:81-112) thesis, entitled *The literary function of point of view in controlling confusion and irony in the Gospel of Luke*. Kingsbury's (1986) book, *Matthew as story*, is one of the prominent narratological studies done on the Gospel of Matthew.

Although Kingsbury (1986:1-2) refers to both Uspensky's and Petersen's works in his introductory paragraph, his treatment of the names of Jesus in chapters 2 and 5 (cf also Kingsbury 1984, 1985b) contains little more than the results he obtained with his earlier redaction-critical works (see especially Kingsbury 1975a and the critique by Hill 1984 as a result of Kingsbury's article, which was published in 1984).

Uspensky (1973:25-27), in a chapter with the title 'Naming as a problem of point of view in literature', indicated that naming could be functional in narrative literature. It is a very effective phraseological method for the narrator to use to communicate his own ideas, ideas about his characters, and one character's ideas about another. The narrator can, for example, by using different names for the same character, indicate the different perspectives of each (or a group) of the other characters regarding that specific character, which perspective (and implicitly the perspective of other characters) is revealed by their respective uses of a typical

name for the character concerned (see Uspensky 1973:26). This is mainly true in respect of the names used for the main character (protagonist): '...the author's attitude towards his hero is manifested primarily in his way of naming the hero...' (Uspensky 1973:22).

In his work on the Gospel of Luke, Dawsey confirmed that neither the narrator nor the characters in the story used Jesus' names in an arbitrary or interchangeable fashion. Different characters and groups of characters used different names when referring to Jesus. Dawsey (1983:99-102) also showed that Luke edited his sources by removing some of Jesus' names from the monologues and dialogues of certain characters and character groups and inserting other names in their place. In this manner the Gospel of Mark, as one of Luke's sources, was adapted by removing the names 'Teacher' (Διδάσκαλε) and 'Rabbi' (Ῥαββί) from the speech of Jesus' inner-circle followers and letting them use names such as 'Master' (ἐπιστάτα), while introducing 'Teacher' (Διδάσκαλε) into the speech of certain members of the crowd.

In the Gospel of Matthew one again notices that the Jewish leaders and Jesus' other opponents, in contrast to the disciples, never refer to him by the name of 'Lord' (κύριος). The opponents address Jesus as 'Teacher' (Διδάσκαλε – e.g. in Mt 19:16) or 'Rabbi' (Ῥαββί – e.g. in Mt 26:49). This gives rise to the question of the function of Jesus' names in the Gospel of Matthew. This question, pertaining to the names used as 'titles' for Jesus in the gospels, usually forms the traditional object of investigation when the christology of the various evangelists is considered.

The aim of this chapter is, firstly, to indicate two tendencies in traditional titular christology as being methodologically and theologically inadequate. Secondly, we particularly wish to indicate how the more prominent names of Jesus in Matthew's story contribute functionally to characterizing Jesus as the fulfiller of the law and the prophets.

This particular characterization of Jesus is a prominent theme of the narrator's perspective on the ideological level in Matthew. Uspensky's term 'ideology' refers to the network of ideas and themes appearing in a narrative text, which makes it possible to talk about the ideological perspective(s) of a narrative. In a non-artistic text such as a gospel, one ideological perspective usually dominates. Because the gospels are religious texts the narrator's *ideological* perspective in reality also is his *theological* perspective. The dominant theological perspective of the narrator in the Gospel of Matthew can be summarized by the phrase God-with-us. Jesus' Hebrew name 'Emmanuel' (Ἐμμανουήλ – Mt 1:23) is a direct explication on the surface of a more profound God-with-us theological perspective. Every event, character, and suchlike in the Gospel of Matthew is presented from

this specific perspective. It echoes through every episode of the Gospel. The perspectives from which the protagonist and the other characters are presented in the story, as well as the particulars of the topography and the different periods, are subordinate to, integrated with, and serve as manifestations of this perspective. This also applies to the other names of Jesus which are not as explicit as 'Emmanuel', as well as to the different names of the various other characters.

And it is in this respect that Uspensky's theory regarding the function of names can make an important contribution to the study of the christologies of the various gospels. As mentioned above, we wish to indicate in this chapter how the more prominent names of Jesus are phraseological manifestations of the theological concept of God-with-us. The mere fact that the narrator calls Jesus 'Emmanuel' in a prophecy-fulfilling citation (Mt 1:22-23), is an indication that the narrator's theological perspective coincides with the main character's perspective. This, in fact, means that the dominant theological perspective in the Gospel of Matthew is not only manifested in what Jesus does, says, thinks and so forth, but it is also evident in the names that are used for him, which are functional in view of his words and deeds.

As mentioned, we wish to indicate how the names of Jesus contribute functionally to characterizing Jesus as the fulfiller of the law and the prophets, and that this characterization is a prominent theme in Matthew's dominant theological perspective. Consequently, it is necessary to shed some light on the connection between the above-mentioned characterization and the theology of Matthew's gospel.

Matthew's 'theology' comprises the creation of an analogy between the Jesus events, from birth to resurrection (pre-paschal period), and the church in the period between the resurrection and the Second Coming (post-paschal period). 'Church' in this sense refers to the space within which the implicit reader of the Gospel finds himself, and the implicit reader of the Gospel of Matthew is a disciple-reader (see Via 1980:209-210). This, in fact, means that the actual, assumed readers are associated with the role played by the disciples in the Gospel. 'Analogy' in the 'theology' of Matthew refers to the association between his readers and the characters and events suggested in Matthew's narrative about Jesus. The idea behind this association is mainly to provide guidelines for establishing the correct relationship between the 'leaders' (the implicit disciple-readers) and the needy in the domain of the post-paschal church. By means of this association, Matthew wishes this relationship to bear witness to the love Jesus has shown towards the Jews (and the Gentiles). This Jesus has done by the remission of their sins through divine power, thus executing the will of the Father, the 'law and the prophets' (= the

Torah) in complete obedience. This love embodies the fulfillment of the Torah, and the fulfillment of the Father's will is the way of life that gives one entry to the kingdom of heaven. Although Jesus called the disciples and made them 'fishers of men' when he started his work of love among the Jews (and the Gentiles), their mission into the world only began after Jesus' resurrection. The disciples, as well as the reader of the Gospel of Matthew, have been given a teaching mission. The content of this mission comprises the Torah as the will of God, interpreted and embodied by Jesus as Emmanuel. Jesus' lasting presence as God-with-the-church until the end of the world will become visible in the disciples' obedience at a time when they are busy with their mission of making disciples of others, following Jesus' example in doing God's will. If the disciples acknowledge this calling and carry it out, they will become like scribes who have become pupils in the kingdom of heaven. In the Gospel of Matthew, however, the disciples are inclined to associate themselves with the legalistic formalism of the Jewish scribes and the Pharisees.

In this study the emphasis is placed on the function of Jesus' names in the theology of Matthew. The study endorses the reference made by Gibbs (1986) to the Matthean Jesus as the 'Torah Incarnate', as well as the remark made by Hummel (1966:56), namely that in Matthew christology and Torah are inextricably linked together.

The term 'Torah', whenever used, also has the implied meaning of 'scribe'. According to Matthew we should not assume that a scribe cannot be a Christian. On the contrary, Matthew relates one of Jesus' pronouncements in which reference is made to a scribe who had become a pupil in the kingdom of heaven (Mt 13:52). Hoh (1926) spoke about 'der christliche γραμματεὺς' in this connection. Gnülka (1986:512) interprets Matthew 13:52 as follows: In his lifetime Christ remains disciple and pupil. The examination still lies ahead. In the image of the father of the house, those who are active in preaching and catechism are specifically addressed. They should teach new and old topics. This 'christian scribe' is portrayed by Matthew as the father of the house who instructs, using both old and new material. Such a scribe is therefore also a pupil – an eternal student – who takes note of the 'old' in relation to the 'new', who makes it his own and takes it further. To Matthew this means that note is taken of and people are instructed in the *old* Torah in relation to the *new* events surrounding Jesus, the 'Torah incarnate'.

3.2 TRADITIONAL TITULAR CHRISTOLOGY

The names used as 'titles' for Jesus in the gospels form the traditional object of study when the christology (image of Jesus) of the various evangelists is being investigated. However, two trends in this study should be indicated as being inadequate both methodologically and theologically.

3.2.1 Concerning the analysis of a narrative as such, historical criticism is retrospective

In the first place, it is methodologically retrospective to assume that a historical-critical study of isolated christological titles will be the most successful angle from which to investigate the various images of Jesus presented in the gospels. Initially, the historical-critical investigation placed the emphasis on the origin of the christological titles in either the Palestinian or Hellenistic background, and on the history of the transmission of these titles from the historical Jesus through the traditional layers of Palestinian-Jewish Christianity and Hellenistic-Jewish Christianity up to that of Hellenistic-Gentile Christianity. Hahn's (1974a) widely read dissertation, *Christologische Hoheitstitel: Ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum*, is an excellent example of such a historical-critical investigation. His study was undertaken from a tradition-critical point of view and many regard the book as a standard work on the christology of the New Testament, replacing that by Cullmann (1966), *Die Christologie des Neues Testaments*.

