

Declaration

I confirm that this thesis presented for the degree of Ph.D., has

- a) been composed entirely by myself;
- b) been solely the result of my own work; and,
- c) not been submitted for any other degree or professional qualification.

Signature:

Brendon Robert Witte

23 May 2016

*“Who Do You, Matthew, Say the Son of Man Is?”:
Son of Man and Conflict in the First Gospel*

Brendon Robert Witte

Ph.D. in New Testament Language, Literature, and Theology
The University of Edinburgh
2016

Abstract

This dissertation analyzes the Matthean “Son of Man” sayings, paying particular attention to their function in the development of conflict and in the anticipation of conflict resolution. The major premise is that the Son of Man is described in Mt as being at the center of the formative conflict that both forced the split between “this generation” of unbelieving Jews and the Matthean community and initiated the community’s Gentile-inclusive mission. According to Matthew, the Son of Man is not engaged in aimless conflict; he confronts and destroys his enemies for the sake of promoting his universal reign and establishing his Church, i.e., the “sons of the kingdom” (13.38), among the nations (cf. OG Dan 7.14; 24.14; 28.18-20). It is his authority over the kingdom of God, given subsequent to and consequent to the judgment of God against “this generation” in 70 CE, that enables the global mission of the disciples, provides the *raison d’être* for their mission, and assures the Christian community that the Son of Man will return at the eschaton to bring a final end to conflict. A corollary question that will be investigated is what Jesus’ idiomatic self-designation meant to Matthew and his community.

The first chapter observes that despite the enormous literary footprint of the “Son of Man” debate, there is a notable lack of adequate studies concerning the Matthean “Son of Man” concept. What literature exists is surveyed, common trends in the debate are analyzed, and a statement of the thesis is provided.

Based on the successes and failures of previous studies, it is suggested in the second chapter that the most promising method by which to examine the Matthean “Son of Man” concept is composition-critical and narrative-sensitive. This provides a rationale for examining the Matthean “Son of Man” sayings in relation to the gospel’s structure and plot, both of which are shown to have been shaped by the theme of conflict. Finally, interpretive issues such as synoptic relationships, composition date, authorship, provenance, and the status of Matthew’s community are discussed.

Chapters Three and Four examine the “Son of Man” sayings in Matthew 8-13 and 16-26 respectively to determine how each saying contributes to the evolving Matthean “Son of Man” concept and the unfolding conflict between Jesus and his “sons” and Satan and his “sons” (cf. 13.37-39). It is shown that the “Son of Man” sayings are not a heterogeneous mixture of “earthly,” “suffering,” and “fu-

ture” statements that simply concern the life and ministry of Jesus. Matthean redaction has woven the “Son of Man” sayings into a grand tapestry of meaning, sewn into the conflict that precipitated the split of the Matthean community from “this wicked and adulterous generation.” It is shown that the advancement of conflict is matched by the resolution of conflict. This resolution occurs in two stages. According to Matthew, God began to resolve the conflict with “this generation” in 70 CE, whence he destroyed Jerusalem and bestowed upon the Son of Man universal dominion and an everlasting kingdom. The Son of Man’s empowerment enables him to preside over the Eschatological Assize, consequently fulfilling the predictions of end-times reprisal given to “this generation” (cf. 11.20-24; 12.39-42) and bringing a permanent end to conflict.

Chapter Five examines the allusion to Old Greek Dan 7.13-14 in 28.18-20 and its connection to the commissioning of the disciples. It is suggested that “all authority in heaven and on earth” is not obtained through a supposed proleptic experience of the *Parousia* in Jesus’ resurrection or death, or simply by means of his sonship to the Father. Rather, the Son of Man’s universal sovereignty, by which the Matthean community is empowered to “make disciples of all nations,” was received from the Ancient of Days after the Temple’s ruination in 70 CE. That is, the exaltation of the Son of Man, which is physically signaled by the destruction of Herod’s Temple, initiated and provided justification for the Matthean community’s schism from “this generation” and their mission to the Gentiles. Additionally, the divine empowerment of the Son of Man grounded the community’s eschatological hope for conflict resolution. This chapter ends with a discussion of how this theory impacts one’s understanding of Matthean christology, missiology, and salvation-history.

The final chapter summarizes the preceding evidence, details the contributions of this dissertation, and concludes that for Matthew “Son of Man” is more than a mere signal word for speech about Jesus’ death, resurrection, and exaltation. “Son of Man” is a self-designation employed by Jesus that Matthew has interpreted as a title referring to Jesus’ office as the exalted human-like figure of Old Greek Dan 7. Like the enigmatic “man” of Daniel’s night-vision, the Son of Man is the representative of the elect who remains with his community “until the end of the age” (28.20).

Lay Abstract

“Who Do You, Matthew, Say the Son of Man Is?” is a six-chapter study that examines the “Son of Man” sayings in the gospel of Matthew. Particular attention is given to the function of each saying in the development of conflict and in the anticipation of conflict resolution throughout Matthew’s story.

It is the primary assertion of this dissertation that the Son of Man in Mt is at the center of the conflict that both forced the split between the unbelieving Jews and the Matthean community and initiated the community’s mission to the Gentiles. According to the evangelist, the Son of Man is not engaged in aimless conflict; he confronts and destroys his enemies for the sake of promoting his universal reign and establishing his Church, i.e., the “sons of the kingdom” (13.38), among the nations (cf. OG Dan 7.14; 24.14; 28.18-20). It is his authority over the kingdom of God, given *subsequent to* and *consequent to* the judgment of God against “this generation” in 70 CE, that enables the global mission of the disciples, provides the reason for their mission, and assures the Christian community that the Son of Man will return at the eschaton to bring a final end to conflict. A corollary question that will be investigated is what Jesus’ idiomatic self-designation meant to Matthew and his community.

Table of Contents

Abbreviations	i
<i>Chapter One: History of Interpretation and Statement of Thesis</i>	
Introduction	1
History of Interpretation	3
Statement of Thesis	18
Prospectus	22
<i>Chapter Two: Methodology and Interpretive Issues</i>	
Methodology	25
Interpretive Issues	26
Sources Behind the Matthean “Son of Man” Sayings	68
<i>Chapter Three: The Son of Man and Conflict in Matthew 8-13</i>	
Introduction	79
Matthew 8.20	80
Matthew 9.6	95
Matthew 10.23	103
Matthew 11.19	107
Matthew 12:8	114
Matthew 12.32, 40	118
Matthew 13.37, 41	126
Conclusion	134
<i>Chapter Four: Conflict, Conflict Resolution, and the Son of Man in Matthew 16-26</i>	
Introduction	137
Matthew 16.13	139
Matthew 16.21	147
Matthew 16.27-28	152
Matthew 17.9, 12, 22-23	159
Matthew 19.28	164
Matthew 20.17-19, 28	173
Matthew 24.27, 30, 37, 39, 44; 25.31	183

Matthew 26.2, 24, 45	196
Matthew 26.64	200
Conclusion	205
 <i>Chapter Five: The Exaltation of the Son of Man in Matthew 28.18 and Conflict</i>	
Introduction	209
The Son of Man's Reception of Universal Authority: Opposing Theories	211
The Reception of Authority and the Destruction of the Temple	219
An Allusion to Old Greek Daniel 7.13-14 in Matthew 28.18-20	223
The Non-appearance of "Son of Man" in 28.18-20	230
Matthew 28.18-20 and Matthean <i>Heilsgeschichte</i>	232
The Son of Man and the Split between the Matthean Community and "this generation"	242
Conclusion	245
 <i>Chapter Six: Conclusion</i>	
Summary	247
The Meaning of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου according to Matthew	250
 Bibliography	 255

Abbreviations

AB	Anchor Bible
ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
ANTC	Abingdon New Testament Commentaries
AUSS	<i>Andrews University Seminary Studies</i>
BBR	<i>Bulletin for Biblical Research</i>
BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
Berit Olam	Berit Olam: Studies in Hebrew Narrative and Poetry
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
BJRL	<i>Bulletin of John Rylands University Library of Manchester</i>
BSac	<i>Bibliotheca sacra</i>
BZ	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CGTC	Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary
<i>CurTM</i>	<i>Currents in Theology and Mission</i>
EBC	The Expositor's Bible Commentary
ECNT	Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
ERT	<i>Evangelical Review of Theology</i>
EThL	<i>Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses</i>
EvT	<i>Evangelische Theologie</i>
<i>Exp</i>	<i>The Expositor</i>
<i>ExpTim</i>	<i>Expository Times</i>
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
FzB	Forschungen zur Bibel
GP	Gospel Perspectives
GTJ	<i>Grace Theological Journal</i>
Hermeneia	Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible
HTKNT	Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
IBS	<i>Irish Biblical Studies</i>
ICC	International Critical Commentary

Int	Interpretation
JAAR	<i>Journal of American Academy of Religion</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JCTCRS	Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies
JETS	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
JJS	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
JSNT	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series
JSOT	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
KBW	Katholisches Bildungswerk
KEK	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (Meyer-Kommentar)
NAC	New American Commentary
NCB	New Century Bible
NCBC	New Cambridge Bible Commentary
NCS	Noyes Classical Studies
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
NovT	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Novum Testamentum Supplements
NTAbh	Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen
NTD	Das Neue Testament Deutsch
NTL	New Testament Library
NTS	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
NTTS	New Testament Tools and Studies
OTS	<i>Old Testament Studies</i>
PBM	Paternoster Biblical Monographs
PCNT	Paideia Commentaries on the New Testament
PNTC	Pillar New Testament Commentaries
RB	<i>Revue biblique</i>
RestQ	<i>Restoration Quarterly</i>
RHPR	<i>Revue de l'histoire et de philosophie religieuses</i>
RNT	Regensburger Neues Testament
RSR	<i>Recherches de science religieuse</i>

SANT	Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testaments
SBL	Studies in Biblical Literature
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
<i>SBLSP</i>	<i>Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers</i>
SBS	Stuttgarter Bibelstudien
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
<i>ScEs</i>	<i>Science et esprit</i>
<i>SE</i>	<i>Studia evangelica I, II, III</i>
SHBC	Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
<i>SJT</i>	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>
SNT	Studien zum Neuen Testament
SNTG	Studies in New Testament Greek
SNTS	Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SP	Sacra pagina
SPCK	Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge
SSEJC	Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity
<i>ST</i>	<i>Studia theologica</i>
<i>StEv</i>	<i>Studia Evangelica</i>
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
SWBTS	Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
<i>TBei</i>	<i>Theologische Beiträge</i>
TC	Thornapple Commentaries
TNTC	Tyndale New Testament Commentaries
<i>TTJ</i>	<i>Trinity Theological Journal</i>
<i>TRu</i>	<i>Theologische Rundschau</i>
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen
<i>TynBul</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
VTSup	Supplements to Vestus Testamentum
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZNW	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</i>

Chapter One

History of Interpretation and Statement of Thesis

—Introduction—

The Greek phrase ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is the most common self-designation employed by Jesus in the gospels.¹ Due to its statistical plenitude and the controversy surrounding the term's translation and interpretation, the "'Son of Man' debate," in all its facets, is arguably the most written about controversy in all of New Testament studies.² Despite the overwhelming interest in solving a possibly insoluble problem,³ a lacuna remains in this vast pool of literature. In 1989, R. T. France commented that although thousands of pages had been written concerning the appellation ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, "[c]omparatively little attention has been paid to any distinctive features of its use in the gospels individually, except in the case of John."⁴ This is especially true of Matthew's gospel; the author's unique depiction of the Son of Man and use of term ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, until relatively recently, have been largely ignored.⁵ Before France published the above comment, only two dissertations,⁶ one christologically-centered "mini-commentary,"⁷ and a small handful of articles and essays⁸ had been dedicated to unraveling the mysteries of the

1. The designation "Son of Man" appears eighty-one times in the canonical gospels.

2. M. D. Hooker commented in the introduction to her book on "Son of Man" in Mark that "no subject in the realm of New Testament scholarship has been more debated" (*The Son of Man in Mark: A Study of the Background of the Term "Son of Man" and Its Use in Mark's Gospel* [London: SPCK, 1967], 3). This comment appears to have stood the test of time.

3. Cf. A. J. B. Higgins, "Is the Son of Man Problem Insoluble?" in E. E. Ellis and M. Wilcox (eds.), *Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honour of Matthew Black* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1969), 70-87; M. Hooker, "Is the Son of Man Problem Really Insoluble?" in E. Best and R. McL. Wilson, *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament Presented to Matthew Black* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 155-68.

4. R. T. France, *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher* (Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity, 1989), 288.

5. M. Müller, *The Expression "Son of Man" and the Development of Christology: A History of Interpretation* (London: Equinox, 2008), 408.

6. C. Glazener, *An Investigation of Jesus' Usage of the Term Son of Man: A Possible Interpretive Key to the Gospel of Matthew* (SWBTS PhD Dissertation, 1974); H. Geist, *Menschensohn und Gemeinde: Eine redaktionskritische Untersuchung zur Menschensohnprädikation im Matthäusevangelium* (FzB 57. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1986).

7. J. P. Meier, *The Vision of Matthew: Christ, Church, and Morality in the First Gospel* (New York: Paulist, 1978). Meier described his work as a "mini-commentary" (*Vision*, 2).

8. H. E. Tödt, *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition* (Trans. by D. M. Barton. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965); J. D. Kingsbury, *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1975), 113-22; *idem*, "The Title 'Son of Man' in Matthew's Gospel," *CBQ* 37 (1975): 193-202; *idem*, "The Figure of Jesus in Matthew's Story: A Literary-Critical Probe," *JSNT* 21 (1984): 3-36; *idem*, *Matthew as Story* (2nd Ed. Philadelphia, Fortress, 1988), 95-103; M. Pamment, "The Son of Man in the First Gospel," *NTS* 29 (1983): 116-29; B. Lindars, *Jesus Son of Man: A Fresh Examination of the Son of Man*

Matthean “Son of Man” sayings as a collection. After the late 1980’s the pace of publications became even slower; only three small publications and a monograph have been directly concerned with investigating Matthew’s “Son of Man” concept in over two decades.⁹

The intent of this chapter is to examine the work of modern scholars who have contributed to the “Son of Man” debate as it concerns Mt. Once the analysis is complete, it is possible to create bridges between theories, to dismiss overtly faulty hypotheses, to state the necessity of this dissertation, and to anticipate results. The organizational method of this history of interpretation will be chronological, based on the publication date of the author’s first study. If an author has published multiple works over an extended period of time, all of his or her publications will be covered at once. Only those works that attempt to examine the Matthean “Son of Man” concept in light of all the gospel’s sayings will be covered. A history of interpretation of this size does not permit coverage of those articles, essays, and books that interact with only a single saying or a limited group of sayings (e.g., the so-called “earthly” sayings of Mt 8-12). This history of interpretation will merely reproduce the respective theories of those who have participated in the Matthean “Son of Man” debate without extensive interaction and critique. To dismiss or consider many of the following positions would require that the present study assume theories about the “Son of Man” concept that can only be defended later in the dissertation proper. So rather than appeal to them in advance, the present author will avoid appearing presumptuous and allow the data to speak for themselves.

Hitherto, only M. Müller has written a historical overview of this type.¹⁰ Although his summary of pertinent literature was superb, this history will cover a few works that his did not. Müller commented that he could not gain access to C. Glazener’s 1974 dissertation, a basic but landmark study that will be discussed below.¹¹ Furthermore, since the publication of Müller’s book, L. W. Walck has au-

Sayings in the Gospels in Light of Recent Research (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 115-31.

9. D. R. A. Hare, *The Son of Man Tradition* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 113-82; U. Luz, “The Son of Man in Matthew: Heavenly Judge or Human Christ,” *JSNT* 58 (1992): 3-21; L. W. Walck, “The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and the Gospels,” in G. Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 299-337; *idem*, *Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and in Matthew* (JCTCRS 9. London: Continuum, 2011).

10. Müller, “*Son of Man*,” 408-12.

11. Müller, “*Son of Man*,” 265.

thored both an essay¹² and a book¹³ defending the literary dependence of Matthew on the *Similitudes of Enoch* for his “Son of Man” concept. Walck’s work will hesitantly be summarized and critiqued in this history. The hesitancy arises from the observation that Walck does not interact with all the Matthean “Son of Man” sayings, but only those in which he perceives citations of or allusions to the *Similitudes*.¹⁴ Formally, this contradicts what was stated earlier, namely, that this history of interpretation will only cover those works that interact with all the “Son of Man” sayings in Mt. However, Walck’s writings are demonstrative of the most recent trends in the debate and, therefore, an analysis of this material will be of benefit to the reader.

— History of Interpretation —

1.2.1 — Heinz Eduard Tödt

H. E. Tödt was the first author to extensively research the Matthean “Son of Man” concept. His monograph, *Der Menschensohn in der synoptischen Überlieferung* (1959), published in English as, *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition* (1965), remains one of the most important works in the “Son of Man” debate. Several years before the publication of the German text, R. Bultmann had used form criticism in an attempt to determine which of the synoptic “Son of Man” sayings were authentic. Tödt followed Bultmann in this endeavor, setting out to ascertain which of the sayings were *verba ipsissima Jesu* and to explicate how Jesus became *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* of the early Church. Like Bultmann and several others before him,¹⁵ Tödt separated the “Son of Man” sayings into three categories: those that refer to the Son of Man’s a) earthly ministry, b) passion and resurrection, and c) future coming/exaltation. Of these, Tödt argued that the sayings in the latter category, in which he suggested

12. Walck, “Son of Man,” 299-337.

13. Walck, *Son of Man in the Parables*.

14. Walck stated, “The earthly sayings and the suffering sayings can be excluded *a priori* since the Enochic view of the Son of Man is of a future, non-suffering figure” (*Son of Man in the Parables*, 165).

15. This triad is usually attributed to R. Bultmann (*Theology of the New Testament* [Trans. by K. Grobel. New York: Scribner’s, 1951], 1:30). However, Hare (*Son of Man*, 7 n. 23) has traced the concept back to two previous sources (W. Baldensperger, “Die neueste Forschung über den Menschensohn,” *TRu* 3 [1900]: 201-10, 243-55 [207]; F. J. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity: The Acts of the Apostles* [London: Macmillan, 1920], 1:376). See C. C. Caragounis, *The Son of Man: Vision and Interpretation* (WUNT 38. Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen, 1986), 145-47, for a more nuanced organizational schema.

Jesus spoke of the Son of Man as one other than himself,¹⁶ were authentic “Son of Man” sayings from the lips of Jesus. On the other hand, those sayings that belong in the former categories—*a*) and *b*)—had been created by the early Church, since it was clear to Tödt that in these Jesus and the Son of Man had been amalgamated into a single character.

Tödt saw the equation of the two figures as the product of the primitive Church. He contended that Jesus spoke of the Son of Man—the exalted human-like one of the Danielic and Enochic traditions¹⁷—as a being who would come in the future to judge men according to the Law and their allegiance to Jesus.¹⁸ In this way, the Son of Man was “the guarantor for the attachment to Jesus on earth.”¹⁹ Because of Jesus’ resurrection from the dead, the early Christian community was assured of the authority Jesus claimed to possess.²⁰ It was then that the Church associated Jesus’ authority with the power of the coming Son of Man:

In all sayings Jesus speaks of the coming Son of Man as of someone different, someone in the future. We would not have expected the community to maintain this differentiating way of speaking; for . . . the community undoubtedly identified Jesus with the coming Son of Man on the basis of their assurance by his resurrection.²¹

This “differentiating way of speaking,” however, was maintained to associate the authority of the coming Son of Man with Jesus in his earthly ministry, but without intermingling the independent stages of salvation-history: the Son of Man’s mission on earth and the Son of Man’s exaltation in heaven.²² Tödt argued that this division was largely respected by the author of Mt,²³ but unlike in Mk,

16. The theory that the historical Jesus spoke of the Son of Man as a heavenly figure other than himself was popular at the time of Tödt, but has received limited acceptance in modern scholarship. However, this hypothesis has recently been accepted by two prominent Historical Jesus scholars (cf. B. Chilton, “Son of Man: Human and Heavenly,” in C. M. Tuckett, *et al.* (eds.), *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck* [BETL 100C. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992], 1:203-18; D. C. Allison Jr., *Constructing Jesus: Memory, Imagination, and History* [Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010], 293-303).

17. Tödt concluded that, “The intimate connection of the synoptic presentation of the Son of Man with that of Jewish apocalyptic literature can no longer be seriously contested” (*Son of Man*, 22).

18. Tödt, *Son of Man*, 227.

19. Tödt, *Son of Man*, 229.

20. Tödt, *Son of Man*, 228.

21. Tödt, *Son of Man*, 228, cf. 230.

22. Tödt, *Son of Man*, 230-31.

23. The lines between the epochs are blurred in Mt, as 13.37 amply demonstrates (cf. Tödt, *Son of Man*, 281).

stress was decidedly placed on the future authority of Jesus as the Son of Man in the First Gospel:

The sayings from Q about the Son of Man's parousia are stressed considerably by Matthew and their number is increased by newly formulated editorial sayings (13.41; 25.31).²⁴

Further,

Matthew introduces a great number of traditional motifs; with regard to this, we may speak of a renaissance of apocalyptic elements within the synoptic Son of Man sayings (Matt. 13.41; 25.31; 24.30f.; 16.27; 19.28). Mark refers chiefly to the one biblical passage Dan. 7.13; Matthew, on his part, refers to broader streams of tradition. Some sayings formed by him are closely related to statements from the book of Enoch²⁵

Therefore, the early Church, according to Tödt, made a single character of the two beings—the earthly Jesus and the heavenly Son of Man—thereby, creating the concept of the Son of Man's two advents, the first lowly and the second exalted. But as Matthew's addition of five future-referring sayings suggests, for the First Evangelist the heavenly Son of Man was of more importance to his community than the earthly Jesus. This is the most lasting contribution of Tödt, since from the publication of his monograph it has been one of the most basic assumptions in Matthean studies that the author of the First Gospel places unbalanced weight on the apocalyptic "Son of Man" concept.

1.2.2—Clyde Glazener

In 1974, C. Glazener submitted a PhD dissertation to the faculty of Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary entitled, *An Investigation of Jesus' Usage of the Term Son of Man: A Possible Interpretive Key to the Gospel of Matthew*. Though it was never published, it remains a landmark study since it was the first monograph dedicated to analyzing the intricacies of the Matthean "Son of Man" sayings.

Glazener's approach to the question, "What does ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου mean in Matthew?" is quite dissimilar from Tödt's method and the *modus operandi* of many subsequent researchers. He attempted to determine the importance ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου held in Matthew's christology by examining the text through the lens of Matthean priority.²⁶ Although Glazener was cautious enough not to state dogmatically that Mt was written prior to Mk, and that the author of the latter re-

24. Tödt, *Son of Man*, 280.

25. Tödt, *Son of Man*, 223.

26. Glazener, *Son of Man*, 2-15, 20.

lied on the reading of the former, he submitted that this historical reconstruction was, in his opinion, the more likely scenario. Consequently, Glazener abandoned the redaction- and source-critical methodologies which were foundational for the works of his contemporaries and took a basic historical-critical approach instead. The only ancient source with which Glazener interacted was Dan 7.13-14, a text by which he assumed Mt had been influenced.²⁷

Glazener argued that if the validity of Matthean priority is assumed, Matthew's distribution of the phrase "Son of Man" into "earthly," "suffering," and "future" sayings does not convey his emphases to the reader.²⁸ That is, Glazener posited that it is not at all clear that Matthew stressed the exalted status of the Son of Man, as many researchers have assumed, since the gospel contains eight "earthly" sayings, nine "suffering" sayings, and thirteen "future" sayings, a nearly even distribution. This makes Matthew's "Son of Man" concept more balanced than that of Mark, who placed a much greater emphasis on presenting the Son of Man as the prototypical sufferer. For Matthew, Jesus is the authoritative Son of Man, whether he is active in his ministry in Israel, dying on a cross, or returning with his angels in the glory of his Father. It is this supposed evenness that led Glazener to suggest that "the grouping of the Son of Man sayings in Matthew's Gospel is quite superficial."²⁹ By introducing balance to the description of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, the character "Jesus" became more rounded.

Glazener provided an interesting approach to the Matthean "Son of Man" problem. Even if one does not hold to Glazener's understanding of gospel relationships, his study demonstrated that when Mt is read on its own terms the assumption that the evangelist stressed the so-called "future" sayings cannot be supported from the text. Although Matthew introduced five "Son of Man" sayings that refer to Jesus' exaltation and role at the eschaton, these additions do not prove that his emphasis was on the Son of Man's future glories to the neglect of Jesus' earthly ministry and sufferings. By redactionally inserting "future" sayings into 13.41, 16.28, 19.28, 24.30, and 25.31,³⁰ Matthew brought balance to the Markan "Son of

27. Glazener, *Son of Man*, 63.

28. Glazener, *Son of Man*, 196-97.

29. Glazener, *Son of Man*, 197.

30. Matthew 13.37 may be added to this list as it refers to the Son of Man's role in the narrative-future, between his exaltation and his *Parousia*.

Man” concept that was heavily biased toward depicting the Son of Man as enduring affliction.³¹

1.2.3—Jack Dean Kingsbury

Over the course of two decades J. D. Kingsbury published various articles and essays attempting to answer the question, “What is Matthew’s precise use and meaning of ‘Son of Man?’”³² In these works Kingsbury argued that the distinction the author drew between the term “Son of Man”—i.e., “this man” or “this human being”³³—and the title “Son of God” “is not primarily material in nature but formal.”³⁴ That is, “Matthew’s portrait of Jesus as the Son of Man coincides with his portrait of Jesus as the Son of God,”³⁵ with the exception of two, supposedly immaterial, aspects. First, “Son of God” never appears in the context of the *Parousia*: “the title Son of God plays no role whatever as a vehicle for setting forth the activity of Jesus at the Parousia.”³⁶ Second, “Son of Man” is a “public” title, while “Son of God” is a “confessional” title.³⁷ Kingsbury claimed that “Son of God” is a “confessional” title “in the sense that though such supernatural beings as God (3:17; 17:5), Satan (4:3, 6), and demons (8:28-29) use it to address Jesus, in the world of humankind it can be uttered only by people of faith, unless such utterance be accounted as blasphemy”³⁸ “Son of Man,” meanwhile, is exclusively Jesus’ *self-reference*; it is not used by others in confessional proclamations, such as “Truly you are the Son of Man.” Further, whereas “Son of God” is used by Matthew to express the foundational Christian belief that Jesus is incarnate deity, “Son of Man,” according to Kingsbury, “marks the people to whom it relates as being the opponents of Jesus or un-

31. Mark’s emphasis on the suffering “Son of Man” was more stark than Glazener realized. Almost a decade after Glazener submitted his dissertation, C. M. Tuckett convincingly demonstrated that Mark likely considered the “earthly” sayings in 2.10 and 2.28 to be connected with the later “suffering” sayings by the theme of repudiation (“The Present Son of Man,” *JSNT* 14 [1982]: 58-81). Based on this theory, he concluded that “the rigid classification of Son of Man sayings into three groups may not ultimately be very helpful” (“Son of Man,” 70).

32. Kingsbury, *Matthew: S., C., K.*, 113-22; *idem*, ““Son of Man,”” 193-202; *idem*, “Figure of Jesus,” 3-36; *idem*, *Matthew as Story*, esp. 95-103.

33. Kingsbury, “Figure of Jesus,” 27-28; *idem*, *Matthew as Story*, 95, 99-100.

34. Kingsbury, *Matthew: S., C., K.*, 114; *idem*, ““Son of Man,”” 197.

35. Kingsbury, ““Son of Man,”” 196.

36. Kingsbury, ““Son of Man,”” 196.

37. Kingsbury, *Matthew: S., C., K.*, 114-16, 121-22; *idem*, ““Son of Man,”” 193, 197-99; *idem*, *Matthew as Story*, 100-01.

38. Kingsbury, ““Son of Man,”” 193.

believers.”³⁹ The precise use of “Son of Man,” then, is not like “Son of God,” which tells the reader who Jesus is.⁴⁰ Rather, Kingsbury posited that “Son of Man” “serves to describe Jesus in terms of his relationship to the world, . . . especially as he interacts with his opponents.”⁴¹ This means “Son of Man” is a technical term, “for it bears the unique stamp of Jesus’ life and ministry: earthly, suffering, and vindicated,”⁴² but is not a title, since it does not signify that Jesus holds a certain office.⁴³ It is by the designation “Son of Man” that, as Kingsbury suggested, “Matthew calls the reader’s attention to the twin elements of ‘conflict’ and ‘vindication.’”⁴⁴ It is simply a narrative signal of the destiny of Jesus, the Son of God, both in his earthly ministry and his future exaltation.

1.2.4—John P. Meier

J. P. Meier wrote his historical-critical “mini-commentary” to compliment the literary-critical work of Kingsbury.⁴⁵ His purpose was to examine the Matthean gospel not only as “literary art” but as a “historical artifact.” He attempted to hold true to the narrative, as the literary critics urged, while analyzing what the text confirms about the author and his community, especially their christology.

Meier suggested that Matthew has a “Son-Christology” rather than Kingsbury’s “Son-of-God Christology.”⁴⁶ The Matthean “Son of Man” concept, according to Meier, “cannot be partly swallowed up by Son of God with the parousia left over as an undigestible morsel.”⁴⁷ But neither can “Son of God” be subsumed under “Son

39. Kingsbury, “Son of Man,” 197.

40. Kingsbury, “Figure of Jesus,” 22-27; *idem*, *Matthew as Story*, 96-98.

41. Kingsbury, “Son of Man,” 201; cf. *Matthew: S., C., K.*, 122.

42. Kingsbury, “Figure of Jesus,” 30; *idem*, *Matthew as Story*, 96.

43. Early in Kingsbury’s writing career he referred to ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου as a “title.” However, in his latest work, *Matthew as Story*, Kingsbury claimed that “Son of Man” is not a title because it does not denote who Jesus is (96).

44. Kingsbury, “Figure of Jesus,” 32. In *Matthew as Story*, Kingsbury called the former of these elements “repudiation” (95, 102-103).

45. Meier, *Vision*, 2.

46. Meier, *Vision*, 219.

47. Meier, *Vision*, 218.

of Man.” “The two titles are equally important” to Matthew,⁴⁸ and both are connected by the use of “the Son.” Meier stated,

What the data impose 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. Instead, we should think of an ellipse with two foci, Son of God and Son of Man, with *the* Son floating somewhere in between.

Therefore, although very similar, “Son of God” and “Son of Man” should be read as distinct titles with specific nuances. Following Kingsbury, Meier concluded that “Son of Man” binds the various stages of Jesus’ life and ministry together into a “continuum of meaning, an arch of tension spanning public ministry, passion and exaltation, rule of the world, and final judgment.”⁴⁹ However, Meier uniquely suggested that the “Son of Man” concept “also ties together the Son of Man with the church.”⁵⁰ That is, he is the one who dies on behalf of the Church and will return at the end of the age to judge based on what he had taught the disciples.

Meier’s work is important for two reasons. First, Meier stressed the equality of “Son of Man” with “Son of God” in Mt. Unlike Kingsbury, his reconstruction of Matthean christology is not Son-of-God-centric. Therefore, Meier’s conception is more balanced than that of his colleague. Second, Meier is the first to emphasize the close connection between the Son of Man and his Church. His basic recognition that the Son of Man is the teacher, savior, and protector of the righteous influenced subsequent studies, especially the dissertation of H. Geist, which will be examined below.

1.2.5—Margaret Pamment

Almost a decade subsequent to the publication of Kingsbury’s first examination of the Matthean “Son of Man” concept, M. Pamment argued in a short article entitled, “The Son of Man in the First Gospel,” that the term ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου should be understood in a representative sense. That is, like T. W. Manson and R. H. Fuller, who argued that the human-like figure in Dan 7.13-14 was a “corporate personality” who symbolically represented the saints and their leader, Pamment suggested that the term “Son of Man” in Mt does not merely define who Jesus is but who the

48. Meier, *Vision*, 70.

49. Meier, *Vision*, 218.

50. Meier, *Vision*, 218.

righteous are.⁵¹ “[T]he term ‘the Son of Man,’” Pamment contended, “draws Jesus and his disciples together into a *shared destiny*.”⁵² This “shared destiny,” according to Pamment, consisted of homelessness, the authority to forgive sins, the acceptance of suffering and death, the promise of vindication, and even a joint participation in the judgment at the eschaton.⁵³ The term “Son of Man,” then, was not merely Jesus’ exclusive self-reference in Mt; rather, the designation carried an “added significance,”⁵⁴ being used to denote “every righteous man”⁵⁵ and his or her connection with the destiny of Jesus.

Pamment’s theory has not been widely accepted, based primarily on the observations that the supposed commonality in the respective destinies of Jesus and his disciples are not exact and that several key Matthean “Son of Man” sayings cannot be accounted for under her hypothesis (e.g., 11.19; 16.13; 20.28; 24.30; 26.64). Nonetheless, Pamment has demonstrated persuasively that “Son of Man” is a designation frequently used by Jesus in Mt to refer to himself in relation to the Church he commissioned. She has proven that any suggested definition of Jesus’ enigmatic self-designation must account for the close connection between the Son of Man and his elect.

1.2.6—Barnabas Lindars

In the same year, 1983, B. Lindars published *Jesus Son of Man: A Fresh Examination of the Son of Man Sayings in the Gospels*. As Lindars had done in a number of articles, he argued in his book that the Aramaic בר אַנְשָׁא was behind the Greek ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, implying that the latter should be rendered “a man/human being.” He posited that

outside the gospels and Acts 7.56, the Son of Man does not function as a title in the relevant literature, both Jewish and Christian. The phrase *bar enash* (and its usual Greek equivalent *huios anthropou*) means a man or human being. It carries with it no further implications, except when these are supplied by the context.⁵⁶

51. Pamment, “Son of Man,” 118.

52. Pamment, “Son of Man,” 118 (emphasis mine).

53. Pamment, “Son of Man,” 117.

54. Pamment, “Son of Man,” 127.

55. Pamment, “Son of Man,” 119.

56. Lindars, *Jesus Son of Man*, 10.

Lindars claimed that four-out-of-thirty sayings in Mt preserve this “authentic” reading of “Son of Man” (Mt 8:20/Lk 9:58; Mt 9:6/Mk 2:10/Lk 5:24; Mt 11:16-19/Lk 7:31-35; Mt 12:32/Lk 12:10).⁵⁷ For Jesus, the term generally conveyed that he was a man among a group of men and, therefore, referred to Jesus indirectly, or “generically.”⁵⁸ It was not until the Aramaic idiom was translated into Greek, Lindars suggested, that the early Church found grounds to interpret the phrase in relation to Dan 7.13-14.⁵⁹ When accompanied by citations of or allusions to Dan, the designation “Son of Man” can be perceived as a title, but “not due to any supposed currency of the phrase as a title in Jewish thought of the time of Jesus.”⁶⁰ Rather, the authors of Mk and Q, recognizing that Jesus called himself “Son of Man” on earth, introduced the designation into the sayings of Jesus that describe his eschatological mission. It is in this context, according to Lindars, that the early Church associated the phrase “Son of Man” with the Danielic “one like a son of man.” He suggested that Matthew took “Son of Man” in an apocalyptic sense from his sources and expanded upon the future-referring sayings. This expansion, contended Lindars, was not due to Matthew’s knowledge of a pre-Christian, Jewish use of “Son of Man” as a title. Instead it was due to Matthew’s strong apocalypticism. As per this summary of Lindars’ position, in conclusion to his examination of the Matthean “Son of Man” concept, Lindars stated:

Matthew contributes no further authentic sayings containing the expression besides those which he has incorporated from Mark and Q. But he has seized the phrase as a characteristic feature of the sayings tradition. He understands it as an exclusive self-reference. He is particularly delighted to find that Jesus is represented as referring to himself in this way in contexts which deal with the parousia. . . . The proliferation of sayings in which Jesus speaks of himself as the apocalyptic Son of Man is thus due to Matthew’s interest in apocalyptic, not to general currency of a Son of Man title.⁶¹

Therefore, according to Lindars, the “Son of Man” concept in Mt is almost completely the creation of Matthew and the early Church. The early Christian community drew a connection between Jesus and the human-like figure of Daniel’s night-vision, giving the term an apocalyptic nuance that appealed to Matthew.

57. Lindars, *Jesus Son of Man*, 29-59.

58. Cf. J. Jeremias, “Die älteste Schicht der Menschensohn-Logien,” *ZNW* 58 (1967): 159-72. Jeremias was the first, according to G. Vermes, to suggest a “generic” interpretation of “Son of Man” (G. Vermes, “The Son of Man Debate Revisited [1960-2010],” *JJS* 61 [2010]: 193-206 [197]).