Scholars concerned with the epistemology and the methodology of exegesis began indicating that the historical-critical approach, including tradition criticism, could only contribute towards identifying the historical turn of events in the texts. Kealy (1979:167) said: 'Too often it seemed to be as if the genuine gospel lay somewhere behind the present gospels.' Although Hahn (1974a:9) leaned towards the hermeneutic importance of the 'gospel as a whole' at the time, he did not make use of it in his description of the christology of the various evangelists.

As a further model of historical criticism, redaction criticism improved upon this. For the very first time the Gospel was explicitly treated as a unit. Of importance in the study of the christology of the various evangelists is the fact that redaction criticism takes into account that the theological profile has an individual evangelist as redactor (*schriftstellerische Einzelpersönlichkeit* – Rohde 1966). It would not be an exaggeration to state that most of the research articles of note published on the gospels during the seventies were, in fact, redaction-critical studies. In 1975 Harrington condensed the first decade of redaction-critical studies on Matthew. According to Harrington (1975:388) the feeling at that time was that it had become necessary to do a comprehensive description of Matthew's christology from a redaction-critical angle.

As mentioned in my overview of Matthean research Kingsbury endeavored to fill the gap with the publication of his book, *Matthew: Structure, christology, kingdom*, in 1975. On the dust cover of Kingsbury's work Norman Perrin declared that this was on the one hand the most important work on the interpretation of the Gospel of Matthew to date (1975), and on the other it represented a new starting-point for the scholars of future studies on Matthew. Since then Kingsbury has been

subjected to both conditional emulation (see also Nolan 1979; Meier 1979) and stringent criticism (see also Barr 1976:351; Borsch 1977; Keck 1980; Hill 1980a; Tatum 1981). However, redaction criticism, too, failed in its effort to take the holistic context as well as the literary nature of the gospels sufficiently into account.

And even should one to a certain degree succeed in discounting the literary nature as well as the holistic context of a Gospel by a specific method of exegesis, would this in any way influence the traditional method by which an evangelist's image of Jesus is portrayed in terms of the christological titles used in that particular Gospel? The crux of the matter remains whether, in traditional titular christology, the use of a title by the historical Jesus and the congregation of the post-paschal period is consistent or not (see Balz 1976:17). Redaction criticism itself was not interested in the question, but placed the emphasis on the theological profile of an evangelist as the one expressing the faith of a particular post-paschal community. This approach was, however, still interested in the history of early Christianity. The narrative character of the gospels was not yet under consideration.

Against the background of an exegetic approach that concentrated on the narrative character of the gospels, the following remark by Werner Kelber about the shortcomings of historical criticism is important:

It is hard to see any imperative reason why a gospel christology ought to be predicted solely on its author's use of christological titles. In the light of redaction criticism titular christology betrays an arbitrary quality because it pays no attention to the narrative mainstream, the very thoughtway of a gospel. As for a gospel theology, finally, we must withhold credence unless it does justice to the literary, religious structure of the whole and to all the elements which compose it.

(Kelber 1979:15)

In this study we do not intend to discuss the merits of the statement that the main emphasis of traditional titular christology is on whether there is continuity in the use of a title in pre-paschal and post-paschal situations. Discussion of this statement is itself of great importance and interest. In studying the historical Jesus 'from below' scholars indeed regard this as one of the crucial questions. At this point in time, however, we intend to corroborate Kelber's statement as quoted above. In this chapter we shall endeavor to show that investigations in terms of tradition criticism done by one such as Hahn are not the only ones that are inadequate to discount both the holistic context and the literary nature of the gospels in the investigation of the christology of an evangelist. The redaction-critical work of someone like Kingsbury also falls short in this respect.

Today the methodology applied by Kingsbury to the study of the Jesus image in Matthew is different. Like certain other scholars of the Gospel, he treats the literary character of a *gospel as narrative* with a great deal of seriousness, and he observes Jesus as being part of the narrator's characterization. In the introduction to this present chapter we have indicated that in his latest book on Matthew, Kingsbury does not investigate the use of names as a narrative technique. In our opinion it is this aspect of narration that enables one to describe the image of Jesus in terms other than those of traditional titular christology. This gives rise to another failing of traditional titular christology, namely that the role of christological titles in the gospels may be overrated.

3.2.2 Concerning character delineation, christological titles are overrated

The conditional emulation and criticism of Kingsbury's redaction-critical investigation into the christology of Matthew, referred to above, has a particular bearing on Kingsbury's idea that Matthew summarized the *scopus* of his theology in a single christological title ('Son of God'), which served as a prism through which everything was viewed. However, he was not the first researcher to hold the opinion that Matthew regarded specific titles as being prominent. The fact is that there were divergent views in this regard both before and after Kingsbury.

The following titles were seen as the so-called dominant christological titles in Matthew's theology during the sixties and seventies: 'Son of David' in respect of the 'earthly' Jesus in the pre-paschal period, as well as 'Lord' (Κύριος) in respect of the 'risen' Jesus of the post-paschal (eschatological) period (Strecker 1966:118-120, 123-126), Κύριος (Trilling 1964:21-51; Frankemölle 1974:80, 85, 89, 144, 298, 377), 'Son of man' (Blair 1960:83; Lange 1973:238-241, 245-246, 487-498), Κύριος and 'Son of man' (Davies 1966:96-99), 'Messiah' (Gaston 1975), 'King of the Jews' (Schniewind 1968:1), 'Son of God' (Kingsbury 1975a:40-83; 1977:34-53) and 'Son of God' and 'Servant' (Gerhardsson 1973). According to these scholars the 'dominant' titles function either with inclusion of the content because they are seen as encompassing all the other titles in the Gospel of Matthew (e.g. Kingsbury's 'Son of God' title, or Gerhardsson's 'Servant' title), or contingently because all the other titles retain their independence although as *auxiliary titles* which recessively support the dominant one (e.g. compare the recessive function of the 'Son of man' title in respect of the 'earthly Messiah' title given by Walker 1967:128-132; that of the Κύριος title in respect of the 'Son of God' title given by Kingsbury 1975a:103-113; that of the 'Messiah' and 'Son of God' titles in respect of the 'Son of David' = 'King' title given by Nolan 1979:149, 216-221, 224; and Meier's 1979:118 elliptical

presentation, according to which the 'Son of God' and the 'Son of man' titles have a recessive function in respect of 'the Son' title).

At present an increasing number of scholars of the Gospel of Matthew are warning against an overemphasis on christological titles and especially against searching for the so-called 'central' title in the theology of the evangelist. Consequently, the following remarks by Keck (serving as a criticism of Kingsbury, and of Meier's elliptical presentation) and Hill (serving as criticism of both Kingsbury and Nolan) are important:

[C]oncentrating on christological titles actually misses much of what the New Testament, and the early Christians as well, wanted to say about Jesus....The same is true for the Gospel according to Matthew. This Gospel includes a great many titles, like Emmanuel, Son of David, Son of God, Son of Man, Christ. Yet Matthew is not as concerned to show how these titles are related to each other as are modern scholars.

(Keck 1980:9)

But like most of these who pursue, with enthusiasm and single-mindedness, the search for one overarching christological theme...he (B M Nolan – A G v A) underrates other motifs and has to press some material to fit his predetermined mould.

(Hill 1980a:68)

Keck's remark is worthy of some consideration. Someone of Kingsbury's stature should note that Matthew was apparently not interested in narrating a structure of interrelational titles to his readers. This criticism is still valid, even after the publication of Kingsbury's book in 1986 (which is revised in 1989). It is not the interrelation of titles as such which catches one's attention when reading the Gospel of Matthew. If the literary context of the Gospel as a whole and its time of origin within the Galilean situation in the post-paschal period and after the fall of Jerusalem in AD 70 are taken into account, one can see that in the Gospel Jesus' names are indeed functional. This function, however, is not to be found in a structured systematic interrelation of names with one another. The evangelist applies Jesus' names to serve to project the rift between the Galilean church of the post-paschal period and the reorganized Pharisaical Judaism after AD 79. In terms of this projected conflict, Jesus' names in the Gospel of Matthew form part of the phraseological characterization of Jesus as the fulfiller of the law and the prophets. We will discuss this hypothesis later on in the chapter.