59. Lindars, *Jesus Son of Man*, 24-28.

60. Lindars, *Jesus Son of Man*, 11.

61. Lindars, *Jesus Son of Man*, 129-30.

1.2.7—Heinz Geist

The first, and until recently, the only *published* monograph dedicated to the Matthean “Son of Man” concept arrived a decade subsequent to the submission of Glazener’s dissertation. In *Menschensohn und Gemeinde: Eine redaktionskritische Untersuchung zur Menschensohnprädikation im Matthäusevangelium*, H. Geist, like Glazener, assumed that ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου was a title that has been derived from pre-Christian, Jewish traditions.⁶² However, the methodologies of the two authors are markedly different. Assuming Markan priority and the existence of Q, Geist took a redaction-critical approach to his examination. Instead of surveying the sayings chronologically, Geist placed the sayings into categories based on each one’s source: Mk, Q, and Matthean *Sondergut*.

As in the majority of redaction-critical studies, *Menschensohn und Gemeinde* placed emphasis on the uniquely Matthean “Son of Man” sayings, drawing special attention to Jesus’ exposition on the Parable of the Tares (13.36-43) and the indirect allusion of Dan 7.14 in Mt 28.18.⁶³ It is primarily upon these passages that Geist built the case that Matthew used ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου as “zum Signal einer ‘ekklesialen’ Christologie” (“a signal for an ‘ecclesial’ christology”).⁶⁴ It is his *universal* authority over the world that grounds the mission of the Church to both the Jews and Gentiles. Geist stated:

Of particular relevance is the Matthean interpretation of the parable of darnel among the wheat (13.36-43). It shows the removal of spacial, time-related and personal borders in the Matthean Son of Man concept. The field of action of the Son of Man not only embraces his earthly activity in Israel and his eschatological function. Far more, it embraces the whole of the cosmos, including both Israel and the pagans and extends itself to the time both before and after Easter until the parousia. The redactional combination of the *basileia* concept and the Son of Man concept is especially conspicuous in the syntagma βασιλεία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. The Matthean epilogue 28.16-20 which, with a high degree of probability, is also marked by the Matthean Son of Man concept and defined as a commandment to the disciples, is to be seen in correlation to this Son of Man conception, which is also hinted at in 13.36-43. A narrow connection between christological saying and ecclesiological dimension is thus already outlined here.⁶⁵

62. Geist, *Menschensohn*, 33-71.

63. Geist, *Menschensohn*, 75-126. Geist suggested that the allusion to Dan 7 in Mt 28.18 was indirect: Mt 11.27 echoed Dan 7.14, and Mt 28.18 alluded to 11.27 (Geist, *Menschensohn*, 117-18).

64. Geist, *Menschensohn*, 436 (translation mine), cf. 410-11.

65. Geist, *Menschensohn*, 368; translated by Müller, “*Son of Man*,” 411.

Therefore, “Son of Man” refers to Jesus as one who possesses universal authority over the whole world, especially the Church, as opposed to “Son of David,” which simply denotes Jesus’ kingship over Israel.⁶⁶

Aside from the universal aspect of the Son of Man’s authority, Geist suggested that the *Menschensohnprädikation* has a horizontal aspect in that Matthew “die drei zeitlichen Ebenen des Handelns Jesu nebeneinander unter eine christologische Formel zu fassen . . .” (“summarizes the three temporal levels [i.e., his ministry on earth, his mission between his resurrection and the *Parousia*, and his role at the eschaton] of Jesus’ actions under a [single] christological formula . . .”).⁶⁷ That is, like Kingsbury, Geist concluded that “Son of Man” is a narrative signal of the destiny of Jesus, from his earthly mission to his position as the judicial king in the end-times. In this way, “Son of Man” is set apart from the title “Son of God,” which Geist claimed refers to Jesus’ relationship to the Father.⁶⁸

Even though Geist’s conclusion that ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is one title in a “christologische Trias” with υἱὸς θεοῦ and υἱὸς Δαβὶδ is reductionistic,⁶⁹ his study is helpful for understanding Matthew’s “Son of Man” concept. Like Meier and Pamment before him, Geist recognized that the Matthean “Son of Man” concept was interconnected with the author’s ecclesiology. Unlike his predecessors, however, Geist argued his thesis with greater clarity, taking into account tradition-, source- and redaction-critical evidence and techniques. Further, he expanded upon the theories of Meier and emphasized the ties between the Parable of the Tares and the Great Commission. This demonstrated that Matthew was imminently concerned with presenting the Son of Man as the heavenly representative of the elect, who participates in the Christian community between his exaltation and second advent.

1.2.8—Douglas R. A. Hare

In 1990, D. R. A. Hare published his influential book, *The Son of Man Tradition*, in which he attempted to test the hypothesis of R. Leivestad concerning the origin

66. Geist, *Menschensohn*, 410.

67. Geist, *Menschensohn*, 425 (translation mine).

68. Geist, *Menschensohn*, 411.

69. Geist, *Menschensohn*, 410-11, 438.

and meaning of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.⁷⁰ Leivestad argued, in the words of Hare, “that since the extant Jewish material is inadequate to prove the existence of a pre-Christian tradition about a heavenly Son of Man, the New Testament ought not to be used to bolster up a flimsy history-of-religions hypothesis but should be examined in its own right; on this basis we see that the New Testament writers do not treat the phrase as an apocalyptic title.”⁷¹ Therefore, as Leivestad had done, Hare discounted the influence of Dan 7 and 1 En 37-71 on the evangelists’ understanding and presentation of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.⁷² He suggested that since “[n]o scholar can fairly claim on the basis of the extant evidence that ‘the Son of Man’ had become a widespread, universally recognized title for a supernatural figure,”⁷³ and that, parroting Perrin, “[t]here was no established [‘Son of Man’] concept, only diverse uses of the imagery of Daniel 7,”⁷⁴ Dan 7 and related texts are a weak foundation on which to begin an investigation of the meaning of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in the New Testament.

Instead of basing his research on an examination of the supposed Aramaic origination of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου or background literature, Hare attempted an “unprejudiced investigation” of the Matthean “Son of Man” concept by observing how Matthew has used the phrase in context.⁷⁵ After examining each “Son of Man” saying in Mt in chronological order, Hare concluded that ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου “denotes” Jesus as an agent of God who must suffer and die, but will one day return as the judge of the nations. However, it is not demonstrable that ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου “connotes” this.⁷⁶ Although the term “is found primarily in passages where Jesus speaks of his vocation and destiny,”⁷⁷ it signals “the mystery of Jesus’ destiny without ‘containing’ that destiny as its connotation.”⁷⁸ Instead, it connotes Jesus as “the

70. Cf. R. Leivestad, “Exit the Apocalyptic Son of Man,” *NTS* 18 (1971-72): 243-67.

71. Hare, *Son of Man*, 4.

72. Hare, *Son of Man*, 9-21 (esp. 20-21).

73. Hare, *Son of Man*, 21.

74. Hare, *Son of Man*, 4.

75. Hare, *Son of Man*, 115.

76. Hare, *Son of Man*, 181.

77. Hare, *Son of Man*, 181.

78. Hare, *Son of Man*, 181-82.

Human Being par excellence,” or it is perhaps a nickname, the origin and exact meaning of which has been lost to time, much like “Sons of Thunder” (Mk 3.17).⁷⁹

Hare’s study is valuable in that it presses upon the reader the necessity and importance of allowing the context of Mt to be the guide for exegesis. Several studies of the Matthean “Son of Man” concept before Hare’s work did employ similar methodologies. However, most split each of the sayings into categories, whether for the purpose of determining the authenticity or inauthenticity of a group of sayings or to confirm the source of certain sayings. These studies, by consequence of their format, stripped the sayings of their context. Thereby, they only succeeded in providing a semi-accurate picture of Matthew’s christology and that of his sources. Hare fortunately did not fall into this trap, but rather examined Matthew’s “Son of Man” sayings according to the order in which the author placed each. This allowed the context to be his guide. It is this portion of Hare’s methodology that should be assimilated by future authors, as it will be in this dissertation.

1.2.9—Ulrich Luz

U. Luz took a similar stance as Hare in his 1992 article entitled, “The Son of Man in Matthew: Heavenly Judge or Human Christ.” However, while Hare suggested that there was no pre-Christian, Jewish tradition concerning a “Son of Man” by which the authors of the canonical gospels might have been influenced, Luz suggested otherwise. He began his article by stating his belief “that the earliest Christians, and even Jesus himself, shared the conviction of some Jewish apocalyptic circles that a messianic heavenly judge called ‘the son of the man’ would appear and that they believed that Jesus was that son of the man.”⁸⁰ Yet, Luz argued that this Jewish apocalyptic tradition was lost to Matthew:

Matthew did not draw on a Jewish apocalyptic expectation of a messianic figure called “Son of Man,” which might have been familiar in certain Jewish circles, but not everywhere in Judaism. He never presupposes or hints at such an expectation.⁸¹

It was Luz’ contention that “[t]here is no indication whatsoever that Matthew presupposed an apocalyptic meaning of ‘the son of the man’ among his readers, because there is no indication whatsoever that he himself was conscious of such a

79. Hare, *Son of Man*, 181.

80. Luz, “Son of Man,” 3-4.

81. Luz, “Son of Man,” 8.

meaning besides his own Christian traditions about Jesus the son of the man.”⁸² That is, he concluded that although Matthew knew Dan 7.13-14, as can be seen in 24.30, 26.64, and 28.18, he only knew the passage through his source or sources.⁸³ He stated, “It is not the title ‘son of the man’ which adds to Matthew’s Christology an apocalyptic dimension, but because Jesus the son of the man will exact the future judgment, the expression ‘son of the man’ has also an apocalyptic dimension.”⁸⁴ Therefore, to Matthew ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is not an apocalyptic designation. Instead, Luz followed Geist in suggesting that “Son of Man” is a christological expression with a “horizontal dimension” and a “universal dimension.”⁸⁵ It is horizontal in that it is the means by which Jesus expresses his destiny: from his earthly ministry, to the cross, to his resurrection, and eventually to his second coming as the eschatological judge. Likewise, the designation possesses a universal quality in that it is used to tell the story of Jesus in relation to all people and not merely Israel. It is this uncolloquial phrase, therefore, that connects the stages in the life and ministry of Jesus.

Luz’ suggestion that there existed a pre-Christian, Jewish tradition concerning “the Son of the Man” but Matthew was not influenced by it is unique among the literature here surveyed. Otherwise, Luz’ perspective on the Matthean “Son of Man” concept is much like that of his predecessors. He demonstrated a superb understanding of both the Matthean narrative and the intricacies of the “Son of Man” debate, but there are few original contributions to the understanding of the Matthean “Son of Man” concept in Luz’ work. It is essentially an amalgamation of previous perspectives, especially those of Kingsbury, Geist, and Hare.

1.2.10—Leslie W. Walck

Aligning himself with such authors as D. R. Catchpole⁸⁶ and J. Theisohn,⁸⁷ L. W. Wal-

82. Luz, “Son of Man,” 8.

83. Luz, “Son of Man,” 8.

84. Luz, “Son of Man,” 18.

85. Luz, “Son of Man,” 18.

86. D. R. Catchpole, “The Poor on Earth and the Son of Man in Heaven: A Re-appraisal of Matthew 25:31-46,” *BJRL* 61 (1979): 355-97.

87. J. Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter: Untersuchungen zum traditionsgeschichtlichem Ort der Menschensohngestalt der Bilderreden des Äthiopischen Henoch* (SUNT 12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975), 149-201.

ck argued that Matthew is literarily dependent upon the *Similitudes of Enoch* for his unique apocalyptic “Son of Man” concept. Walck provided a summation of the parallels between the documents:

The Son of Man in both Matthew and *Par. En.* is seated on the throne of his glory, and angels are present. The scene of enthronement in both carries within it the theme of judgment. All the world is to be judged in both. The world is divided into two groups, some for blessing, and the others for condemnation. Mercy is not granted following the judgment, even though it is sought. The theme of recognition and non-recognition is significant in both works, and judgment in both is dependent on how those with whom the judge identifies were treated. These many common themes and perspectives . . . indicate a significant relationship between the two documents.⁸⁸

One of the most prominent obstacles to Walck’s proposal has been the date of the *Parables*. Until recently it had been the majority perspective that the composition date of *1 En* 37-71 was concurrent with or after the composition of Mt, i.e., the late first- or early second-century CE. However, in recent years there has become a consensus that the *Parables* were written prior to the turn of the millennium. The changing of the tide can be seen starkly in the published determinations of the Third Enoch Seminar in Camaldoli, Italy, in the summer of 2005, to which Walck was a contributor.⁸⁹ Walck agreed with the findings of this seminar and proposed that Matthew could have been aware of the Enochic apocalyptic tradition.

Having advanced an early date for the *Parables*, Walck provided a detailed description of “that Son of Man” in *1 En* 37-71 before he proceeded to highlight parallels between the Enochic text and a selection of Matthean “Son of Man” sayings (10.23; 13.37, 41; 16.13, 21, 27-28; 19.28; 24.30-31; 25.31-34, 41, 46). He charted thirty parallels between the Enochic presentation of the Danielic figure and Mt’s christology.⁹⁰ The most significant similarities are the possible citation of the second and third parables’ “(his)⁹¹ throne of glory” in Mt 19.28 and 25.31,⁹² the common judicial role of the respective apocalyptic figures,⁹³ the presence of angels at the eschato-

88. Walck, *Son of Man in the Parables*, 13.

89. G. Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), *passim*.

90. Walck, *Son of Man in the Parables*, 226, 227-28, 244. Walck goes outside the “Son of Man” sayings into the larger Matthean narrative for these parallels, since Jesus and the Son of Man are clearly identified by Matthew (Walck, *Son of Man in the Parables*, 227 n. 1).

91. Note that there is no possessive pronoun in Classical Ethiopic.

92. Cf. *1 En* 62.5, 69.27, 29.

93. Cf. *1 En* 46; 62-63; 69.26-29; Mt 13.36-43; 16.27; 19.28; 24.30; 25.31.

logical judgment,⁹⁴ and the shared worthiness to be worshipped.⁹⁵ Although many, or possibly all, of Walck's supposed parallels can be explained based on known Matthean sources such as Mk, Q, and Dan 7, he demonstrated that the "Son of Man" concepts of the *Parables* and Mt are remarkably similar and, at the very least, evolved from the same primordial ooze.

—Statement of Thesis—

Matthew consists of two narrative parts: the "story" and the "discourse."⁹⁶ The "story" of the gospel "is of the life of Jesus from conception and birth to death and resurrection."⁹⁷ This storyline anticipates the continuation of Jesus' story into his after-life: his post-exaltation presence with the disciples as they complete their mission to all nations (cf. 13.37-38; 28.18-20), as well as his role in the Eschatological Assize (cf. 16.27; 19.28; 25.31-46). The "discourse," meanwhile, is how Matthew conveyed the "story,"⁹⁸ namely, through a series of events (i.e., the plot),⁹⁹ the characters (e.g., Jesus, the disciples, the religious leaders),¹⁰⁰ and the setting (which Kingsbury defined as "the place or time or social circumstances in which the character acts").¹⁰¹

It is widely accepted "that the element of conflict is the essence of Gospel-plot."¹⁰² That is, conflict, "the struggle of forces vying to prevail,"¹⁰³ is the pivot on

94. Cf. 1 En 71.8-14; Mt 13.41; 16.27; 24.31; 25.31.

95. Cf. 1 En 48.5, 62.6; Mt 2.2, 11; 8.2; 9.18; 14.33; 15.25; 20.20; 28.9.

96. Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story*, 2-3. This terminology was derived from the work of the literary critic S. Chatman (*Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film* [Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978], 19-27).

97. Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story*, 3.

98. Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story*, 3.

99. Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story*, 3-9; cf. Arist, *Politics* 6.8.

100. Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story*, 9-28.

101. Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story*, 28-30. Kingsbury's definition of "setting" (cf. *Matthew as Story*, 28) was obtained from M. H. Abrams, *A Glossary of Literary Terms* (4th Ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1981), 175.

102. J. D. Kingsbury, "The Developing Conflict between Jesus and the Jewish Leaders in Matthew's Gospel: A Literary-Critical Study," *CBQ* 49 (1987): 57-73 (57).

103. D. Rhoads, et al., *Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel* (2nd Ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999), 77.

which the plot turns.¹⁰⁴ Concerning the importance of conflict to stories, D. Rhoads wrote:

Conflict is at the heart of most stories. Without conflict, stories would be only a sequence of events [i.e., plot] strung together without tension or suspense or struggle on the part of the characters. *Conflict reveals the core values and beliefs of a narrative.*¹⁰⁵

It is noteworthy, then, that the Matthean “Son of Man” concept is directly bound to *the progression of conflict* in Matthew’s story of Jesus.

The first person to examine the relationship between the “Son of Man” concept and the theme of conflict in Mt, and the one to do so in the most thorough manner, was Kingsbury. Kingsbury recognized that in Mt Jesus commonly refers to himself as the “Son of Man” in contexts where he speaks about his past, present, or future engagements in conflict with those outside the ἐκκλησία. This includes, but is not limited to, Jesus’ polemical discourse with the religious leaders concerning matters of the Law (cf. 12.8), his predictions of his execution at the hands of the citizens of Jerusalem (cf. 12.39-40; 17.12, 22-23; 20.18-19, 28; 26.2, 24, 45), and his predictions of his adjudication over the nations at the eschaton (cf. 13.41-42; 16.27; 19.28; 25.31-46). But Kingsbury’s remarkable observation is overshadowed by two marked deficiencies.

First, Kingsbury put very little emphasis on the Son of Man’s role past the narrative bounds of Matthew’s gospel. He, like many of his fellow scholars, failed to take account of the continuance of conflict, and the Son of Man’s role in that conflict, past the resurrection. The participation of the Son of Man not only in conflict but the resolution to conflict also has been noticeably underdeveloped in the work of Kingsbury and those mentioned above who have followed in his footsteps.

Second, Kingsbury approached his analysis of the Matthean “Son of Man” concept with the assumption that “Son of God” was a superior, “confessional” title under which “Son of Man,” the “public” title, was to be subsumed.¹⁰⁶ By suggesting

104. Kingsbury, “Developing Conflict,” 57-73; *idem*, *Matthew as Story*, 3-9; *idem*, *Conflict in Mark: Jesus, Authorities, Disciples* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989), 86; M. A. Powell, “The Plot and Subplots of Matthew’s Gospel,” *NTS* 38 (1992): 187-203; R. C. Branden, *Satanic Conflict and the Plot of Matthew* (SBL 89. New York: Peter Lang, 2006); cf. D. Rhoads, “Narrative Criticism and the Gospel of Mark,” *JAAR* 50 (1982): 411-34 (415). Powell asserted that Mt has a main plot and various subplots. The main plot, according to Powell, revolves around God saving his people from their sins and his conflict with Satan. Although Kingsbury would bring Jesus’ conflict with the religious leaders and disciples to the fore, Powell claimed that these conflicts are simply subplots to the main.

105. Rhoads, *Mark as Story*, 77 (emphasis mine).

106. Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story*, 102-03.

that “Son of God” was the title that believers used to express faith in Jesus, while “Son of Man” was the title Jesus used exclusively to confront the world,¹⁰⁷ Kingsbury neglected to note that “Son of Man” was also employed by Matthew’s Jesus to allude to his relationship to the elect and to his leadership role in the kingdom of God. Although at times more subtle than his conflict with outsiders, scholars such as Meier, Pamment, Geist, and Luz have demonstrated that the Son of Man is depicted by Matthew as being intimately involved with the advancement of the kingdom and the preservation of the righteous. He is a teacher of (8.20) and an example to (20.28) the community of believers. It is his power that grounds the disciples’ authority to heal and to forgive sins (9.6, 8; cf. 19.28), as well as to take the gospel to “all the nations” (13.36-43; 24.30-31; 28.18-20) in his kingdom (13.41; 16.28; cf. 20.21). The Son of Man’s self-sacrifice established a “covenant” (17.22-23; 20.17-19; 20.28; cf. 16.21; 26.28) for the new “people” of God (21.43), and it is the one who is righteous under this covenant that will be blessed by the Son of Man at the eschaton (13.43; 16.27; 19.28; 25.31-46). Thus, “Son of Man” is the self-designation with which Jesus engages “the world” and the Church as the representative of the righteous and the sovereign ruler over the kingdom of God.

Although a portion of the scholars who published works after Kingsbury rightly recognized that his theory concerning the Son of Man’s interaction with outsiders was unjustifiably limited, the conclusion that the Son of Man is the representative of the Church has not been properly evaluated in light of the theme of conflict. That is, it is now commonly recognized that the Son of Man, according to Mt, engages his Church and confronts outsiders, but, hitherto, the connection between these interactions has largely gone undiscussed.

It is the intent of this dissertation to demonstrate that the Son of Man is described in Mt as being at the center of the formative conflict that forced the split between “this generation” and the Matthean community and initiated the Gentile-inclusive mission. According to Matthew, the Son of Man is not engaged in aimless conflict; he confronts and destroys his enemies for the sake of promoting his universal reign and establishing his Church, i.e., the “sons of the kingdom” (13.38), among the nations (cf. OG Dan 7.14; 24.14; 28.18-20). It is his authority over the kingdom of God, given subsequent to and consequent to the judgment of God

107. Kingsbury, “Son of Man,” 201-02; *idem*, “Figure of Jesus,” 28-29.

against “this generation” in 70 CE, that enables the global mission of the disciples, provides the *raison d’être* for their mission, and assures the Christian community that the Son of Man will return at the eschaton to bring a final end to conflict.

It is the first aim of this dissertation, therefore, to analyze each Matthean “Son of Man” saying for indications of conflict between those inside the kingdom (i.e., Jesus and the righteous) and those outwith the kingdom (i.e., Satan and the unrighteous). This has been done to a limited extent by Kingsbury. However, he left substantial room to develop the connection between conflict and the “Son of Man” sayings in the plot of Mt, especially as it pertains to the narratively early sayings in Mt 8-13 and those that refer to the Son of Man’s post-exaltation roles. This study will attempt to demonstrate that the Matthean “Son of Man” sayings are not a heterogeneous mixture of christological statements that recall “the whole of the history of Jesus”¹⁰⁸—his life, death, and after-life generally—which may loosely be united by the theme of tension.¹⁰⁹ Instead, the “Son of Man” sayings in Mt refer specifically to Jesus’ role in the developing conflict between the kingdom community and those who oppose its establishment. It is the strong bond of conflict that unites the “Son of Man” concept in Mt, from the first saying in 8.20 to the Matthean epilogue, and from his role as the prophetic spokesperson of God to his role as the eschatological judge.

As in every story, tension anticipates alleviation. Hence, the second objective of this dissertation, and one that has largely been neglected in modern analyses of the Matthean “Son of Man” concept, is to evaluate how the Son of Man participates in conflict resolution. It is commonly assumed that conflict “reaches its resolution in the cross and resurrection.”¹¹⁰ But for Matthew, the resolution does not happen in the narrative itself. The vindication of the resurrection is the first step towards resolution; but there was no resolution of conflict in the resurrection because “the Messiah’s task of defeating the enemies of God, judging the earth and establishing God’s Kingdom still was not accomplished.”¹¹¹ Rather, this conflict is

108. Luz, “Son of Man,” 19-20; cf. Kingsbury, “Figure of Jesus,” 30; *idem*, *Matthew as Story*, 96; Meier, *Vision*, 218; Pamment, “Son of Man,” 118; Geist, *Menschensohn*, 425; Hare, *Son of Man*, 181.

109. Meier, *Vision*, 218.

110. J. D. Kingsbury, “The Plot of Matthew’s Gospel,” *Int* 46 (1992): 347-56.

111. M. Bockmuehl, *This Jesus: Martyr, Lord, Messiah* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994), 57.

brought to an end, according to Mt, in two stages, both of which center on the Son of Man and his community.

First, the Father punished “this generation”—that is, those Jews who did not respond in a positive manner to Jesus or his message—by allowing Jerusalem to fall under the Roman sword in 70 CE. For their lack of repentance and their repudiation of God’s Son, the generation of Jews who denied Jesus’ kingship experienced God’s reprisal. This exhibition of God’s wrath was not only an indication that the Matthean community was justified in abandoning the exclusive mission to the “lost sheep of the house of Israel” (10.5-6); it was a concrete, physical manifestation of the Son of Man’s reception of “all authority in heaven and on earth” (28.18; cf. 10.23; 16.28; 24.30; 26.64), an empowerment that enabled Matthew’s community to commence a mission to “all the nations.” Additionally, the Father’s appointment of the Son of Man over the kingdom after the fall of the Temple authorized the Son of Man to execute the second stage of conflict resolution: the Eschatological Assize. This end-times judgment is for the elimination of all causes of evil and evildoers, including “this generation,” those from among the nations who do not receive the disciples, Satan, and his angels. But such punishment is balanced with the reward of the righteous sufferer. It is by this end-times adjudication that the Son of Man provides a permanent end to conflict on behalf of his kingdom-people.

The focus of this dissertation is on the text of Mt and its development of the “Son of Man” concept rather than on historical issues behind the gospel. But since literary conclusions have historical implications, this study will question how the Son of Man’s conflict with “this generation” and his exaltation in the wake of their punishment was used to explain and justify the Matthean community’s mission to the Gentiles. Further, this study will attempt to answer the corollary question concerning what meaning and significance Matthew gave the designation ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

—Prospectus—

In the following chapter, methodological and interpretive concerns will be examined. At the end of the chapter there will be a brief discussion of the textual history, translation, and theology of the oldest Greek reading of Dan 7.13-14, a text cited and alluded to frequently in Mt. Since several studies have demonstrated confusion

concerning the Danielic vision, and because Matthew's christology appears to have been heavily influenced by this text (a postulation defended later in this dissertation), a short exegesis is pedagogically beneficial.

In Chapters Three and Four, the "Son of Man" sayings in Mt 8-13 and 16-26 are analyzed to determine how each saying contributes to the evolving Matthean "Son of Man" concept and the unfolding conflict between Jesus and his "sons" and Satan with his "sons" (cf. 13.37-39). It is demonstrated that the "Son of Man" sayings are not a heterogeneous mixture of "earthly," "suffering," and "future" statements that simply concern the life and ministry of Jesus. Matthean redaction has woven the "Son of Man" sayings into a grand tapestry of meaning, sewn into the conflict that precipitated the split of the Matthean community from "this wicked and adulterous generation" for the purpose of spreading the word of the kingdom to the nations. It is shown that the advancement of conflict is matched by the resolution of conflict. This resolution occurs in two stages. According to Mt, God began to resolve the conflict with "this generation" in 70 CE, when he destroyed Jerusalem and bestowed upon the Son of Man universal dominion and an everlasting kingdom. The Son of Man's empowerment enables him to preside over the Eschatological Assize, consequently fulfilling the predictions of end-times reprisal given to "this generation" (cf. 11.20-24; 12.39-42) and bringing a permanent end to conflict.

Chapter Five examines the allusion to the Old Greek version of Dan 7.13-14 in 28.18-20 and its connection to the commissioning of the disciples. It is suggested that "all authority in heaven and on earth" is not obtained through a supposed proleptic experience of the *Parousia* in Jesus' resurrection or death, or simply by means of his sonship to the Father. Rather, the Son of Man's universal sovereignty, by which the Church is empowered to "make disciples of all nations," was received from the Ancient of Days after the events of 70 CE. That is, the exaltation of the Son of Man, which is physically signaled by the destruction of Herod's Temple, initiated and justified the Matthean community's schism from "this generation" and their mission to "all the nations." Additionally, the divine empowerment of the Son of Man grounded the community's eschatological hope for conflict resolution. This chapter ends with a discussion of how this theory impacts one's understanding of Matthean missiology and salvation-history.

The final chapter summarizes the preceding evidence, details the various contributions of this dissertation, and concludes that, for Matthew, “Son of Man” is more than a mere signal word for speech about Jesus’ death, resurrection, and exaltation. “Son of Man” is a self-designation employed by Jesus that Matthew has interpreted as a title referring to Jesus’ office as the exalted human-like figure of Old Greek Dan 7. Like the enigmatic human-like figure of Daniel’s night-vision, the Son of Man is the exalted representative of the elect and is with his community “until the end of the age” (28.20).

Chapter Two

Methodology and Interpretive Issues

—Methodology—

As with all words, both titles and designations hold little meaning apart from the contexts in which they appear. Having been heavily influenced by the work of J. Barr, L. E. Keck stated,

“Significance” is intelligible only in relation to something or someone. Accordingly, the subject-matter of christology is really the syntax of relationships or correlations.¹

This implies that the significance of a title or designation to an author and his or her readers is derived from an investigation of its narrative interactions.² To remove christological terms from the narrative context for the purpose of what Keck has cleverly deemed “palaeontology”³ is to assume that meaning resides in words and phrases when, in fact, meaning resides in the sentence. For it is there that “real theological thinking is done.”⁴ Keck’s critique, then, reminds the reader of the importance of knowing not only the philological and socio-religious backgrounds of a term such as ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, but also the seriousness of recognizing the way in which the author uses the phrase in the narrative as a whole:

Titles are, after all, simply shorthand expressions for what is to be held true. To understand what is meant by the use of a title, it is necessary to look at the way in which it is used in the story.⁵

The studies of Tödt and Geist, for instance, separated the individual sayings from the context by grouping them according to their respective source or time-referent (i.e., narrative-present or narrative-future). In doing so, the sayings were robbed of their context. This allowed the authors to skew certain sayings towards

1. L. E. Keck, “Toward the Renewal of New Testament Christology,” *NTS* 32 (1986): 362-77 (363).

2. Keck’s article could be taken to suggest that any examination of christological titles will lead to greater “aridity” in the discipline of christology (Keck, “Christology,” 368). But although his language is very harsh—for example, Keck declares, “Renewing the discipline of NT christology requires . . . liberating it from *the tyranny of titles*” (Keck, “Christology,” 368 [emphasis mine])—it is clear that not all studies of christological terms are being condemned, for “obviously they cannot be ignored” (Keck, “Christology,” 368). Keck is primarily concerned about the “fascination with the palaeontology of christological titles” (Keck, “Christology,” 368) to the exclusion of the narratives in which the terms are found. Since this dissertation tries to give weight to both the “palaeontology” of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, as well as the Matthean narrative in which the designation appears, it does not seem that the present study falls under the critiques of Keck.

3. Keck, “Christology,” 368.

4. J. Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961), 234.

5. M. D. Hooker, “‘Who Can This Be?’: The Christology of Mark’s Gospel,” in R. N. Longenecker (ed.), *Contours of Christology in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 79-99 (81).

their biases and caused them to miss themes and intertextual connections that may otherwise have been recognized if their studies had sought to consider the sayings from the contexts in which they had been placed. As R. G. Hammerton-Kelly aptly commented, “systematic arrangement of the [examined] material . . . too often pre-determines the results of the investigation.”⁶ Although classifying “Son of Man” sayings can be pedagogically profitable, to understand the significance of the “Son of Man” sayings in and the meaning of the term “Son of Man” according to the plot of Mt, it is imperative to examine each saying in its respective context.

Therefore, as Hare has done prior,⁷ this dissertation will examine the Matthean “Son of Man” sayings in the order in which they appear in Matthew’s gospel. This will not be a narrative-critical reading, though this study is informed of literary concepts. Rather, this dissertation is a narrative-sensitive reading of the Matthean “Son of Man” sayings, one that attempts to analyze Matthew’s christological concept as it relates to the plot of the gospel. Since focus will be placed on Mt as a narrative whole, there will be less emphasis on Matthew’s redaction of Mk and Q than has been seen in previous studies. This does not, however, exclude the use of source and redaction criticisms when and where necessary to illuminate Matthew’s emphases.

—Interpretive Issues—

2.2.1—Assumptions Regarding Authorship and Synoptic Relationships

Without attempting to imply that the disciple Matthew was the author of the gospel that bears his name, this dissertation, for the sake of terminological clarity, will refer to the author as “Matthew.” Likewise, the authors of the Second, Third, and Fourth gospels will be referred to respectively as “Mark,” “Luke” and “John” without any historical assumption on the part of the present author.

As in the vast majority of modern biblical scholarship, this study accepts the basic Two-source hypothesis as the most plausible understanding of synoptic relationships. It is assumed that Matthew consulted the final form of Mk and a

6. R. G. Hammerton-Kelly, *Pre-existence, Wisdom, and the Son of Man* (SNTSMS 21. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 13.

7. Cf. Hare, *Son of Man*, 115.

shared source with the evangelist Luke, known as “Quelle”—commonly designated “Q.” The existence of the hypothetical documents “M” and “L” proposed by B. H. Streeter and supposed recensions of “Q” (i.e., “Q¹,” “Q²,” etc.) will not be considered.

2.2.2—The Composition Date of Matthew’s Gospel

Determining the date of Mt’s composition is challenging, to say the least. Therefore, one must not be dogmatic with one’s conclusions,⁸ when speculating about the nature and setting of a historical author or community behind a certain writing, one must proverbially write his or her findings in pencil. This uncertainty, however, should not dissuade the researcher from making educated guesses based upon what evidence is available.

Scholars are divided as to whether Matthew penned his gospel before⁹ or after¹⁰ the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE. A *terminus ad quem* of approximately 100 CE is suggested by citations of Mt in the writings of Ignatius, who died c. 108 CE. Streeter concluded that there are fifteen citations of Mt in the works of Ignatius, two of which refer to Matthean *Sondergut* (cf. Mt 3.15/Smyrn i.1; Mt 8.17/Polyc i.2-3).¹¹ A *terminus a quo* is, of course, around 30 CE, after the death and resurrection of Jesus; but to narrow the time down more than this is complicated.

There are a few theories select scholars have advanced with the goal of proving a post-70 CE date for Mt, though most are not convincing. Dating Mt based on its dependence upon Mk is a fruitless task since there is little consensus about when Mk was written and there is no way of knowing how long Mk circulated be-

8. D. A. Hagner, *Matthew 1-13* [WBC 33a. Dallas: Word Books, 1993], 1:lxv.

9. R. Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 599-608; France, *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher*, 91; *idem*, *The Gospel of Matthew* (NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 18-19; Hagner, *Matthew*, 1:lxiii-lxxv; D. A. Carson, *Matthew 1-12* (EBC. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995), 1:20-21; C. Blomberg, *Matthew: An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture* (NAC 22. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1992), 41-42; D. A. Carson and D. J. Moo, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (2nd Ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005), 156; C. A. Evans, *Matthew* (NCBC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 5.

10. R. H. Mounce, *Matthew: A Good News Commentary* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1985), xiv-xv; Meier, *Vision*, 12-13; W. D. Davies and D. C. Allison Jr., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew* (ICC. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988), 1:138; C. Keener, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 42-44.

11. B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (London: Macmillan, 1925), 505. Meier claimed that Ign, Eph 19.2-3 may be the earliest exegesis of Matthew’s story of the magi (*Vision*, 13-14 n. 15)

fore it fell into the hands of Matthew. Second, Mt 27.8; 28.15 state that a certain thing has lasted “to this day.” Although this implies that an extended period of time has passed between the original event and the composition date of Mt, there is no need to posit more than a one or two decade separation. Third, the references to the ἐκκλησία (cf. 16.18; 18.17-18) are not necessarily indicative of late first-century Christian writings since advanced ecclesiastical structure can be witnessed in Paul’s Epistle to the Philippians (cf. Phil 1.1), for example.¹²

However, there are at least four indicators in the text of Mt that may suggest the gospel was written within a few decades after the first Roman siege of Jerusalem.

First, Mt 22.7 may be taken to suggest that Mt was written after the destruction of the Temple: “The king was angry, and he sent his troops and destroyed those murderers and burned their city.” The context suggests that Matthew is referring parabolically to the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE,¹³ an event accompanied by the ruination of Herod’s Temple with fire. But this is not *ipso facto* prophecy *ex eventu*. It is possible that Matthew, to stress the severity of Jerusalem’s impending destruction, added prior to the event the reference to “fire,” a devastating weapon of war. Nonetheless, the reference to a troop consuming a city with fire is a conspicuous Matthean addition that gives the impression that Matthew is reflecting retrospectively on the 70 CE catastrophe.

Equally suggestive is the advanced christology of the gospel. One may suggest, as many have before, that Mt’s christology is no more advanced than what one finds in, for example, Phil 2.5-11, or the trinitarian formulas of 1 Cor 12.4-6 and 2 Cor 13.14. However, “the loaded phrase, ‘the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Spirit,’ is, excepting possibly Did. 7, which in any case here depends upon Matthew, without true parallel in first-century Christian literature.”¹⁴ It stands as a potential link between the binitarianism and latent trinitarianism of the

12. Cf. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:132-33.

13. Davies and Allison rightly stated: “The Jewish mind passed indiscriminately from city (Jerusalem) to temple. As far as the ancient literature is concerned, one may speak of the interpenetration or identification of city and temple. So who is to say that when Matthew wrote of the city being burned (22.7), he could not have been thinking of the burning of the temple?” (*Matthew*, 1:132).

14. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:133.

first-century and the more developed trinitarian thought of the subsequent centuries.

Third, as will be discussed further elsewhere, Matthew has taken pains to distinguish between the coming of the Son of Man “on the clouds of heaven” in association with the destruction of the Temple and the Son of Man’s *Parousia* at the “end of the age,” events that Mark conflated.¹⁵ This may indicate that Matthew, when expanding on his Markan source, reflected back on the fall of the Temple as a past event and recognized, naturally, that Jesus had not yet returned.

Finally, the post-Easter conflict between Matthew’s congregation and Pharisaical Judaism alluded to throughout the gospel (e.g., 10.16-23; 12.1-50; 23.2-36; 24.9-13) may suggest a post-70 composition of Mt. With the severity of the Roman siege and the destruction of the Temple, the Sadducees, Herodians, and Zealots lost much—if not all—of their power and influence. However, due to their close ties with the synagogue rather than the Temple or the State, the Pharisees and scribes took over as the representatives of Israel and her people in the post-70 leadership vacuum. Matthew’s emphasis on the Pharisees and the scribes as being the primary enemies of Jesus and his disciples, as well as his elimination of Pharisees sympathetic to Jesus’ message from his sources (cf. 9.18-26; 22.15, 34-40), possibly suggest that he is writing after 70 CE during the beginning of the Pharisaical, proto-Rabbinic movement.

Although suggestive, these observations are not enough to prove definitively that Mt was written after the destruction of Jerusalem and her Temple. Yet, based on the above-mentioned observations, there is enough evidence to tentatively conclude that Mt was written after 70 CE.

2.2.3—Can We Speak of a Matthean “Community”?

In the collection of essays entitled, *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*, R. Bauckham provocatively proposed that the gospels were not written for single communities. Rather, “an evangelist writing a gospel expected his work to circulate widely among the churches, had no particular audience in view, but

15. Keener, *Matthew*, 43.

envisaged as his audience any church (or any church in which Greek was understood) to which his work might find its way.”¹⁶ He substantiates his theory by means of two primary claims.

First, Bauckham contrasts the Pauline Epistles with the gospels.¹⁷ He argues that it remains common among biblical researchers to employ the same hermeneutic when examining the gospels and the Letters of Paul. Missives have a narrow audience and message; but, as Bauckham argues, gospels do not.¹⁸ Letters were tailored for a particular readership and rarely circulated broader than their intended audience. However, gospels, as analogous to the genre *bios*,¹⁹ are suited for wide consumption.²⁰ An author would compose his gospel and circulate it in his immediate community. But since, as Bauckham claims, gospels have a broad message and intended audience, it is reasonable to deduce that an author expected his gospel—if it was accepted in his own community—to be disseminated widely.²¹ This explains why the evangelists composed written gospels instead of allowing their respective communities to perpetuate Jesus traditions through oral accounts: the evangelists expected their gospels to be read by any Christ-follower or prospective Christian.²²

Second, Bauckham argues that due in part to the ease of mobility in the Roman Empire during the first-century CE,

The early Christian movement was not a scattering of isolated, self-sufficient communities with little or no communication between them, but quite the opposite: a network of communities with constant, close communication among themselves.”²³

16. R. Bauckham, “For Whom Were the Gospels Written,” in R. Bauckham (ed.), *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 9-48 (11).

17. Bauckham, *Gospels*, 26-30.

18. Bauckham, *Gospels*, 26-27.

19. Although some have argued against the proposal that the gospels are representative of Christian *bios* (see in particular D. C. Sim, “The Gospels for All Christians? A Response to Richard Bauckham,” *JSNT* 84 [2001]: 3-27), this conclusion is widely accepted (cf. R. A. Burridge, *What are the Gospels?: A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography* [2nd Ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004]).

20. Bauckham, *Gospels*, 29.

21. Bauckham, *Gospels*, 29.

22. Bauckham, *Gospels*, 30. To Bauckham’s argument one might add the observation that small communities taking on the financial burden of creating gospels may suggest that they intended the works to be circulated widely and that the gospels were not simply for the consumption of specific communities.

23. Bauckham, *Gospels*, 30.

Bauckham infers that the evangelists expected their gospels to be sent out beyond the bounds of their respective communities to be read and enjoyed throughout the Greek-speaking world. But he also suggests that it was relatively easy for multiple communities to procure gospels commissioned by other groups.

Although Bauckham's theory has come under attack repeatedly over nearly two decades,²⁴ it has largely received a warm welcome in the biblical studies community,²⁵ and for good reason. Bauckham's argument is well-articulated, backed up by solid research, and mostly sound. Yet, there is room to critique his hypothesis while simultaneously learning from its conclusions.

Given the evidence presented in Bauckham's essay, it is difficult not to conclude that the evangelists, and of particular importance for this dissertation, that Matthew, "envisaged as his audience any church." It seems likely that the author interacted with other communities of Christ-followers, as is demonstrated most clearly by his use of Mk and Q. Hence, it is reasonable to conclude that he was aware that his work would be distributed widely. However, it is not necessary to conclude, as does Bauckham, that when Matthew "envisaged as his audience any church" he did not write with the needs of his ideal readers at the fore of his mind (e.g., 10.5-6, 16-23; 24.9-14; 28.16-20).

Matthew did not write in a vacuum. He may have approached the composition of Mt knowing that it might have a broad readership; but he wrote through the worldview and with the biases of his community, i.e., a group of house-churches who together took part in a socio-religious movement. That is, Matthew composed his gospel in a certain context, and one would expect his text to reflect such a social, religious, and historical setting, even if he foreknew that his gospel would be circulated throughout the Roman Empire and perhaps beyond.

Moreover, it remains distinctly possible that Matthew wrote to an ideal audience, even though he was fully aware that other Christians outside this collective would read and benefit from his work.²⁶ This "ideal audience"—what R. A. Burridge

24. P. F. Esler, "Community and Gospel in Early Christianity: A Response to Richard Bauckham's 'Gospels for All Christians,'" *SJT* 51 (1998), 235-48 (242); Sim, "The Gospels for All Christians?" 3-27; M. M. Mitchell, "Patristic Counter Evidence to the Claim that 'The Gospels Were Written for All Christians,'" *NTS* 51 (2005), 36-79.

25. Cf. Burridge, *What Are the Gospels?* 294-99; M. F. Bird, "Bauckham's *The Gospel for All Christians* Revisited," *EuroJTh* 15 (2006), 5-13.

26. Esler, "Community and Gospel in Early Christianity," 242; Sim, "The Gospels for All Christians?"

called the “target audience” or “market niche”²⁷—in its broadest sense, refers to Jewish Christians who were concerned with messianic apologetics, Jesus’ interpretation of Scripture, and upholding the weightier matters of the Law. However, this can possibly be narrowed to a specific “community” of like-minded Jewish Christians in a relatively small collection of house-churches with whom Matthew was closely associated. Narrowing the ideal audience in this manner best explains why Matthew places an emphasis on Jewish-Gentile relations (arguably a topic of interest for his house-churches), preserves narratorial remarks that may have meant something to his particular community (cf. 24.15, 28.15), appears to have Jesus speak past the context of the narrativized audience to the context of his own community (cf. 10.16-23; 18.15-20; 24.20; 28.15, 16-20), and describes persecution that was not necessarily experienced by all Christians of this period (cf. 10.16-23; 24.9-14).

It is necessary to clarify that such is not meant to imply that the whole of the gospel was written specifically for such a limited audience; but this does suggest that at least on occasion the narrator or Matthew’s Jesus speaks through the gospel directly to the evangelist’s “community.” It is, then, the task of the gospel scholar to identify such messages as best as possible, and from these, extrapolate the *Sitz im Leben* of the said community.

In conclusion, even when taking the genre and setting of the gospels into account, there is no evidence that suggests that the evangelists *could not* have written with specific communities in mind. However, it is equally true that, given the genre of the gospels, there is no reason that the evangelists *must have* written each to his own narrowly defined congregation. At the very least Bauckham’s hypothesis encourages the researcher to be cautious and conscious of his or her claims about the community behind the gospels. As he argues convincingly, a *bios* is not the

3-27. Matthew may have expected his gospel to be spread far afield, but this does not necessarily mean, as Esler suggests, that Matthew “hoped that his version would compete with and even supplant the unsatisfactory gospels of others” (Esler, “Community,” 242). In so arguing, Esler has come to the same conclusion as Bauckham whom he critiques, albeit with each author’s reconstructed “Matthew” expressing different motives: the audience of the gospels were unspecified Christian communities, the respective gospels of whom Matthew wished to supplant (J. M. Smith, *Why Bios? On the Relationship between Gospel Genre and Implies Audience* [London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015], 5-6).

27. R. A. Burridge, “About People, by People, for People: Gospel Genre and Audiences,” in R. Bauckham, “For Whom Were the Gospels Written,” in *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 113-45 (143).

most fitting conduit through which an evangelist might communicate with his particular community. But this does not outrightly prevent the researcher from attempting to bring greater clarity to the portrait of Matthew's ideal audience, and more narrowly, the community of house-churches with which the evangelist was closely associated. One must simply keep in mind the uncertainty of matters involving the identification of Matthew's community, and that any conjectures about his community are best written in pencil to be changed if or when new evidence arises.

2.2.4—The Religious Identity of Matthew and His Community

Prior to World War II, "there was virtual unanimity among scholars that Matthew himself was Jewish in origin."²⁸ This consensus was challenged with the rise of redaction criticism.²⁹ Based on a handful of observations from the text of Mt, certain redaction critics began to hypothesize that the author of Mt and his community were Gentile rather than Jewish Christ-followers,³⁰ undermining both the Jewishness of Matthew and his gospel.

This theory, however, is not now widely accepted since, among other aspects, it makes light of the Jewish elements in the gospel, confuses polemical language against Pharisaical Judaism with anti-Semitic propaganda, and ignores anti-Gentile rhetoric. Nonetheless, it is pedagogically useful to outline below a few of the more apparent problems with this theory before evaluating briefly some of the key reasons for concluding that the Matthean community was predominately composed of Jewish Christ-followers.

K. W. Clark was the first to suggest that passages such as 8.11-12; 12.21, and 21.39 prove that Matthew considered all of Israel to have been rejected forever by Jesus. Based on these passages, he proposed that the evangelist must have been a Gentile, as such a scathing condemnation of Jews could not have come from a Jew.³¹

28. Meier, *Vision*, 17-18.

29. Meier, *Vision*, 17-18; Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 45.

30. K. W. Clark, "The Gentile Bias in Matthew," *JBL* 66 (1947), 165-72; W. Trilling, *Das wahre Israel* (SANT 10. 3rd Ed. Munich: Kosel, 1968), 215.

31. These passages and more will be discussed in further detail below when this study questions whether or not anti-Semitism pervades Mt.

But although Matthew's polemical language against the Jews is strong and, at times, unsettling (e.g., 8.11-12; 11.16-30; 12.31-45; 15.1-20; 16.1-12; 23.1-39; 27.25), these passages do not justify seeing Matthew as a Gentile. It should be recognized that the evangelist does not reject the people of Israel as a whole.³² Although, according to Matthew, the bloodguilt for Jesus' execution is on those Jews who continue to doubt that Jesus was the Lord's Anointed (23.35; 27.25), Israel is included among "all the nations" to whom the Matthean community takes the message of the crucified and risen Christ (24.14; 28.18-19). The evangelist holds out hope that one day all Jews will welcome Jesus at his second coming as they did at his last entry into Jerusalem days prior to his death (21.9; 23.39). Additionally, the prophets of old, such as Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, are witness to the fact that Jewish prophets could make strong proclamations of judgment against their own people while retaining their Jewishness. Hence, the polemical rhetoric against the Jews throughout Mt does not necessarily signal that the author was a Gentile.

Matthew's supposed lack of knowledge concerning the religious beliefs of the Sadducees (cf. 16.12; 22.23) has also been used to support the claim that Matthew was a Gentile.³³ It is notable that Jesus refers to the singular "teaching (τῆς διδασκαλίας) of the Pharisees and Sadducees" in Mt 16.12. However, it is unlikely that Matthew intended his readers to gather that both groups espoused the same doctrine. It is to be implied from Jesus' statement that one should be equally cautious when accepting either the teaching of the Pharisees or the teaching of the Sadducees, both of which Matthew's Jesus claims are corrupt.³⁴ Clearly, the evangelist is aware that the Sadducees and the Pharisees differ on key points of theology elsewhere (cf. 22.23).³⁵ Therefore, Matthew does not express ignorance concerning the religious convictions of the Sadducees or of their relationship with the Pharisees;

32. Contra D. R. A. Hare, *The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel According to St. Matthew* (SNTSMS 6. Cambridge: Cambridge, 1967), 153; D. R. A. Hare and D. J. Harrington, "'Make Disciples of All the Gentiles,' (Mt. 28. 19)," *CBQ* 37 (1975), 359-69.

33. L. Gaston, "The Messiah of Israel as Teacher of the Gentiles," *Int* 29 (1975), 25-40 (34); Meier, *Vision*, 19-21.

34. Matthew 16.12 appears to be in tension with Mt 23.2-3. It is possible that "teaching" in the earlier passage is specifically the opinion of the Pharisees and Sadducees concerning Jesus as a messenger of God, which they challenge (cf. 16.1-4; 12.22-45). But Matthew is far from clear on this issue.

35. Meier (*Vision*, 20-21) suggests that when Matthew drops the article οἱ before λέγοντες in Mt 22.23 (see Lk 20.27), thereby taking the verb out of the attributive position, he shows that he does not believe that all the Sadducees denied the resurrection but simply *these Sadducees*. However, this reads too much into the elimination of a simple article.

he merely confirms that these two groups, from his perspective, were part of the corrupt Jewish leadership who sought to defame Jesus. For Matthew, “the similarity between the Pharisees and Sadducees is more important than their differences.”³⁶

More alleged support for the hypothesis that Matthew was a Gentile comes from his supposed misinterpretation of Zech 9.9 in Mt 21.5-7. Zechariah 9.9b reads,

Behold, your king is coming to you; righteous and bringing salvation, humble and riding on a donkey—on a colt, the foal of a donkey.

It has commonly been argued that Matthew was not familiar enough with Hebrew to recognize the Hebraic parallelism in the prophecy between “donkey” and “foal” or “young donkey.”³⁷ Hence, the evangelist misread Zech 9.9 and, consequently, posited that Jesus must have entered Jerusalem on two donkeys: one, the mother, on which Jesus rode, and one, the foal, which walked beside its mother under a single blanket.

From this some have deduced that the evangelist was not a Jew, as he would have been familiar with such parallelism if he were Jewish.³⁸ But this line of reasoning has several difficulties. First, the observation that Matthew may have misunderstood Zechariah’s parallelism does not necessitate a Gentile origin for the evangelist. It would be equally possible to identify Matthew as a Diaspora Jew who was unfamiliar with the Hebrew language. Second, given the apparent familiarity of the evangelist with Judaism and the Hebrew Scriptures elsewhere, “it is very difficult . . . to believe that . . . he would have been ignorant of something as obvious as synonymous parallelism.”³⁹ Third, it is possible to explain Matthew’s doubling without insulting his intelligence or concluding that he must have been a Gentile.

36. G. N. Stanton, *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992), 136.

37. A. H. McNeile, *The Gospel According to St. Matthew* (London: Macmillan, 1915), 294; W. F. Albright and C. S. Mann, *Matthew* (ABC 26. New York: Doubleday, 1971), 252; G. Strecker, *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit. Untersuchung zur Theologie des Matthäus* (FRLANT 82. Third Edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), 76; F. W. Beare, *The Gospel according to Matthew* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1981), 414; Gnilka, *Das Matthäusevangelium*, 2:202-3; Meier, *Vision*, 21-22.

38. Strecker, *Der Weg*, 76; Meier, *Vision*, 21-22.

39. D. A. Hagner, *Matthew 14-28* (WBC 33B. Dallas: Word, 1995), 594; cf. K. Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968), 200.

The average donkey when fully grown weighs 600 pounds or less and can carry live loads roughly thirty percent of their body weight.⁴⁰ The prophecy of Zech 9.9 states that “your king” will enter on a “colt/foal” (בן-אתונה [“son of a donkey”]), what the LXX translates with πῶλον νέον, that is, a “young” or “new donkey.” The language is vague. But it is possible that Zechariah here refers to a colt that has not stopped nursing and, therefore, is younger than six months old—the standard time at which a donkey is weaned from its mother.⁴¹ It appears as though Matthew read the passage in this way since he clarifies that the colt which the disciples were to seek was tied up with its mother (Mt 21.2). Hence, Zechariah is plausibly speaking of a colt that weighs no more than 150 pounds, in which case the young donkey would be maimed or killed by the weight of an adult human rider.

If this reflects the correct reading of Zech 9.9, the prophecy sounds ridiculous. A king riding a colt would be like a monkey riding a Rugby ball—the imagery is laughable.⁴² It is likely that Matthew was aware of this given the ubiquitousness of donkeys in ancient transportation, just as the present author recognized the odd nature of the prophecy because he was raised around donkeys, horses, and cattle. Therefore, either Matthew portrays Jesus riding the colt’s mother with the foal in tow as his source or sources described,⁴³ or he adds the mother to make sense of the seemingly silly imagery of Zech 9.9. Whichever is the case, both are more sensible explanations than hypothesizing that Matthew, who was skilled enough to compose a gospel and was very familiar with Judaism and its writings, was too inept to recognize a very straightforward example of Hebraic parallelism. There is no reason to conclude, then, based on Mt 21.7, that Matthew was a Gentile.

Finally, Matthew’s emphasis on the inclusion of the Gentiles (e.g., 8.10-12; 12.38-42; 13.38; 15.21-28; 24.14; 28.18-20) does not confirm that he was himself a Gentile. As will be explained in more detail elsewhere, Matthew likely places

40. Dick Vet Equine Practice, “The Donkey Fact Sheet” (Website: http://www.ed.ac.uk/polopoly_fs/1.21412!/fileManager/donkey%20fact%20sheet.pdf), 22 September 2015.

41. B. Huggins, “*Equus asinus*” (Website: http://animaldiversity.org/accounts/Equus_asinus), 22 September 2015.

42. Entering Jerusalem on a donkey was a sign of peace and humility (M. Green, *The Message of Matthew: The Kingdom of Heaven* [The Bible Speaks Today. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1988], 218; Davies and Allison, *Matthew 19-28*, 3:120; F. D. Bruner, *Matthew: A Commentary* [Revised and Expanded. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004], 2:354). Although strange, Zechariah may have depicted the donkey as a foal in order to stress further the humble manner in which the king was to enter Jerusalem.

43. Stendahl, *School*, 200; B. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations* (London: SCM, 1961), 114.

emphasis on the Gentile inclusion because his community was in the process of or had recently completed the process of transitioning from an Israelite-exclusive mission (10.5-6; 15.24) to a mission inclusive of “all the nations” (21.43; 24.14; 28.19). Therefore, Matthew is conveying to his audience the reasons why they should violate or have violated Jesus’ command to “only go to the lost sheep of the house of Israel” (10.6; cf. 15.24). Additionally, it is worth noting that Matthew, while open to the inclusion of the Gentiles, simultaneously includes material that might be considered anti-Gentile (1.21; 5.47; 6.7, 32; 10.5, 18; 15.24, 26; 18.17; 20.25; 24.9). This alone should not impel one to conclude that Matthew cannot be a Gentile, just as it should not be inferred from possible anti-Jewish rhetoric in Mt that the evangelist could not have been a Jew. Rather, these verses cast doubt on identifying Matthew or the majority of those in his community as Gentiles since they preserve broadly-referring negative generalizations of *all* non-Jews.

Therefore, as this study has demonstrated, the primary evidence for identifying the evangelist as a Gentile carries little weight. Although Matthew a) believes that the bloodguilt of Jesus’ death is on the hands of unrepentant Jews, b) does not sharply distinguish between the Pharisees and Sadducees, and, c) is open to the inclusion of the Gentiles, there is no reason to abandon the current consensus that Matthew was a Jew.

What positive evidence exists, then, to support the hypothesis that Matthew was a Jew who wrote primarily to Jewish Christ-followers? Several aspects of Mt could be cited to substantiate this claim, but only three will herein be given extensive treatment.

First, Matthew’s stress on Jesus’ fulfilment of Hebrew Testament prophecy, both within and without the formula citations (1.22; 2.6, 15, 16, 23; 4.15-16; 8.17; 12.17-21; 13.14, 35; 21.4; 27.9-10), might suggest that he and his community were Jewish Christians. The overarching purpose of the formulaic statements of fulfilment is to defend the claim that Jesus was indeed the promised Messiah of Israel despite the objections of the Jewish leadership. It is possible that Jesus’ anointing would have been important to a Gentile author and audience as well, since Matthew claims it is by his birthright and Spirit-anointing that Jesus is the rightful King of Israel in whom the nations will hope (Isa 42.1-4; Mt 12.17-21). But Jesus’ messiahship is equally important, if not more important, to a Jewish author and au-

dience. For a group of Jewish disciples, its belief in Jesus' role as the Christ would have been the primary distinguishing doctrine of their community. Moreover, such belief would have supplied the primary source of tension between the Matthean community and Jews who did not accept Jesus' messiahship. Hence, the evangelist's emphasis on this messianic apologetic may indicate that the evangelist and his community were primarily Jewish.

Second, Matthew frequently assumes his audience's knowledge of the Jewish Scripture. For example, the audience is left to determine the significance of the four women (not including Mary) mentioned in Jesus' genealogy, the mountain-settings of both the Sermon on the Mount and the Transfiguration, and several of Jesus' miracles (8.23-27; 9.18-26; 12.9-14; 14.13-21, 22-33; 15.32-39; 21.18-19) based on the Hebrew Testament. Further, Matthew appears to assume that his readers will recognize and understand unmarked biblical allusions and citations. These observations suggest that the evangelist's ideal audience was intimately familiar with the Jewish holy writings and, therefore, consisted largely of biblically educated Jews.

Third, Matthew's emphasis on portraying Jesus himself as one who upholds the Law of Moses may imply that Matthew and his community were Jewish Christians who sought to present Jesus as a good Jew in the face of detractors. Matthew's Jesus is one who "did not come to abolish the Law and the Prophets, but to fulfill them" in order that he might teach his followers how to have a righteousness "greater than that of the scribes and Pharisees" (5.17, 20). He does so by teaching his disciples to internalize the Law (e.g., 5.21-22, 27-28; 6.1-4) rather than simply externalizing it as do those called "hypocrites" or "false prophets" (6.1-4, 5-6, 16-18; 7.1-5, 15-20 [cf. 23.25-28]). Matthew also shows that Jesus paid the Temple Tax without argument (17.24-27) and encouraged the miraculously healed leper to seek ritual purification according to the Law of Moses (8.4). Hence, the evangelist's portrayal of Jesus as a faithful observer of the Law may indicate that Matthew and the majority of his community consisted of Law-abiding Jews.

There are also many minor idiosyncrasies of the evangelist and details of his gospel that further suggest he and his ideal audience were Jewish: a) the structuring of the genealogy of Jesus according to the gematria of David's name in Hebrew (1.1-17); b) an inclination toward the use of "kingdom of heaven" as opposed

to “kingdom of God”; c) the double reference to Jerusalem as “the holy city” (4.5; 27.53); d) the elimination of the description of Pharisaical practices in Mk 7.3-4 from Mt 15.2; e) the warning concerning travel on the Sabbath in 24.20; and, f) Jesus’ mission exclusively to “the house of Israel” (15.24) and his prohibition of missionary work among the Gentiles and Samaritans (10.5-6).⁴⁴

Given these factors, it remains possible to conclude that Matthew and his intended audience were proselytized Gentiles who held the Law in high regard, recognized Jesus as Israel’s Messiah, and were familiar with the Greek version of the Hebrew Testament.⁴⁵ But the suggestion that the members of the Matthean community were primarily Jewish makes better sense of the evidence. Hypothesizing a Gentile authorship and readership does not help the researcher explain anything that cannot be accounted for under a Jewish identification. But it does introduce notable difficulties since it cannot account for either the thorough Jewishness of Mt or the focus placed on Jesus’ mission exclusively “to the lost sheep of the house of Israel” (10.6; 15.24).

Therefore, this study agrees with the majority of Matthean scholars in seeing Matthew and most among his community as Jews. As a result, the question of whether the community perceived itself as consisting primarily of Christ-following Jews within the walls of the synagogue or Jewish Christians outside the walls of the synagogue must now be considered.

2.2.5—The Matthean Community’s Place in Diverse Judaism

From the first time it was stated unambiguously in Origen’s commentary that Matthew was a Jew (Eusebius, *Hist.* 6.25.4), researchers have often assumed the Jewish ethnicity of Matthew and the Jewish background of his gospel.⁴⁶ When redaction criticism rose to the fore of scholarly research, it became common to identify

44. There are several more hints from the text of Mt that the author was a Jew mentioned in W. Carter, *Matthew: Storyteller, Interpreter, Evangelist* [Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996], 20-24.

45. See Carter’s rightly warns that it is “difficult to conclude that a particular emphasis *must* reflect a Jewish or Gentile author” (*Matthew*, 20). Therefore, he concludes cautiously that Matthew was most likely a Jewish Christian, but he holds out the possibility that the evangelist was a Gentile (Carter, *Matthew*, 24).

46. Stanton, *New People*, 114-15.

Matthew as a Gentile who interacted with Judaism from a distance. However, there remain few proponents of this theory today.⁴⁷

The large majority of researchers have returned to the assumption that Matthew was Jewish, as were his ideal readers. But related questions still divide biblical scholars. Did the Matthean community consist primarily of Jewish Christians who were “outside the walls” of the synagogue (i.e., *extra muros*), or Christ-following Jews who were still “within the walls” of the synagogue (i.e., *intra muros*)?⁴⁸ That is, is the faith of the Matthean community Christianity with Jewish overtones or Judaism with Christian overtones? One’s answer to these questions determines how one approaches issues such as the relationship between the Matthean community and the Gentiles, the possibility of anti-Semitism in Mt, and the possible provenance of Matthew’s gospel. Thus, an attempt will herein be made to bring some clarity to this issue before proceeding.

Several notable Matthean scholars have argued that “the congregation which he [i.e., Matthew] represented had not yet separated from Judaism The struggle with Israel is still a struggle within its own walls.”⁴⁹ That is, some have suggested that Matthew still writes from “within Judaism”⁵⁰ even though his community and the synagogues in its vicinity were beginning to take divergent paths. Thus, the *intra muros* theory posits that Matthew’s community had not finished parting ways with Judaism by the time Mt was composed, and, therefore, it should be considered a sect within Judaism.

47. Meier, *Vision*, 17-23; Idem, “Matthew, Gospel of,” *ABD* 4:22-41.

48. The language of *extra muros* and *intra muros* has been adapted from Stanton (*New People*, 113-14). But the first person to employ “within the walls” and “outside the walls” language in reference to the *Sitz im Leben* of Matthew and his audience was Bornkamm (G. Bornkamm, “End Expectation and Church in Matthew,” in G. Bornkamm, G. Barth, and H. J. Held [eds], *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963], 15-51).

49. Bornkamm, “End Expectation,” 39.

50. G. D. Kilpatrick, *The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1946), 106 (but he thinks the communities split after the *Birkat ha-Minim*); W. D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964), 290-92, 332; J. A. Overman, *Matthew’s Gospel and Formative Judaism: The Social World of the Matthean Community* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990); Idem, *Church and Community in Crisis: The Gospel according to Matthew* (The New Testament in Context. Valley Forge: Trinity, 1996); Davies and Allison, *Matthew 19-28*, 3:692-704; A. J. Saldarini, *Matthew’s Christian-Jewish Community* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1994); D. C. Sim, *The Gospel of Matthew and Christian Judaism: The History and Social Setting of the Matthean Community* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998); Idem, “The Gospel of Matthew and the Gentiles,” *JSNT* 57 (1995), 19-48.

Unlike the theory that suggests Matthew and his community were Gentiles, this theory has the benefit of rightly taking into account the Jewish elements of Matthew's gospel. Matthew is not merely a Gentile who is familiar with Judaism but has no direct ties to the religion, nor is the thorough Jewishness of his work the byproduct of later editing. The Jewish elements of the gospel stem from Matthew's status as a Jew within the boundaries of Judaism. Furthermore, this hypothesis fits quite well with the recent trend of seeing heterogeneity in Palestinian and Syrian Judaism. Judaism was not monolithic but was characterized by multiple, sometimes feuding, factions of Jews.⁵¹ Although the number of opposing factions decreased substantially after the Roman conquest of Israel, there remained marked diversity in "formative Judaism" until the late second-century CE. From a sociological standpoint, as A. J. Saldarini has suggested, Matthew's community may have been considered a "deviant" sect who was attempting to establish credibility in the face of opposition.⁵² Nonetheless, the community understood itself to be within the walls of Judaism, though it was in conflict with one or more other sects.

Overman and Sim claim that the Matthean community defined itself within Judaism by a strong sense of dualism (i.e., "them" verses "us"), conflict with the Jewish leaders, and commitment to the centrality of the Law.⁵³ Certainly, Mt is replete with examples supporting that the first two of these were defining characteristics of the community. However, as D. A. Hagner has convincingly argued in a recent essay⁵⁴—a work to which this study is greatly indebted—its belief system was not centered on Torah but on Christ, the divine Son of the Father, an article of faith that "is almost bound to have fixed a great gulf between Matthew's community and Judaism."⁵⁵

51. J. Neusner, et al. (eds.), *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 1-10; Overman, *Church and Community*, 9; Saldarini, *Matthew's Christian Jewish Community*, 13-18. It must be noted, though, that most Jews did not belong to one particular group or another. These individuals simply sought to remain faithful to Judaism based on their understanding of the Torah (cf. E. P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 BCE-66 CE* [London: SCM, 1992], 153-54, 448-51).

52. Saldarini, *Matthew's Christian Jewish Community*, 107.

53. Overman, *Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism*, 16-30; Sim, *Gospel of Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 109-13.

54. D. A. Hagner, "Matthew: Christian Judaism or Jewish Christianity?" in S. McKnight and G. Osborne (eds.), *The Face of New Testament Studies: A Survey of Recent Research* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), 263-82.

55. R. Gundry, "A Responsive Evaluation of the Social History of the Matthean Community in Roman Syria," in D. L. Balch (ed.), *Social History of the Matthean Community: Cross-Disciplinary*

As Hagner aptly claims, for the evangelist, *Jesus' interpretation of the Law*, not the Law itself, was the prime authority for his community.⁵⁶ The kingdom community is to “do and observe” what the scribes and Pharisees tell them to do since they sit on “the seat of Moses” (23.2). Nevertheless, Jesus holds an honored place as *the “teacher”* of the Church:

You are not to be called “rabbi,” for you have *one teacher* and you are all brothers Nor be called “masters,” for you have *one master—the Christ* (23.8, 10).

It is by means of his interpretation that the Law and the Prophets can be considered “fulfilled” (5.17), the practice of which leads to “righteousness exceeding that of the scribes and Pharisees” (5.20). His superior authority as the teacher of the kingdom community is such that he can state boldly, “You have heard it said . . . but I say unto you” where one might expect him to appeal to the authority of Moses. And it is such that the crowds were “astonished at his teaching, for he was teaching them as one who had authority, and not as one of their scribes” (7.28b-29).

Therefore, even though the Torah was important to the Matthean community, from the perspective of the evangelist, its true, complete value was realized only when mediated through Jesus’ teaching. The community was “called to obey not Torah, but Jesus.”⁵⁷ Or, as Luz explains, “The community keeps the entire law, but it does so—to state it pointedly—not so much because it belongs to Israel but because Jesus commands it (5.17-18).”⁵⁸ It seeks Jesus’ easy yoke (11.28-30), not simply the yoke of the Torah. His teachings are of eternal significance (24.35), and, consequently, are to be preserved by being taught to and observed by future generations of disciples (28.20). Thus, the shift in focus away from the Torah to Jesus indicates that the Matthean community was moving away from a Jewish belief system centered on the Law to a Christian belief system centered on Jesus, the exalted Son of Man.⁵⁹

Approaches (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 64; cited in Hagner, “Matthew,” 271. Pace Hare (*Theme of Jewish Persecution*, 133) who claims that the devotion to Jesus was “the central point at issue in the conflict between the church and Judaism.”

56. Hagner, “Matthew,” 266-68; following D. R. A. Hare, “How Jewish is the Gospel of Matthew?” *CBQ* 62 (2002), 264-77 (277).

57. Hagner, “Matthew,” 268.

58. Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 48.

59. Overman (*Church and Community*, 20) and Saldarini (“Matthew and Jewish Christian Conflict,”

This latter theory is supported by the advanced Christology preserved in Mt.⁶⁰ Jesus was not merely the Lord's Messiah to whom the Jewish Scriptures pointed. He was, for the Matthean community, "God with us" in the fullest sense (1.23). After the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE, Jesus, the Son of Man, is made to sit at the right hand of the Father (24.30; 26.64) and is given "all authority . . . in heaven and upon the earth" (28.18). It is, therefore, into his name that the members of the kingdom community are to be baptized, a name that is sandwiched between "Father" and "Holy Spirit." Hence, it is not simply Jesus' interpretation of the Torah that occupies the center of the Matthean community's belief system. The pillar on which the community's faith is built is its high Christology. The religion of Matthew and his community is rightly considered Christocentric.

If, then, one of the defining attributes of Judaism is Torah-centeredness, and the faith of Matthew's collection of churches is characterized by Christ-centeredness, is the community's struggle with its local synagogues accurately called an *intra muros* conflict? This dissertation posits—following a small handful of Matthean scholars⁶¹—that such is not the case. Matthew's Christology and perspective on the Torah signal that his community interacts with the synagogue from without.

But while Matthew's view of Jesus' significance is one of the primary indicators of an *extra muros* dispute, it is not the sole factor in determining the state of the Matthean community's relationship with the synagogue. The communal distancing language, the allusions to the persecution of Matthew's community by synagogues, and the emphasis on the destruction of the Temple as a turning point for the community together imply that it had separated from formative Judaism.

Matthew employs distancing language to mark the separation between his community and the synagogue. The evangelist exclusively uses labels such as "*their*

50) recognize that "Torah becomes subordinate to both Jesus and his interpretation" (quoting Saldarini), but they fail to recognize that with this shift away from Torah-centeredness there is also a shift away from the basic tenants of Judaism.

60. Hagner, "Matthew," 269-71.

61. Kilpatrick, *Origins*, 111 (after the *Birkat ha-Minim*); E. P. Blair, *Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1960), 42, 113 n. 4; Stendahl, *School*, xii-xiv; Hare, *Theme of Jewish Persecution*, *passim*; Stanton, *New People*, 113-45; *Idem*, "The Gospel of Matthew and Judaism," *BJRL* 66 (1984), 264-84 (273); C. F. D. Moule, *Essays in New Testament Interpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 69-72; Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 52-56; Gundry, "Responsive Evaluation," 62-67; Hare, "Gospel of Matthew," 264-77.

synagogues” (4.23; 9.35; 10.17; 12.9; 13.54) or “your synagogues” (23.34). This use of language may hint that the Matthean community had their own worship assemblies among a larger network of synagogues.⁶² However, Matthew uses “their cities” (11.1) and “their scribes” (7.29) seemingly to convey separation. If so, the demonstrative pronoun with “synagogue” might suggest that the Matthean community and the synagogue had parted ways. This may be indicated further by Jesus’ anachronistic references to “the Church” (16.18; 18.17). By referring to his community as “the Church” rather than, for example, “the synagogue” or “our synagogue,” Matthew may be signaling subtly to the reader that his community was set apart.⁶³ Consequent to this separation, the community developed a unique self-designation by which both outsiders and insiders might distinguish between its congregations and those of other groups.

The persecution of the Matthean community by the synagogue alluded to in several passages also casts doubt on the *intra muros* theory. There are five passages in which such post-Easter conflict is most pronounced: 5.11-12; 10.16-23; 16.24-25; 23.34-35; and, 24.9-13.

In the last of the Matthean beatitudes (5.11-12), Jesus states,

Blessed are you when others reproach and persecute you, and speak all kinds of evil against you falsely on account of me. Rejoice and be glad, because your reward in heaven is great. For so they persecuted the prophets who were before you.