The above remark made by Hill in 1980, can still be applied to Kingsbury's reworked narrative-critical study of the Gospel after seven years (1986). In 1984 Hill expressed strong criticism of an article in which Kingsbury (1984) described Matthew's image of Jesus with reference to the art of narration. In this article Kingsbury made interesting comments related to God as a 'character' of the Gospel, and we cannot fully agree with Hill's criticism in this regard. Specifically in respect of the Matthean Jesus, however, Kingsbury presented nearly no new information. Hill (1984:40) says, amongst other things: 'It looks as if Kingsbury's language is chosen and calculated to *advance his known position*' (my emphasis).

One of the best known aspects of Kingsbury's stance in respect of the Matthean Jesus is that the Son of God title is the central christological title in the Gospel. There are a number of arguments against this. Don Meier summaries his objections as follows:

What the data imposes upon us is the abandonment of talk about *the* central title in Matthew's gospel, along with the implicit image of a circle with one center.... We can certainly say that Matthew's dominant Christology is a Son-Christology. But that should not be automatically equated with a Son-of-God Christology. Matthew's position is broader and more complex than that.

(Meier 1979:218-219; his emphasis)

Yet, Meier is only proposing a variation on Kingsbury's theme. He considers that the image of Jesus in Matthew can be described in terms of an ellipsis. The titles 'Son of God' and 'Son of man' are the focal points of the ellipsis, whereas the title '*the Son*' lies somewhere between the two. At a later stage we will argue that the sonship theme is very important in the Gospel of Matthew, but we cannot ignore the fact that Keck rightly applied his criticism of Kingsbury to Meier as well. Here we can indeed talk about an overstrained system of interrelational christological titles which do not come to the fore in Matthew's theological perspective.

Are we then not also guilty of a 'single-mindedness' and a 'search for one overarching christological theme' (see Hill above) when we maintain that the *Emmanuel* title is the dominant perspective of the theology of Matthew (see Van Aarde 1982a)? No. The difference is that we do not consider that the *Emmanuel* title functions as an inclusive title, encompassing all the other christological titles. Neither do we argue that the *Emmanuel* title functions as the center of an ellipsis, recessively integrating all the other titles. As a Hebrew name *Emmanuel* is a direct explication of an Old Testament theme. This Old Testament God-with-us theme

was taken up by Matthew in order to provide the deep-seated theological perspective from which the narrator evaluates and presents *all* the names of Jesus, as well as everything else in the Gospel of Matthew. In view of this, Matthew's Jesus is, generally speaking, presented as the *fulfiller of the Old Testament*, that is, *Emmanuel – the Torah incarnate*.

At the time, the Old Testament was known to Matthew and his community as the 'law and the prophets'. The Gospel of Matthew does not make a qualitative distinction between the 'law' and the 'prophets'. The reason why these so-called fulfillment citations only come from the 'prophets', and are absent from the passion narrative, should possibly be sought in Matthew's point of view, namely that prophecies are predictions and that Jesus obediently fulfilled them until his death. The expression 'the law and the prophets' denotes quite simply the whole of the Old Testament as it is known to the church of Matthew and functions for it as Scripture (cf Mt 5:17; 7:12; 11:13; 22:40; cf Kingsbury 1977:82).

We will go on to indicate by means of the names of Jesus why Matthew's Jesus can be typecast as the fulfiller of the law and the prophets by means of the names of Jesus. The above-mentioned methodological objection to the overrated christological titles has not caused us to underestimate the special importance of names in narrative material. Although we agree with Meier (1979:217) that Matthew 'is quite capable of making important christological statements without titles', the use of titles as a phraseological narrative technique remains an important aid to the narrator in his characterization and his employment of mood-reflecting techniques such as irony.

We will indicate that the name 'Teacher' (Διδάσκαλος or 'Ραββί) when used by Jesus' adversaries, is an ironic reference to Jesus' *correct interpretation* of the law and the prophets. In contrast, the name 'Lord' (Κύριος), when used by the disciples and Jesus' potential followers, refers to the *authority* with which Jesus interprets the law and the prophets. The name 'Son of David' (Υἱὸς Δαυίδ), when used by the Jewish crowd and the Gentiles, on the one hand emphasizes the way in which Jesus *concretely fulfills* the law and the prophets through healings (in particular the 'blind' who begin to 'see'), and on the other emphasizes Jesus' conduct as a *continuation* of the law and the prophets. The continuity theme is also present in names such as 'Prophet' (Προφήτης), 'Messiah' (Χρίστος) and 'King' (Βασιλεύς). The name 'Son of man' (Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου) as used by Jesus himself, refers to his function as *judge* who will sit in judgment at the Second Coming, and who will use obedience (or otherwise) to the law and the prophets as a measure. The name 'Son of God' (Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ), when used by divinely or diabolically inspired characters, on the one hand presents Jesus as the one whose *origins* lie with his Father in heaven and on the other presents him as the *totally obedient Son* who fulfilled every jot or tittle of the law and the prophets up to the time of his death.

3.3 'TEACHER' AND 'LORD'

3.3.1 Introduction

It is significant that while the group name 'disciples' (μαθηταί) correlates with the name 'Teacher' (see Mt 10:24), 'Teacher' or 'Rabbi' is not used by the disciples when referring to Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew. The relationship between a disciple and Jesus is expressed by means of the name 'Lord' (Κύριος) in this Gospel (see Bornkamm 1961:38). The Jewish leaders and Judas Iscariot use the name Διδάσκαλος or 'Ραββί (see Mt 9:11; 17:24) when referring to Jesus; in contrast the disciples refer to Him as Κύριος (see Mt 14:28; 17:4). These two names for Jesus, used by his 'opponents' and 'helpers' respectively, are very noticeable in the section on the last supper (Mt 26:17-25). Here Judas Iscariot addresses Jesus as 'Ραββί (Mt 26:25; see also 26:49), while the other disciples address Him as Κύριος (Mt 26:22). This distinction is even more evident when one takes into account that the gospels of Mark and Luke do not contain such a parallelism in respect of these names. In both the Gospel of Mark (see Mk 4:38; 9:5, 38; 10:35; 13:1) and the Gospel of Luke (see Lk 21:7) the vocative Διδάσκαλε or 'Ραββί is, in fact, used by the disciples with reference to Jesus. Matthew, however, changed the name used by the disciples to Κύριε (cf Mt 8:25 with Mk 4:38; Mt 17:4 with Mk 9:5; Mt 20:33 with Mk 10:51; 'Ραββί in Mk 11:21 was omitted by Matthew). Although Jesus uses the name ὁ διδάσκαλος when referring to himself in the Gospel of Matthew (Mt 23:8; 26:18), the disciples do not use it. It therefore appears that the names 'Teacher' and 'Lord' are 'vehicles' used by the narrator in the Gospel of Matthew to convey certain perspectives. It is obvious that the names Κύριος and Διδάσκαλος are used to portray certain aspects of the binary relationships existing between the narrated characters: On the one hand we find the relationship between the disciples (as the 'helpers') and the Jewish leaders (as the 'antagonists') in relation to Jesus as the 'protagonist'; on the other there are the relationships between Jesus and the Jewish leaders, and between Jesus and the disciples.

3.3.2 Διδάσκαλος

The so-called 'controversy dialogues' between Jesus and the Jewish leaders form the context in which Διδάσκαλος is used by the Jewish leaders as a form of address. Generally, these controversy dialogues in the gospels focus on the typical rabbinic question regarding the correct interpretation of the Torah. In fact, the opposition between the protagonist and the antagonists in the Gospel of Matthew, broadly speaking, have a bearing on this problem. Hummel (1966:34, 56) refers to the matter in the following manner: In Matthew's examination of Judaism, the problem

of the law takes up the most space. Christology and Torah are inextricably linked together. The messianity of Jesus, clearly distinguishable from the Jewish image of the Messiah, is legitimized by the Torah, and vice versa, the Torah is given its due worth through Jesus' messianic authority.

The function of the name Διδάσκαλος that was given to Jesus by the Jewish leaders was to accentuate the nature of the opposition that existed between the two parties – that the interpretation of the Torah, in fact, was the issue. This applies to all cases where the name is used in the 'controversy dialogues'.

* Matthew 9:1-13

Matthew 9:1-23 (see v 11) deals with Jesus eating with publicans and sinners (the *non-accounts* in the eyes of the Jewish leaders), as well as with Jesus' teachings: '[G]o and learn what this means: 'I desire mercy, not sacrifice' (quoting from Hs 6:6). In Jesus' motivation of this logion (cf the γάρ in v 13) there is a reference to what we can call the *raison d'être* in the plot of Matthew's gospel: '[F]or I have not come to call the [so-called – A G v A] righteous, but sinners.'

* Matthew 12:38-42

Matthew 12:38-42 (see v 38) deals with the temptation of Jesus by the Jewish leaders when they ask him for a sign (from heaven/from God – cf Mt 16:1-4). This 'request' should be seen against the background of the full Beelzebub controversy in Matthew 12:22-50 (see Cope 1967:36-52). In this controversy the Jewish leaders are contrasted with the Gentiles who react positively to Jesus' message. Jesus passes judgment on the Jewish leaders because they have spoken blasphemous words against the Holy Spirit (vv 22-32). The Jewish leaders' guilt is depicted by the metaphor 'good tree'-'good fruit'/'bad tree-bad fruit' (v 33). 'Good fruit' means doing the will of the heavenly Father; 'bad fruit' means committing βλασφημία (vv 46-50). In rabbinic theology the concept of 'sin that cannot be forgiven' (vv 31-32) appears within the referential framework of transgression of the Torah as the will of the Father (see Meier 1980b:135). According to Wrege (1978:134) the expression 'sin against the Holy Spirit' refers to the Jewish leaders obstruction of Jesus and the disciples in the fulfillment of their mission. In the argument the 'sign of Jonah' is used as a reference to the positive reaction of the Gentiles from Nineveh and the 'sign of Solomon' as a reference to the positive reaction of the Gentile 'queen of the South'. These references are examples of a typical rabbinic midrash interpretation technique. The reaction of the Gentiles is portrayed in this manner, and contrasted

with the reaction of the Jewish leaders who refuse to pay attention to the proclamation of the will of God by Jesus, whereas Jesus as God-with-us is much more (πλεῖον...ᾧδε) than Jonah (v 41) and Solomon (v 42). This whole controversy therefore deals with the question of the correct interpretation of the law and the prophets. Gundry (1982:242) formulates it as follows: '...Jesus' reply deals with the OT, their [the Jewish leaders – A G v A] field of expertise.'

• **Matthew 17:24-27**

The purpose of Matthew 17:24-27 (see v 24), the pericope dealing with payment of temple taxes by Jesus and Peter, is to show the opposition between the disciples and the Jewish leaders in respect of Jesus' standpoint regarding the temple (see Van Aarde 1991a). The theme of 'temple' in the Gospel of Matthew, when viewed from a certain angle, is a variation of the theme of 'Torah'. Consequently this pericope may be regarded as correlating with that in Matthew 12:1-8, dealing, as regards the opposition between Jesus and the Jewish leaders, with the conduct of the disciples on the sabbath. Both pericopes deal with Jesus' interpretation of the 'law', by means of which formalism is excluded (see Montefiore 1964/1965:71), while the law as the expression of the will of God is observed fully.

• **Matthew 19:16-30**

Likewise, Matthew 19:16-30 (see v 16) is a passage which has Jesus' interpretation of the law as its theme, contrasting sharply with that of the 'rich young man' from the ranks of the Jewish leaders. Jesus' 'radical' interpretation of the Torah is placed on an equal footing with the mission to be 'perfect'/'whole' and this demand, in the context, has a bearing on the theme of 'many who are first will be last; and many who are last will be first' (v 30). The demand contained in this logion implies that the legalism and formalism characterizing Judaism should be set aside. As in Matthew 5:48 where the word τέλειος (to be 'perfect') again appears in the Gospel of Matthew, we find in Matthew 19:21 that Jesus censures this form of legalism. Yarnold (1968:270) says the following in this regard:

He (Jesus – A G v A) takes the word τέλειος from the spiritual vocabulary of his hearers (the Jewish leaders – A G v A) and gives it a twist: If you really want to be τέλειος you must love friend and foe alike (Mt 5:48), you must get rid of this money which is holding you back from whole-hearted service of God (Mt 19:21). If you really want to be τέλειος, to be faithful to all that is noble in the pharisaic ideal, you must be rid of the legalism which so easily taints it.

(Yarnold 1968:270)

Also Przybylski (1980) has indicated that the terms 'perfection' (τέλειος) and 'righteousness' (δικαιοσύνη) in the Gospel of Matthew form part of related terms. Both terms refer to an attitude towards life which is the fruit of the correct interpretation of the Torah:

Δικαιοσύνη is a term which refers to conduct according to a norm which in this case is the law. Both the disciples and the scribes and Pharisees have righteousness insofar as both groups live according to the demands of the law. This, however, does not mean that the righteousness of the two groups is identical. Jesus demands that the righteousness of the disciples is to exceed that of the scribes and the Pharisees. This does not mean that the disciples are to live according to a different law but they are to live according to a different interpretation of the law...The goal of this type of conduct is perfection...The disciples are to observe everything that Jesus commanded.

(Przybylski 1980:87)

In view of the remarks by Yarnold and Przybylski quoted above, it is correct and with merit that Engelbrecht (1985:151, 154) implicitly creates a connection between the words 'mercy' (ἔλεος) and 'perfect' (τέλειος) on the one hand and δίκαιος on the other. He correctly treats the first two words as being part of the usage surrounding non-formalistic abiding with the law. The reference to the latter Greek word in the Gospel of Matthew can be interpreted as 'conforming to God's standard' (see Van Aarde 1986b:175-176). Engelbrecht refers to ἔλεος ('loyalty' as the translation for this word is not entirely satisfactory but not without merit) as the 'central nerve' in correctly abiding with the law. This is of course true. Later on I will recap on the importance that the above association has in respect of the theme of sonship in the Gospel of Matthew. I will indicate that, like Jesus, the 'perfect disciple' can be called 'Son of God'.

To be a disciple of Jesus means that you have to follow him. Kingsbury (1978) has convincingly indicated that 'following' (ἀκολουθεῖν) Jesus is a prominent theme in the Gospel of Matthew. For our own purposes it is noticeable that both the rich young man (Mt 19:21) and the disciples (Mt 19:27) were to hear that if someone wanted to be τέλειος – that is, to abandon his possessions and his family, he has to follow Jesus as well. And to follow Jesus, who is the embodiment of the will of God, is to obey his interpretation of what the will of God, the 'divine order, is all about.

This 'divine order' is expressed notably by the Greek word ἅγιος (cf Van Staden 1991:2): "Ἄγιοι ἔσεσθε, ὅτι ἅγιος, κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν (Lv 19:2 LXX; cf also 1 Pt 1:16). In this analogous formula the word ἅγιος may be replaced by the word τέλειος: "Ἐσεσθε οὖν ὑμεῖς τέλειοι ὡς ὁ Πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος τέλειος ἐστίν (Mt 5:48) – 'You must be *whole* just as your Father in heaven is *whole*!' Mary Douglas (1966:54) states: '...to be holy is to be whole, to be one; holiness is integrity, perfection of the individual and of the kind.' This 'wholeness' thus applied, for example, to both the sacrificer and the sacrificial animal. To be 'holy' in the sense that God is 'holy' therefore implies that one has to fit in with God. According to this, cripples (θλαδίας καὶ ἀποκεκομμένος – Dt 23:1), the handicapped and the Gentiles were not acceptable before God, and were therefore not allowed to enter the cultic space where God dwelled, the Temple (Neyrey 1988:67) or the ἑκκλησία (cf Dt 23:18) – the community of 'saints'.

What this amounts to is that the Jews regulated God's presence. In their concept of God he is seen as being present on a restricted scale. The regulations that determined whether God was present or absent consisted of the multitude of regulations on purification. This particularly applied to the Temple, the Temple accessories, the Temple staff and the Temple worshipers (cf Neusner 1973a). In this respect Neusner (1973a:75) indicated in detail how the ideology of especially the Pharisees in particular was directed 'to extend into the day-to-day living of ordinary Jews the concerns of ritual purity usually associated only with the priests and Temple'. Elliott (1991b:220; cf also Neusner 1979:47) formulated this as follows:

Particularly in Pharisaic ideology, food and meals formed a mediating link between the Temple with its altar and the private home and its table. For the Pharisees, the rigorous purity regulations pertaining to the Temple, its priesthood and sacrifices, were extended to the bed and board of every observant Jew.

(Elliott 1991b:220)

In support of this they harnessed not only the Old Testament, but also the 'traditions of the elders' (cf Mk 7:3; Malina 1988:17). They drew up a comprehensive classification system, according to which almost everything in daily life was arranged in terms of acceptability – that is, 'holiness'/'wholeness'. Following on Mary Douglas (1966), Neyrey (1988:76) refers to this as 'boundaries' and speaks of *maps of time, maps of persons, maps of things* and 'perhaps it is fair to say that their primary map was a *map of meals*'. Meals were an important sociological mechanism which exerted control with regard to purity or the lack of it (Douglas 1966:126-127;

Elliott 1991b). This also had direct relevance to the maintenance of 'boundaries' in reference to the avoidance of intermarriage between Jew and non-Jew, so that the integrity of the familial community could be protected (cf Bossman 1979; Pilch 1988a:36). 'Accordingly, codes defining social, sexual, and food purity and pollution will form one unified complex of concerns' (Elliott 1991b). This implies that God's 'holiness'/'wholeness' is replicated in man's world. Consequently, all of creation should portray the divine order relating to classification as well as discrimination (cf Neyrey 1988:68). Like the Pharisees, Jesus also considered that the temple community should be extended to everyday life. Jesus, however, opposed social-religious ostracism.