This persecution appears to be primarily verbal, as the righteous are to encounter “reproach” and “evil” speech. However, this oppression is likened to that experienced by the prophets of old, the spiritual ancestors of Matthew’s community (cf. “who were before you”).⁶⁴ Since it is a recurring theme in the Testaments that the Israelites mistreat and kill the prophets (cf. 1 Kgs 19.10; 2 Chron 24.20-21; 36.15-16; Jer 2.30; 26.20-24; Neh 9.26; Mt 21.33-46; 22.6; 23.29-35; Mk 12.1-12; Lk 11.47-50; 13.34; 20.9-19; Acts 7.51-52; Rom 11.3; 1 Thess 2.14-16; Heb 11.32-38),⁶⁵ it is possible that Mt 5.11-12 indicates that members of the evangelist’s community have met

62. S. Brown, “The Matthean Community and the Gentile Mission,” *NovT* 22 (1980), 216.

63. B. Przybylski, “The Setting of Matthean Anti-Judaism,” in P. Richardson, with G. Granskou (eds.), *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity: Paul and the Gospels* (Studies in Christianity and Judaism 2. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1986), 181-200 (195).

64. D. R. A. Hare, *Matthew* (Interpretation. Louisville: John Knox, 1993), 43; cf. R. A. Guelich, *The Sermon on the Mount: A Foundation for Understanding* (Waco: Word, 1982), 97.

65. Guelich, *Sermon on the Mount*, 96; cf. Hare, *Theme of Jewish Persecution*, 137-41.

such a violent end in the synagogue. Of course, death by Jewish hands was promised to some of the prophets of the Matthean community in 23.34-35:

Therefore, I send to you prophets, wise men, and scribes. Some you will flog in your synagogues and persecute from town to town, so that on you may come all the righteous blood shed on the earth—from the blood of righteous Abel to the blood of Zechariah, the son of Barachiah, whom you murdered between the sanctuary and the altar.

Thus, 5.11-12 and 23.34-35 may refer to a time after Jesus' resurrection when the synagogue actively persecuted followers of Jesus. Like the prophets of old, certain members of the Matthean community experienced ridicule, beatings, and even martyrdom for the sake of Christ. Such intense persecution is indicative of a severely strained relationship between the Church and the synagogue, one that does not lend support to the *intra muros* position.⁶⁶ As W. D. Davies wrote, "In v. 11 ff. [i.e., 5.11-12] these two groups"—those who will receive eschatological blessings and those who will not—"emerge as Christians and Jews,"⁶⁷ that is, two separate, opposing religious groups.

Again, Jesus speaks past the pre-Easter setting of Jesus' story to the violence that had befallen the evangelist's community:

Beware of men, for they will hand you over to courts and flog you in *their synagogues*, and you will be dragged before governors and kings for my sake, to bear witness before them and the Gentiles . . . you will be hated by all for my name's sake (10.17, 22).

This persecution, which, according to Matthew, was conducted by both the Jews and the Gentiles, included beatings and executions (10.21) that caused Christ-followers to flee from one town of Israel to the next (10.22-23). Nevertheless,

66. Contra H. D. Betz, who suggests that in spite of the conflict alluded to in 5.11-12, "The SM [i.e., Sermon on the Mount] shows a situation that is still far away from this final separation [between the Matthean community and Judaism], but, as Matthew's gospel as a whole points out, situations such as those described in the SM led ultimately to the separation" (H. D. Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount* [Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995], 150-51).

67. Davies, *Sermon on the Mount*, 289. It is surprising to see Davies speak of Matthew's community as *extra muros* on page 289 of his study when approximately forty pages later he writes, "the struggle between Judaism and Christianity was still for him [i.e., Matthew] a struggle *intra muros* . . ." (*Sermon on the Mount*, 332). This explains why Stanton groups Davies with those who argue for the *intra muros* interpretation (Stanton, *New People*, 121), whereas Senior places Davies alongside Luz as defending the *extra muros* reading (D. Senior, *Matthew* [ANTC. Nashville: Abingdon, 1998], 23). Overman is inconsistent in a similar manner, as Stanton highlighted (Stanton, *New People*, 123 n. 2). On page 148 of *Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism*, Overman states that Matthew and his community "have not gone their separate way" from Judaism. But on the following page (149) he remarks that, "Lines of separation [between the Matthean community and formative Judaism] had been drawn, in a manner that appears to offer no way back." These inconsistencies capture best the complex nature of the topic and the confusion Matthew's difficult text occasions.

Matthew's Jesus encourages the community not to fear those who can kill the body (10.28). Instead, the community should revere God (10.28), acknowledge Jesus before men (10.32-33), and rely on God to provide protection (10.29-31).

Repeating parts of Mt 10 verbatim, Matthew once again alludes to the persecution faced by his community at the hands of both the Jews and the Gentiles. Matthew 24.9 reads,

Then they will deliver you up to tribulation and put you to death, and you will be hated by all nations for my name's sake.

The latter portion of this statement is almost a word-for-word reproduction of Jesus' earlier prophetic pronouncement in 10.22 (cf. 23.24). Here, Matthew simply adds that it is "all nations" who will express hostility toward the followers of Christ. These parallels, together with the plausible inclusion of Israel in "all nations" (cf. 24.14; 28.19), suggest that the evangelist is once again referring to the persecution of his community by the synagogue, though not the synagogue exclusively.

Finally, another general reference to the persecution of Christians in the first-century CE can be found in Mt 16.24-25:

Then Jesus said to his disciples, "If anyone would come after me, let him deny himself, take up his cross, and follow me. For whoever wishes to save his life will lose it, but whoever loses his life for my sake will find it."

Jesus herein makes it clear that following him entails great sacrifice, even crucifixion. Who it is, though, that wishes to do violence to Jesus' followers is never stated. But seeing as the evangelist considered both Jews and Gentiles to be responsible for Jesus' crucifixion (cf. 27.15-31) and putting to death members of the Church, it is reasonable to infer that the synagogue may be one of the entities attempting to harm Christians in the manner herein described.

These allusions to an aggressive persecution against the Matthean community—in which the evangelist claims the synagogue took part—indicate that the proponents of the *intra muros* hypothesis may suppose a closer tie between the Church and the synagogue than can be supported by the text. Some conflict is to be expected between these groups—disputation which the Matthean community would likely have interpreted as "persecution" no matter how slight. But it appears that the conflict escalated past verbal confrontation to beatings and executions.

Even assuming that these occurrences of persecution were rare, these accounts “confirm that the relationship between the Church and the synagogue is most definitely not *intra muros*.”⁶⁸

Lastly, the emphasis on the Temple’s desolation in Mt may signal that the Matthean community had parted ways or was in the process of parting ways with the synagogue. The separation between the two groups was likely gradual and organic. Therefore, it cannot be narrowed to a single event or point in time.⁶⁹ Yet, the 70 CE siege of Jerusalem appears to have had a great impact on Matthew’s community and its relationship with formative Judaism. Thus, it was likely a milestone event in the separation process involving these two groups (cf. 21.33-44; 22.1-14; 23.36; 24.29-35; 26.64).

In Mt 10.5-6, the Twelve are told not to go to the Gentiles or Samaritans but “to the lost sheep of the house of Israel” (cf. 15.24), a command that was binding on the post-Easter community also. Matthew 10.16-23 describes a mission that is impeded by intense persecution at the hands of both Jews and Gentiles. This indicates that the evangelist has moved focus away from the mission of the Twelve in the narrative-now to address a later mission. This mission, in which the early Matthean community probably participated, was to be conducted exclusively in the cities of Israel “until the Son of Man comes” (10.23). As will be defended later in this dissertation, according to the evangelist this coming of the Son of Man happened immediately subsequent to the destruction of the Temple, when Jesus, the Danielic “one like a son of man,” approached the Ancient of Days on the clouds of heaven to receive dominion and a kingdom (Dan 7.13-14; Mt 13.37-38; 24.29-31; 26.64). Both the devastation of Jerusalem (visible) and the Son of Man’s approach to the Father (invisible) marked the Son of Man’s reception of universal authority and the consequent initiation of a mission inclusive of “all the nations” (24.14, 31; 28.18-20). The Temple’s destruction was a concrete, physical signal that a way was being opened by the Son of Man for the community to actively pursue the inclusion of the Jews and Gentiles alike (cf. 24.31; 28.18-20). Jesus’ followers were or-

68. Stanton, *New People*, 126; following E. Schweizer, *Mattäus und seine Gemeinde* (Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 71. Stuttgart: KBW, 1974), 126, 126 n. 3.

69. Cf. J. D. G. Dunn, *The Parting of the Ways Between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity* (2nd Ed. London: SCM, 2006), 301-38.

dered to share the teachings of Jesus with all those over whom he—as the Son of Man—had been given dominion (cf. Dan 7.14; Mt 28.18 [24.29-31]).

Of course, the mission to “all the nations” (24.14; 28.19) could have begun whether the Matthean community was *intra* or *extra muros*. Even though it is often questioned whether or not Jews actively sought the conversion of Gentiles to Judaism, it is clear that many Jewish sects were open to proselytes and “God-fearers.” However, a new, inclusive mission, which was meant to replace the rather unsuccessful, exclusive mission, certainly would have pulled the Matthean community away from Judaism; its focus was no longer solely on the “lost sheep of the house of Israel” but on “all the nations,” Israel included. Moreover, a rift between the synagogue and the Church would have been created by the evangelist’s explicit assertion that the destruction of the Temple was due to the transgressions of the Jewish leaders and the doubting laymen at the time of Jesus (21.33-46; 22.1-14; 23.36; 24.34; 27.25). These were the spiritual ancestors of Matthew’s Jewish opponents. It is unlikely, therefore, that the synagogue would have taken kindly to the Matthean community’s interpretation of history, widening the gulf between the two assemblies. It stands to reason, then, that the destruction of the Temple, which brought issues of Christology and missiology to the fore of conversation, was one of the benchmark events on the Matthean community’s path away from Christian Judaism toward Jewish Christianity.

It is, therefore, the conclusion of this study that the Matthean community interacted with the synagogue from outside its walls. But it should not be lost that the Matthean community practiced a thoroughly Jewish Christianity, a fact to which Overman, Saldarini and Sim properly call attention. The community is concerned with adhering to Jesus’ interpretation of the Torah, celebrating Jesus as Israel’s Messiah, and defining its beliefs and itself by what it sees as the proper reading of Jewish Scripture. But disputations centering around the identity and importance of Jesus created a chasm between the Church and the synagogues that could not be bridged. It appears, therefore, that Sim’s assertion that, “[t]he religion of the Matthean community was not Christianity but Judaism,”⁷⁰ does accurately reflect the evidence. Of course, Matthew did not think that he and his people practiced a *completely* new religion. He thought of Jewish Christianity as “the perfection

70. Sim, *The Gospel of Matthew and Christian Judaism*, 163; cited in Hagner, “Matthew,” 281.

and fulfillment of Judaism.”⁷¹ But there was a newness to what the Matthean community believed; “what is new and what is old” were to be equally treasured in the community of Christ-followers (13.52; cf. 9.16-17).⁷² As a “new people” (21.43)—new “sons of the kingdom” (13.38; cf. 8.11-12; 12.38-42; 21.43; 23.34-36; 27.25)—the Matthean community was dedicated first-and-foremost to following Jesus and understanding all things through him.⁷³

2.2.6—The Matthean Community and Gentile Relations

According to Matthew’s gospel, Jesus and his disciples were tasked to minister only to “the lost sheep of the house of Israel” (10.6; 15.24). This does not mean that Jesus was unconcerned with the spiritual and physical well-being of Gentiles. Jesus simply did not see it as his goal or the immediate purpose of his earliest followers to *actively pursue* Gentiles for kingdom-inclusion. When a foreign centurion and a Canaanite woman demonstrated extraordinary belief and humility, he granted their respective requests for healing and complimented each for faithfulness (8.5-13; 15.21-28). Additionally, Jesus performed exorcisms and miracles outside the land of Israel (cf. 8.28-34; 14.34-36; 15.21-28), and either prophesied or eluded to a future Gentile inclusion (e.g., 8.11-12; 12.41-42; 13.38; 21.43; 24.14). Yet, neither Jesus or his disciples are ever depicted as seeking the inclusion of the Gentiles.

The Matthean community followed the stipulations of Jesus’ commissioning as issued in 10.5-6: it pursued the kingdom-inclusion of the “house of Israel” to the exclusion of all other people groups. Missionaries went from town-to-town

71. Hagner, “Matthew,” 281.

72. Hagner, “Matthew,” 280-81; *Idem*, *The New Testament: A Historical and Theological Introduction* (E-book Edition. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012).

73. There has purposefully been no discussion in this section of the *Birkat ha-Minim* in the *Shemoneh Esreh*—that is, the “Blessing on the Heretics”—which is the twelfth of “Eighteen Benedictions.” If the records of Acts and Galatians are to be trusted, the council at Yavneh did not introduce segregation but merely codified it. That is, Christ-followers had been removed from synagogues throughout the Roman Empire prior to the creation of the Twelfth Benediction in 85 CE. Second, the “Blessing”—euphemistic for “curse”—may have made the segregation official, but only for those in that immediate community of the rabbinical school in Yavneh (Dunn, *Parting of the Ways*, 303). This ruling may have had a negative effect on Christian worship in Palestine as a whole, but it is unclear if this would have occurred immediately. Therefore, since the “Blessing on the Heretics” was not widely accepted as law, and it only made official the ejection of Christians which had already started in various synagogues, the existence or non-existence of the “Blessing” does not impact one’s conclusion in the matter discussed above (cf. Gundry, *Matthew*, 600-01, 605; R. T. France, *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher* [Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1989], 100-01).

throughout Israel preaching the message of the kingdom (10.22). Although they were met with intense persecution in synagogues and before Gentile rulers (5.11-12; 10.16-23; 23.34-25; 24.9), they continued their mission as ordered until the Son of Man came (10.23). This “coming” was not to the “sons of the kingdom” on earth (13.37-38) but to the Father in heaven, where Jesus received “all authority in heaven and on the earth” immediately subsequent to the Temple’s destruction in 70 CE (10.23; 16.28; 24.29-30; 26.64; 28.18).

It was consequent to Jesus’ newfound authority and the desolation of the Temple that the mission of the Matthean community changed. The fall of Jerusalem demonstrated that the mission to the Jews which Jesus and John the Baptist had started had a less than ideal outcome (cf. 11.20-24; 23.37-39): the large majority of Jews did not gather to Jesus through repentance and belief and, as a result, they met judgment. But the Jews were not abandoned by God for refusing the invitation of Jesus.⁷⁴ On the contrary, the Son of Man’s universal authority provided the *raison d’être* for an inclusive mission, one in which the Matthean community actively sought *both Gentiles and Jews* for inclusion into the new covenant (cf. Dan 7.14; Mt 21.43; 28.18-19). Christ-followers from these two people groups together constitute a new “people” of God (21.43).

Thus, it is the epilogue of the gospel, which was created by the evangelist, that places a statement of his community’s mission on the lips of Jesus (28.18-20). That is, the community justified its new mission by placing what it inferred from both the destruction of the Temple and the correlated fulfilment of LXX Dan 7.13-14 into the words of Jesus. It was the original command of Jesus that kept the members of the evangelist’s collection of house-churches from going εἰς ὁδὸν ἐθνῶν (10.5-6). In turn, it would be a command inferred from divine action that would open the way for Matthew and his fellow Christ-followers to “go and make disciples of all nations” (28.19-20).

Discussion of the Gentile mission brings to the fore questions concerning the proselytizing of Gentiles in the first-century CE and the nature of the Matthean community’s association with Gentiles prior to 70 CE. Is one to gather from the above hypotheses that the Matthean community did not interact with Gentiles pri-

74. *Contra*, for example, D. R. A. Hare, *Theme of Jewish Persecution*, 147-48.

or to its separation from Judaism? Were not the members of the Matthean community concerned with the proselytization of the Gentiles as were other communities of Christians at the time?

It is commonly proposed that many synagogues in the first-century CE, including those from which Matthew's community sprang, would have accepted a "proselyte," though there were no regulations concerning proselytism in the Law.⁷⁵ Προσήλυτος is "a Greek word often meaning one who 'came over' to the Jewish faith," that is, "a Gentile who is converted to Judaism."⁷⁶ Gentile men would be circumcised like Jewish males (Ex 12.44, 48; Jdt 14.10; Jos., *Ant* 20.44; Test. Levi 6.3, 6-7; t. 'Abod. Zar. 3.12; Ber. 6.13; b. Shab. 135a; Ex. Rab. 30.12).⁷⁷ This physical mark, along with baptism, seems to have separated proselytes from "God-fearers" (cf. Ps. 115.9-11; 135.19-20; Mal 3.16; Acts 10.2, 22, 35; 13.6, 26): those who, to varying degrees, "accepted the moral teachings and religious practices of Judaism without accepting the stigma of circumcision and so full identification with the Jewish community."⁷⁸ It is unclear if Matthew's community encouraged prospective converts to be circumcised since the act is never mentioned in Mt. It is possible that circumcision had been abandoned by the community since only baptism is explicitly mentioned in 28.19. But because in the ancient conversion process bathing oneself in a *mikvaot* and circumcision went hand-in-hand,⁷⁹ it may be difficult to draw a clear line between the two rituals. John's baptism may have been a template for baptism without circumcision, a method that may have appealed to Matthew since his Jesus placed stress on the internalization of the Law. Yet, it is not difficult to imagine that Matthew, with his emphasis on fulfilling the Law as interpreted by Jesus, would have defended the act of circumcision when the door opened to evangelize the Gentiles.

But while many Jews were likely comfortable with the proselytization of Gentiles, there is no evidence that Jews conducted a systematic missionary movement among the Gentiles prior to or within a few centuries after the initiation of

75. E. J. Schnabel, *Early Christian Mission: Jesus and the Twelve* (Downers Grove: Inter Varsity, 2004), 1:68.

76. Evans, *Matthew*, 393.

77. Keener, *Matthew*, 548 n. 40.

78. E. Ferguson, *Backgrounds of Early Christianity* (3rd Ed. Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 2003), 550.

79. T. M. Taylor, "The Beginnings of Jewish Proselyte Baptism," *NTS* 2 (1955-56): 193-98; K. Pusey, "Jewish Proselyte Baptism," *ExpTim* 95 (1984), 141-45.

the Christian mission. This means that while the Matthean community was within the walls of Judaism it likely accepted Gentile converts, but, like other Jewish sects, it did not actively seek the conversion of Gentiles to faith in the God of Israel. Gentiles were expected to convert to Judaism *en masse* at the eschaton.⁸⁰ But such conversions were considered to take place only during the messianic age, and the texts are unclear as to whether or not such conversions were to be consequent to a full scale Jewish mission.

Against this hypothesis, some have cited Mt 23.15 as proof of Jewish missionary work in the first-century CE,

Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you travel across land and sea to make a single proselyte and when he becomes a proselyte you make him twice as much a child of hell as yourselves.

However, Matthew does not herein use the word “proselyte” in its typical sense to denote “a full convert to Judaism.”⁸¹ Instead, it is employed in a metaphorical, “non-technical sense”⁸² to refer to a “Jewish convert to Pharisaism.”⁸³

The claim that the Pharisees and scribes travel great distances to make a single proselyte should not be taken to imply that Jews sent “missionaries” in the modern sense of the term. First, “travel across land and sea” is ironic hyperbole in light of 23.13:

Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you shut the kingdom of heaven in men’s faces; you neither enter yourselves nor allow those who would enter to go in.

That is, for one convert they spare no expense, but they shut the doors of the kingdom on everyone else who might easily be brought in, including themselves. Second, the ridicule of the Pharisees and scribes may be a reference to a specific conversion. The most likely candidate is the proselytization of King Izates of Adiabene in 40 CE (Jos., *Ant.* 20.2.3-5). Josephus recorded that the king was taught the ways of Judaism and was eventually converted by a merchant. Izates feared that his people

80. Cf. 1 En 90.33-38; Tob 13.11; T. Jud. 24.5-6; 25.3-5; T. Benj. 9.2; 10.9-11; b. Ber. 75b; Philo, *Praem.* 164-72; Mos. 2.43-44.

81. Ferguson, *Backgrounds*, 546.

82. M. Goodman, “Jewish Proselytizing in the First Century,” in J. Lieu, et. al. (eds.), *The Jews among the Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 53-78 (62); cited in I. Levinskaya, *The Book of Acts in Its Diaspora Setting* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 5:39.

83. Levinskaya, *Diaspora Setting*, 38.

would rebel if they discovered their king had been circumcised. Hence, the merchant told the young man not to become circumcised but instead to do the superior thing: worship God (*Ant.* 20.2.4). However, a Jew by the name of Eleazer, who was “very skillful in the learning of his country,” came to the king and, unhappy with the lack of requirements placed on him, demanded that he have himself circumcised immediately and abide by the whole Law (*Ant.* 20.2.4).

If indeed Matthew is referring to this account, he may be identifying the “skillful” Jew in the story as a Pharisee to make a cross-comparison with the Pharisees of his day. If so, Eleazer did not convert the king to Judaism but to Pharisaism, making him “twice as much a child of hell” as the Pharisees were: a Gentile, who was outside the covenant people, is made doubly distant from God through the “proselytizing” of the Pharisees.⁸⁴ But even if the story of Izates does not lie behind 23.15, “proselyte” still may be employed here in a metaphorical sense for the drawing of an individual to Pharisaism even though this is a departure from the word’s technical use. Therefore, Mt 23.15 cannot be cited as evidence for a systematic Jewish missionary movement in the first-century CE, but is instead part of Matthew’s anti-Pharisaical polemic.

There is likewise no evidence for a Jewish mission among the Gentiles in any other writings of the period.⁸⁵ Many Jewish sects were open to proselytes and God-fearers and encouraged them to worship Yahweh as the God of all people. But, as E. J. Schnabel concludes, “this fundamentally positive stance is not synonymous with an active endeavor to convince Gentiles who worship other gods and who practice different customs that their religious convictions are wrong, that their behavior is improper, that they must believe in the God of Israel and that they need to be integrated into the Jewish community.”⁸⁶ That is, the documented acceptance of proselytes by synagogues does not equate with a systematic Jewish mission to

84. Cf. J. Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind* (London: SCM, 1959), 267; D. A. Carson, *Matthew 13-28* (EBC. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984), 48; Goodman, “Jewish Proselytizing,” 62-63; Levinskaya, *Diaspora Setting*, 38-39. S. McKnight argues that Jesus is rebuking the scribes and Pharisees for attempting to turn “partial converts” into “total converts,” that is, God-fearers into proselytes (*A Light among the Gentiles: Jewish Missionary Activity in the Second Temple Period* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991], 104-5). This is a possible reading. However, since Matthew’s Jesus stresses adherence to the Law and even commands his disciples to “teach them [i.e., ‘all the nations’] to observe all that I have commanded you [concerning the Law and the Prophets],” it is difficult to explain why he would take offense at God-fearers being turned into proselytes.

85. Cf. Goodman, “Jewish Proselytizing,” 53-78; Schnabel, *Mission*, 1:171-72.

86. Schnabel, *Mission*, 1:171.

Gentiles around the time of Mt's composition. As D. Bosch stated, Jewish authors were "engaged in vigorous propaganda in the time of Jesus," but not in missionary activity:

However indefatigable the Jews may have been in their advertising attempts, and whatever zeal they may have displayed in the literary propaganda, the fact remains that this literature is not much more than "speeches on religion to its cultured despisers" and that the Jews were more interested in the glory and dignity of the Jewish name than in the selfless devotion to serving Yahweh. . . . [Their activity] was propaganda and not missionary work because it lacked the awareness of being sent and because it grew out of zeal for Yahweh and his cause rather than out of obedience to him."⁸⁷

How, then, is one to explain the rapid growth of Judaism between the sixth-century CE, when the land of Judah housed a few hundred thousand inhabitants, and the first-century CE, when the number of Jews in Diaspora alone has been reckoned at between two and seven million?⁸⁸ This growth could simply be the product of biology.⁸⁹ But it may have been due, at least in part, to the acceptance of proselytes, though not to active proselytism, i.e., Jewish missionary work.⁹⁰ Judaism was a very attractive religion to Gentiles⁹¹ and, therefore, it did not necessarily need missionaries to propagate. As J. Nolland stated, "proselytes, drawn by the ethical standards, the meticulous regulation of life, and the lofty view of God in Judaism, largely converted themselves and had then to find their place in the Jewish community"⁹²

Hence, it is probable that Matthew's community interacted with Gentile proselytes in the same manner as other Jewish groups before its split from formative Judaism. It likely accepted Gentile converts who expressed interest in joining a

87. D. Bosch, *Die Heidenmission in der Zukunftsschau Jesu: Eine Untersuchung zur Eschatologie der synoptischen Evangelien* (AThANT 36. Zürich: Zwingli, 1959), 31-32, 40-41; Translated by Schnabel, *Mission*, 1:125.

88. L. Feldman, *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 293. C. H. Kraeling estimated that there could have been as many as one million Jews in Syria alone ("The Jewish Community at Antioch," *JBL* 51 [1932], 130-60 [136]).

89. W. Ameling, "Die jüdischen Gemeinden im antiken Kleinasien," in R. Jütte and A. P. Kustermann (eds.), *Jüdische Gemeinden und Organisationsformen von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart* (Aschkenas Beiheft 3. Vienna: Böhlau, 1996), 29-55 (33).

90. *Contra* Feldman, *Jew and Gentile*, 293.

91. Cf. Feldman, *Jew and Gentile*, 369-82. Feldman lists thirty-one things about Judaism that may have been attractive to Gentiles.

92. J. Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 933-34.

house-church; but it is unlikely that the community actively pursued Gentiles for inclusion. Not only would this have been atypical for Jewish communities, the Matthean community saw itself as being under Jesus' command to take the message of the kingdom to Jews only (10.5-6; 15.24). Therefore, though it may have allowed proselytized Gentiles entrance pre-70 CE, it is doubtful that the community *actively sought* the conversion of Gentiles before it was made aware through the Son of Man's coming (10.23; 24.29-31) that the exclusive mission to "the house of Israel" had ended.

Was it possible for the Matthean community to remain so insular when it undoubtedly saw, read about, or heard about the great success other Christian communities were having converting Gentiles? The simple answer to this question is, "yes." If such texts as Acts 11, Acts 15, and Paul's Letter to the Galatians are any indication, there was not a consensus among Jewish Christians when it came to the "why" and "how" of permitting Gentiles entry into the community of believers. Given that there was diversity on this issue and that the Matthean sect still saw itself as being under the command of 10.5-6, it is not shocking that the community avoided pursuing Gentiles for some forty years after Jesus' resurrection. Again, the community likely interacted positively with proselytes who approached it, as Matthew's preservation of 8.5-13 and 15.21-28 may imply. However, it took acts of God to prompt it to diligently seek Jew and Gentile alike: the destruction of the Temple and Jesus' reception of "all authority in heaven *and on the earth*" (Mt 10.23; 24.29-31; 28.18; cf. Acts 10).

2.2.7—Was Matthew an Anti-Semite?

With the turbulent split between the Matthean community and formative Judaism in its recent past, the evangelist portrays the Jews, especially their Pharisaical leaders, in a harsh, hostile light. W. Carter posits that the gospel

encourages its audience to regard all synagogues as places of hypocrisy and violence, and Jewish leaders as hypocrites and murderers. It encourages us to view Jews who do not follow Jesus as faithless and deserving of destruction. It expects us to accept its demonization of the Jewish leaders accomplished by describing them in the same terms as the devil and by presenting them as the devil's agents (4:1-11; 12:34; 16:1-14; 19:3; 22:15, 34). It expects us

to share its co-option of Jewish history and traditions with its claim that their significance resides only in their relation to Jesus.⁹³

Are modern readers who have become evermore sensitive to anti-Semitism and anti-Semitic claims after World War II to find in these “questionable assertions”⁹⁴ an anti-Jewish apologetic?

Certainly, Mt has provided fuel for hatred against Jews for millennia. Particularly useful for supporting an anti-Semitic agenda have been such passages as 11.16-24 and 23.2-36. In these accounts, Matthew’s Jesus unabashedly proclaims that all Jews who reject Jesus as the prophet or Messiah of God (or John the Baptist as Wisdom’s prophet [cf. 11.19]) will experience judgment in the present age and at the eschaton. But these do not compare to the shocking declaration of self-condemnation Matthew alone places on the lips of ὁ λαός in 27.25, which has been used to justify more hostility toward Jews than any other passage in the Christian Testament:⁹⁵

And all the people answered [Pilate], “His [i.e., Jesus’] blood be upon us and our children!”
(καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς πᾶς ὁ λαὸς εἶπεν· τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα ἡμῶν)

This fulfilment of 23.35, which carries over “the overtones of bloodguilt and of punishment which the OT links provide for [in 23.35],” was used by the Nazis to justify charging innocent Jews with Jesus’ death. The most macabre example can be found at Dachau. When Jews were offloaded like cattle into the concentration camp, they were met with a sign that read, “You are here because you killed our God!”⁹⁶ No doubt it was in Mt 27.25 that the Nazis found the greatest support for placing the full weight of Jesus’ crucifixion on the shoulders of every subsequent generation of Jews. And, unfortunately, Matthew’s use of ὁ λαός—which is used in Mt to refer to the collective people of Israel⁹⁷—and ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα ἡμῶν does not expressly preclude this interpretation.

93. W. Carter, *Matthew and the Margins: A Socio-Political and Religious Reading* (JSNTSS 204. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 5.

94. Carter, *Matthew and the Margins*, 5.

95. C. Y. Glock and R. Stark, *Christian Beliefs and Anti-Semitism* (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), 197; referenced by Przybylski, “Matthean Anti-Judaism,” 182.

96. T. D. Baker, *Matthew 27:25: “His Blood Be Upon Us”: Are the Jewish People Racially Condemned for the Death of Christ* (Bloomington: iUniversity, 2008), Google Books, 9 November 2015.

97. E.g., 1.21; 2.4, 6; 4.16, 23; 13.15; 15.8; 21.23; 26.3, 5; 26.47; 27.1, 64.

It is not difficult to imagine after reading this, then, why one might accuse Matthew of promoting anti-Semitism, or how one in whom the seed of hatred toward Jews has already been planted might find in Jesus' words support for his or her perverted socio-ethnic ideology. But is one justified in accusing Matthew of purposefully promoting anti-Semitism? Is the bloodguilt for the persecution of millions of Jews rightly on the hands of the evangelist?

The coarse language and imagery of Jesus' speeches—especially those in 11.16-24 and 23.2-36—combined with the stark judgmental tone, seem harsh and inappropriate to sensitive modern audiences. In the “woes” of Mt 23 it appears at first glance as though Matthew has Jesus attack caricatures of the Jewish authorities—ludicrous exaggerations created in the mind of a biased author. However, as critical as the prophetic pronouncements are, nothing in these passages affirms the supposed anti-Semitism of Matthew. There is no denying that several verses are difficult to read, as such outbursts have little place in today's rhetoric. But even though these pericopae are foreign and scathing, both biting critiques and sometimes excessive hyperbole are part and parcel of ancient prophetic declarations of impending judgment. Just as Isaiah, Jeremiah or Ezekiel should not be called “anti-Semitic” for their exaggerated assertions and heated prophetic speech against their fellow Jews (e.g., Isa 56.9-12; Jer 23; Ezek 23), so too should one not charge Matthew with anti-Semitism simply for preserving similar language and style. These passages might go against modern sensibilities and be embarrassing to some Christians, but there are no grounds here for charging the evangelist with anti-Semitism.

Just as the harsh prophetic pronouncements of judgment in Mt 11 and 23 do not equate to anti-Semitism, neither does the bold declaration of the crowd preserved in 27.25. This self-condemning proclamation of the Jews is balanced with the bloodguilt to the Romans, as well as with numerous indicators throughout the gospel that the evangelist and his community cared for the Jews, sought to treat them with love and kindness (or, at least, not with violence), and looked forward with eager anticipation to their inclusion into the kingdom of God.

First, concerning the near context of Mt 27.25, Matthew is clear that the Jews were not the only people responsible for Jesus' death. Despite using a ritual washing to appear innocent, Pontius Pilate and the Jewish protestors were equally

responsible for Jesus' execution. The Jewish crowd was eager to accept responsibility for the crucifixion because of their unbelief and anger. Conversely, Pilate was earnest to deny responsibility for the execution due to his cowardice. Even though he knew Jesus to be innocent (27.23), was aware that the people had only accused Jesus due to φθόνον (i.e., "spite" or "envy" [27.18]), and had been told of Jesus' righteousness through his wife's dream (27.19), Pilate handed him over to the crowd to avoid a potential riot that he had the power and responsibility to quell (27.24). Therefore, blame for the crucifixion of Jesus does not rest solely on the shoulders of the Jews in Mt. The Roman prefect Pilate played a substantial part in letting an innocent man die. This does not mean that Matthew does not consider the Jewish crowd to be culpable, in part, for their Messiah's death. Rather, this implies that there was plenty of blame to go around, and that Matthew has not unduly placed all the guilt of the crucifixion on unbelieving Jews.

Second, the crowd calling down the bloodguilt of Jesus' death on themselves alludes back to Jesus' prophetic pronouncement in 23.35 that the blood of all the righteous was soon to come upon "this generation" (23.35-36); but it also recalls Jesus' expressed promise that "you [i.e., Jerusalem (23.37)] will not see me again until you say, 'Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord!'" (23.39). That is, Jesus will not return to Israel until the citizens of Jerusalem—the children of the Jews who crucified him—celebrate his coming as they did when he entered Jerusalem riding on the foal of a donkey (21.9). This prediction implies that Matthew's Jesus anticipated the repentance of the Jews for crucifying him. A portion of the blame for murdering Jesus may rest on "this generation" of Jews and their children. But the bloodguilt will not last in perpetuity (note the absence of "forever" [cf. 1 Kgs 2.33]⁹⁸ or other time markers [cf. Ex 20.5; 34.7; Num 14.18; Deut 5.9]⁹⁹). The hand of forgiveness is outstretched by Jesus and, by extension, Matthew and his community, as it always had been by God whenever the Israelites failed to adhere to covenantal stipulations (cf. Deut 30.1-20).¹⁰⁰ The Pharisees and scribes may have, from the perspective of Matthew, committed an "unforgivable sin" (12.32). Howev-

98. D. Senior, *The Passion Narrative according to Matthew: A Redactional Study* (BETL 39. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1975), 260.

99. J. D. G. Dunn, "The Question of Anti-semitism in the New Testament Writings of the Period," in J. D. G. Dunn (ed.), *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways, A.D. 70 to 135* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 175-211 (209).

100. Dunn, "Anti-semitism," 209.

er, the evangelist sees all other Jews as capable of receiving forgiveness upon repentance and proper belief.

Third, after the resurrection narrative, Matthew exclusively records Jesus commissioning his disciples to “go and make disciples of *all the nations*” (28.19; cf. 24.14). Exactly what πάντα τὰ ἔθνη means will be discussed in more detail later in this dissertation. To anticipate the results, πάντα τὰ ἔθνη means “every nation in the purview of Jesus’ universal authority ‘in heaven and on the earth’” (28.18). This would, of course, include the nation of Israel and her people. Should it not, the Son of Man’s authority could not be considered complete (cf. “*all authority*” [28.18]). Therefore, in terminating the exclusive mission to the Jews, Jesus has not prohibited the disciples from ministering to “the lost sheep of the house of Israel.” On the contrary, the mission to the Jews continues, except now Gentiles are actively sought as well. The end of the exclusively Jewish mission has simply opened the door wider for sharing the good news of the kingdom. *Repentant Jews receive the same welcome as Gentile converts.*

Finally, should Matthew be anti-Semitic, he has demonstrated the utmost hypocrisy. No other gospel places more emphasis on loving one’s enemies as does Mt. According to the Sermon on the Mount, the members of the kingdom community are to be “peacemakers” (5.9) who do not retaliate when their honor is taken (5.38-42), but are instead to rejoice in suffering (5.11-12). The community is to love both its neighbors *and* its enemies (5.43-45), praying for those who persecute it (5.44) and forgiving whomever has wronged it (6.14-15). Even when one of its own turns away from the community toward the world, he or she is to be treated like a “Gentile and tax collector”—that is, as one who is in need of repentance and discipleship (cf. 9.10-13; 21.31-32; 28.18-20). He or she is not to be shunned. Rather, the offender is to be actively sought for entry into the community once more. Matthew may be disappointed with unbelieving Jews or incensed by their faithlessness to the point that he resorts to name-calling and, at times, gross hyperbole to describe their sin. But the convictions preserved in the Sermon on the Mount are not those of an author who is filled with hatred toward his religious opponents. It is the theme of loving social outsiders and one’s enemies that speaks the strongest against seeing Matthew as anti-Semitic.