* Matthew 22

The last three instances in which the name Διδάσκαλος appears in the Gospel of Matthew are all to be found in chapter 22. All these pericopes similarly emphasize the opposition between Jesus and the Jewish leaders in regard to the interpretation of the Torah. Matthew 22:15-22 (see v 16) deals with the question of whether one should pay taxes to Caesar. Hill (1972:303-304) has the following comments to make:

The question on which Jesus is asked to give an authoritative opinion is not one merely of expediency or civil law, but of a theological nature: In the eyes of God (i.e. in the light of the law) is it permissible to pay tribute?... (T)his (is a) kind of question (that) exercised the mind of the rabbis.

Hill (1972:303-304)

Matthew 22:23-33 (see v 24) deals with the question of the Sadducees' opinion about the resurrection. In this regard Schlatter (1963:651, 654) states that the Sadducees and the Pharisees always expected that a theological argument should be able to be proved from the Torah. This was all the Sadducees acknowledged as the law. According to the Sadducees, however, the Torah refrains from mentioning the resurrection, which rules out the possibility of the resurrection altogether. Jesus' verdict is that the theology of the Sadducees 'narrows' and 'impoverishes' the Torah (see Schlatter 1963:653). And the third instance, namely Matthew 22:34-40 (see v 36), deals with the question regarding the crux of the Torah (ἐντολή μεγάλη ἐν τῷ νόμῳ). Hultgren (1979:186) is correct in saying that this question resulted in a controversy dialogue in which Jesus' dual commandment of love was indicated as being the key to the correct interpretation of the law and the prophets.

3.3.3 Κύριος

The term Κύριος or the name Κύριε which is used for Jesus does not function as a honorary title throughout the Gospel of Matthew. In Matthew 21:3, for example, the term is used to refer to Jesus either as the (new) owner of the donkey (Foerster 1938) or as the actual owner of the donkey (Klostermann 1971:166; Schmid 1965:299). Hahn (1974a:85-86), Bornkamm (1961:38-39), Gaechter (1963:656) and Kingsbury (1975a:108), among others, are of the opinion that there is in fact a christological titular motif behind the use of the term Κύριος in Matthew 21:3. The first three scholars feel that Matthew is using a title for the pre-paschal Jesus which is, in anticipatory fashion, referring to what he will be only after his ascension (resurrection). According to Kingsbury the use of the term should in this case not be ascribed to Matthew's redaction activity, which he adopted from Mark. Matthew sees it as having an auxiliary function because the 'title' Κύριος supports and builds the other christological titles which appear prominently in Matthew's redaction with reference to Matthew 21:1-9, namely 'Son of David' (v 9) and 'King' (v 5). According to Kingsbury the name of Κύριος accentuates the divine authority through which Jesus, as the 'King', commands them to take possession of the donkey so that he can enter Jerusalem as the 'Son of David'.

The term Κύριος is, moreover, not applied exclusively to Jesus. In Matthew 1:22 and 4:10, for example, Jahwe is called Κύριος and in Matthew 27:63 the Jewish leaders respectfully address Pilate as Κύριε (= 'sir'/'your honor'). In Matthew 24:46 the term more or less functions as a synonym for the term οἰκοδεσπότης which to my mind cannot be regarded as a christological title. Kingsbury (1975b:255), however, is of the opinion that Κύριος, in fact, functions as a christological title in Matthew 24:46. According to him this is the only instance in the Gospel of Matthew in which Κύριος has not been applied as an auxiliary title. He feels that here it should be regarded as being on the same level as the titles 'Son of David', 'Son of man' and 'Son of God'.

When the word Κύριος has the function of a honorary title in the Gospel of Matthew it accentuates the authority of Jesus' actions. We consider that scholars of the Gospel of Matthew are on the wrong track when they use the studies of Bousset (1967) and Conzelmann (1977) to guide them in their search for the function of the Κύριος name in the Gospel. With reference to Bousset we find scholars like Hurtado (1979) attempting to prove him wrong, while someone like Hahn (1974a) wishes to prove the opposite. According to Bousset the title Κύριος could only be used on non-Palestinian ground. And, regarding Conzelmann, we find that some scholars transfer the results of his study on the title Κύριος in the Gospel of Luke to the Gospel of Matthew. According to Conzelmann the Κύριος title as used in the

Gospel of Luke has no ontological reach as such. He maintains that this title indicates a 'functional compromise' which the congregation concluded in respect of the difference between Jesus' work and that of God in the execution of the 'history of salvation'. On the grounds of this 'compromise' one can infer a difference between the use of the title in the pre- and post-paschal periods. In respect of the Gospel of Matthew, Vögtle (1964) and Bornkamm (1964), for example, attempt to indicate that the theme of *divine authority* serves as a background to the use of the Κύριος title in the Gospel of Matthew.

This insight, namely that Matthew uses the name Κύριος as an indication of Jesus' divine authority, is correct. The reach of the authority motif behind the Κύριος name should, however, be looked for not within the sphere of the concept of 'salvation history', but within the sphere of interpreting the Torah. This 'authority' has a bearing on Jesus' radical interpretation of the Torah corresponding to the will of God in contrast to the interpretation given by the Jewish leaders (cf Rogers 1973:265). Furthermore, the use of the name Κύριος is an indication of the perspective from which the disciples and the Jewish crowd are characterized in the Gospel of Matthew. While the Jewish leaders by, inter alia, their use of the ironic name Διδάσκαλος for Jesus are simply presented as his opponents, the complexities surrounding the character of the disciples as 'those of little faith' and of the Jewish crowd and the Gentiles as potential followers of Jesus are highlighted by their calling him Κύριος.

• **Matthew 12:1-8**

In Matthew 12:1-8 (see v 8) the authority with which Jesus correctly interprets the law in respect of the sabbath and by which he decides what is and is not permissible on the day of the sabbath, is explicitly stated by, inter alia, the name Κύριος.

• **Matthew 14:22-33 and 17:1-19**

In Matthew 14:22-33 (see vv 28-29, 30) and Matthew 17:1-19 (see v 4) the name 'Son of God' has a more prominent function, but the name Κύριος, with which Peter addresses Jesus in both these passages bears witness to the 'insight' Peter has into the authority with which Jesus can command. In the first instance he shows insight into the fact that Jesus has the authority to command Peter to walk on water, as well as the authority and power to save the sinking Peter (see also Mt 8:25), and in the latter instance insight into the fact that Jesus, should he wish to do so, can authoritatively command the building of three huts (one each for Jesus, Moses and Elijah).

* Matthew 16:21-28 and 18:21-35

Both Matthew 16:21-28 (see v 22) and Matthew 18:21-35 (see v 21) may be labelled 'didactic' passages in which Peter addresses Jesus as Κύριε. Jesus' authoritative 'instruction' and Peter's admission that he indeed has such authority vested in him, are conveyed by this form of address. At the same time, however, both passages bear witness to a lack of insight on Peter's part. In the first pericope there is the announcement of the passion, a report on Peter's embarrassment and the so-called 'Satan' reference. In its introduction, the latter pericope contains Peter's question regarding the 'remission of sin' and Jesus' answer in the form of the parable of the 'wicked servant'.

* Matthew 8:1-4; 8:5-13; 15:21-28; 7:21; 25:11; 25:31-46 and 26:17-25

Individuals among the Jewish people (Mt 8:1-4 – see v 2; Mt 17:14-18 – see v 15) and the Gentiles (Mt 8:5-13 – see vv 6, 8; Mt 15:21-28 – see v 27), called 'outcasts' by Sand (1974:164), also address Jesus as Κύριος on occasion. They probably address him in this way because they assume that he has the authority and power to heal. In this manner they are portrayed by Matthew as potential followers of Jesus. However, these potential followers, as well as the disciples, have to hear that not all who call Him 'Lord, Lord' will enter into the kingdom of heaven (see Mt 7:21; 25:11), but only those who fulfill the will of the Father as taught by Jesus.