Most of the other passages that scholars commonly forward as proof of Matthew's anti-Semitism that have not yet been cited are better read as promoting anti-Pharisaism.¹⁰¹ Until Jesus' climactic proclamation of seven woes in Mt 23, Matthew presents the "Pharisees and scribes" as the primary opponents of Jesus. Even though the Matthean Jesus compliments the scribes and Pharisees by commanding his disciples to "do and observe whatever they tell you" (23.3a), he immediately warns his disciples not to act as their leaders do (23.3b) and proceeds to pronounce his "woes" against them, ending with a prophetic word on their impending doom (23.34-39). The weight of this compliment is lessened even further when tempered by the earlier command of Jesus to, "Beware the leaven [i.e., 'the teaching' (cf. 16.12)] of the Pharisees and Sadducees" (16.11). When these two passages are read in light of one another it appears as though the disciples are being taught to follow Pharisaical teaching but only with the utmost caution.

Though the teachings of the scribes and Pharisees can be sound on occasion, according to Matthew, their actions of attempting to lead the crowds against Jesus and of blaspheming the Spirit have condemned them. Only four chapters after Jesus' conflict with the Jewish leaders began, the Pharisees commit the "unforgivable sin" of blaspheming the Spirit by openly denying that Jesus cast out demons through the Spirit's power (12.22-45). For their "careless word" (12.36) in requesting a sign (12.38) they are promised only the "sign of Jonah," that is, Jesus' resurrection from the dead after three days (12.38-40). It is the sign of the resurrection that simultaneously marks both Jesus' vindication and the leaders' condemnation. Because of their hardness of heart, the Pharisees are promised eschatological punishment based upon the respective testimonies of the Gentile citizens of Nineveh and the foreign Queen of Sheba (12.41-42).

Punishment is not simply relegated to the afterlife. According to the evangelist, the Pharisees and scribes are also promised the agony of seeing the Temple's desolation at the hands of the Roman military due to their sin. At the end of pronouncing woes against the Pharisees and scribes in 23.13-36, Jesus states that "all the righteous blood shed on earth" (23.35) will come upon "this generation," of which the Pharisees and teachers of the Law are chief. Based on the context, this bloodguilt will precipitate the desolation of the Temple (23.38; 24.2) and the devas-

101. Dunn, "Anti-semitism," 203.

tation of both Galilee and Judea. These passages illuminate the Parables of the Tenants and the Wedding Feast, in which Jesus claims that the kingdom will be stripped from the Pharisees and chief priests (21.43, 45), while the city of the “murderers”—Jerusalem—will be destroyed (22.7; cf. 23.29-36).

Aside from broad examples of conflict between Jesus and the Pharisees in Matthew’s story, there are finer details in the text that may signal the presence of tension between the evangelist and his community, on the one hand, and the Pharisaic leaders of its day, on the other.¹⁰² First, in Mt 8.19 the evangelist identifies the man whom Jesus does not accept into his band of disciples as a “scribe” (cf. Lk 9.57). Later, at the next appearance of “scribes,” Matthew adds to his source that the leaders thought “evil” in their hearts (9.4), a negative detail not included in Mk 2.8. These additions were likely meant to cast aspersions on the scribes of the synagogue and subtly promote the scribes of the Church who recognized Jesus’ authority and were called to discipleship.¹⁰³ Second, in Mt 9.18-26, Jarius, the “ruler of the synagogue” according to Mk (Mk 5.22, 35, 36, 38), is simply identified as an “official” (Mt 9.18, 23). Matthew, thereby, avoids attributing faith to one who was connected with the synagogue and, by extension, the Pharisees and scribes who are explicitly associated with the synagogue in Mt 23.6, 34. Third, Matthew eliminates any reference to “the Herodians” in 12.14 (cf. Mk 3.6) possibly to place the responsibility for schemes against Jesus solely on the shoulders of the Pharisees.¹⁰⁴ Fourth, the astute scribe who is impressed by the teaching of Jesus in Mk 12.28-34, and whom Jesus compliments in Mk 12.34, is replaced by a Pharisee who attempts “to entangle [Jesus] in his words” (22.15, 34-40). Finally, Matthew is the only evangelist to introduce the Pharisees into the Passion Narrative (27.62), whereas in the other gospels the Temple authorities were the only leaders mentioned as being involved with Jesus’ trial.

Therefore, a strong anti-Pharisaical theme runs though the gospel that can be seen most clearly in Mt 8-12 and 23. This is to be expected given the state of Ju-

102. Cf. Davies, *Sermon on the Mount*, 291-92.

103. The “Pharisees” and “scribes” were, of course, two distinct groups in the first-century CE. But Matthew has often conflated the two groups, making them a single “character” in his story, likely due to their knowledge of and adherence to the Law. Therefore, Matthew’s unique negative references to the scribes will be considered alongside those to the Pharisees.

104. Matthew does not eliminate the reference to the Herodians because he is unfamiliar with the group. He mentions them as trying Jesus alongside the Pharisees later in 22.15-16.

daism after the fall of Jerusalem. Prior to the 70 CE destruction of the Temple, there were four traditional religious “parties”: the Pharisees, Sadducees, Zealots and Essenes. But after the Roman conquest of Israel only the Pharisees had survived. In this religio-political vacuum, the Pharisees seized the reins of leadership over the Jewish people,¹⁰⁵ an easy matter since they already held sway with the common Jew (Jos., *Ant.* 18.15). Thus, it is plausible that the primary interlocutors of the Matthean community post-70 CE were synagogues that upheld the customs and values of Pharisaical Judaism.¹⁰⁶ If so, numerous passages in Mt that have been used to support the claim that Matthew was an anti-Semite instead confirm that the evangelist opposed the Pharisaical movement that had gained a solid foothold in post-70 Judaism.

Based on the above observations, there is good reason to suggest friction existed between the Matthean community and those synagogues that upheld the traditions of Pharisaical Judaism. But it is the conclusion of this study that there are no grounds for condemning Matthew or his community for promoting hatred for Jews in general.¹⁰⁷ The evangelist and his fellow Christ-followers clearly believed that their Jewish opponents had denied the Messiah, were in league with Satan against God (cf. 13.38-39), and were worthy of severe punishment. But the evangelist and his community were not so calloused as to think that the Jews were beyond the point of redemption. Though the community’s mission had been altered to allow its members to go into the way of the Gentiles, there is no indication that it neglected the Jews. On the contrary, it took the message of the Son of Man’s reign to “all the nations” (24.14; 28.19) and held out hope that all Jews might one day turn to Jesus in repentance to be gathered under his wing (23.37-39). Although Matthew’s words are abrasive and critical at times, they ultimately come from a heart of love for his enemies, Christ, Yahweh, and the Jewish Scriptures. They are a stark call to unbelieving Jews to turn toward Christ lest they suffer “eternal punishment” (25.46). But Matthew’s words are simultaneously a call to the Church to

105. Ferguson, *Backgrounds*, 515.

106. See Kilpatrick, *Origins*, 108-11; Davies and Allison, *Matthew 1-7*, 1:137.

107. *Contra*, for example, Hare, *Theme of Jewish Persecution*, 157; S. Sandmel, *Anti-Semitism in the New Testament?* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978), 68; E. Buck, “Anti-Judaic Sentiments in the Passion Narrative According to Matthew,” in P. Richardson, with G. Granskou (eds.), *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity: Paul and the Gospels* (Studies in Christianity and Judaism 2. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1986), 165-80 (179).

stand firm; he does not write “‘a gospel against the Jews,’ but a gospel for the church, to warn it by Israel’s example.”¹⁰⁸

Many atrocities against Jews have been justified by twisted readings of Matthew’s gospel. Nonetheless, he cannot be faulted for outcomes he never could have predicted. Seeing that Matthew’s Jesus taught the kingdom-community to love their enemies, it is almost certain that the evangelist would greatly lament the violence that has precipitated from his work.

2.2.8—The Provenance of Matthew’s Gospel

There are few aspects of the Matthean gospel’s background about which there is consensus, and the issue of provenance is no exception. Where Mt was written is not of much concern for this dissertation, as none of its conclusions stand or fall on the issue of provenance. Yet, since this subject is closely connected to the previous discussion of the religious and social contexts of the Matthean community, it may be wise to outline briefly the heart of the matter.

As former sections have suggested, Mt was composed in an area that was replete with both Jews and Gentiles (cf. 6.7; 10.18; 18.17). Additionally, as Kingsbury has argued, the region would have likely been home to a large city with wealthy inhabitants due to Matthew’s fondness of πόλις as compared to κώμη¹⁰⁹ and his inflation of currencies.¹¹⁰ Nearly every commonly proposed place of origin fits well this description: Jerusalem,¹¹¹ Caesarea Maritima,¹¹² Tiberias or Sepphoris,¹¹³ Tyre or

108. France, *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher*, 240-41; following S. Légasse, “L’ ‘antijudaïsme’ dans l’Evangile selon Matthieu,” in M. Didier (ed.), *L’Evangile selon Matthieu: Rédaction et Théologie* (Gembloux: Duculot, 1972), 417-28.

109. “City” appears twenty-six times, whereas “village” appears but a meager four times in Mt. Compare this to eight and seven times respectively in Mk.

110. Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story*, 152-53.

111. W. Allen, *The Gospel According to St. Matthew* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1907), 310; A. Plummer, *An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew* (London: Stock, 1909), xxxiii.

112. B. Viviano, “Where Was the Gospel According to St. Matthew Written?” *CBQ* 41 (1979), 533-46.

113. Overman, *Matthew’s Gospel and Formative Judaism*, 158-59; A. J. Saldarini, “The Gospel of Matthew and Jewish-Christian Conflict in the Galilee,” in L. I. Levine (ed.), *The Galilee in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992), 26-27; P. Hertig, “Geographical Marginality in the Matthean Journey of Jesus,” *SBL Seminar Papers*, 1999 (SBLSP 36. Atlanta: SBL, 1999), 479; A. M. Gale, *Redefining Ancient Borders: The Jewish Scribal Framework of Matthew’s Gospel* (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 41-63.

Sidon,¹¹⁴ and Antioch.¹¹⁵ Nonetheless, it is possible to narrow this list further.

Various factors in the text of Mt may indicate that the gospel was composed in Syria. Matthew adds to his source text (i.e., Mk 1.28, 39) that Jesus' "fame spread throughout all Syria" (cf. 4.24).¹¹⁶ As Carter posits, "given the focus on Galilee, . . . [Matthew's redaction] is somewhat surprising (cf. Matt 4:12-15, 23, 25)." There are few readily apparent reasons for the evangelist to have mentioned Syria, one of which is the possibility that his community resided within the provenance. Furthermore, Mt was frequently cited in the writings of Ignatius, the bishop of Antioch. This suggests that Mt was well-known in Syria and, perhaps, was the place of its composition. Finally, Matthew places considerable emphasis on the role of Peter as the leader of the disciples (see especially 16.17-19). Given the close tie between Peter and the church in Antioch (cf. Gal 2.11-14), this too may signal a Syrian provenance.

This evidence supports the assertion that Mt was composed in Syria, and if so, probably in Antioch. Antioch was one of the major cities of the eastern Roman Empire, located in an ideal area for commerce. Such trade would have supported a strong economy, meaning the Matthean community could have been comprised, at least in part, of wealthy Christ-followers. Further, according to Josephus (Jos, Wars 7.43), Antioch was welcoming of Jews and, therefore, boasted a sizable population comprised of both Jews and Gentiles:

Men of Jewish blood in great numbers are diffused among the native populations all over the world, especially in Syria, where the two nations are neighbors. The biggest Jewish colony was at Antioch owing to the size of the city, and still more because the kings who followed Antiochus had made it safe for them to settle there.¹¹⁷

There is, then, evidence to support the hypothesis of an Antiochian provenance. But it must be admitted that none of the evidence is strong. As Stan-

114. Kilpatrick, *Origins*, 131-34.

115. Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 500-23; E. Schweizer, *Matthäus und seine Gemeinde* (Stuttgart: KBW, 1974), 138-39; R. E. Brown and J. P. Meier, *Antioch and Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity* (New York: Paulist, 1983), 18-27; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:138-47; Blomberg, *Matthew*, 37; Hagner, *Matthew*, 1:lxxv; D. C. Sim, *The Gospel of Matthew and Christian Judaism: The History and Social Setting of the Matthean Community* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998).

116. Cf. Evans, *Matthew*, 5-6 n. 12.

117. Cited in D. J. Harrington, S.J., *The Gospel of Matthew* (Sacra Pagina 1. Collegeville: Liturgical, 1991), 9-10.

ton rightly commented, all attempts to identify the location of Mt's composition are "based on flimsy evidence."¹¹⁸ The hypothesis of an Antiochian provenance has garnered widespread support simply because it is "not the worst hypothesis" currently forwarded.¹¹⁹ Yet, as it is not the worst hypothesis, it is the best of less-than-ideal choices, and the one herein accepted.

This dissertation cautiously posits that the gospel of Matthew was composed in Antioch though the Matthean community may have originated somewhere in Israel. The latter is inferred from the commissioning in 10.5-6 not to go to the Gentiles and Samaritans, but only to the "lost sheep of the house of Israel," a command the community adhered to until after the Son of Man's coming in 70 CE (cf. 10.23; 24.31). After the Roman military devastated the regions of Galilee and Judea in 66-70 CE, the community may have migrated north to Antioch. Once witnessing first-hand the Gentiles' reception of the gospel and having had time to contemplate the consequences of the Temple's destruction, the community was forced to consider seriously a ministry to the Gentiles (24.14; 28.19). It gave voice to this concern among many others in a new gospel for a new people.

2.2.9—The Structure of Matthew's Gospel

To investigate properly the significance of the "Son of Man" sayings to the plot of Mt, it is helpful to discuss briefly the structure of the gospel and the author-imposed divisions. Although structure is not plot, "structure . . . is a step in delineating plot."¹²⁰ And since the plot of Mt is paramount to this study, the macrostructure of the gospel is worth examining.

There are three primary interpretive schemes. First, the *narrative model* claims that there are two major shifts in the narrative, each marked by the phrase Ἀπὸ τότε ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς ("From that time Jesus began . . ." [4.17; 16.21]).¹²¹ The first signals the initiation of Jesus' ministry (4.17), while the second calls attention

118. Stanton, *New People*, 50.

119. Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 58; see Stanton, *New People*, 50 n. 1.

120. Branden, *Satanic Conflict*, 90.

121. J. D. Kingsbury, "Structure of Matthew and the Concept of Salvation History," *CBQ* 35 (1973): 451-74; *idem*, *Matthew: S., C., K.*, 7-25; *idem*, *Matthew as Story*, 41-94; D. R. Bauer, *The Structure of Matthew's Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (JSNTSup 31. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988), 73-108, Powell, "Plot and Subplots," 187-203.

to Peter's confession and Jesus' pivotal revelation to his disciples that he must suffer and die in Jerusalem (16.21). Second, the *discourse model* suggests that the gospel consists of at least five pairs of discourses and narratives.¹²² The division between the pairs is signaled by the phrase Καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς (“And when Jesus had finished . . .” [7.28; 11.1; 13.53; 19.1; 26.1]), which concludes the discourse and introduces a new narrative. A closely related structural theory to the second is the *chiastic model* that posits that the discourses fall into a chiasmus that centers around chapters 11,¹²³ 13,¹²⁴ or 14.¹²⁵

These three theories are not mutually exclusive. Kingsbury's *narrative model* takes the narrative of Mk as its starting point, emphasizing the beginning of Jesus' ministry, the confession of Peter, and Jesus' turn toward Jerusalem. Although this captures the major thrust of the Matthean narrative, and certainly harmonizes Mt with its Markan source, it neglects a crucial feature of Mt's textual landscape: the presence of the discourses. Although the progression of the narrative is certainly important—especially for literary critics like Kingsbury—to ignore the discourses in one's suggested structure is to produce an incomplete outline. A similar critique can be leveled at the proponents of the *discourse model*. By overemphasizing the place of the discourses in the structure of Mt, one's perspective on the narrative can become lost. For example, B. W. Bacon, who proposed that the five central narratives and discourses were designed to act as the new Pentateuch for the fledgling Matthean community,¹²⁶ formulated a structural theory that completely neglected the narrative, undermining Matthew's message of the Messiah and, thereby, the genre of “gospel” itself.

122. See especially B. W. Bacon, “The ‘Five Books’ of Matthew against the Jews,” *Exp* 15 (1918): 56-66. Meier structured his “mini-commentary” on the *discourse model* (*Vision, passim*).

123. H. B. Green, “The Structure of St. Matthew's Gospel,” *StEv* 4 (1968): 47-59.

124. P. F. Ellis, *Matthew: His Mind and His Message* (Collegeville: Liturgical, 1974), 10-13; J. M. O'Connor, “The Structure of Matthew XIV-XVII,” *RB* 82 (1975): 360-84 (370 n. 33); C. H. Lohr, “Oral Techniques in the Gospel of Matthew,” *CBQ* 23 (1961): 403-35; T. J. Keegan, “Introductory Formulae for Matthean Discourses,” *CBQ* 44 (1982): 415-30; H. J. B. Combrink, “The Structure of the Gospel of Matthew as Narrative,” *TynBul* 34 (1983): 61-70; G. W. Derickson, “Matthew's Chiastic Structure and Its Dispensational Implications,” *BSac* 163 (2006): 423-37; T. J. VanderWeele, “Some Observations Concerning the Chiastic Structure of the Gospel of Matthew,” *JTS* 39 (2008): 669-73.

125. X. Léon-Dufour, “Vers l'annonce de L'Église: Matthieu 14,1-16,20,” in J. Guillet, *et al.* (eds.), *L'homme devant Dieu: Mélanges offerts au Père Henri be Lubac* (Paris: Aubier, 1963), 1:37-49.

126. Bacon, “Five Books,” 56-66.

This examination of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in Mt assumes a synthesis of the *narrative*, *discourse*, and *chiastic models*. It recognizes that Kingsbury has identified marked shifts in the plot at 4.17 and 16.21, while also maintaining that the author of Mt has used the pattern of alternating discourses and narratives to give his work a skeletal frame. Further, it is suggested that Matthew has carefully arranged his material in a symmetrical fashion centering on the Kingdom Discourse (13.3-52). As Luz has recognized, the “first and last Matthean discourses are the longest, the second and fourth—almost equal in length—are the shortest, and the middle discourse, chap. 13, is of medium length.”¹²⁷ Additionally, the second and fourth discourses focus on discipleship.

Therefore, while maintaining that Kingsbury has marked the ebb and flow of the plot, the assumed macrostructure of the text of Mt is as follows:

1.1-4.25 ¹²⁸	Prologue and Narrative ¹²⁹
5.1-7.29	First Discourse (A)
8.1-9.35	Narrative
9.36-10.42	Second Discourse (B)
11.1-12.50	Narrative
13.1-52	Third Discourse (C)
13.53-17.27	Narrative
18.1-19.2	Fourth Discourse (B')
19.3-22.46	Narrative
23.1-25.46	Fifth Discourse (A')
26.1-28.20	Narrative and Epilogue

2.2.10—Identifying Old Testament and Pseudepigraphical Allusions and Citations in Matthew

The theme of fulfillment, one of the central themes in the gospel of Mt,¹³⁰ is frequently expressed through uniquely Matthean “formula-quotations” (cf. 1.22; 2.15, 17, 23; 4.14; 8.17; 12.17; 13.35; 21.4; 27.9 [possibly 2.5]). These quotations of Jewish Scripture are easily recognized and commonly follow the Hebrew reading of the

127. U. Luz, *Matthew 1-7* (Trans. by J. E. Crouch. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 1:5.

128. Combrink suggested that the discourse begins at 4.18 in order to draw together the *narrative* and *discourse models* (“Structure,” 71). This fails to convince for two reasons. First, the first discourse clearly begins in 5.1, as the author sets the scene for the Sermon on the Mount. Second, this confuses the two structural schemes: the *discourse model* informs the reader of the textual structure of the gospel, whereas the *narrative model* highlights the pivoting points in the gospel’s story.

129. It is the conclusion of the present author that Mt 1.1-4.25 and 26.2-28.20 are not a “prologue” and “epilogue” respectively. This terminology implies that these sections are nothing more than introductory and concluding notes appended to the beginning and end of the story of Jesus. Rather, it is herein suggested that Mt is comprised of seven narratives and five discourses. Or, perhaps, Mt is better considered a continuous narrative with blocks of discourse inserted periodically.

130. France, *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher*, 166-205; *idem*, *Matthew*, 10-14.

cited passage. Meanwhile, other citations and allusions that appear without an introductory formula can be more difficult to identify.¹³¹ Since numerous scholars have suggested that Mt contains echoes or citations of such passages as Dan 7 and 1 En 37-71, either or both of which may have influenced Matthew's "Son of Man" concept, the reader should be made aware of the method by which this study will determine the likelihood of textual dependence.

This is by no means a science, and is largely based on how the researcher subjectively evaluates the evidence. But the simple guidelines offered by R. Hays can assist one in recognizing one's own biases and those exhibited by fellow students of Matthew the scribe. Further, they can assist one in presenting his or her findings in a readable, convincing fashion. R. Hays presented seven criteria for identifying the literary phenomena of textual echo: in every case one must evaluate

- a) the *availability* of the supposed source text to the author;
- b) the *volume* of the echo (that is, for example, the amount of words in common between the texts);
- c) the *recurrence* of the potential echo;
- d) the *thematic coherence* of the potential allusion with the context in which it has been placed;
- e) the *historical plausibility* the author used the suggested source text in question;
- f) the purported echo's *history of interpretation* (that is, has anyone else perceived an allusion previously, which may support the validity of one's own theory); and
- g) does the proposed allusion provide a *satisfying* interpretation of the passage.¹³²

— Sources Behind the Matthean "Son of Man" Sayings —

There are three primary sources that have influenced the Matthean "Son of Man" sayings: Mk, Q, and, as will be substantiated, Old Greek (OG) Dan 7.¹³³ Tödt and Walck, among others, have proposed that Matthew was also influenced by the Enochic

131. In the non-formulaic quotations and allusions, it is the tendency of Matthew, as it is with most New Testament authors, to follow the septuagintal recension (M. J. J. Menken, *Matthew's Bible: The Old Testament Text of the Evangelist* [BETL 173. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2004], 5; France, *Matthew*, 13).

132. R. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 29-32.

133. "Old Greek" is a specialist term used "to designate a text that in the judgment of the scholar represents the original translation of a book" (R. T. McLay, *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003], 6). Following the lead of McLay and other Greek Old Testament researchers, in this dissertation "OG will be employed to refer specifically to what is believed to be the oldest recoverable form of the Greek text of a particular book, and LXX will designate more generally that group of Greek Jewish Scriptures as they are commonly known" (McLay, *Septuagint*, 7).

tradition when forming his “Son of Man” concept. But *1 En* 37-71 will not be added here since the exegesis of subsequent chapters will demonstrate that there is little support for Matthew’s dependence on the *Similitudes*. The “Son of Man” sayings of Mk¹³⁴ and the hypothetical “Q” source¹³⁵ have been discussed extensively elsewhere, so there is no need to summarize here their respective conceptions of the “Son of Man” tradition. Parallels between the Matthean “Son of Man” sayings and those of Mk and Q will be analyzed in the following chapters when applicable.

It is necessary, however, to discuss briefly the textual history and translation of OG Dan 7, as well as select idiosyncratic theological traits. As will be shown in the dissertation proper, this passage was exceedingly influential to Matthew, having been cited twice (cf. 24.30; 26.64) and alluded to as many as six or seven times (cf. 13.41; 16.27-28; 19.28; 24.30-31; 25.31; 28.18-20 [possibly 20.28]). But the passage is ignored or misunderstood by a large number of contemporary researchers. Hence, its impact on one’s understanding of the Matthean “Son of Man” concept has also often been missed.

2.3.1—The Extant Text of Old Greek Daniel 7

There are three extant versions of Dan 7: the MT, written in Aramaic—the *Muttersprache* of Jesus and most Jews in the Second Temple period¹³⁶—the Theodotian (Θ), and OG, the latter two having been written in Greek. The OG is witnessed in three manuscripts: a) *Codex Chisianus*, now commonly known as *Codex 88*,¹³⁷ dated between the ninth- and eleventh-centuries CE; b) the Syriac translation of Origen’s

134. Cf. Hooker, *Son of Man in Mark*; G. D. Kirchhevel, “The ‘Son of Man’ Passages in Mark,” *BBR* 9 (1999): 181-87.

135. Cf. L. E. Vaage, “The Son of Man Sayings in Q: Stratigraphical Location and Significance,” *Semeia* 55 (1992): 103-29; C. M. Tuckett, “The Son of Man in Q,” in M. C. De Boer (ed.), *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge* (JSNTSup 84. Sheffield: JSOT, 1993), 197-215; J. M. Robinson, “The Son of Man in the Sayings Gospel Q,” in C. Heil and J. Verheyden (eds.), *The Sayings Gospel Q: Collected Essays by James M. Robinson* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005), 405-25; P. Foster, “The Pastoral Purpose of Q’s Two-Stage Son of Man Christology,” *Bib* 89 (2008): 81-91.

136. Cf. M. Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1967).

137. H. B. Swete incorrectly labeled this codex “87” (*The Old Testament in Greek* [4th Ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1912], 3:498-593). This error was repeated by F. G. Kenyon (*The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible: Ezekiel, Daniel, Esther* [London: Emery Walker, 1937], 7:xi).

Hexapla, known as the *Syro-hexaplar* (*Syh*), penned in 615-617 CE; and, most importantly, c) *Papyrus 967*,¹³⁸ which has been dated as early as the second-century CE.¹³⁹

In the early Church, for reasons not completely known by modern scholars, the θ replaced the OG in corporate reading. A possible reason for this is that the θ is a more accurate translation of the Aramaic, lacking many of the OG's alterations. The reason for these derivations from the Aramaic reading is highly debated. F. F. Bruce explained these as examples of the scribe's theological *Tendenz* being reflected upon the text,¹⁴⁰ whereas S. P. Jeansonne has suggested the differences are due to the translator's unique *Vorlage*, making them primarily mechanical.¹⁴¹ Several small scale studies as exemplars for the translational and interpretive alterations between the MT and θ on the one hand, and the OG on the other, have found Dan 7.13 to be fertile ground for debate. The differences are plentiful and substantial, leading to a multiplicity of scholarly opinions. Below is a reconstruction of the OG version of Dan 7.13-14, followed by the present author's translation:

138. The Chester Beatty papyri of Daniel were acquired by an American traveler in 1935-36 and were subsequently labeled *P45*. These fragments contained portions of Daniel 7.1-6, 8-11, 14-19, 22-25, and 28. It was discovered in the 1960's that some of the missing fragments of Daniel 7 had been sent to Cologne, Germany (7.1, 5-8, 11-14, 19-22), and later Daniel 7.25-28 was uncovered in Barcelona, Spain. It is now common to refer to all of these fragments by the designation *P967*.

139. A. A. DiLella, "The Textual History of Septuagint-Daniel and Theodotion-Daniel," in J. J. Collins and P. W. Flint (eds.), *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (VTSup 82. Leiden: Brill, 2001), 2:586-607 (586-87, 590); S. Kreuzer dates the manuscript to 200 CE ("Papyrus 967: Bemerkungen zu seiner buchtechnischen, textgeschichtlichen und kanongeschichtlichen Bedeutung," in M. Karrer and W. Kraus [eds.], *Die Septuaginta—Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten* [WUNT 219. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008], 64-82 [64]).

140. F. F. Bruce, "The Oldest Greek Version of Daniel," *OTS* 20 (1977): 22-40 (25).

141. S. P. Jeansonne, *The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 7-12* (CBQMS 19. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association, 1988), 131-33.

<p>ἐθεώρουν ἐν ὀράματι τῆς νυκτὸς καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἦρχετο¹⁴² ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, καὶ ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν παρῆν, καὶ οἱ παρεστηκότες προσήγαγον¹⁴³ αὐτῷ. καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐξουσία βασιλική,¹⁴⁴ καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς κατὰ γένη καὶ πᾶσα δόξα αὐτῷ λατρεύουσα.¹⁴⁵ καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτοῦ ἐξουσία αἰώνιος,¹⁴⁶ ἥτις οὐ μὴ ἀρθῆ, καὶ ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ, ἥτις οὐ μὴ φθαρῆ.</p>	<p>I [i.e., Daniel] saw in a vision of the night: behold, one like a son of man was coming upon the clouds of heaven, and he was like the Ancient of Days, and the standing ones [i.e., the angels] approached him. Authority was given to him, and all the nations of the earth according to tribe, and all glory, and worship were given to him. His authority is an everlasting authority which will not be taken away, and his kingdom is one which will not be destroyed.</p>
---	--

2.3.2—The “one like the Ancient of Days” in Old Greek Daniel 7.13

It has often been questioned why the scribe of the OG version rendered the Aramaic *וְעַד יְוִמֵי קְדִמָּתָא* (“and to/until/as far as the Ancient of Days”) as ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν rather than ἕως τοῦ παλαιοῦ τῶν ἡμερῶν as had the scribe of the θ. J. A. Montgomery,¹⁴⁷ who has been followed by J. Ziegler,¹⁴⁸ S. P. Jeansonne,¹⁴⁹ A. Y. Collins¹⁵⁰ and J. J. Collins,¹⁵¹ suggested that ὡς is a scribal error, the proper reading being ἕως, in conformity with the θ and the MT. It is possible that the scribe inadvertently eliminated the epsilon. However, the textual evidence does not support this construction; the extant manuscript tradition unanimously supports the reading ὡς.¹⁵² Further, the genitive παλαιοῦ, which is the case one would expect to find

142. Papyrus 967 reads: ἦρχετο^A ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου^B, καὶ ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν^B παρῆν^A. Meanwhile, *Codex Chisianus* reads: ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου^A ἦρχετο^B, καὶ ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν^A παρῆν^B.

143. *Codex 88* reads παρῆσαν, which is supported by the *Syh*. This changes the translation to, “and the standing ones were present beside him.” The older reading is herein adopted.

144. The above reading is supported by *P967*. *Codex 88*, supported by the *Syh*, expands the reading: ἐξουσία καὶ τιμὴ βασιλική. This later reading is likely a Theodotonic or Masoretic contamination.

145. The first epsilon in λατρεύουσα is missing in *P967*.

146. Papyrus 967 incorrectly reads αἰώνος, a noun meaning “age” or “eternity,” rather than αἰώνιος, an adjective that is commonly rendered “eternal” or “everlasting.” It is likely that the scribe responsible for *P967* simply misspelled αἰώνιος, as αἰώνος does not make sense in this context.

147. J. A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (ICC. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1927), 304.

148. J. Ziegler, *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum 16/2: Suzanna, Daniel, Bel et Drago* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954), 170.

149. Jeansonne, *Old Greek Translation*, 98.

150. A. Y. Collins, “The ‘Son of Man’ Tradition and the Book of Revelation,” in J. H. Charlesworth, *et al.* (eds.), *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 536-68 (554-55).

151. J. J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 311; cf. 275 n. 41.

152. J. Lust, “Daniel 7.13 and the Septuagint,” *ETHL* 54 (1978): 62-69; T. J. Meadowcroft, *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel: A Literary Comparison* (JSOTSup 198. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 223.

after ἔως, is altered to the nominative form in the OG to agree grammatically with ὧς (cf. παλαιός). This phenomenon is more likely the product of a deliberate, midrashic alteration of the Aramaic reading that reflects the theological *Tendenz* of the recensionist¹⁵³ than a scribal error for which the editor grammatically compensated.

To whom, then, does ὧς παλαιός ἡμερῶν refer? Meadowcroft suggested that ὧς παλαιός ἡμερῶν refers to the Ancient of Days. However, this theory does not explain why the scribe switched from using the absolute παλαιός ἡμερῶν in 7.9 to the descriptive ὧς παλαιός ἡμερῶν in 7.13. S. Kim alternatively suggested, though he did not advocate, that one could read the passage as referring to three beings: the “one like a son of man,” the “one like the Ancient of Days,” and the “Ancient of Days.”¹⁵⁴ Such an explanation is not plausible, for if the author was describing two different individuals, the double αὐτῶ in 7.14 would refer to the ὧς παλαιός ἡμερῶν and not ὧς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, leaving the human-like figure in limbo.¹⁵⁵ The most plausible interpretation of the extant Greek text is to read ὧς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου and ὧς παλαιός ἡμερῶν as referring to the same entity; Daniel sees in his night-vision an individual who, while he is approaching (ἤρχετο), looks like a human in form, but when he arrives before (παρῆν) the Ancient of Days he looks like the one to whom he draws near,¹⁵⁶ presumably in glory if not also form. This is supported by the B. E. Reynolds’ study of the comparative in the Greek Old Testament. He found that when ὧς . . . καὶ ὧς is used, both conjunctions are comparative and refer to the same entity (e.g., Joel 2.7; Isa 38.14; Ezek 38.9; Sir 24.15).¹⁵⁷ Therefore, the scribe of the OG version has altered the reading of the Aramaic in order to describe the “son of man” as sharing the physical characteristics of the Yahwehic figure.

153. F. F. Bruce, “Oldest Greek Version of Daniel,” 25-26; J. E. Goldingay, *Daniel* (WBC 30. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1989), 145; L. T. Stuckenbruck, “‘One like a Son of Man as the Ancient of Days’ in the Old Greek Recension of Daniel 7,13: Scribal Error or Theological Translation?” *ZNW* 86 (1995): 268-76 (276); cf. A. F. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism* (SJLA 25. Leiden: Brill, 1977), 202; *idem*, “‘Two Powers in Heaven’ and Early Christian Trinitarian Thinking,” in S. T. Davis, *et al.* (eds.), *Trinity: An Interdisciplinary Symposium on the Trinity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 73-95.

154. S. Kim, “*The ‘Son of Man’ as the Son of God*” (WUNT 30. Tübingen: Mohr, 1983), 23.

155. S. Kim, “*The ‘Son of Man,’*” 23.

156. S. Kim, “*The ‘Son of Man,’*” 23-24.

157. B. E. Reynolds, “*The ‘One Like a Son of Man,’*” *Bib* 89 (2008): 70-80 (73-74).

2.3.3—The Throne of God in Old Greek Daniel 7.13

The OG version of Dan 7.13 depicts the “son of man” as having been propelled through the sky ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, whereas the θ version translates the Aramaic ܢܘܢ with the standard μετά. The word ἐπί is used to translate an Aramaic equivalent word twenty-six times in the OG version, eighteen of which ἐπί is employed to translate ܠܘܢ, carrying the meaning “upon” or “over” (in the sense of dominion). It can also translate ܩܕܩ, i.e., “before the face of,” and the prefixes ܠ and ܒ. The preposition ܢܘܢ is found eleven times in Dan 2-7, most often carrying the meaning “with” or “among.” It is translated with ἅμα (2.18), μετά (2.11, 43; 4.15; 6.22) and πρός (7.21), but only in 7.13 does ἐπί render ܢܘܢ.¹⁵⁸ Consequently, “there are enough instances of its [i.e., the OG version’s] use of ἐπί to say that, except in v. 13, the LXX of Daniel is consistent in its employment of that preposition . . . not once does θ use ἐπί as a translation of ܢܘܢ.”¹⁵⁹

Why then would the translator of the OG version use ἐπί to render ܢܘܢ instead of the semantically parallel ἅμα, μετά, or πρός that he had used previously? It is here posited that the scribe consciously switched to ἐπί for theological reasons. The Old Testament is replete with theophanic symbolism—exactly 70% of all clouds are markers of theophanic imagery.¹⁶⁰ Roughly parallel to the depiction of the “one like a son of man” in OG Dan 7.13, Yahweh can be located “upon” or “above” the clouds or heavens. To be above the clouds is to be like the Most High (Isa 14.14; cf. LXX Ps 55.6, 12; LXX Ps 106.6; LXX Ps 111.4), since this was thought to have been the realm of God. The clouds are metaphorically described in Neh 1.3 as “the dust of his feet.” Deuteronomy 33.26 (cf. LXX Ps 67.5, 34) envisions God riding upon the heavens (LXX: ὁ ἐπιβαίνων ἐπὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν) or in the clouds (MT: ובגאותו שחקים), imagery mirrored in *Pss Sol* 2.30, whence God is described as the judge of the kings and kingdoms of the earth (αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς ἐπὶ τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ κρίνων βασιλεῖς καὶ ἀρχάς). However, the closest thematic and verbal parallels to the representa-

158. There is no Greek equivalent of ܢܘܢ in Dan 3.33 and chapters 4 and 5 (Meadowcroft, *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel*, 225).