This aspect is highlighted in the report on the last supper (Mt 26:17-25) and the parable of the final judgment (Mt 25:31-46). In the first pericope Jesus is addressed as Κύριος by a disciple (Mt 26:22), while the other disciple (Judas Iscariot) addresses him as 'Ραββί (Mt 26:25). In the latter pericope the δίκαιοι (the 'sheep') address him as Κύριος (Mt 25:37) and the others (the 'goats') also address Him as Κύριος (Mt 25:44) – the one group is blessed and the other condemned. From these two pericopes it is clear that not all who call Jesus Κύριε Κύριε will enter the kingdom of heaven.

* Summary

The perspective derived from the name Κύριος may be summarized in the following words of Sand (1974:164): The authorization to describe Jesus as Lord, Matthew took from his received sources. However, he deduced it mainly from the fact that his congregation is not committed to the Jewish rabbi's anymore, but to a new master, different from the rabbi's, mostly because of the authority he received from the Father and through his compassion for the despised 'outcasts'. To emphasize this, Matthew explains the call for compassion addressed to the Kyrios (Mt 9:27; 15:22; 17:15; 20:30), as well as to the Son of David (9:27).

3.3.4 Υἱὸς Δαυὶδ, Χριστὸς, Βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων and Προφήτης

3.3.4.1 Connection between the name Κύριος and Υἱὸς Δαυὶδ

On the basis of, inter alia, Matthew 22:41-46, scholars like Bornkamm (1961:30-31), Strecker (1966:118-120), Hummel (1966:121-122), Walker (1967:129-132), Suhl (1968:69, 75-76, 81) and Sand (1974:47, 50, 62-67) are of the opinion that the title Υἱὸς Δαυὶδ functions in *opposition* to the title Κύριος in the Gospel of Matthew. The former would indicate the *earthly* Jesus and the latter the *resurrected* Jesus. If these scholars are correct, it would imply that this binary relation should give direction to our discussion of the name, Υἱὸς Δαυὶδ. Although it is correct to state that the name, Υἱὸς Δαυὶδ, appears only in regard to the *earthly* Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew, it is incorrect to contend that the name Κύριος is used only in respect of the *risen* Jesus. On the basis of the discussion of the function of the name Κύριος above, we are of the opinion that an aspect of the finding by Conzelmann (1977:165-166) in respect of the function of the Κύριος title in the Gospel of Luke, is also demonstrated in the Gospel of Matthew. This is namely that the Κύριος title is also used to denote the *earthly* Jesus, and then not necessarily in an anticipatory sense. To my mind the Υἱὸς Δαυὶδ name should not be researched from the 'pre-paschal' perspective as against the 'post-paschal'. The connection between the names Κύριος and Υἱὸς Δαυὶδ is to be found in the theme of compassion (see the remark made by Sand 1974:164 above). This in turn, is an expression of the fundamental *Leitmotif* God-with-us. As such Jesus is the embodiment of the will of the Father, as expressed through the law and the prophets.

3.3.4.2 Theme of blindness and the expectations of the Old Testament

What is of importance to our study is the fact that except for the narrator, it is only the object of Jesus' mission, namely the Jewish crowd and the Gentiles, who address him as Υἱὸς Δαυὶδ and not the disciples or the Jewish leaders. This creates a specific perspective from which the narrative about the Jewish crowd and the Gentiles in relation to Jesus is set. Two aspects may be inferred when we look at the passages containing the name Υἱὸς Δαυὶδ.

Firstly, it is significant that all passages in which the Jewish crowd (Mt 9:27; 12:23; 20:30; 21:15) and the Gentiles (Mt 15:22) address Jesus as Υἱὸς Δαυὶδ are pericopes that deal with healing (see e.g. Gerhardsson 1979:86-88) and that all, except Matthew 15:21-28, deal with the healing of the blind in one way or another. Matthew 21:9, the entry into Jerusalem, is an exception because it does not deal directly with healing. However, the entry bears a close relation to the following incident of healing that takes place inside the temple (Mt 21:15).

The role that both the Jewish crowd and the Gentiles play in the Gospel of Matthew is that of potential followers of Jesus. In comparison to the Gentiles the characterization of the Jewish crowd is not one-sided. At times the decision of the Jewish crowd in respect of Jesus is 'positive' (e.g. Mt 15:31; 21:9), but it can also be 'negative' (e.g. Mt 13:53-58). And eventually they cry out: 'Crucify him! Let his blood be on us, and on our children!' (Mt 27:23, 25). By means of, among other things, the theme of the healing of the blind and the form of address *Υἱὸς Δαυὶδ* which is used for Jesus, the Jewish crowd and the Gentiles are implicitly guided into accepting Jesus as Israel's anointed messenger. For this reason Matthew stresses the fact that the evangelization of the Gentiles does not exclude the Jewish crowd.

Secondly, by using a name such as *Υἱὸς Δαυὶδ*, the narrator wishes to associate the nature of Jesus' mission with the expectations of the Old Testament regarding the ideal 'anointed one' (*Χριστός*), 'king of the Jews' (*βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων*) and the role of a 'prophet' (*προφήτης*).

The name *Χριστός* appears both as a proper name (Mt 1:1, 18; 16:21) in the Gospel of Matthew, and as a honorary title, that is as a christological title. The latter use is a method employed by the narrator to represent Jesus as the *one who has come* in accordance with the promises of the prophets and who was expected as such by Israel. Seen in this light, the name *Χριστός* together with the name *Υἱὸς Δαυὶδ* is connected to the fulfillment of the (law and the) prophets as well as to the idea that God is with us. This same nuance is to be found in Matthew's use of the name *βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων*. As seen from the viewpoint of Herod the Great (Mt 2:2, 4, 13, 16), Pontius Pilate and the Roman cohort (Mt 27:11, 17, 22, 29, 37), the Roman soldiers (Mt 27:27-31) and the Jewish leaders (Mt 26:63, 68; 27:37, 41-42) this name has a political connotation. From the viewpoint of the narrator the name is characterized by the servant theme (see Mt 12:18). Kingsbury refers to Matthew's vision of Jesus as 'King' (*βασιλεύς*) and 'Servant' (*παῖς*) as follows:

In the pericope 27:27-31, Matthew provides a detailed sketch of the true nature of Jesus' kingship: As he stands draped in a scarlet robe with a crown of thorns on his head and a reed for a scepter in his right hand, the soldiers abuse him and, kneeling in mock obeisance before him, hail him as 'King of the Jews'. Hence, if 'King' marks Jesus Messiah as a political throne-pretender in the eyes of his enemies, in the eyes of Matthew it marks him as the one in the line of David (1:6, 20, 25; 21:9) who establishes his rule, not by bringing his people to heel, but by suffering on their behalf.

(Kingsbury 1977:34)

As Βασιλεὺς and as Παῖς, as Υἱὸς Δαυὶδ and as Κύριος the Matthean Jesus allows the will of God to triumph (Mt 12:20) by interpreting the *law* as a command to be merciful (Mt 12:6-7; cf also 23:23). Consequently he heals people from the Jewish crowd (Mt 12:9-13, 22-23) and the Gentiles set their hopes upon him (Mt 12:21). But the Jewish leaders who witness Jesus' acts of healing wish to murder him (Mt 12:14). In the way that their fathers rejected the *prophets*, they reject him as Υἱὸς Δαυὶδ, as Χριστός, and as Βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων (see Mt 21:14-15; 27:29, 37). Jesus' declaration of 'woe to you' in Matthew 23:29-32 is a very direct and clear indication of this. Derrett's comment on this 'woe to you' pronouncement, which was directed at the Jewish leaders as 'murderers of the prophets', reads as follows:

The scholars of Jesus' time and later called themselves 'builders', 'builders in the Torah'. They applied to themselves, one may suspect, the passages in the prophets which speak of the builders of Jerusalem. They were certainly proud of their scholarship, as if it were constructive as well as laborious. Perhaps Jesus said something like this: 'You say you are the builders [and I am knocking down your structure with my unexpected interpretation of the Torah...]. Of what are you the builders? You are building the tombs of the prophets....'

(Derrett 1968:193)

In turn the Jewish leaders accused Jesus of being Satan's accomplice (Mt 12:22-24). Ironically, these accusations are based on the acts of healing performed by Jesus as the Υἱὸς Δαυὶδ. The behavior of the Jewish leaders correlates with their image as 'blind leaders' of the people (see Mt 15:14; 23:16). Therefore, the 'insight' gained by the Jewish crowd as a result of the healing of their blindness should have led to the deduction that according to Matthew their leaders were, in fact, 'blind leaders'. Owing to the ambivalent behavior of the Jewish crowd as a character group, however, their 'seeing' is not actually 'seeing' and their 'hearing' is not actually 'hearing' (cf Mt 13:13). The Jewish crowd's 'insight' into the identity of Jesus consists at most of addressing Him as Υἱὸς Δαυὶδ and as Προφήτης ὁ ἀπὸ Ναζαρέθ τῆς Γαλιλαίας (Mt 21:9-11) – the one who has the power to heal. They do not, however, know him for what he really is.