159. Meadowcroft, *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel*, 225.

160. A. Feuillet, “Le fils de l’homme de Daniel et la tradition biblique,” *RB* 60 (1953): 170-202 (187-88); J. A. Emerton, “The Origin of the Son of Man Imagery,” *JTS* 9 (1958): 225-242 (231-32); A. Lacocque, *The Book of Daniel* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1979), 146.

tion of the son of man in OG Dan 7.13 come from both the Hebrew and Greek readings of Ps 104.3 (LXX Ps 103.3), Isa 19.1, and Ezek 1.4.¹⁶¹

The septuagintal version of Ps 103.3 poetically recounts the glories of Yahweh, describing him as one who rides the clouds like a chariot:

Who covers his chambers with waters; who makes the clouds his chariot: who walks on the wings of the wind.

This passage stands out for its placement of God on the clouds rather than amid them, and for its ascription to the clouds the function of a chariot. This is witnessed once again in LXX Isa 19.1:

Behold, the Lord sits on a swift cloud, and shall come to Egypt: and the idols of Egypt shall be moved at his presence, and their heart shall faint within them.

The action of sitting implies enthronement, but “swift cloud” expresses movement. Chariots were typically vehicles for hunting or doing battle, on which one stood to pilot. However, chariots could be outfitted with a seat, i.e., a throne, as the imagery here implies. Yahweh is envisaged, therefore, as being enthroned atop a cloud as a dignitary would have been seated on a throne-chariot. This Psalmic and Isaianic symbolism may have influenced Ezekiel’s depiction of Yahweh as one who traveled on a throne-chariot, which was perceived to be a “great cloud” by the seer (cf. Ezek 1.4).

Thus, when OG Dan 7.13 depicted the human-like one riding through the heavens “on the clouds of heaven,” it is plausible that the reader was intended to infer that the human-like being sat on the very throne of Yahweh. The scribe responsible for the OG version of Dan 7, possibly in an attempt to eliminate confusion, omitted the phrase in MT Dan 7.9c that ascribed wheels to the throne of the Ancient of Days reminiscent of the divine throne-chariot in Ezek (1.16; 10.2): כרסיה: נור דלק גלגלוי נור דלק די-נור גלגלוי נור דלק (compare OG Dan 7.9c, which simply reads: ὁ θρόνος ὡσεὶ φλῶξ πυρός). This alteration permits the reader to conclude that the “son of man” is enthroned on God’s throne-chariot, while Yahweh is seated on a non-specific, stationary throne. Therefore, it appears that once again the scribe responsible for the OG version has brought the “one like the son of man” and the “one like the Ancient of Days” more closely together.

161. For more information on the *merkavah* in Ezekiel, the Psalms, and Isaiah, see I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* (AGJU 14. Leiden: Brill, 1980), 36-37.

2.3.4—The Angelic Hosts in Old Greek Daniel 7.13

There is a great deal of confusion concerning the proper reading of OG Dan 7.13d: καὶ οἱ παρεστηκότες προσήγαγον αὐτῶ. This clause describes “standing ones” either being brought to, or bring forward, the “one like a son of man.” These celestial bystanders¹⁶² are the same group who congregated around the Ancient of Days in 7.10, signaled by a form of παρίστημι in both 7.10 and 7.13.

Confusion arises when one attempts to discern whether προσήγαγον αὐτῶ should be translated transitively, as is in the θ and MT, or intransitively. Lust read προσήγαγον transitively (i.e., “to bring into one’s presence, to bring forward”), speaking specifically of the “standing ones” bringing the “son of man” into the presence of the Ancient of Days.¹⁶³ Due to his choice, he saw grammatical tension between the verb and the case of the pronoun: one would expect the accusative αὐτόν, not the dative αὐτῶ, to follow the transitive verb (cf. Num 15.33; Josh 8.23; Tob 12.12; 1 Macc 5.54; Sus 1.52). He explained this phenomenon by suggesting that there had been “a contamination of the LXX by the Theodotionic version,”¹⁶⁴ though he did not elaborate on this theory. To correct the “contamination,” both Lust and Ziegler amend the text to προσήγαγον αὐτόν.¹⁶⁵

However, there is no need to eliminate “grammatical tension”; one can legitimately interpret προσήγαγον αὐτῶ intransitively. This reading describes the angelic beings approaching near to the “son of man” once he arrives in the heavenly courtroom and is perceived by the seer as being “like the Ancient of Days.”¹⁶⁶ That is, the celestial entourage of the Ancient of Days mentioned earlier in 7.10 becomes the retinue of the human-like one when he arrives before Yahweh. Should this be considered the correct reading, the description of the “son of man” is once again made to parallel that of the Ancient of Days.

162. It was common in the Second Temple period to describe the angelic servants of Yahweh as eagerly awaiting to attend to God, as is shown by their standing position (e.g., Dan 7.10; 4Q530 2.18; 1 En 14.22; 39.12; 40.1; 47.3; 60.2; 2 En 21.1; Ques Ezra A26, 30; 2 Bar 21.6; 48.10; 4 Ezra 8.21; T Abr A 7.11; 8.1; 9.7; T Adam 2.9 [R. Bauckham, *Jesus and the God of Israel: “God Crucified” and Other Studies on the New Testament’s Christology of Divine Identity* (Colorado Springs: Paternoster, 2008), 163]).

163. Lust, “Daniel 7.13,” 63.

164. Lust, “Daniel 7.13,” 64.

165. Lust, “Daniel 7.13,” 63; Ziegler, *Septuaginta: Suzanna, Daniel, Bel et Drago*, 170.

166. Kim, “The ‘Son of Man,’” 24; Reynolds, “‘One like a Son of Man,’” 76-77.

2.3.5—Honor/Glory, Service/Worship, and the People of the Earth the Extant Versions of Daniel 7.14

The MT and θ versions claim that the “son of man” is given $\text{וְיִשְׁלַטְוּ/ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ τιμὴ}$ (“dominion/rule and honor”), whereas the OG version states that the exalted figure receives $\text{ἐξουσία . . . καὶ πᾶσα δόξα}$ (“authority . . . and all glory”). “Authority” and “dominion” are roughly equivalent, and both describe the human-like one’s governance over the eternal kingdom. The same is true of “glory” and “honor,” though the former often contains connotations of power and grandeur, which means it compliments the attribution of ἐξουσία .

Both the MT and the OG versions agree that the “son of man” is worthy of $\text{יִפְלִיחַ/λατρεύουσα}$ (“cultic worship/service” [cf. Exod 3.12; 20.5; 23.24; Deut 6.13; Ezek 20.32]). Forms of λατρεύω occur nine times in LXX Dan (3.12, 14, 18, 95; 4.37; 6.17, 21, 27; 7.14); the first four refer to worshipping the statue and gods of Nebuchadnezzar, the following four refer to Daniel worshipping God, and the last concerns the worship of the “one like a son of man.” This transference of worship to the human-like one is likely due to the transmission of dominion from Yahweh to the “son of man.” In LXX Dan, Yahweh is said to possess an empire that is greater than all other kingdoms (2.37), is everlasting (2.44; 3.33; 6.27), and can be freely given to whomever he pleases (4.32). By accepting Yahweh’s kingdom, the “son of man” has been made a vassal of the divine suzerain, and, therefore, can be worshipped like the Ancient of Days by the tribes of the earth.

2.3.6—Old Greek Daniel 7 and the Gospel of Matthew

Though it is clear from the MT and θ versions of Dan 7.13-14 that the “one like a son of man” is a highly exalted figure, the alterations to the Aramaic reading of Dan 7.13-14 made by the scribe of the OG version more obviously connect the “son of man” and the Ancient of Days. N. T. Wright claimed that the “son of man” being accorded divine attributes would not have been perceived in Second Temple Judaism as challenging the strict ideas of Jewish monotheism. Mediatorial figures during this period were accorded extraordinary attributes in an attempt to explain the intricacies and mysteries of monotheism in practice.¹⁶⁷ However, it is doubtful

167. N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Christian Origins and the Question of God. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 2:627.

that all Jews of the Second Temple period would have been indifferent to the transference of Yahweh's throne, kingdom, glory, authority, and physical likeness onto another figure. This may be why the scribe behind the OG version inserted ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν. The comparative conjunction may not have been added to render the "son of man" and the Ancient of Days nearly indistinguishable; rather, it may have been introduced to maintain a monotheistic interpretation.

The Greek form of this apocalyptic account likely appealed to Matthew, whose strong apocalypticism and latent trinitarianism are frequently recognized. As will be defended in later chapters, it was plausibly this text that influenced the Matthean ascription of a kingdom (cf. 13.41; 16.28; 20.21), an angelic entourage (cf. 13.41; 16.27; 24.31), the right to sit on the "throne of glory" (cf. 19.28; 25.31), the prerogative to judge at the eschaton (cf. 13.41-42; 16.27; 25.31), and dominion over πάντα τὰ ἔθνη (cf. 28.18-20) to the Son of Man.

Chapter Three

The Son of Man and Conflict in Matthew 8-13

—Introduction—

It was stated in the first chapter that this dissertation will demonstrate that the “Son of Man” concept is united with the theme of conflict in Mt, and that this relationship is primarily manifest in the Son of Man’s polemic against “this generation” of Israel. That is, the Son of Man is at the center of the tensions that a) forced the split between the Matthean community and “this generation” of Jews, and, b) led the community to pursue a Gentile-inclusive mission. Conflict draws the story of Jesus towards its inevitable climax at the cross, and the Son of Man’s participation in conflict, from his first advent until his *Parousia*, anticipates his role in the resolution of hostilities.

Therefore, the objective of this chapter is to examine the “Son of Man” sayings in the first half of the gospel to determine

- a) how each saying contributes to the evolving Matthean “Son of Man” concept;
- b) how this concept relates to the unfolding conflict between Jesus, his followers, and those allied with Satan;¹ and,
- c) how the “Son of Man” concept is relevant to the eventual resolution of conflict.

Since this study is guided by the plot of Matthew and the central theme of conflict, the “Son of Man” sayings will be analyzed chronologically. This chapter will close with a summary and a tentative conclusion. Definitive conclusions will be reserved for the end of the dissertation, where all data from the respective chapters can be taken into account.

To anticipate the results of this chapter, this study will demonstrate that what caused the conflict between the Son of Man and “this generation”—i.e., a collective of doubting Jewish leaders and their followers—was the latter’s disregard for Jesus’ kingdom message and its disbelief concerning his prophetic ministry (cf. 8.20; 9.3). Because of the wickedness of “this generation,” Jesus promises the crowds destruction absent repentance (11.20-24), condemns the scribes and Phar-

1. M. A. Powell argued that it is the purpose of the narrative critic to determine what characters symbolize. In the case of the religious leaders, they are the arch-villains of Jesus allied with Satan (M. A. Powell, “Toward a Narrative-Critical Understanding of Matthew,” *Int* 46 [1992], 341-46 [345]; cf Kingsbury, “Developing Conflict,” *passim*). But even from the point of view of a redaction critic, it is obvious that, according to Matthew, the officials are the primary enemies of Jesus in league with Satan (cf. 3.7-12; 4.1-11; 9.3, 34; 10.25; 12.30, 39-42, 43-45; 13.19, 28, 38-39).

isees to future punishment for committing the unforgivable sin of blaspheming the Spirit (12.22-42), and withdraws “Son of Man” and the revelation that accompanies it from public hearing in the Kingdom Discourse onward. “This generation” will only know the Son of Man as the one whose resurrection marks its condemnation before God (that is, “the sign of Jonah”), whereas the disciples will be blessed with the knowledge that God’s salvation comes through the Son of Man. In private only are they told that the conflict between the Son of Man and Satan will last until the *Parousia* (cf. 13.37-38), but that the Son of Man will destroy the wicked and reward the righteous at the eschaton (13.40-43). Thereby, the Son of Man will bring an end to the conflict in which he participated from his first advent.

— Matthew 8.20 —

The first Matthean “Son of Man” saying is, perhaps, the most difficult saying to interpret, and, therefore, one of the least discussed christological sayings of the gospel. Smith commented on the lack of debate concerning the meaning and significance of 8.20, positing that “[u]nderlying all this evasion and digression is the embarrassment of scholars to admit that what one has here is in fact a very difficult saying, which does not fit neatly into any niche within the Jesus tradition.”² The researcher’s exegetical struggles are well-rewarded, though, since, once interpreted adequately, 8.20 is one of the most revealing statements about Jesus’ status as the Son of Man. For the sake of the reader, the entire pericope reads as follows (8.18-22):

When Jesus saw the crowd around him, he gave a command to depart to the other side [of the lake]. And a scribe came and said to him, “Teacher, I will follow you wherever you might be going!” Jesus said to him, “Foxes have holes and the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man has nowhere to lay his head.” Another, a disciple, said to him, “Lord, allow me to first go and bury my father.” But Jesus said to him, “Follow me, and let the dead bury their own dead.”

It is the intent of this analysis to demonstrate that this, the first “Son of Man” saying in Mt, is embedded in the gospel’s first direct polemical interaction with the religious authorities. Emphasis will be placed on Jesus’ self-description as a teacher in the prophetic tradition rather than a teacher in the scribal tradition. By describing himself as a prophet, Jesus sets himself apart as the mouthpiece of

2. M. Smith, “No Place for a Son of Man,” *Forum* 4 (1988): 83-107 (84).

God and the leader of God’s people. This is the beginning of conflict with “this generation” that will eventually lead to the Son of Man’s death, the separation of the Matthean community from the synagogue, and the bittersweet resolution to conflict.

3.2.2—Matthew 8.18-22: Its Connection to the Preceding Narrative and Structure

This pericope is separated from the previous triad of miracle stories (8.2-15) not only by the gospel’s sixth fulfillment citation (8.17; cf. Isa 53.4), but also by the use of δὲ—a particle commonly used to signal discourse disruption in Mt—in conjunction with shifting ὁ Ἰησοῦς before the main verb, which “suggests some discontinuity from [the] previous narrative.”³ Matthew 8.18-22, therefore, functions as a transition pericope between the first and the second triad of miracle stories (8.2-15; 8.23-9.8).

Matthew set this brief dialogue, derived from Q 9.57-60, after the command to cross the sea (cf. Mk 4.35) and prior to the “Stilling of the Storm” story (cf. Mk 4.36-41). Hence, Matthew altered his Markan source by interjecting Q material between the call to depart and the account of Jesus’ departure.

3.2.3—The Scribe and the Disciple

Upon seeing the crowds, Jesus commands (ἐκέλευσεν) presumably Simon, Andrew, and the sons of Zebedee (cf. 4.18-22) to set sail to Decapolis and Gaulanitis,⁴ the first in a series of crossings (e.g., 9.1; 14.13, 22-34; 15.39-16.5).⁵ Capitalizing on the opportunity to speak to Jesus before he departs, a certain γραμματεὺς approaches Jesus and exclaims, “Teacher (διδάσκαλε), I will follow you to wherever you might be

3. S. L. Black, “How Matthew Tells the Story: A Linguistic Approach to Matthew’s Narrative Syntax,” in D. M. Gurtner and J. Nolland (eds.), *Built Upon the Rock: Studies in the Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 43 (24-52). See also Black’s chapter on the use of δὲ in Matthew in her monograph, *Sentence Conjunctions in the Gospel of Matthew: καί, δέ, τότε, γάρ, οὖν, and Asyndeton in Narrative Discourse* (JSNTSup 216. SNTG 9. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 142-78.

4. These regions, which were under the prefect of Syria, were home to both Gentiles and Jews (Jos., *Wars* 3.56-58 [W. Carter, *Matthew and the Margins: A Socio-Political and Religious Reading* (JSNTSup 204. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 207]). The emphasis, though, is on the foreignness of the region, seeing as the city outside of which Jesus purged the possessed men of their demons was commercially dependant, at least in part, on raising pigs (for prohibitions against the herding and consumption of swine in Israelite law, cf. Lev 11.7; *m. B. Qam.* 7.7 [France, *Matthew*, 340]).

5. France, *Matthew*, 324.

going!” Although Matthew appears to have known of Christian scribes (cf. 13.52; 23.34), a group to which he may have belonged, none of the scribes hitherto in the Matthean narrative (2.4; 5.20; 7.29),⁶ and none outside the Christian community hereafter, are portrayed favorably by the evangelist (see especially Mt 22.34-40/Mk 12.28-33).⁷ With this stigma having been placed on scribes, as well as on other sects of Jewish leaders—even Jerusalem herself has been depicted as a menacing place occupied by people who wished to see Jesus dead (cf. 2.1-6, 16-18)⁸—it would appear that Matthew has indicated subtly to the context-conscious reader that the scribe in Mt 8.19 was a member of Jesus’ opposition (i.e., the Jewish leadership) and likely would not receive acceptance into his band of disciples.⁹

Against this conclusion D. A. Carson¹⁰ and R. Gundry¹¹ have argued that the scribe was already a disciple of Jesus. Appealing to the introduction of the second individual’s response (8.21), they posited that the scribe, who was previously introduced as εἷς γραμματεὺς (“a certain scribe”), was “another (ἕτερος) of his disciples,” though a disciple in a “loose sense.”¹² This theory does not stand under close scrutiny. It is more plausible that ἕτερος δὲ τῶν μαθητῶν [αὐτοῦ] should be translated in apposition: “a different person, [one] of the disciples.”¹³ For if the scribe were a disciple, his claim to have been willing to follow Jesus anywhere would have been unusual, if not completely unnecessary. That is, to have been a disciple, the scribe would have answered Jesus’ call to discipleship at some point in the past, an act that would have assured he was willing to follow Jesus wherever Jesus was headed.¹⁴ To accept Carson’s interpretation is to make the scribe’s request superflu-

6. The scribes are likely among the “hypocrites” spoken against frequently in Mt (cf. 6.1-6, 16-18; 7.1-5; 15.7; 22.18; 23.13, 23, 25, 27, 29; 24.51).

7. Carter, *Matthew and the Margins*, 207. In 22.34-40, Matthew changes Mark’s inquisitive and responsive scribe into an unidentified Pharisee (the most logical antecedent for εἷς ἐξ αὐτῶν is οἱ...Φαρισαῖοι [v. 34]) who underhandedly puts Jesus to the test (πειράζων αὐτόν).

8. J.T. Carroll and J.B. Green (eds.), “His Blood on Us and Our Children: The Death of Jesus in the Gospel according to Matthew,” in *The Death of Jesus in Early Christianity* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995), 39-59 (40).

9. J. Gnllka, *Das Matthäusevangelium* (HTKNT. Freiburg: Herder, 1988), 1:310; J. D. Kingsbury, “On Following Jesus: The ‘Eager’ Scribe and the ‘Reluctant’ Disciple (Matthew 8:18-22),” *NTS* 34 (1988): 45-59 (48-49); Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:39; France, *Matthew*, 325-26; Blomberg, *Matthew*, 146.

10. Carson, *Matthew*, 1:208.

11. Gundry, *Matthew*, 151-52; G. Osborne, *Matthew* (ECNT 1. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010), 304.

12. Carson, *Matthew*, 1:207.

13. J. Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew* (NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 367.

14. Kingsbury, “On Following Jesus,” 48.

ous. Further, the interpretation proposed in this study, i.e., that the teacher of the Law was not “another one of his disciples,” can be supported linguistically. As has been widely recognized, εἷς does not always carry the meaning “one,” which, in context, could be placed in apposition to ἕτερος (i.e., “one . . . another”). Instead, εἷς can have the same force as the indefinite pronoun τις, “a certain one.”¹⁵ Therefore, it is not necessary to posit that the scribe was *a disciple of like kind* to the second man who was explicitly called a μαθητής. Again, due to the less than flattering portrayal of Jewish scribes elsewhere in the Matthean narrative, it is unlikely that Matthew would have asserted that a scribe of the synagogue was accepted into Jesus’ entourage.¹⁶

3.2.4—The Son of Man Has Nowhere to Lay His Head

Jesus responds to the scribe’s declaration in a puzzling manner: “Foxes have holes and the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man has nowhere to lay his head” (8.20). This response has perplexed many, exhibited by the multiple answers forwarded by researchers to the following questions: “To what did ‘nowhere to lay his head’ refer?” and, “In what way was Jesus’ ambiguous aphorism a response to the request of the scribe?”

The interpretations of the phrase “nowhere to lay his head” can be placed in two, not necessarily exclusive, categories: *hyperbolic* and *figurative*. The former understands the saying as a hyperbole, expressing Jesus’ homelessness in comparison with the beasts of both the field and the air who have been supplied natural dwellings (cf. 6.25-26).¹⁷ Although it is certainly likely that according to modern standards, at least, Jesus could be considered poor,¹⁸ Matthew has recorded on sev-

15. J. H. Moulton and N. Turner, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1963), 3:195-97; C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom Book of the Greek New Testament* (2nd Ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), 125; J. D. Kingsbury, “The Verb *Akolouthein* (‘to Follow’) as an Index of Matthew’s View of His Community,” *JBL* 97 (1978): 56-73 (60 n. 31); *idem*, “On Following Jesus,” 48; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:41; Nolland, *Matthew*, 367.

16. One might say that the same is true of the tax-collector, Matthew, in 9.9. But “the tax-collectors and sinners” are the group whom Jesus has been sent to call, not the “righteous,” to whom the Pharisees and scribes belong (cf. 9.10-13).

17. P. M. Casey emphasizes parallels between the migratory habits of jackels and birds and the itinerant mission of Jesus (“The Jackels and the Son of Man,” *JSNT* 23 [1985], 3-22). But Jesus seems to be *contrasted* with the beasts of the field and the air. It is their homesteading rather than migratory practices that are herein the focus.

18. Cf. Mt 17.24-27. For parallels with the life and ministry of Paul, see C. Wolff, “Humility and Self-denial in Jesus’ Life and Message and in the Apostolic Existence of Paul,” in A. J. M. Wedderburn

eral occasions that Jesus resided in “the house.”¹⁹ This is possibly Jesus’ own home, though it is certainly possible that Jesus resided in the home of Peter in Capernaum, in which Jesus healed Peter’s mother-in-law (cf. 8.14). Therefore, in the strict sense of the term, Jesus cannot be classified as “homeless.”²⁰ Nevertheless, due to Jesus’ itinerant mission, one can easily imagine that both he and his disciples spent many nights under the stars without even the comforts afforded to the least of God’s creatures.²¹

Closely related, there are several who have suggested that this phrase figuratively indicated that Jesus experienced consistent persecution at the hands of outsiders.²² That is, “nowhere to lay his head” means that Jesus was “a man without a country,” never finding rest due to rejection. Often this interpretation is meant to support the former by suggesting a reason for Jesus’ constant movement: he entered a town, faced persecution because of his message, and, therefore, moved to the next village. This pattern is substantiated by the depiction of Jesus’ ministry

(ed.), *Paul and Jesus* (London: T & T Clark, 1989), 145-60 (esp. 147).

19. Cf. Mt 9.10, 28; 13.1, 36; 17.25 (see “dwell” [4.13] and “his own city” [9.1]). It is impossible to determine definitively if “the house” in 9.10 is the home of Jesus or Matthew, the newly recruited tax collector, though the presence of the article—ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ—might indicate that this was Jesus’ abode.

20. *Contra* Tödt, *Son of Man*, 121; M. Hengel, *The Charismatic Leader and His Followers* (New York: Crossroad, 1981), 5; *idem*, *Studies in Early Christology* (2nd Ed. London: T & T Clark, 2004), 92; Hare, *Son of Man*, 136; U. Luz, *Matthew 8-20: A Commentary* (Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2001), 2:18. The literal homelessness of Jesus is implied in A. H. McNeile’s hypothesis that this pericope has been placed by the First Evangelist too early in the gospel seeing as 9.1, 10 calls Capernaum “his (= Jesus’) own city” and describes Jesus as being reclined “in the house” (*The Gospel according to St. Matthew* [London: MacMillan and Co., 1915], 108; cf. L. Morris, *The Gospel according to Matthew* [PNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992], 201 n. 49). Against McNeile, these should be taken as indicating the hyperbolic meaning of “nowhere to lay his head” rather than considered signals of Matthew’s poor redactional skills. The only “Son of Man” saying in the Gospel of Thomas—GThom 86—appears to be based on the present aphorism. It is possible that “[t]he allusion to homelessness within the physical world may have been what first attracted Thomas to this saying” (Smith, “Son of Man,” 85). U. Plisch, took a similar stance (*The Gospel of Thomas: Original Text with Commentary* [Trans. by G. S. Robinson. Freiburg: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2008], 197).

21. Relevant passages describing the itinerancy of Jesus and his followers are Mt 6.24-33/Lk 10.4, 7-8; Mt 10.9-11; Mk 1.16-20; 2.13-14; 10.17-27; Lk 12.22-31, 33-34; 16.13. Cf. Lindars, *Jesus Son of Man*, 31; Kingsbury, “On Following Jesus,” 50; Smith, “Son of Man,” 98-99; Hagner, *Matthew*, 1:216; J. B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 407; Carter, *Matthew and the Margins*, 208; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:42; Nolland, *Matthew*, 366; Allison, *Constructing Jesus*, 212. Luz has called attention to the omission of Jesus’ pillow in the Matthean version of the Stilling of the Storm scene as possibly having been motivated by the inclusion of the Q logion immediately before it (*Matthew*, 2:18). This is an interesting observation, but there is no way to say for sure why Matthew eliminated this detail. It can be used to support interpreting “nowhere to lay his head” hyperbolically, though only with caution.

22. Kingsbury, “On Following Jesus,” 50; Caragounis, *Son of Man*, 179; Gundry, *Matthew*, 152; Nolland, *Matthew*, 367.

throughout Mt (cf. 2.13-14; 12.14-15; 14.1-3; 15.12-14, 21; 16.1-5),²³ as well as that of his disciples (cf. 10.9-13, 23). Notably, it is Jesus' "restless" movement, initiated by the command to cross to the opposite side of the lake earlier in this pericope, that eventually leads to Jerusalem, the place of his torture and death at the hands of the Jewish and Roman authorities.²⁴

Based on this, it is difficult to determine whether "nowhere to lay his head" should be interpreted as hyperbole concerning Jesus' lack of shelter or whether it should be taken as figurative language for Jesus' persecution at the hands of the primarily Jewish crowds. Perhaps, on this occasion, one should not limit the phrase to one referential meaning. That is, it may be better not to practice *either/or* exegesis. It is certainly possible that Matthew intended the reader to understand the phrase in *both* manners—figuratively and hyperbolically—through retrospective reading.²⁵ Matthew does not tell the reader why Jesus gave an order to cross the sea, though ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὄχλον²⁶ περὶ αὐτὸν possibly indicates that Jesus wished to retreat due to the crowd's overwhelming presence (cf. 5.1; 14.13).²⁷ However, he does inform the reader that Jesus returned to Israel from Decapolis because he was asked to leave by the fearful and angry citizens of the region (8.34). Hence, the author provides a concrete example of Jesus' lack of a place to lay his head in the immediate context, one that emphasizes both itinerancy and persecution. It is with both a figurative and hyperbolic understanding of the phrase

23. Kingsbury, "On Following Jesus," 50.

24. "From the conflict with Herod the Great in Jesus' birth narrative (2.1-18), Jerusalem is pictured as a menacing place in which there are authorities who threaten his life. As he moves towards Jerusalem tension builds as the reader anticipates conflict" (cf. Carroll and Green, "His Blood on Us and Our Children," 40)].

25. Cf. Nolland, *Matthew*, 366.

26. The reading ὄχλον, which is the preferred reading of the UBS 4/NA 27 editors even though it is narrowly attested in the manuscript tradition (i.e., *B* and *cop^{sa}*), is taken here to be the earliest reading, despite objections to the contrary (cf. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:40 n. 114). All the some six other variants appear to be expansions on this reading, making the crowd larger. It may be that early Christian scribes, wishing to provide a more sure reason for Jesus' departure, increased the size of the crowd so that it would appear Jesus left because the amount of people had become overwhelmingly great.

27. *Contra* Kingsbury who argued that the reason Jesus retreated to the other side of the sea is because of his confrontation with the scribe ("On Following Jesus," 50). This does not make sense given the chronology of the passage. If Jesus were to have commanded the disciples to cross *after* he was approached by the teacher, then this hypothesis might have been valid. However, Jesus commanded his entourage to embark *before* his confrontation with the scribe. It would appear that Kingsbury interpreted the passage thusly to support his theory that Jesus' movement was largely governed by his conflict with the Jewish authorities.

“nowhere to lay his head” that this study now turns toward determining in what way Jesus’ aphorism was a challenge to the scribe’s request.

3.2.5—Loyalty, Attitude, Motives, or Misconception?

The most widely accepted reading of the interchange has been to understand Jesus’ apophthegm as challenging the *loyalty* of the scribe.²⁸ In this suggested scenario, the scribe, when he saw that Jesus was soon to depart, pledges his loyalty, promising to follow him wherever he might be going. Jesus does not reply with a simple “yes” or “no,” but, recognizing the weakness of his devotion and the eagerness used to hide it, informs the teacher that his is not a life of comfort.²⁹ Rather, it is a ministry marked by repudiation and the insecurity of constantly relying on the hospitality of the kind few.³⁰ Jesus, therefore, “bids the man count the cost”³¹ and urges him to rescind his request until he has thoroughly evaluated his “conflict of loyalties.”³²

Although few researchers would argue that this portrayal misrepresents the nature of Jesus’ lifestyle, this interpretation does not cohere with the pattern of discipleship commissioning delineated elsewhere in the synoptic tradition. Unlike the pattern one witnesses in rabbinic material, Jesus was the active rather than passive agent in the act of recruiting followers.³³ That is, it was not acceptable in the economy of the kingdom to request placement as a disciple of Jesus. In every case of commissioning preserved in the synoptic gospels, Jesus is depicted as the

28. Tödt, *Son of Man*, 122; I. H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke* (NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 410; Lindars, *Jesus Son of Man*, 30; Blomberg, *Matthew*, 159-60; Morris, *Matthew*, 199, 201; Carson, *Matthew*, 1:208; Green, *Luke*, 407; Keener, *Matthew*, 274; J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke I-IX* (AB 28. London: Yale University Press, 2007), 834; France, *Matthew*, 326; D. L. Turner, *Matthew* (BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 239; Osborne, *Matthew*, 305.

29. This is in agreement with Morris who remarked, “There were people who were well disposed to him and apparently recognized that his teaching was outstanding, but who were not prepared to make the sacrifice necessary to be real disciples. *Matthew leaves his readers in no doubt that Jesus demanded wholehearted loyalty*” (Morris, *Matthew*, 199 [emphasis mine]).

30. Mt 6.11/Lk 11.3; Mt 6.25-34/Lk 12.22-31; Mt 10.8-15/Mk 6.8-11; Lk 8.3; 9.3-5; 10.4-12. Cf. G. Theissen, “Jesus as an Itinerant Teacher,” in J. H. Charlesworth and P. Pokorný (eds.), *Jesus Research: An International Perspective: The First Princeton-Prague Symposium on the Current State of Studies on the Historical Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 98-122 (100).

31. Marshall, *Luke*, 410.

32. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:834.

33. See Davies and Allison who remarked: Jesus’ commissioning of his own disciples “recalls the story of Elijah and Elisha (1 Kgs 19.19-21) and contrasts with the rabbinic practice, where the disciple chose his rabbi” (*Matthew*, 1:396; cf. Hagner, *Matthew*, 1:76-77 [cf. Jn 15.16]).

initiator of discipleship. One must receive the summons ἀκολουθεῖ μοι³⁴ or δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου³⁵ before following is possible. “One cannot,” as Carter recognized, “volunteer to be a follower.”³⁶ Since the scribe had not received “an unconditional, unexplained demand” to follow,³⁷ it did not matter if he had truly counted the cost of following Jesus. He had not received a commissioning and, consequentially, could not be part of Jesus’ inner circle of disciples.³⁸

Instead of loyalty, a few modern scholars have interpreted Jesus’ aphorism, as have some patristic commentators,³⁹ as attempting to correct the scribe’s *hubris*. F. D. Bruner suggested that the scribe’s statement has a ring of audacity and must be translated to reflect his ostentatiousness—“Jesus, this is your lucky day: I have decided to be your disciple.”⁴⁰ Jesus’ response, then, would have been intended to inform the teacher of the Law that there is no room for pride in the heart and mind of one who wishes to become a disciple of the kingdom. One’s life should be characterized by humility, as Jesus’ lack of a place to lay his head demonstrates.

Again, although the maxim in 8.20 certainly depicts Jesus as a man of humility, it is highly unlikely that the response was tailored to challenge the scribe’s supposed egotism. Even though the scribes (and Pharisees) are characterized in the Sermon on the Mount as being hypocrites who love the recognition of men,⁴¹ there is nothing in the context of 8.18-20 that would suggest that the scribe was doing anything but sincerely and humbly requesting acceptance into the inner group of disciples. Further, this theory does not take into account the socio-religious background of Matthew’s identification of “a certain person” (cf. τῆς in Lk 9.57) as a

34. Mt 8.22/Lk 9.59; Mt 9.9/Mk 2.14/Lk 5.27; Mt 19.21/Mk 10.21/Lk 18.22; cf. Jn 15.16.

35. Mt 4.19/Mk 1.17.

36. Carter, *Matthew and the Margins*, 121.

37. Turner, *Matthew*, 136. It must be recognized that Jesus’ call was not an invitation, it was a demand of the highest order, as the imperatival form of ἀκολουθεῖω signals.

38. Although there are general descriptions of discipleship in the First Gospel, there are no general calls to discipleship (Mt 12.50 is not a general call seeing as Jesus ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ [*contra* J. R. C. Cousland, *The Crowds in the Gospel of Matthew* (NovTSup 102. Leiden: Brill, 2002), 153]), as there might be in Lk, for example (cf. Lk 9.23). Cousland has amply defended his theory that 10.38; 16.24; and 19.28 are not universal summons but “are aimed at the disciples, and . . . give evidence of the radical and sacrificial obedience entailed in following Jesus as a disciple” (*Crowds*, 153-54).

39. Cf. Chrysostom, *Hom. Matt. 27.2*; Maximus of Turin, *Sermons* 41.3.

40. F. D. Bruner, *Matthew: Christbook, Matthew 1-12: A Commentary* (Rev. Ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 314; cited in Osborne, *Matthew*, 305.

41. Cf. Mt 6.1-4, 5-6, 16-18.

γραμματεὺς. “For a Jewish family,” M. Hengel noted, “it was . . . an honour, when one of its members was deemed worthy of becoming ‘the pupil of a scribe,’ for the scribe, by his knowledge and his legal decisions generally attained to a higher social position.”⁴² Should Bruner have been interpreting the Lukan form of the pericope, his suggestion could, perhaps, be considered valid. However, Matthew identified this man as one who was already an established teacher of the Torah and not simply “a certain person.” Hence, the reader is made to understand just how humbling the scribe’s request truly was. This man is no longer unknown to the reader, as he is in Lk (which probably stands closer to the Q tradition). He is identified as a person who has earned the honor to call himself a teacher of the Law; he was once under the yoke of a rabbi and quite possibly has or has had disciples of his own.⁴³ For the teacher to express that he wishes to take on the mantle of a pupil once again means that he is humble enough to subject himself to Jesus’ tutelage, an action that could have jeopardized his social and financial future. Hence, it seems that Jesus must have challenged an aspect other than the scribes alleged superciliousness.

Closely related to the previous interpretation, some insist that Jesus was questioning the scribe’s *motives*.⁴⁴ At the end of Mt 7 the narrator stated:

And when Jesus finished these sayings (i.e., the Sermon on the Mount), the crowds were astonished at his teaching them as one who had authority (ἐξουσίαν) and not as one of their scribes (οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν [v. 29]).

It is suggested that the scribe approached Jesus for the wrong reason. He saw Jesus as a promising new διδάσκαλος and wished to be educated by Jesus to proverbially “ride his coattails” to future accolades. Jesus, however, warned the man that his is not a path toward “honour nor a higher social status.”⁴⁵ Instead, it is marked by hardship and repudiation. “[F]ollowing Jesus was diametrically opposed to the peaceful, secure atmosphere of the rabbinic school.”⁴⁶ Unlike the foxes and

42. Hengel, *Charismatic Leader*, 14.

43. Cf. Keener, *Matthew*, 274; Hare, *Son of Man*, 136.

44. Hengel, *Charismatic Leader*, 14; D. E. Garland, *Reading Matthew: A Literary and Theological Commentary* (Macon: Smyth & Helwys, 2001), 98; Nolland, *Matthew*, 366. W. C. Allen is mentioned here since he stated that “the Lord doubted his [= the scribe’s] sincerity of purpose” (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew* [ICC. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1907], 82). He does not elaborate on what he meant by this assertion, so Allen’s interpretation is cautiously placed in this category.