In his comment on Matthew 21, Beare formulates the perspective from which the Jewish crowd is represented by means of using the name Προφήτης for Jesus:

The masses (οἱ ὄχλοι, 'the crowds') look upon Jesus as a prophet.... For Matthew this means that they still do not know him for what he is in truth – the Messiah, the Son of God. For the moment, their respect for Jesus as a prophet is so great that the authorities do not dare to offend them by seizing Jesus forthwith (Mt 21:46); a few days later, they will be ready to shout, 'Let him be crucified' (27:22f).

(Beare 1981:431)

With the name Προφήτης that the Jewish crowd uses for both Jesus (Mt 16:13-14; 21:11, 46) and John the Baptist (Mt 14:5; 21:26), the narrator places Jesus and John the Baptist in a continuous line with the (law and the) prophets. The disciples are also named as such within this same framework (Mt 10:41; 23:34). However, when the Jewish crowd addresses Jesus in this way, the narrator emphasizes it to indicate that their perspective is ambivalent and thus incomplete. The narrator allows Jesus to declare indirectly that he is *more* than a 'prophet' (Mt 11:9) and directly that as 'Son of God' he is *more* than a 'Son of David' (Mt 22:41-46).

The perspective used to portray the Jewish crowd is thus one depicting them as *potential followers* of Jesus, but at the same time they are shown as a people lacking *complete insight* – a 'short-sightedness' that, throughout the middle part of the Gospel of Matthew (Mt 4:23-25:46), is in danger of merging with the perspective from which the Jewish leaders are drawn. This does in fact happen in the final part of the Gospel. In view of this the 'cursing of the fig tree' by way of hypothesis probably refers to both the Jewish crowd and the disciples (Mt 21:18-22). This pericope should probably be read against the background of the two incidents that, according to the story, had taken place in the temple the previous day and which has been narrated in the two preceding pericopes. They dealt with the 'entry into Jerusalem' (Mt 21:1-11) and the 'cleansing of the temple' (Mt 21:12-17). In both the latter pericopes we find that the Jewish crowd uses the invocation ὡσαννὰ τῷ υἱῷ Δαυίδ. (The 'children' in Mt 21:15 plays the same role as the Jewish crowd does – see Van Aarde 1982a:87-94.) One may say 'Lord Lord' or 'Praise the Son of David' but, if he does not do the will of the Father as taught by Jesus, he will wither like a fig tree because he bears only leaves and no fruit.

3.3.5 Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου and Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ

3.3.5.1 Introduction

It has become practically impossible to give an overview of research into the historical and theological study of the problems of the christological titles Υἱὸς τοῦ

ἀνθρώπου and Ὑλὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ. With regard to the first title we can refer to works such as those of Kümmel (1980:50-84) and Higgins (1980:29-53) for an overview of this kind of research, and in respect of the latter the works of Van Iersel (1964:3-8) as well as those of Bieneck (1951), De Kruijf (1962), Pokorny (1971), Hengel (1976), Hahn (1974b:280-333) and Delling (1977).

We referred earlier to Kingsbury's one-sided approach according to which the Ὑλὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ title is seen to be an inclusive concept in the Gospel of Matthew, either containing the frames of reference of all the other titles within itself or next to which titles (such as the Κύριος title) function in subordinate fashion on an *auxiliary* basis. We cannot, however, support such a view unconditionally. Like Hill (1979), we cannot agree with Kingsbury that the titles of Ὑλὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου and Ὑλὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ have an inseparable function in the Gospel of Matthew and that 'the difference between the two [is] more a matter of function than of content' (Kingsbury 1977:56). Elsewhere Kingsbury (1975c:202) says: '...they [the Ὑλὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου and Ὑλὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ names respectively – A G v A] describe Jesus, the one from the standpoint of the world and the other from the standpoint of the church....'

In Kingsbury's view, the following pattern is consistent in the Gospel of Matthew:

[I]f Matthew views Jesus in his interaction with his disciples during his ministry and with his church following Easter as the Messiah, the Son of God, he views him in his interaction with the world, first Israel and then the gentiles, as the Son of man. Still, at the consummation of the age, when Jesus will appear visibly as the Judge and Ruler of the universe so that the whole world will see what until that time only the eyes of faith had ever been given by God to perceive, then says Matthew, the distinction between Jesus as the Son of God and Jesus as the Son of man will fall away; indeed, at the consummation both church and world will behold Jesus in all the majesty of God as the Son of man.

(Kingsbury 1977:57)

There are five reasons why we cannot support Kingsbury's view regarding the so-called binary function of the titles Ὑλὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου and Ὑλὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ in the Gospel of Matthew. In the first place it would only be legitimate to argue that the Ὑλὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ title, both in the pre-paschal and the post-paschal periods, represents the perspective by means of which the narrator reflects the interrelation

between Jesus and the church, if the $\Upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ title is a template for the concept of God-with-us. And this is not the case throughout. Secondly, nowhere in the Gospel of Matthew does the $\Upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ title appear in pronouncements regarding the Second Coming. It is totally unnatural to argue on the basis of the absence of this in the logia regarding the Second Coming that, when the $\Upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\upsilon$ title does appear in such contexts, it corresponds with the $\Upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ title of the Second Coming. Thirdly, Kingsbury makes no distinction between the roles played by the Jewish leaders and the Jewish crowd. The Jewish leaders as the antagonists and the Jewish crowd as the object of Jesus' mission are simplistically called 'Israel', while 'Israel' and the 'Gentiles' form the 'world'. Through this the fundamental binary relations between the characters in the Gospel of Matthew are intermingled with the result that, to our thinking, the plot of the story of Matthew is not analyzed correctly. In the fourth place, Hill (1979:144) is correct when he indicates that it is unacceptable to regard the mother of James and John (Mt 20:28) as a character functioning on the same level as the Jewish leaders or Judas Iscariot, merely on the basis that Jesus referred to himself with the phrase $\Upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\upsilon$ during his conversation with her. Fifthly, Kingsbury does not really treat the fact that the phrase $\Upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\upsilon$ normally carries the 'general meaning' of the first person pronoun 'I' or 'man' in Jewish intertestamental literature seriously (see Vermes 1973:145-156, 160-186; 1987:27). His translation of the phrase 'this man' (Kingsbury 1985:68-74) into English indicates that he is aware of this Aramaic usage. He even uses a later work by Vermes to corroborate his English translation. The point on which we differ with Kingsbury in this regard does not, as in the case of Hill (1984), have a bearing on his English translation as such. It is merely that we cannot accept that the phrase functions as a honorary title throughout the Gospel of Matthew. However, Hill (1984) is not correct, either, when he maintains that the phrase has no function at all as honorary title in the Gospel of Matthew.

3.3.5.2 $\Upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\upsilon$: Philological and titular use

Without agreeing with Vermes in all respects, we have to accept that many of the $\Upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\upsilon$ logia in the Gospel of Matthew do not function as names. Before Vermes' study there was more or less consensus among the scholars of the New Testament that these logia in the Synoptic gospels fell into three categories, namely that pertaining to the coming of the $\Upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\upsilon$ to fulfill his function as judge, that pertaining to Jesus' appearances in public which are usually also referred to with first-person pronouns, and finally that pertaining to Christ's suffering and death (see e.g. Aulén 1976:111-112). Someone like Jeremias

(1971:247-248), however, believes that in ten of the sixty-nine instances that this phrase occurs in the Synoptic gospels it, in fact, has the function of a christological title and that all refer to the Second Coming of Jesus (Jeremias 1971:251). Seven of the ten logia occur in the Gospel of Matthew, namely Matthew 10:23; 24:27, 30, 37b, 39b; 25:31 and 26:64. The observation that the theme of the Second Coming is very prominent in Matthew's application of the Ὑλὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου phrase was also made by Tödt (1959:62-88, 128-130, 138-140) on the basis of a redaction-critical study in which he did not distinguish between the 'philological' and the 'titular' use of the phrase.

3.3.5.3 Ὑλὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου as the coming judge

With Jeremias' conclusion as starting point (see also Vermes' criticism 1987:21-22 of Jeremias), it is sufficient for the purposes of our study to describe the characterization of Jesus as given by the narrator of the Gospel of Matthew, which he does by means of the name Ὑλὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, as at least that of the *coming judge*. At the Second Coming Jesus as the Ὑλὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου will judge the Jewish leaders (Mt 10:23; 26:64) as well as 'all the tribes of the earth' (Mt 24:30). He will separate the blessed who have done the will of the Father from the hypocrites who supported the Jewish leaders and their attitudes (Mt 24:27, 30, 37b = 39b; 25:31). In other words, the perspective which has been used to draw Jesus by means of the name Ὑλὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, is that of a *judge* who will sit in judgment at the Second Coming, using obedience to God's will as embodied in Jesus himself as the yardstick.