45. Hengel, *Charismatic Leader*, 14.

46. Hengel, *Charismatic Leader*, 14.

birds who find daily comfort in their burrows and nests, the Son of Man was subject to the elements due to his itinerancy and the rejection of men due to the nature of his message.

This hypothesis, although appealing, is not plausible since it too succumbs to the same objections that were leveled at the previous expositions. First, this interpretation assumes that the teacher can re-evaluate his motives, learn from the folly of his ways, and assume the role of disciple irrespective of the lack of a command to ἀκολουθεῖ μοι. But analogous with the scribe's loyalty, the character of his motives is immaterial if he has not been chosen to join Jesus' inner group of disciples. Second, as an established scribe, the man was sacrificing social status to follow Jesus, and even the simple act of requesting to become a pupil once again put him at risk of irreparably damaging his reputation. Although his motive may have been to sacrifice honor temporarily to gain greater honor in the future, one should question this hypothesis. Such a tactic would have been overly risky, especially if Jesus were to deny his request, adding shame to shame. Therefore, this theory that Jesus questioned the motivation of the scribe does not appear to provide a viable option for reading 8.18-20.

How, then, should one interpret the scribe's request and Jesus' retort? If Jesus was not questioning the scribe's loyalty, hubristic attitude, or rationale for requesting to become a disciple, to what was Jesus' response directed? *It is uniquely suggested here that Jesus challenges the man's conception of who he is by positing that he is not a typical teacher of the scribal tradition, but rather, a teacher of the prophetic tradition, who only accepts those who have been called to follow.* That is, Jesus' aphorism is not, as Hagner suggested, "a slightly cryptic response of Jesus in words about the nature of discipleship,"⁴⁷ it is a slightly cryptic response of Jesus concerning his status as a prophet. Jesus, therefore, rejects the scribe because he had misunderstood both Jesus and the nature of his ministry.

47. Hagner, *Matthew*, 213.

3.2.6—Jesus as Prophet Calling Servants of the Kingdom

The scribe greeted Jesus as διδάσκαλε—likely a Matthean insertion into the Q logion⁴⁸—a term that, in Mt, often has slightly negative connotations.⁴⁹ Although Matthew emphasized Jesus’ role as a teacher, and even *the* teacher in the Sermon on the Mount, διδάσκαλος, which appears to be synonymous with ῥαββί,⁵⁰ is not prevalent in the gospel. Διδάσκαλος does appear on the lips of Jesus twice to describe himself.⁵¹ However, those who wish to address him with respect and sincerity in the First Gospel, such as the disciples or those who seek healing, beseech him as κύριε or υἱὸς Δαυίδ, never διδάσκαλε or ῥαββί.⁵² It is almost exclusively from the mouths of those who wish to flatter Jesus or those who have an inadequate perception of his person and mission that διδάσκαλε or ῥαββί proceeds—such as from the Pharisees,⁵³ the rich young ruler,⁵⁴ the Herodians,⁵⁵ the Sadducees⁵⁶ and Jesus’ betrayer, Judas.⁵⁷ Hence, it is plausible that the insertion of γραμματεὺς and διδάσκαλε into the Q reading, along with Jesus’ terse response discussed in greater detail below, are included to orient the reader toward considering the eager man as one who, like other Jewish leaders in the Matthean narrative, has an “inadequate”⁵⁸ perception of Jesus’ status and mission.⁵⁹ It is based upon this deficient impression—not his misplaced loyalty, pride, or improper motives—that the scribe approached Jesus and requested to become a disciple.

Frequently in early Greek and Jewish literature the sole responsibility of acquiring a teacher or philosopher was placed on the shoulders of the one who

48. It is less likely that Luke dropped διδάσκαλε since he appears to have had no qualms with the application of the address to Jesus (cf. Lk 6.40; 7.40; 8.49; 9.38; 10.25; 11.45; 12.13; 18.18; 19.39; 20.21, 28, 39; 21.7; 22.11).

49. *Contra* Davies and Allison who claim διδάσκαλε “is usually addressed to Jesus out of respect” (*Matthew*, 2:41).

50. Mt 23.8; cf. 23.7; 26.25, 49; Jn 1.38.

51. Mt 10.24; 26.18.

52. Mt 8.25/Mk 4.38; Mt 17.4/Mk 9.5; cf. Mk 11.21; 5.35; 9.17, 38; 10.35; 13.1; Lk 7.40; 8.49; 9.38; 21.7.

53. Mt 9.11; 12.38; 22.16, 36.

54. Mt 19.16.

55. Mt 22.16.

56. Mt 22.24, 36.

57. Mt 26.25, 49. Carter suggests that by calling Jesus διδάσκαλε the scribe might have usurped some of Jesus’ authority, i.e., the scribe implies he is just a teacher (*Matthew and the Margins*, 207).

58. Meier, *Vision*, 68; cf. Blomberg, *Matthew*, 146.

59. Cf. Kingsbury, “On Following Jesus,” 48-49; Hagner, *Matthew*, 216.

wished to be taught.⁶⁰ For a rabbi to seek out his followers would have been, according to Malina, socially inconceivable.⁶¹ However, in accordance with other anti-social traits—e.g., not fasting regularly,⁶² eating with men and women from the fringe of society,⁶³ and having a lower than average evaluation of the worth of family relationships⁶⁴—Jesus is consistently portrayed as *calling* men to become disciples.⁶⁵

The most likely source for Jesus' model of discipleship comes from the prophetic tradition of a prophet calling his successor, just as Elijah called Elisha in 1 Kgs 19.19-21. This suggestion is supported by the allusion to 1 Kgs 19 in the near context of 8.20 (8.21-22). In the Old Testament account, Elijah found Elisha plowing behind twelve oxen (cf. Lk 9.61-62)⁶⁶ and placed his garment over Elisha's shoulders as a sign of his prophetic commissioning.⁶⁷ Recognizing the call to serve, Elisha pleaded with Elijah: "Permit me to kiss my father and mother, then I will follow you." Elijah's reply, which is unrestrictive according to the LXX and Josephus (*Ant* 8.254) and prohibitive in the MT, should most likely be taken literally rather than rhetorically.⁶⁸ That is, Elijah urges Elisha to evaluate the gravity of the situation: "Go. Go back again,⁶⁹ for what do you believe is the significance of this action?"

As in the story of Elisha's call, Mt 8.21-22 depicts a man expressing the desire to tend to his family before he follows Jesus, a request that Jesus expressly de-

60. Cf. *m.* 'Abot 1.6, 16; ARN 3, 8A; Socrates, *Ep.* 4; Diog. Laert. 7.1.3 (Keener, *Matthew*, 150; Garland, *Reading Matthew*, 49; cf. the helpful chart in G. Theissen and A. Merz, *The Historical Jesus: A Comprehensive Guide* [Trans. by John Bowden. London: SCM, 1998], 214).

61. B. Malina, *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1981), 78; cited in Keener, *Matthew*, 150.

62. Mt 9.14-17/Mk 2.18-22/Lk 5.33-39.

63. Mt 9.10-13/Mk 2.15-17/Lk 5.29-32; Mt 11.16-19/Lk 7.31-34; Lk 15.1-2; 19.1-10.

64. Mt 8.21-22/Lk 9.59-62; Mt 10.37/Lk 14.26; Mt 12.46-50/Mk 3.31-35/Lk 8.19-21; Mt 19.29/Mk 10.29/Lk 18.29; Lk 11.27-28.

65. Mt 4.19, 21; 8.22; 9.9; 19.21 (Kingsbury, "Akolouthein," 56-73).

66. The parallel to 1 Kgs 19 is strengthened in Lk 9.61-62 by the addition of a dialogue with a third man who after requesting to say farewell to those at home is told, "No one who puts his hand to the plow and looks back is worthy of the kingdom of God."

67. This is the same cloak that Elijah left behind for Elisha when he was assumed to heaven in a whirlwind (cf. 2 Kgs 2.13-14).

68. J. T. Walsh, *1 Kings* (Berit Olam. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1996), 279; *contra* M. Cogan, *1 Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 10. Doubleday: New York, 2000), 455. Cf. S. J. DeVries, *1 Kings* (2nd Ed. WBC 12. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2003), 239.

69. Cogan notes the double imperative in the Hebrew, prompting the translation "Go. Go . . ." (*1 Kings*, 455).

nies. Certainly Matthew and the author of his Q source intended, “Let the dead bury their own dead!” to shock the reader. Even if the disciple was referring to the second burial of his father,⁷⁰ the absence of the son from the ceremony would have shamed his father, breaching the fourth commandment: “Honor your father and your mother, that your days may be long in the land that Yahweh your God gives you” (Ex 20.12 [cf. Deut 5.16]). Hence, it is plausible that Matthew is concerned here in showing Jesus as one who, like Elijah,⁷¹ calls men to follow him. But by recording that Jesus harshly forbid the man to exercise his duty under the Law, he implies that Jesus is one who demands immediate action because he has a more significant mission than Elijah, *one that makes demands that supersede the demands of the Law.*⁷² In the words of D. L. Bock,

The refusal to allow the disciple to bid farewell to his family shows the greater urgency of the era of Jesus. Jesus is not Elijah; he is more than Elijah The time of salvation has come, and it is a time which demands response.⁷³

This prophetic understanding provides an explanation for why Jesus *called* disciples, rather than having accepted men who proved themselves worthy to learn, a common practice in his day. Unlike teachers, an individual could not take up the mantle of a prophet’s servant unless he or she was called to such task. To become a teacher one needed nothing more than desire (cf. 1 Tim 1.7; Jas 3.1), whereas election was necessary to become the successor of a prophet.⁷⁴ According to this pattern of prophetic calling, therefore, the scribe’s request in 8.19 is perceived as inappropriate. He assumed that it was his responsibility to earn Jesus’ blessing and, thereby, a place in his entourage, as if Jesus were a common teacher of the Torah. However, Jesus, being himself a prophet, does not take individuals under his wing as a mere teacher. He actively selects men to be servants before one day sending them out to spread the gospel of the kingdom (cf. 10.5-23; 28.18-20).⁷⁵

70. M. Bockmuehl argued extensively against this interpretation (“‘Let the Dead Bury Their Own Dead’ [Matt 8:22/Luke 9:60]: Jesus and the Halakhah,” *JTS* 49 [1998], 553-81).

71. It is possible that the prophet Moses could be thought of here as well since he took Joshua as a minister (J. A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Kings* [ICC. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1950], 316).

72. This will be returned to again in the exegesis of Mt 12.1-8 below.

73. D. L. Bock, “Elijah and Elisha,” in J. B. Green, et al. (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* (Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity, 1992), 203-06 (205).

74. Cf. Theissen, “Itinerant Teacher,” 101.

75. This conclusion is supported by Theissen and Merz: “There is no doubt that the calls of the prophets offer the nearest analogy to [the] discipleship of Jesus. In the case of Elijah and Elisha we have the calling of a prophet of equal status: a primary charismatic communicates his authority to a secondary charismatic; Jesus promises his disciples a high status. They are basically more than just

The reader is to deduce, then, that the scribe was sent away by Jesus as one who did not understand that Jesus was a teacher of the prophetic tradition as opposed to a teacher of the scribal tradition.⁷⁶

The conclusion that Jesus is herein presented as a prophet is further supported by his aphoristic reply: “Foxes have holes and birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man has nowhere to lay his head.” As was discussed above, Jesus’ answer to the scribe’s request paints his mission as one marked by itineracy. This characteristic wandering was not indicative of rabbis during the first-century CE, despite J. Klausner’s claim that there were frequently rabbis who were referred to by the title “Galilean itinerant,” an assertion that remains unsubstantiated.⁷⁷ Rather, as Hengel stated,

Whereas *stabilitas loci* in a fixed school building, and an assured living were basic presuppositions for proper conduct of teaching, Jesus went around in Galilee and the adjacent regions—more like a wandering Cynic preacher than a rabbi—and spoke to the uneducated masses.⁷⁸

Along with the act of calling his own disciples, Jesus’ itinerant ministry and the persecution he faced set him apart not as a common teacher of the Torah, or as a “Cynic preacher,” *contra* Hengel, but as a prophetic figure. Jesus had “nowhere to lay his head,” that is, he was frequently without lodging as he was peripatetic, retreating into the wilderness or moving from city-to-city due to threats of violence or to spread the gospel of the kingdom.⁷⁹

This “behavior of the Lord” (τοὺς τρόπους κυρίου [Did 11.8]), which J. R. Michaels has argued is “a phrase suggesting a tradition about Jesus’ own practice

‘disciples’” (*Historical Jesus*, 215). Hengel notes that the prototype for calling “apostles,” as well as for disciples, “is the call of Old Testament prophets where the verb שלח (= ἀποστέλλειν LXX) repeatedly plays a fundamental role” (Ex 3.10-15; Is 6.8; Ezek 2.4; cf. also 1 Sam 15.1; Jer 19.14; 25.17; 26.12; Ezek 13.6 [*Charismatic Leader*, 83]).

76. B. Gerhardsson has rightly noted that there is a close parallel between a prophet and a teacher (“Der Weg der Evangelientradition,” in P. Stuhlmacher [ed.], *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien* [WUNT 28. Tübingen: Mohr, 1983], 79-102 [92]; cf. Riesner, *Jesus als Lehrer: Eine Untersuchung zum Ursprung der Evangelien-Uberlieferung* [WUNT 2/7. Tübingen: Mohr, 1981], 276-98).

77. J. Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth: His Life, Times, and Teaching* (Trans. by H. Danby [ed.] London: Allen and Unwin, 1925), 253; cited and refuted in R. Otto, *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man: A Study in the History of Religion* (Trans. by F. Filson and B. Lee-Woolf. 2nd Ed. Cambridge: James Clarke and Co., 1943 [2011 reprint]), 13. Cf. Hengel, *Charismatic Leader*, 55 n. 61.

78. Hengel, *Charismatic Leader*, 54. Elsewhere Hengel states, “For the Rabbis, the teacher belonged in the school or in the synagogue. Both institutions were connected in the closest way with the Torah wisdom entrusted to Israel, and were its proper home. Thus, we know nothing of itinerant rabbinic teachers of no fixed abode” (*Early Christology*, 92).

79. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:43.

during his ministry,”⁸⁰ was prototypical for the prophets of the early Church. In the *Didache*, a late first- or early second-century Christian treatise on the teaching of Jesus, it is assumed that itinerancy is the trademark of a Christian prophet: “Let every apostle who comes to you be received as the Lord, but he shall stay only one day or if necessary a second as well; but if he stays three days, he is a false prophet” (11.4-5; cf. 12.2). Likewise, itinerancy was characteristic of certain prophets of the Jewish Scriptures. Of the four prophets Jesus is depicted as having modeled his prophetic self-understanding upon—namely, Moses, Elijah, Jonah, and the anointed one of Isa 61—two of them, Elijah and Jonah, were itinerant prophets. Jonah, of course, is best known for being regurgitated out of a sea creature on the shore of presumably Joppa (Jon 2.10; cf. Jon 1.3), in order to journey to Nineveh to preach repentance (Jon 1.1-2; 3.1-4). Likewise, Elijah and his servant Elisha are known not only for their miracles but also for their travels throughout Israel and the surrounding regions, movement that was prompted both by the command of the Spirit and by the necessity to flee persecution (cf. 1 Kgs 17.1-5, 8-10, 18.1-2, 7, 19-20, 42, 46; 19.3, 4, 8, 15, 19; 21.17-18; 2 Kgs 2.3-4, 6, 15, 23; 4.8, 25, 32, 38; 6.1-4, 13, 19; 8.7).

3.2.7—Summary and Conclusion

Jesus’ reply to the scribe was not meant merely to inform the teacher that he was a man of abnormal poverty—both monetarily and honorifically—thereby encouraging the scribe to reflect on what discipleship truly meant. Jesus, rather, rebuked the scribe, and informed him through his enigmatic response in 8.20 and his harsh reply to the disciple in 8.22 that he was an itinerant prophet like one of the prophets of old. Similar to the famed Elijah, Jesus too had nowhere to lay his head and called men to take upon themselves the mantle of servanthood. Therefore, the Son of Man holds the unique status of prophetic leader over the band of disciples, who stand against those who align themselves with the primary opponent of God’s kingdom—Satan.

This reading of 8.18-22 is exceedingly important for understanding the Matthean “Son of Man” concept. Although subtle, this pericope contains Jesus’ first direct confrontation with the religious leaders. The scribe demonstrated that he

80. J. R. Michaels, “The Itinerant Jesus and His Hometown,” in B. Chilton and C. A. Evans (eds.), *Authenticating the Activities of Jesus* (NTTS 28/2. Boston: Brill, 1999), 177-93 (181).

misunderstood the prophetic commissioning of Jesus by taking the initiative in the discipleship process. Jesus corrects the man's misperception by informing him in cryptic terms that he is a teacher in the prophetic tradition and not a standard teacher of the law. Though Jesus' response to the scribe's eager declaration is not a simple "no," the reply is negative and would likely have been considered a slight to the authority of the already established teacher of the law. Jesus, in essence, stated, "The Son of Man is an itinerate prophet, not like you, a scribe." The implication, therefore, is that if Jesus wanted the scribe to be a disciple, he would have called him to be a disciple.

Hence, this pericope marks the initiation of the conflict between the Son of Man and the Jewish leaders that will culminate in the Son of Man's crucifixion and divine reprisal. Thus, from the first "Son of Man" saying in Mt, the Son of Man is seen to be in tension with an opponent. This hostility will eventually result in God's judgement against those who doubt his Son's status as prophet and Messiah, and, conversely, the Son of Man's establishment of a new kingdom community.

Matthew 8.18-22 sets the tone for future "Son of Man" sayings. In 7.29 the people were astonished at Jesus' teachings, claiming that he taught with more ἐξουσία than the scribes. By Jesus identifying himself in the present pericope as a teacher of the prophetic tradition rather than of the scribal tradition, he indicates that his unique authority is prophetic in nature. It is this divine enablement that Jesus will exercise throughout the following narrative, and it is the same prophetic authorization that will repeatedly generate tension with the religious leaders. It is, therefore, no coincidence that the next time Jesus and the scribes meet, they will clash once again over Jesus' prophetic ἐξουσία (cf. 9.1-8 [specifically 9.6]).

—Matthew 9.6—

The triad of miracle stories in 8.23-9.8 is the central of a larger triad in the Second Narrative. The first collection in 8.2-15 consists of the healings of the leper, the centurion's servant, and Peter's mother-in-law. The later group, although containing four miraculous accounts, can be considered a triad since the healing of the hemorrhaging woman (9.20-22) is intercalated by the account of Jesus raising the ruler's daughter to life (9.18-19, 23-26) in Mt, as well as in Mk and Lk (cf. Mk

5.22-43; Lk 8.41-56).⁸¹ The purpose of these miraculous stories is to establish Jesus' authority on earth (cf. 9.6; 11.2-5).⁸² The Son of Man's ἐξουσία and its source receive direct discussion in the culminating pericope of the centermost triad (9.1-8), where Jesus simultaneously heals a man of his crippling condition and forgives him of his sins:

Which is easier to say: "Your sins are forgiven," or "Get up and walk"? But that you might know that the Son of Man has authority on earth to forgive sins—then he said to the paralytic—"Get up, take your mat, and go home" (9.5-6).

It will be shown that these extraordinary actions confirm that Jesus possesses remarkable authority from God to manifest divine power, much like the miracle prophets before him, such as Moses, Elijah and Elisha.⁸³ The religious leaders, however, do not recognize Jesus' authority. Instead of praising God, as the crowds do (cf. 9.8), Matthew claims that the scribes secretly and maliciously charge Jesus with blasphemy.

3.3.2—Setting of the Scene and the Genre of the Pericope

As in the account of the exorcisms of two men in Gadara (8.28-34),⁸⁴ Matthew heavily redacted the Marcan form of the story of the paralytic's healing (Mt 9.2-8/Mk 2.1-12). He drastically shortened the Marcan introduction, eliminating any mention of a home⁸⁵ and the radical removal of the roof to the house in which Jesus was residing (cf. Mk 2.1-2). These exclusions may mark the author's attempt to conform the description of Jesus' lifestyle to the earlier assertion that "the Son of Man has nowhere to lay his head" (8.20). It is of greater probability, though, that Matthew has condensed the Marcan pericope to take the spotlight off of the radical faith of the four men. This serves to place attention squarely on Jesus, who does the more

81. J. L. Resseguie, *Narrative Criticism of the New Testament: An Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), 54. These two accounts are connected not only by the observation that the recipients of these miracles are female. The resurrected girl and the hemorrhaging woman are connected by similar states of impurity (cf. Lev. 15.19-31 [Resseguie, *Narrative Criticism*, 139]).

82. J. D. Kingsbury considered these miracles to be an extended commentary on Mt 4.23-25 ("Observations on the 'Miracles Chapters' of Matthew 8-9," *CBQ* 40 [1978], 559-73 [567]). This may be accurate, but it must not be ignored that these miracle accounts also lay the groundwork for Jesus' declaration in Mt 11.4-5.

83. Cf. M. D. Hooker, *The Signs of a Prophet: The Prophetic Actions of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1997), 3.

84. For discussion of the Matthean redaction of this scene, see Luz, *Matthew*, 2:23-25.

85. The omission of references to a "house" is a pattern in Mt (cf. 12:22; 15:15, 21; 17:19; 19:8 [Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:87; D. J. Harrington, *The Gospel of Matthew*, (SP 1. Collegeville: Liturgical, 1991), 121]).

extreme act: absolving the man of his sins.⁸⁶ If the redactor intended to conform this pericope's introduction to the assertion of Jesus' homelessness in 8.20, one would not only have expected him to have removed any mention of a "house," one would also not have expected him to insert the phrase τὴν ἰδίαν πόλιν (compare Mk 2.1).

D. A. Carson suggested that shortening the pericope does not change its genre from a "miracle story" to a "controversial story." According to Carson, the form-critical trappings of a "miracle story" are still present.⁸⁷ But as D. Hagner has noted, the Matthean form of the pericope has "the primary characteristic not of a healing narrative so much as a controversy story plus apophthegm (cf. v 6)."⁸⁸ Therefore, although a miracle prompts polemical discourse between the scribes and Jesus, *the controversy is the focus of the story and not the paralytic's restoration*. One should not surmise from this observation, however, that the Mt 9.1-8 is either a "miracle story" or a "controversial story" exclusively. Although the redactor has perhaps made the controversy more prominent in the passage than the miracle, to force this pericope into one formal category or another is to miss its complexity. Wooden genre labels, in this case, hinder rather than assist exegesis. Matthew 9.1-8 is a "controversy story" amid a triad of "miracle stories" (cf. 8.23-27, 28-34; 9.1-8), a group introduced by what was earlier determined to be a "controversial story" (cf. 8.19-22).

3.3.3—Forgiveness, Divine Prerogatives, and Blasphemy

Healing the paralyzed, among other manifestations of God's power, was an act of mercy for which Jesus was known (cf. 4.23-25). Upon being told that "Jesus saw their faith" (ἰδὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν [9.2]),⁸⁹ i.e., the faith of the men carrying the paralytic, the reader naturally expects Jesus to heal once again. But to the reader's surprise, Jesus does not immediately command the man, "arise and walk."

86. Morris, *Matthew*, 213.

87. Carson, *Matthew 1-12*, 220.

88. Hagner, *Matthew*, 1:231.

89. The observation that Jesus "saw" their faith may presuppose the reading preserved in Mark and Luke. This may indicate that Matthew assumed the intended readers had knowledge of a more detailed version, likely Mark (cf. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:88).

Rather, he exclaims, “Take heart, my son/child! Your sins have been forgiven” (θάρσει, τέκνον, ἀφίενταί σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι [9.2]).⁹⁰

In response to this declaration, some of the scribes said to themselves, “This man blasphemes!” Matthew omitted the explanatory remark in Mk 2.7: τίς δύναται ἀφίεναι ἁμαρτίας εἰ μὴ εἶς ὁ θεός;⁹¹ One might consider the Markan exposition superfluous after the exclamation βλασφημεῖ (Mk 2.7), and, therefore, explain the omission as Matthew’s attempt to eliminate a redundancy. To the contrary, though, “No one is able to forgive sins but God alone,” does not create a redundancy in the Markan account; instead, the statement clarifies the reason for the charge of blasphemy.⁹² Although *m. Sanh.* 7.4-5 considered blasphemy to involve the pronouncement of the divine name, the term “blasphemy” was by no means a *terminus technicus* in the first-century CE. “Blasphemy” could refer to a wide range of sins, the common denominator being that the words spoken by the blasphemer dishonor God or the righteous (cf. 2 Kgs 19:4, 6, 22; 2 Macc 15:24; Rom 14:16; Jos., *C. Apion* 1.59, 223, 279).⁹³ Hence, the term “blasphemy” alone is not enough to assure the interpreter that the scribes charged Jesus with the capital crime because they believed that he usurped authority only belonging to God.

Matthew eliminated the statement, “No one can forgive sins but God alone,” so that he might introduce another, more sinister reason for the scribes’ charge. The scribes, according to the Matthean form of the account, do not stand for God’s honor and holiness when they accuse Jesus of the capital crime of blasphemy; instead, the accusation was the result of “evil” thoughts (ἵνατί ἐνθυμεῖσθε πονηρὰ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν; [9.4]). The misperception of the scribes described in 8.19 has quickly evolved into animosity. When Jesus and the religious leaders met the first time (cf. 8.19-20), controversy was caused by a scribe misunderstanding the

90. Although we do not generally relate sin and disease, they were closely related in Judaism: “A sick man does not recover from his sickness until all his sins are forgiven him” (*b. Ned.* 41a; cf. Exod 20:5; Lev 26:14-16; Deut 28:15-68; 2 Chr 21:15, 18-19; Ps 103:3; 147:3; 4Q510; 1QapGen 20.16-29; 1QS 3.20-24; 4QPrNab; 1 Macc 9:55; 3 Macc 2:21-23; Lk 13:2; Jn 5:14; 9:2; 1 Cor 11:30; Jas 5:14-15).

91. Cf. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:91 n. 67.

92. Gundry suggested that the elimination of this pronouncement makes the charge of blasphemy “more forceful” (*Matthew*, 163). It is unclear how this could be correct; “Who could forgive sins but God alone?” would certainly have made the charge more specific and, thereby, “more forceful.”

93. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:91 n. 68; cf. France, *Matthew*, 346; D. L. Bock, *Blasphemy and Exaltation in Judaism and the Final Examination of Jesus: A Philological-Historical Study of the Key Jewish Themes Impacting Mark 14:61-64* (WUNT 2/106. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck], 1998), 110-12.

prophetic commissioning of the Son of Man. Now, in their second confrontation, conflict is caused by the religious leaders' explicit denial of the Son of Man's authority.

Jesus challenged the doubt of the scribes concerning his ability to speak on behalf of God by healing the paralytic: "But that you might know that the Son of Man has authority on earth to forgive sins—then he said to the paralytic—"Get up, take your mat, and go home" (9.6). The logic of Jesus' actions is apparent: if the Son of Man has the authority to restore the health of a crippled man, a feat readily visible to the narrative audience, then it is reasonable to conclude that his authority extends to the invisible act of absolving sins. To state the argument in a different manner, "Get up and walk," is the harder thing to say since the lack of immediate physical response makes it readily apparent that the speaker has no authority. Meanwhile, anyone can say, "Your sins are forgiven," and there is no way to invalidate the claim. Hence, when the Son of Man healed the man, he successfully proved that he had the authority to corroborate the more difficult claim. This, in turn, implies that Jesus had the power to support the less difficult claim.

Some researchers contend that the Son of Man "has acted not as a channel of forgiveness but as its source."⁹⁴ That is, it is suggested that Jesus exercises divine prerogatives of his own accord, due either to his divine nature,⁹⁵ his future role as the eschatological judge,⁹⁶ or both. The miraculous events in 9.1-8, of course, indicate that Jesus possesses extraordinary authority; but such power is not dependent upon his suggested divinity. The above theory takes Jesus' statement in 9.6 into account, though it ignores other details of the pericope that temper one's reading of Jesus' aside.

First, the possibility that ἀφ'ἑνταί in 9.2 is a *passivum divinum* is sometimes outrightly denied, or the exegetical weight of the observation is lessened by elevating the interpretative importance of the rhetorical aside in 9.6 over that of the di-

94. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:91; cf. Nolland, *Matthew*, 380; Morris, *Matthew*, 215; Hagner, *Matthew*, 1:232; France, *Matthew*, 345.

95. Gundry, *Matthew*, 163; Luz, *Matthew*, 2:28; Keener, *Matthew*, 290; cf. J. Jeremias, *New Testament Theology: The Proclamation of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1971), 114.

96. Hooker, *Son of Man*, 81-93; Carson, *Matthew*, 1:222; Gundry, *Matthew*, 163; Nolland, *Matthew*, 382; Keener, *Matthew*, 290; R. Maddox, "The Function of the Son of Man according to the Synoptic Gospels," *NTS* 15 (1968): 45-74 (57). An argument against this position will not here be made. The failings of this interpretation should become clear in the following chapters of this dissertation.

vine passive.⁹⁷ However, the *passivum divinum* should be taken seriously and allowed, along with other aspects of the passage, to moderate one's reading of the anacoluthon. When the "divine passive" is given the proper interpretive significance, its presence supports identifying the Son of Man as *the privileged conduit* ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (cf. 9.6) for the Father's absolution of sins ἐν οὐρανῶ.⁹⁸ The Son of Man has authority insofar as he proclaims sins forgiven on behalf of God.

Second, if the goal of the Matthean redactor was to attribute to Jesus divine prerogatives, it is noteworthy that he deemphasized the slander of the scribes by dropping their exclamation, τίς δύναται ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας εἰ μὴ εἶς ὁ θεός; (Mk 2.7).

Third, whereas the Markan account ended with the crowds saying, οὕτως οὐδέποτε εἶδομεν (Mk 2.12), Matthew alternatively wrote that the crowd glorified the Lord "who had given such authority to men" (τὸν δόντα ἐξουσίαν τοιαύτην τοῖς ἀνθρώποις [Mt 9.8]). Matthew, thereby, generalized the Son of Man's authority. W. Schenk and L. Morris have argued that the dative should be interpreted as a *dativus commodi*, producing the translation "on behalf of men."⁹⁹ Luz overstated his case when he wrote that this interpretation was "impossible because of 10:1; 21:23; 28:18."¹⁰⁰ Nonetheless, he was correct that those who maintain such an interpretation must explain away texts that describe Jesus transferring his authority to his followers (cf. 10.1), or those that describe them as "binding and loosing" (cf. 16.19; 18.19 [cf. ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς in 9.6; 16.19; 18.18]),¹⁰¹ itself an act of forgiveness, since "binding and loosing" determines one's membership in the community (cf. 18.15-17).¹⁰² It is possible that Gundry was correct, despite France's claim to the contrary,¹⁰³ that the article in τοῖς ἀνθρώποις should be interpreted as anaphoric and not generic. This means that the phrase "the men" could have been used to refer to the disci-

97. Davies and Allison claim that 9.6 "disallows this interpretation" (*Matthew*, 2:89).

98. G. Vermes, *The Religion of Jesus the Jew* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 192; C. H. Talbert, *Matthew* (PCNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010), 118; B. Witherington, *Matthew* (SHBC 19. Macon: Smyth & Helwys, 2006), 195; Keener, *Matthew*, 289; R. Leivestad, *Jesus in His Own Perspective: An Examination of His Sayings, Actions, and Eschatological Titles* (Trans. by D. E. Aune. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1987), 137; D. R. A. Hare, *Matthew* (Int. Louisville: John Knox, 1993), 100; Carter, *Matthew and the Margins*, 216; Bruner, *Matthew*, 1:412; Garland, *Reading Matthew*, 102.

99. W. Schenk, "'Den Menschen' Mt 9,8," *ZNW* 54 (1963): 272-75 (275); Morris, *Matthew*, 218.

100. Luz, *Matthew*, 2:28-29 n. 19.

101. Cf. Maddox, "Son of Man," 57.

102. D. Senior, *Matthew* (ANTC. Nashville: Abingdon, 1998), 192.

103. France, *Matthew*, 348-49 n. 50.

ples, as it did earlier in 8.27. This conclusion is supported by the observation that the theme of discipleship runs like a thread throughout Mt 8-10. Whether the disciples are explicitly mentioned in this pericope or not, they are the logical antecedent. Therefore, the Son of Man is merely one among many in the kingdom community who has been given the right to heal the sick¹⁰⁴ and to forgive sins on earth. Those who follow Jesus partake in the same authority herein given to the Son of Man.

Finally, remitting sins on God's behalf, according to R. Leivestad, was "in and of itself, not particularly extraordinary."¹⁰⁵ As E. P. Sanders stated,

The oft repeated claim that Jesus "put himself in the place of God" is overdone. He is often said to have done so in forgiving sins; but we must note that he only pronounced forgiveness, which is not the prerogative of God, but of the priesthood.¹⁰⁶

Forgiving sins was not only the prerogative of the priests in the Temple cultus,¹⁰⁷ prophets such as Nathan (2 Sam 12.13) and Isaiah (2 Kgs 20) forgave sins in the authority of the Lord. This was true also of John the Baptizer, who promised absolution of sins if one repented and was baptized (Mt 3.1-3, 6, 11). There is even a sectarian document that may have depicted an exorcist pronouncing a man's sins forgiven (4QNab 1.4), though the reading is contested due to the fragmentary nature of the text.¹⁰⁸ Hence, by saying "your sins are forgiven," Jesus "was presumably speaking for God . . . not claiming to be God."¹⁰⁹

The act of proclaiming forgiveness, therefore, aligned Jesus with the prophets of old. It is unlikely that Matthew intended to depict Jesus as a priest, since priests' pronouncements of forgiveness were accompanied by cultic rituals and were performed in the Temple precincts. Prophets, meanwhile, forgave on behalf of God by means of authoritative proclamations, since a prophet was "by defin-

104. There is no reason to believe that the authority given to men is just the ability to forgive sins. From the context the authority could be the ability to heal physical ailments as well (cf. Hagner, *Matthew*, 1:234).

105. Leivestad, *Jesus*, 137; Cf. G. Vermes, *Jesus the Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospels* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981), 68-69.

106. E. P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 240.

107. The Qumran sect expected the "anointed one of Aaron" to come and take away the sins of the community (CD 14.19; cf. 11QMelch 4-9).

108. Cf. A. Dupont-Sommer (*The Essene Writings from Qumran* [Trans. by G. Vermes. Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1973], 325) who argued that the Essene community believed that exorcists, among others, had the right to forgive sins, *contra* the Pharisees who thought only God could exercise such authority.

109. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 273.

ition a spokesman for God.”¹¹⁰ Additionally, the prophetic interpretation of the Son of Man’s cleansing ministry is supported by the close connection between 8.18-22 and 9.1-8, the former passage having portrayed the Son of Man as a prophetic teacher.

3.3.4—Summary and Conclusion

Matthew has not, as R. Gundry has claimed, “take[n] pains to identify Jesus as God”¹¹¹ in 9.1-8. Rather, *Matthew has taken pains to identify the Son of Man as a prophet in conflict with the people of God to whom he was sent.* The tensions between Jesus and the religious leaders have rapidly evolved past simple misunderstanding. The scribes have boldly denied the Son of Man’s authoritative commissioning and, as an expression of their corruptness, have accused Jesus, this time secretly, of committing blasphemy. This pericope, then, is the second direct interaction Jesus has had with the religious leaders, the second account in which Matthew has emphasized the conflict between Jesus and the authorities, and the second passage in which Jesus has referred to himself as the “Son of Man.” Although it is, perhaps, unwise to suggest that a pattern has formed after evaluating only two pericopae, it would certainly not be surprising to witness a pattern develop as the story of Jesus progresses.

Despite the controversy between the Son of Man and the scribes, the theme of discipleship runs like a thin thread through the pericope. Although the focus of the story is on Jesus’ conflict with outsiders, by means of Matthean redaction, the prophetic Son of Man is depicted as the authoritative leader of the disciples. He is not empowered by the Father simply for his own sake; rather, his authority is shared with τοῖς ἀνθρώποις (9.8) for the purpose of advancing the kingdom community. In like manner, the Son of Man, once exalted to the right hand of the Father (cf. 24.30; 26.64; 28.18), will use his universal authority to enable the disciples to spread the gospel throughout his kingdom to all nations (cf. 13.37-38; 24.14; 24.31; 28.19-20).

110. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 273.