3.3.5.4 Ὑλὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ

Although we therefore do not agree with Kingsbury about the functional interrelation between the christological titles Ὑλὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου and Ὑλὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, we do maintain that he and many other Matthean scholars have emphasized, and correctly so, the functional value of the name Ὑλὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ in the Gospel of Matthew. Without a doubt this name 'expresses for Matthew the deepest mystery of the person of Jesus Messiah' (Kingsbury 1975a:82). In our discussion of the specific perspective that is expressed in respect of Jesus by the use of the name Ὑλὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, we deliberately avoid the problem of whether the names Ὑλὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ and the absolute ὁ Ὑλὸς (= 'the Son') represent a development in tradition (cf Hahn 1974b:319-333; Van Iersel 1964:185-191). We also avoid the question of whether the sonship theme of Matthew's Gospel would only appear within the framework of the contemporary Judaic 'royal messianism' without being influenced by the

Hellenistic θεῖος ἄνθρωπος representation (see e.g. the discussions by Pokorný 1971:7-25, 39; Hengel 1976:31-32; Jones 1979:426) and whether it would form part of the presentation of the implied contemporary Judaic Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (see e.g. Mowinckel 1956:293-294, 366-368).

ἱσχυροὶ καὶ οἱ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ

Our standpoint is that the names ὁ Υἱὸς and Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ have the same functional range in the Gospel of Matthew. The same fundamental meaning, namely the *sonship theme* is to be found throughout. This theme is also expressed by the use of names such as ὁ Υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπῆτος (= 'my beloved Son'), Πάτερ μου (= 'my Father'), Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (= 'our Father who art in heaven') and so on.

The sonship theme in the Gospel of Matthew refers first and foremost to Jesus, 'empowered by the Holy Spirit' (Mt 1:20), and therefore, to the Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ and, secondly, to the disciples as υἱοὶ Θεοῦ, and ἀδελφοί (Mt 5:9, 45; 6:9, 26; 7:11; 12:50 etc). The basic meaning of the name Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ and the sonship theme in Matthew's gospel refers on the one hand to the *special relationship* between Jesus and God, and on the other to his mission as the 'Son of God', which is expressed through his *obedience* to the will of the Father. When applied to the disciples as 'sons of God' it can be expressed in the words of Bauckham (1978:258-259):

Jesus' filial relationship to God and his filial mission from God are interrelated and the uniqueness of his sonship is to be found in this interrelation. He experienced his sonship both as an already given relationship and also as a responsibility to be fulfilled in obedient submission to the Father's will....But it belongs to the unique quality of his sonship that it can be shared, or rather, that it must be shared. It is imperative of his filial mission (and therefore essential to his sonship) to mediate to others his own filial relation to God. His sonship *means* this.

(Bauckham 1978:258-259)

We already mentioned that the disciple who can be called υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, according to Matthew, is the 'perfect disciple'. In this regard Frankemölle (1974:172) says that in the designation of the disciple as 'Son of God' the possibility lies for him to be 'perfect' as 'his Father in heaven'. In the Gospel of Matthew the name Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ which is used for Jesus comes forth from the mouths of 'metaphysical' characters namely God ('a voice from heaven' – Mt 3:17; 'a voice from the cloud' – Mt 17:5) and Satan/demons (Mt 4:3, 6; 8:28-29).

Just as Kingsbury (1984:5-7) talks about 'God's evaluative point of view' I can use the expression 'demonic perspective' in this regard as a reference to the opposite. Earlier in the chapter I specifically referred to this aspect of Kingsbury's narrative study of the Gospel of Matthew. The comment I made at that stage, that I could not fully agree with David Hill's criticism of the 1984 article by Kingsbury, should be understood against this background (see Kingsbury 1985:63-66).

The confession of both the disciples (Mt 14:33; 16:16) and the centurion and soldiers (Mt 27:54) that Jesus is the $\Upsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ does not come from personal insight, but comes from an insight gained as a result of 'mythical events' which may be described as 'christophanies'. It is therefore significant that, besides God and Satan, the narrated characters who address Jesus by the name $\Upsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ are presented in the Gospel of Matthew as characters who, as a result of their respective perspectives, side with either God or Satan: The disciples and the centurion and soldiers in a confession of their faith; the Jewish leaders (Mt 27:43) and the Jewish crowd (Mt 27:40) in blasphemy. The image of a 'marionette' or 'puppet' (see Kamphaus 1971:50) clearly expresses these 'helping' roles of the disciples as $\nu\iota\omicron\iota\ \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon/\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\iota\alpha\varsigma$ (Mt 5:9, 45; 13:38) in their relationship with Jesus, and those of the Jewish leaders as $\nu\iota\omicron\iota\ \pi\omicron\upsilon\eta\eta\rho\omicron\upsilon/\gamma\epsilon\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\varsigma$ (cf e.g. Mt 13:38; 23:15) in their relationship with Satan. The final 'decision' of the Jewish crowd (who initially play a role that bears testimony to an 'uncertainty' regarding Jesus' true nature) comes to the fore when they allow the Jewish leaders to convince them and they, like (see the adverb $\omicron\mu\omicron\iota\omicron\omega\varsigma$ in Mt 27:41) their 'leades', blasphemously reject Jesus at the crucifixion as $\Upsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ (Mt 27:40). The Roman officer (and soldiers), however, confess in faith: ' $\text{Ἀληθῶς Θεοῦ υἱὸν οὗτος}$ ' (Mt 27:54). This 'confession' should not be regarded, as it is by Walker (1967:116), as one of the pieces of evidence indicating a turning point from a particularistic trend to a universalistic trend in Matthew's theological theory (see Van Aarde 1982a:87-94). We feel that, in this instance, the exclamation by the Gentile(s) cannot be separated from the temple theme. The rending of the temple veil is the final destruction of the formalism and particularism of Judaism (as represented in the Gospel of Matthew by the Jewish leaders), and the start of the new eschatological community (see De Kruijf 1962:105-107).

3.3.5.5 Summary

The two aspects concerning Matthew's functional use of the name $\Upsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ with reference to the characterization of Jesus are of a supplementary nature: The *Son* who has existed in an intimate relation to the Father in heaven and the *Son* who, unto death, is obedient to the will of the Father. The result of this sonship

theme is that the *beginning* of the Gospel of Matthew has the *ending* in view, and that the *ending* is also the *beginning* – not only in hindsight, but also when looking towards the future, because after the conclusion of the epoch of Jesus, a new one commenced that will continue until the end of time (see Van Aarde 1985b:272-273).

By means of various words that refer to the sonship theme a step-by-step picture of Jesus as being completely obedient is gradually drawn (see Kingsbury 1975a:40-83): At conception, birth and in his childhood, at his baptism and temptation; his public appearances in Galilee, and finally at his death and resurrection. In the *beginning* the Jewish leaders and Satan unite against the *Son*; they are similarly united in their opposition to the *Son* at the *end*.

As far as the *beginning* is concerned: Pesch (1967) was able to identify conclusively a Moses-like trend in Matthew 1-2. Although Gibbs (1968:38) declares: 'I have come not to praise the Matthean "New Moses" but to bury him', the following comment, with which we agree, holds some Moses typological implications: '[T]here is no Torah and Gospel in Matthew...but there is rather the Good News that in Jesus the Torah, the demand of God's righteousness, is now totally and efficaciously present....' Hill (1979:144) is of the opinion that Gibbs' formulation of Jesus being the 'Torah incarnate' is a refinement of Kingsbury's all-embracing accentuation of the $\Upsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ name in the theology of Matthew. It is my opinion, moreover, that this statement is not only correct but also corrective in respect of the exaggerated emphasis Kingsbury places on the $\Upsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ name.

As far as the *end* is concerned: In so much as Jesus' opponents addressing him by the name of Διδάσκαλος or 'Ραββί may be regarded as irony, the same could apply to their use of the name $\Upsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ for Jesus, especially before the crucifixion. The irony becomes quite apparent when the high priest refers to Jesus as the Χριστός ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ζῶντος (Mt 26:63). Although Caiaphas' question reflects the truth and is thus answered by Jesus in the affirmative: 'It is as you say...' (Mt 26:64), it is in fact an attempt to have him, ironically, accused of blasphemy (Mt 26:65). Kingsbury formulates one of the probable reasons why the narrator would allow Jesus' opponents to use this name as follows: 'Matthew's ultimate concern is that Judaism should condemn Jesus, i.e. reject him totally, on the basis of nothing short of that title that conveys the deepest mystery of his person....'