111. Gundry, *Matthew*, 163.

—Matthew 10.23—

The theme of discipleship that began in 8.18-22 continues into the Second Discourse (9.36-10.42), commonly called the “Mission Discourse.” After the accounts of Jesus healing the paralytic (9.1-8) and calling Matthew (9.9), there are two extended pericopae in which the Pharisees challenge the eating habits of Jesus and his disciples (9.10-13, 14-17). Subsequently, the author compiled a triad of miracle stories (e.g., 9.18-26, 27-31, 32-34), intended to compliment the two previous triads of miracles recorded earlier in the narrative (e.g., 8.2-4, 5-13, 14-15/8.23-27, 28-34; 9.1-8). Thereby, in typical Matthean fashion, the redactor formed a grand triad of nine miraculous events.

In the ninth miracle story—the exorcism of the mute demoniac (9.27-34)—the reader was told that the crowd, upon seeing the extraordinary deed performed by Jesus, marveled as they had after the restoration of the paralytic (9.8), or as the disciples had after Jesus stilled the storm (8.27). However, unlike the previous concluding statements, the reader is made privy to the post-miracle response of the Jewish leadership (cf. 9.34). Earlier, in 9.3, the scribes, having heard Jesus forgive the paralytic, maliciously (notice the Matthean insertion of *πονηρὰ* in 9.4) charged him with blasphemy. Unfortunately, the reader was not told how the scribes ultimately reacted to having seen the healing miracle, though it is not likely that they are to be counted among those who glorified God (cf. 9.8). In 9.33-34, however, the author placed the respective responses of the crowds and Pharisees in stark contrast; the crowds again “marveled” (*ἐθαύμασαν*) while the Pharisees claimed for the first time that the source of Jesus’ power was the prince of demons (cf. 10.25; 12.24). It is in the shadow of this escalating conflict with the Jewish authorities and Jesus’ growing compassion for the crowds (cf. 9.35-38) that the author recorded the formation (cf. 10.1-4) and commissioning (cf. 10.5-23) of the Twelve.

3.4.2—Until the Son of Man Comes

In the first half of Mt 10, the evangelist reports that Jesus took the twelve disciples aside privately and gave them the authority to heal and exorcize (10.1; cf. 9.8). They are commanded explicitly not to proceed to the cities of the Gentiles or the Samaritans, but rather exclusively “to the lost sheep of the house of Israel” (10.5-6).

It is this command that lies in the background of the third “Son of Man” saying in 10.23—the *crux interpretum*¹¹² of the Mission Discourse:

When they persecute you in one city, flee to another. For truly I say to you, you will not finish the cities of Israel until the Son of Man comes (Ὅταν δὲ διώκωσιν ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ, φεύγετε εἰς τὴν ἑτέραν· ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ τελέσητε τὰς πόλεις τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου).

Unfortunately, the Mission Discourse does not afford the reader enough evidence on its own to provide solid answers for such questions as: “What does it mean to ‘finish’ (τελέσητε) the cities of Israel?” “To what coming does ἔλθῃ refer?” and finally, “In what manner should the reader understand ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου?” Matthew 10.23 can only be understood fully in retrospect through the lens of Mt 23-24, with which the discourse shares many parallels.¹¹³ What can be stated with confidence here, will be, and what cannot, will be anticipated.

Τελέσητε can either refer to the end of the disciples fleeing or the end of their mission. That is, on the one hand, the verse could be rendered, “there will not be a shortage of towns in Israel to proclaim the coming kingdom before the Son of Man comes,” or it could be interpreted, “you will not finish your mission to the cities of Israel until the Son of Man comes.” Either of these readings is acceptable, and both essentially convey the same meaning: since there will be no shortage of towns to which the disciples can flee and proclaim the gospel, the Son of Man’s arrival will cut the disciples’ mission short. Therefore, the coming of the Son of Man signals an unexplained shift in the disciples’ mission to “the lost sheep of the house of Israel.”

“To what ‘coming’ does the phrase ‘coming of the Son of Man’ refer?” has been the center of much debate. J. Dupont suggested that the statement refers to Jesus’ rendezvous with the disciples after they return from the mission for which they were commissioned in 10.5-6.¹¹⁴ He argued further that 10.23 was originally found immediately after 10.5-6 in Matthew’s source text, but was displaced to elaborate on the disciples’ mission. A similar theory has been forwarded by D.

112. Luz, *Matthew*, 2:91.

113. See list below.

114. J. Dupont, “‘Vous n’aurez pas achevé les villes d’Israël . . .’ [Mat. X 23],” *NovT* 2 (1958): 228-44; cf. Chrysostom, *Hom. Matt.* 34; Witherington, *Matthew*, 223-24; Talbert, *Matthew*, 134-35.

Wenham¹¹⁵ and H. Schürmann,¹¹⁶ who argued that 10.23 was formed from the same Q tradition as Lk 10.1, which stated that Jesus sent out seventy-two followers, two-by-two, to go ahead of him to the towns he was about to visit. It is possible that 10.5-6 and 10.23 appeared together in Matthew's source text, as Dupont suggested, since these verses share similar terminology and a like concern for the disciples' mission to Israel. It is also possible, yet far less likely, that Mt 10.23 and Lk 10.1 did originate from the same Q logia, though there are virtually no verbal parallels between the texts. However, the claim that 10.23 refers to Jesus' rendezvous with the disciples in the near future largely ignores the observation that in 10.16-23 Jesus is made to speak past the core Twelve to a post-Easter ἐκκλησία. Though Matthew's hypothetical source may have referred to the mission of the Twelve in the narrative-present, the changes Matthew has made suggest that he is using the material to refer to a narrative-future mission, perhaps the mission of his own community.

This description of the future followers of Jesus and the persecution they will endure shares many parallels with Mt 23-24:

- a) the disciples will be "handed over" (παραδίδομι [10.17, 19, 21/24.9-10]);
- b) "they will flog you in their synagogues"/"you will flog them in your synagogues" (10.17/23.34);
- c) the disciples will be a "witness" (μαρτύριον) to "the nations"/"all the nations" (10.18/24.14);
- d) the disciples will be put to death (10.21 [cf. 10.34-37]/23.34/24.9-10);
- e) "You will be hated by all for my name's sake"/"You will be hated by all nations for my name's sake" (10.22/24.9);
- f) "But the one who endures to the end will be saved" (10.22/24.13);
- g) the disciples flee from town to town due to persecution (10.23/23.34);
- h) mention of the coming of the Son of Man (10.23/24.30).¹¹⁷

It stands to reason, then, that ἔλθῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου should be interpreted in light of the prophetic material of Mt 23-24, especially the prediction concerning the Son of Man's coming on the clouds of heaven (24.30). The apocalyptic¹¹⁸ im-

115. D. Wenham, *The Rediscovery of Jesus' Eschatological Discourse* (Gospel Perspectives. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984), 219-52.

116. H. Schürmann, "Zur Traditions- und Redaktionsgeschichte von Mt 10, 23," *BZ* 3 (1959): 82-88.

117. There are also parallels with Mt 25 in the broader context of the Mission Discourse: a) the theme of uncovering what is hidden (10.26-28/25.24-30); b) eschatological reward based upon the reception of Jesus' disciples (10.40-42/25.34-40, 46); c) certain disciples are called "little ones"/"least of these brothers of mine" (10.42/25.40, 45); d) the disciples stand as representatives of Jesus (10.40/25.40, 45).

118. J. J. Collins stated, "More recent scholarship has abandoned the use of 'apocalyptic' as a noun and distinguishes between apocalypse as a literary genre, apocalypticism as a social ideology, and apocalyptic eschatology as a set of ideas and motifs that may also be found in other literary genres and social settings" (*The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to the Jewish Matrix of Christianity* [New York: Crossroad, 1984], 2). The term "apocalyptic," unless used to refer to "apocalyptic

agery and the disciples' questions in 24.3 permit 24.30, and, therefore, 10.23, to refer to one-of-two separate comings: the advent of the Son of Man at the *Parousia*¹¹⁹ or the going up of the Son of Man to the Ancient of Days to receive authority after the destruction of Herod's Temple in 70 CE.¹²⁰ As will be discussed in the following chapter, evidence from the Eschatological Discourse will suggest that the "coming" in 10.23 is to be equated with the latter of the above events. Matthew 24-25 makes it clear that the *Parousia* will not be accompanied by signs (cf. 24.36-25.30), whereas the Son of Man's exaltation to the right hand of God subsequent to Jerusalem's fall will be signaled by multiple portents (cf. 24.4-35). Since Jesus speaks here of the timing of his coming, it is improbable that he refers to his *Parousia*. Should Jesus' prediction in 10.23 refer to the *Parousia*, it contradicts his later claim that he is not aware of the time of his second advent (cf. 24.36).

The observation to emphasize at this point is that the Son of Man's coming, whenever it might be, is of great importance to the post-Easter missionaries in Matthew's audience. Whatever "coming" is referred to here, it marks a change in the community's mission to the people of Israel.

3.4.3—Summary and Conclusion

Matthew 10.23 stands at the pinnacle of the disciples' mission mandate to proclaim the approaching kingdom to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel." Although embedded in a pre-Easter narrative, the discourse has been made to reflect the experience of the Matthean community. Even though the reader is not told at this point when the Son of Man will appear or what role he will assume at that moment, it is clear that his coming marks a shift in the missional mandate of his post-Easter followers.

Unlike the previous two "Son of Man" sayings, "Son of Man" is not used here in a directly polemical context. This is simply due to the observation that Je-

literature," is used in this dissertation to "apocalyptic eschatology."

119. Cf. A. Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* (New York: Macmillan, 1959), 360; Gnlika, *Matthäusevangelium*, 1:379.

120. R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Matthew's Gospel* (Columbus: Wartburg, 1943), 405; J. A. T. Robinson, *Jesus and His Coming* (London: SCM, 1957), 80, 91-92; A. Feuillet, "Les origines et la signification de Mt 10, 23b," *CBQ* 23 (1961): 182-98; C. F. D. Moule, *The Birth of the New Testament* (2nd Ed. London: A & C Black, 1966), 9; R. T. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament: His Application of Old Testament Passages to Himself and His Mission* (London: Tyndale, 1971), 140; Carson, *Matthew*, 1:252-53; Hagner, *Matthew*, 1:280.

Jesus employs the title in private, rather than in the presence of the religious leaders. Nonetheless, in the background of this saying lies the tension between the Son of Man and his enemies. Should one identify the advent of the Son of Man in 10.23 either with his exaltation immediately after the fall of Jerusalem or with his second coming to judge the nations, the Son of Man's "coming" is closely associated with the punishment of his opponents. Thus, even though the setting has changed and Jesus refers to the future destiny of the Son of Man rather than his narrative-present deeds, the "Son of Man" saying in 10.23 is tied into the developing tapestry of conflict.

—Matthew 11.19—

Matthew 11.1-19 brings together three pericopae which are thematically centered on the identities of Jesus, John the Baptist, and the crowds: a) 11.2-6; b) 11.7-15; and, c) 11.16-19. Each is introduced by a question: a) "Are you the Coming One?" (the identity of Jesus); b) "What did you go out into the wilderness to see?" (the identity of John); and c) "To what shall I liken this generation?" (the identity of their opponents). The parallel phrases "the deeds of the Messiah" (11.2) and "the deeds of Wisdom" (11.19) create an *inclusio* around this triad.¹²¹ These pericopae belong to a larger collection of three passages that make up the first half of the third Matthean narrative: a) 11.2-19; b) 11.20-24; c) 11.25-30.¹²²

After closing the discourse with the disciples—Καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς διατάσσων τοῖς δώδεκα μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ (11.1)—the third narrative begins where the second ended, with Jesus moving on "to teach and preach in their cities" (9.1; cf. 9.35). D. Hill posited that one should read into this verse the sending out of the disciples.¹²³ But, as has been stated previously, the account of the disciples' commissioning has been altered by Matthew to refer to the post-Easter mission of his community (cf. 10.16-23). Thus, one would not expect to see Jesus sending out the Twelve immediately after the close of the Mission Discourse.

121. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:235.

122. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:235.

123. D. Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew* (NCB. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), 196.

The distancing use of the demonstrative αὐτῶν with συναγωγή has appeared earlier in the Matthean narrative (cf. 4.23; 9.35; 10.17). However, this is the only time in the gospel that the demonstrative pronoun appears with πόλις. This serves to distance Jesus from the people of Galilee; Capernaum was once “his own city,” but now the narrator alludes to Jesus’ unwelcomeness in the cities north of the Sea of Galilee. He is once again without a place to lay his head. The phrase “their cities” hints at the pivotal nature of Mt 11 in the growing tensions between Jesus and outsiders (cf. 11.20-24); it is the first indication in the section that tensions will intensify in the proceeding narrative.

3.5.2—Jesus as the Isaianic Eschatological Prophet

Having heard of “the deeds of the Christ,” messengers from John the Baptist approached Jesus asking him if he was “the one who is to come” (cf. Mt 3.11-12) or if John should be looking for another of a different type (notice the use of ἕτερον as opposed to ἄλλος).¹²⁴ Jesus does not reply by stating unambiguously “I am the Christ” or “I am he who is to come.” Instead, Jesus responds to John’s inquiry by relating his deeds in Mt 5-9 to the predicted deeds of the anointed prophet in LXX Isa 61¹²⁵ and the miraculous occurrences expected to accompany the messianic age:¹²⁶

- a) sight is restored to the blind (Mt 9.27-28; Isa 29.18b; 35.5a; 42.7a, 18b; LXX 61.1);
- b) the lame are made to walk (Mt 9.6-7; Isa 35.6a);
- c) the lepers are cleansed (Mt 8.2; cf. 10.8; 2 Kgs 5.14 [There is no prophetic reference to the cleansing of lepers in Isa]);
- d) the deaf are made to hear (Mt 9.32-33; Isa 29.18a; 35.5b; 42.18a);
- e) the dead are raised (Mt 9.18-26; cf. 10.8; Isa 26.19);
- f) the poor hear the good news (Mt 4:14-17, 23; 5-7 [cf. 5.3]; Isa 61.1c [cf. LXX Isa 29.19: “the poor shall rejoice”]).

124. Turner, *Matthew*, 291.

125. The speaker in Isa 61.1-3 is not the same “Servant of Yahweh” introduced in Isa 42. The anointed one in Trito-Isaiah is an individual, whereas the anointed one in Deutero-Isaiah is a collective representation for the people of Israel. Yet, it appears that the speaker in Chapter 61 has been modeled after the prophetic function of Servant (48.16; 49.1-6; 50.4-9; 59.21 [J. Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 56-66* (AB 19b. New York: Doubleday, 2003), 220-21]). Most interpreters follow the lead of the Isaiah Targum, which identifies the anointed one in Chapter 61 as a prophetic figure. The language used in Isa 61 is reminiscent of prophetic commissioning; the speaker carries the Spirit-inspired proclamation of God and is himself anointed by the Spirit. “The language of spirit possession combined with that of mission, both in Isaiah (cf. 6:8; 9:7; 42:19; 48:16) and elsewhere (Exod 3:13-15; 1 Sam 15:1; 2 Kgs 2:4; Jer 25:17; 26:12-15), points to a prophetic profile” (Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 56-66*, 221). This anointing is for the purpose of prophetic authority rather than royal sovereignty.

126. Isaiah 61 speaks of the Jubilee according to Leviticus 25.13. It was taken in an eschatological sense by 11QMelchizedek and 4QMessianicApocalypse (4Q521).

As has been argued by Davies and Allison, the proclamation of the gospel to the poor comes at the end of the list and gives meaning to the miracles listed before it; it is for the sake of spreading the good news of the kingdom that miracles are performed.¹²⁷

Notice that it is not stated that Jesus relates to John that he has come “to proclaim liberty to the captives” (LXX Isa 61.1e). This prophecy may not have been cited since its inclusion, in light of the imprisonment and later death of John (Mt 14.1-12; cf. Jos. *Ant.* 18.118-19), may have caused embarrassment.¹²⁸ Nonetheless, it appears to be the purpose of Mt and Q to identify Jesus with the Trito-Isaianic anointed prophet.¹²⁹ Jesus is, therefore, the mouthpiece of God who announces eschatological reversal for the poor and the beginning of the kingdom age.

3.5.3—John and the Son of Man: Prophets of Wisdom

In 11.16-17, Jesus asks,

To what shall I liken this generation? It is like children sitting in the marketplace calling to their playmates: “We played the flute for you, and you did not dance; we sang a song of lament, and you did not mourn.”

There has not been a lack of scholarly discussion concerning the identity of these two groups of hypothetical children. The majority of scholars claim that “this generation”—a contemptuous way to refer to both the crowds and their leaders, first seen here (cf. 12.39, 41-42, 45; 16.4; 17.17; 23.36; 24.34)¹³⁰—are the children playing the flute and singing the song of lament, expecting Jesus and John to dance to their tune.¹³¹ Meanwhile, there are other interpreters who see Jesus and John as the chil-

127. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:243.

128. Hagner, *Matthew*, 1:300.

129. Although messianism generally concerns the eschatological high priest or king in Second Temple Jewish writings, it could concern eschatological prophets (J. J. Collins, “The Nature of Messianism in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in T. H. Lim [ed.], *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context* [Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000], 199-217 [200]; *idem*, *The Scepter and the Star: Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* [ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 1995], 116-22). Therefore, “Christ” should not be read as merely relating to the reader Jesus’ Davidic kingship; it is possible that the term takes on different nuances in different contexts.

130. Josephus stated that Jerusalem and her Temple were destroyed in 70 C.E. because the capital had “produced a generation such as that which caused her overthrow” (*Wars* 6.408).

131. A. Jülicher, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu* (2nd Ed. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1899. Reprinted, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963), 2:31-33; A. Plummer, *An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew* (TC. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1982), 163; J. Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus* (2nd Rev. Ed. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall, 1972), 161-62; M. J. Suggs, *Wisdom, Christology, and Law in Matthew’s Gospel* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970), 44; O. Linton,

dren playing the flute and lamenting while “this generation” is unmoved to participate in either of opposite games.¹³² The latter interpretation is the more acceptable, even though it does compare Jesus and John to “complaining children.”¹³³ As the explanation of the parable in 11.18-19 makes clear, it is not the response of John and Jesus to the actions of the crowds that is central; it is the improper response of the crowds to the ministries of the prophets with which Jesus takes issue.

Although John and Jesus landed on the extreme ends of the spectrum, both men were slandered equally by the crowds and Jewish authorities as being unrighteous and impure. The crowds slandered John, claiming that he was demon-possessed (11.18; cf. 9.34; 10.25). This accusation probably arose from the observation that he could function for an abnormally long time without food or water as his ascetic lifestyle dictated, much as those who were animated by unclean spirits could. Further, his wilderness home was “thought by many to be the home of evil spirits.”¹³⁴ Jesus, on the other hand, is accused of being licentious, carelessly cavorting with social and religious outsiders in unkosher symposia (11.19; cf. 9.10-17). This slander would never have befallen him, though, if the crowds and their leaders had understood Jesus when he said, “I desire mercy and not sacrifice” (9.13; cf. Hos 6.6).

The gravity of the slanderous claim of “this generation” against Jesus should not be lost; it is likely that they were alluding to the Torah-mandated punishment of “a stubborn and rebellious son.” According to MT Deut 21.18-21, a son who does not obey his father and mother is to be taken to the gate of the city, where they are to say before the elders,

“The Parable of the Children’s Game,” *NTS* 22 (1976): 159-79 (175-77); Gundry, *Matthew*, 212; Hagner, *Matthew*, 1:310-11; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:262; H. C. Kee, “Jesus: A Glutton and Drunkard,” *NTS* 42 (1996): 374-93 (383-84); Hare, *Matthew*, 124; Carson, *Matthew*, 1:270; A. J. Hultgren, *The Parables of Jesus: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 206.

132. A. H. McNeile, *Matthew*, 157; J. M. Creed, *The Gospel according to St. Luke* (London: Macmillan, 1930), 108; D. Zeller, “Die Bildlogik des Gleichnisses Mt 11 16f./Lk 7 31f.” *ZNW* 68 (1977): 252-57; E. Schweizer, *The Good News According to Matthew* (Trans. by D. E. Green. Atlanta: John Knox, 1975), 264; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 679-80.

133. Hultgren, in his commentary on the parables, contests that “it is not likely that Jesus and John should be compared to the complaining children” (*The Parables of Jesus*, 206). However, though this is an unsavory prospect, it was common for prophets to argue with the stubborn generations to whom they were sent. This was bickering that, from the outside, most certainly looked like the squabbles of children.

134. Evans, *Matthew*, 241.

“This one, our son, is stubborn and rebellious; he will not obey our voice; *he is a glutton and a drunkard*” (MT Deut 21.20b; cf. Prov 23.20-21).¹³⁵

Subsequently, the men of the city are to stone the young man and, thereby, purge the land of the son’s impurity. Should 11.19 be considered to preserve an echo of MT Deut 21.20, by calling the Son of Man “a glutton and drunkard” the crowd and their leaders were suggesting that he should be stoned for his moral uncleanness under the Law of Moses.¹³⁶

“Yet Wisdom is justified by her deeds” (11.19c).¹³⁷ These deeds are probably the same ones mentioned in 11.4-5, except now “deeds” encompasses the acts of John as well as Jesus.¹³⁸ The Wisdom of God is “actualized” in the actions of Jesus and John.¹³⁹ Carson aptly stated,

Both John the Baptist and Jesus are justified by their works—or, put more poetically, Wisdom is always justified by what she does.¹⁴⁰

Hence, “Wisdom” is not used to designate Jesus, as though the Son of Man were the personification of Wisdom. Rather, the verse confirms that God’s Wisdom, and, thereby, God himself, is justified by *both* John’s and Jesus’ starkly different, but related, works.¹⁴¹

135. The LXX has a different reading: συμβολοκοπῶν οἰνοφλυγεῖ. Based on this reading, Luz claimed that LXX Deut 21.20 and Mt 11.19 are too different for there to be a deliberate allusion. But it is possible that the combination of gluttony and drunkenness would have been recognized at the time of Jesus as grounds for one’s exclusion from the covenant people (cf. Gundry, *Matthew*, 213; Hagner, *Matthew*, 1:310).

136. Kee, “Jesus,” 374-93; J. B. Modica, “Jesus as Glutton and Drunkard: The ‘Excesses’ of Jesus,” in S. McKnight and J. B. Modica (eds.), *Who Do My Opponents Say that I Am?: An Investigation of the Accusations against Jesus* (London and New York: T & T Clark, 2008), 50-75.

137. Luke 7.35, which reads, “wisdom is justified by her *children*,” probably preserves the reading found in Q. As mention above, it is more likely that Matthew changed “children” to “deeds” to create an *inclusio* around 11.2-19 (cf. D. A. Carson, “Matthew 11:19b/Luke 7:35: A Test Case for the Bearing of Q Christology on the Synoptic Problem,” in J. B. Green and M. Turner [eds.], *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ* [I. H. Marshall Festschrift. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994], 128-46).

138. The inclusion of the works of John is probably the strongest critique against those who wish to read 11.19c as claiming Jesus is the personification of the plenipotentiary Wisdom (cf. Suggs, *Wisdom*, 56-57; Geist, *Menschensohn*, 258; Gundry, *Matthew*, 213). It is no longer merely the deeds of τοῦ Χριστοῦ (cf. 11.2) to which τῶν ἔργων in 11.19c is referring. Wisdom is justified by the works of John as well (cf. 11.18). This is not to say that a Wisdom christology cannot be found in Matthew (cf. 23.34/Q 11.49), but rather that such is not present here and, hence, should not color one’s reading of the pericope or one’s interpretation of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

139. R. Schnackenburg, *The Gospel of Matthew* (Trans. by R. R. Barr. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 107.

140. D. A. Carson, “Do the Prophets and the Law Quit Prophesying Before John? A Note on Matthew 11.13,” in C. A. Evans and W. R. Stegner (eds.), *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel* (JSNTSup 104. SSEJC 3. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 179-94 (189).

141. Turner suggested that Jesus purposed to show that his and John’s “deeds prove their wisdom” (*Matthew*, 296). It is correct that Jesus is seeking to establish that he and John are wise. However, it is

As was confirmed in 11.2-6, Jesus is “the Christ,” i.e., “the anointed prophet” of Isa 61. This is supported by his and John’s relationship with Wisdom. According to *Wisd* 7.27 and Q 11.49 (cf. Mt 23.34), Wisdom is the personified attribute of God who sends out the prophets. Jesus, like John, is a prophet of God sent by Wisdom to proclaim the good news of the kingdom to the Jews (cf. 3.1-2; 4.17), and to pronounce a verdict against scoffers and unbelievers (cf. 3.7-12). The latter prophetic ability—i.e., the empowerment to announce the coming of God’s wrath—is exercised by Jesus in the following scene (11.20-24).

Although the citizens of the Galilean region have been witness to Jesus’ Spirit-anointed miracles, Matthew claims that they remain in a state of denial concerning Jesus’ authority and, therefore, are promised judgment.¹⁴² Jesus prophesied that those in Chorazin and Bethsaida, because they ignored his mighty works, will be judged more harshly than the Ba’al-worshipping citizens of Tyre and Sidon (cf. Isa 23; Ezek 26-28; Joel 3.4; Amos 1.9-10; Zech 9.2-4). The people of Capernaum, likewise, are assured that the final judgment on the people of Sodom will be more bearable than that which will be inflicted upon them. Hence, in 11.20-24 the Son of Man exercises his prophetic role as judgment-bearer. He turns the tables on “this generation”—the religious leaders and crowds—who slanderously claimed that John was demon-possessed and Jesus was a “glutton and drunkard.” John and Jesus, as the prophets of Wisdom, are justified. Meanwhile, Jesus’ generation of skeptical Israelites, according to the evangelist, condemns itself to eschatological judgment absent repentance by doubting the presence of the kingdom in the Spirit-empowered proclamations and works of the prophets Jesus and John.

3.5.4—Summary and Conclusion

As in the public “Son of Man” sayings earlier in Mt (cf. 8.20; 9.6), ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is herein used of Jesus in a controversy scene where his prophetic role is emphasized. According to 11.2-24, the Son of Man is a prophet who announces the messianic age through miracles and the proclamation of the gospel (cf. LXX Isa 61;

perhaps more accurate to state that the purpose of Jesus here is to establish his and John’s allegiance is with or to Wisdom. Their wise actions exhibit that relationship.

142. Although John also doubts that Jesus is the anointed one, he is not condemned for his doubt due to the fact that he is in prison. The people of northern Galilee have seen Jesus’ works firsthand, whereas John, being in prison, must be told of Jesus’ works by his disciples.

Mt. 11.2-5). Rather than participating in kingdom blessings, the citizens of northern Galilee have “fallen away” (11.6), having seen the Son of Man’s power and having not repented (11.20). Therefore, they have been disqualified from taking part in the coming kingdom (11.21-24). This unexpected turn of Jesus against the crowds marks the pivotal moment in the story of Jesus where conflict escalates to include the common people. The pronouncement of God’s wrath against Chorazin, Bethsaida and Capernaum is merely the beginning; eventually, all of “this generation,” both the religious leaders (12.38-45) and the unbelieving citizens of Jerusalem (23.33-39), will fall under condemnation.

Jesus’ seemingly irenic statement that ends the triadic narrative (i.e., 11.2-19, 20-24, 25-30) is used against the religious officials in a bellicose manner:

Come to me, all who labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn from me, for I am gentle and lowly in heart, and you will find rest for your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light (11.28-30).

Matthew depicts Jesus drawing a line in the sand between the little children who have had wisdom revealed to them¹⁴³ and the “wise” religious leaders (cf. 11.25). The point of contention: the Law. The imagery of taking up the yoke was commonly used in Jewish and Christian writings to depict metaphorically one’s observance of the Torah.¹⁴⁴ The two following Sabbath controversies (12.1-9, 10-14) demonstrate the starkly different interpretations of the Law held by Jesus and the Jewish officials.¹⁴⁵ Jesus’ yoke is shown to be a lighter interpretation of the Law in that love and charitable acts are placed above strict, ritualistic observance.¹⁴⁶

Once questions concerning the Law arise, the Pharisees and scribes advance from verbal slander to plots of destruction (“But the Pharisees went out and plotted against him, how αὐτὸν ἀπολέσωσιν” [12.14]). The Jewish leaders have won the

143. As Evans noted, this prayer is the antithesis of Daniel’s prayer in Dan 2.21, 23 (*Matthew*, 245). There, Daniel thanked God that he had given wisdom to the wise and understanding, whereas Jesus thanks God for withholding wisdom from the same.

144. Cf. Jer 5.5; Lam 3.27; Sir 51.26 (34); Acts 15.10; Gal 5.1; Did 6.2; 2 Bar 41.3; 2 En 48.9; *m. ’Aboth* 3.5; *m. Ber* 2.2 (D. C. Allison, Jr., *The Intertextual Jesus: Scripture in Q* [Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2000], 50 n. 122).

145. The twice mentioned “rest” in 11.28-29 may have been used to conjure ideas of sabbath rest (S. Bacchiocchi, “Matthew 11:28-30: Jesus’ Rest and the Sabbath,” *AUSS* 22 [1984], 289-316 [296]). If so, this supports the claim made here that 11.28-30 is meant primarily to introduce the disputations between Jesus and the Jewish leaders concerning the Law, with issues of the Sabbath being the first battleground.

146. Cf. M. Maher, “‘Take My Yoke Upon You’ [Matt. XI. 29],” *NTS* 22 (1975): 97-103 (103).

crowds and still the Son of Man preaches judgment against them. To stop God's prophet, they must resort to harsher tactics.

—Matthew 12:8—

The imagery of taking up Jesus' lighter yoke introduces to the text disputation concerning the proper interpretation of the Law of Moses.¹⁴⁷ Conflict is heightened as discussion of the Torah becomes central. It is after the second Sabbath controversy—the healing of the withered man's hand (cf. 12.9-14)—that the Pharisees¹⁴⁸ decide to ἀπολέσωσιν Jesus, a Greek word commonly interpreted “destroy,” “bring to ruin,” and even “kill.” As Jesus' examination of “this generation” becomes more legally-pointed, the tactics of the leaders become evermore direct. Their strategy evolves from slander, to plots of destruction, and finally to appeals for Jesus' death before their Roman overlords.

3.6.2—The Justifying Missions of David and the Priests

After drawing battle-lines between the enlightened “little children” and the rejected “wise” (11.25-30), Jesus continues his mission “to teach and preach in their cities” (11.1). As he and his disciples walked through a field on the Sabbath, the disciples, because they were hungry,¹⁴⁹ plucked heads of grain, shucked them by hand, and ate the seeds. Whether or not this form of work was an infringement of Sabbath law is not a question raised by the text.¹⁵⁰ Clearly, the Pharisees took offense at

147. Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story*, 120-22.

148. In Mt 12, the enemies of Jesus are described merely as “Pharisees” rather than “scribes” or “scribes and Pharisees.” This should not be taken to imply that the scribes no longer persecute Jesus or that Matthew is only concerned with the actions and words of the Pharisees. As Kingsbury has noted at length, the Jewish leaders are *flat characters*, who are primarily characterized by “evil” and their authority over “this generation” (“Developing Conflict,” 60). The absence of the scribes, then, is of little consequence.

149. Matthew emphasized that the disciples broke the Law of Moses due to hunger rather than from a disregard for the Law (cf. 12.1). G. Barth suggested that this implies that Matthew's community upheld Sabbath legislature (G. Bornkamm, “End-Expectation and Church in Matthew,” in G. Bornkamm, et al. [eds.], *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew* [Trans. by P. Scott. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963]: 15-51 (81). But this is not necessarily correct. Simply because Matthew showed respect for the Law does not mean that he and his community abided by the Sabbath laws of the Mosaic covenant.

150. Although not particularly laborious, the disciples' action was considered “reaping,” a form of work which was unlawful to perform on the Sabbath (cf. Ex 20.10; 34.21; Deut 5.14; CD 10.14-11.18; *m. Shab.* 7.2 [cf. A. Edersheim, *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* (8th Rev. Ed. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1912), 2:56, 780]). Further, according to *Jubilees* 2.29 nothing was to be eaten that had

the disciples' actions and Jesus' reply seems to assume that under normal circumstances his followers did breach Sabbath regulations. But as Plummer rightly wrote, "every rule has its limitations, . . . ceremonial regulations must yield to the higher claims of charity and necessity."¹⁵¹ It was necessary for the disciples to eat the grain, for without it, they would not be properly supplied in their quest to follow Jesus and proclaim the kingdom's presence.

The necessity for supplies to complete a mission and the infringement of the Mosaic Law connects the present account to the story of David's acquisition of the bread of presence (1 Sam 21.1-6). Having been urged by Jonathan and Michal to escape the wrath of Saul (1 Sam 19.2-3, 11-12; 20.13, 16-17, 42) until he finds how God will act in his favor (22.3), David approached the high priest Ahimelech¹⁵² for food (21.3) and weapons (21.8-9). If David had told Ahimelech that he was evading Saul's capture, it is unlikely that he would have supported David. Hence, he deceived the priest, saying that "the king" had given him a clandestine mission, a possible reference to Yahweh rather than Saul.¹⁵³ But without correction or elaboration, David's ambiguous speech naturally led the high priest to believe that "the king" was the current suzerain, Saul. Understanding the importance of David's *supposed* mission, Ahimelech offers David the consecrated bread from the most holy place, as well as the sword of Goliath for his personal protection.¹⁵⁴ In spite of David's deceit, he was justified in taking the bread set apart for the Lord because of the nature of his *true* assignment: his mission to flee from Saul to remain alive. Even though he transgressed the Law concerning the tabernacle, he remained un-

not been prepared the day before. This was not, however, a form of stealing, as this form of reaping while passing through another man's fields was permitted, as long as there was no sickle involved (Deut 23.25). See L. Morris, *The Gospel According to Luke: An Introduction and Commentary* (TNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 122, who finds in Luke at least for infractions of Sabbath law.

151. Plummer, *St. Matthew*, 172.

152. In Mark's account, Abiathar, the son of Ahimelech, was the high priest at the time of David's eating the bread of presence (cf. Mk 2.26). Recognizing the incompatibility of his source text with the reading of 1 Sam, both Matthew and Luke omit the high priest's name (cf. Lk 6.3-4).

153. It is possible, as R. D. Bergen has stated, that David meant Yahweh when he referred to "the king" (cf. 21.2 [*1, 2 Samuel: An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture* (NAC 7. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1996)]). This does not change the fact, however, that David's statement was purposefully deceitful.

154. Matthew states that David "entered the house of God" (12.4). Thereby, he "makes his [David's] action even bolder than the OT original" (France, *Matthew*, 458), and yet, David is justified on the basis of his God-given mission.

blemished before the Lord since his mission to escape necessitated supplies; he and his men were in physical need.

The references to the “house of God” and the “priests” in 12.4 connect the story of David to the example of the priests’ duty in the Temple.¹⁵⁵ Jesus referred to a paradox that was recognized in rabbinic literature: the priests, who were charged to uphold the Law and, thereby, remain holy, were commanded in the Torah to work in the Temple on the Sabbath (cf. Num 28.9-10; *11QTemple* 13.17). Although such actions as cleaning, feeding, and transporting animals, as well as preparing fires and gathering supplies were considered labor that contravened Sabbath legislature, the priests were considered exculpated based on the necessity of their mission: the preservation of cultic rituals for the purification of the people and the worship of God (cf. *b. Shab.* 132b: “temple service takes precedence over the Sabbath”). Without their continued sacrifices, the Temple would have fallen into a state of perpetual uncleanness and, therefore, would have become, along with the people, worthy of destruction. Hence, the Temple was more important than the Sabbath, and, in turn, the priests’ work in the Temple was more important than their adherence to Sabbath strictures.

Both David and his troop, in the eating of the bread of presence, and the priesthood, by working on the Sabbath, have profaned the Law. However, the infringement is forgiven because of the gravity of their respective missions and because their actions were necessary. Without the sundries from the Temple it is possible that David and his men would have starved, and certainly they would have gone without the physical protection afforded by the confiscated weaponry. Hence, it is unlikely they would have completed their mission. Likewise, as has been mentioned above, without the actions of the priests the Temple would have become unclean, making sacrifices on its alter null and void. Under Jesus’ “light yoke” interpretation of the Law, David and the priests were justified in ignoring strict Temple and Sabbath laws because doing so was necessary to complete an important task.

155. At the time of David’s reception of the bread from Ahimelech the Temple in Jerusalem did not yet exist. The Tabernacle, however, was erected at that time in Nob (cf. Ex 23.19; Judg 18.31; 1 Sam 1.7, 24; 3.15; 2 Sam 12.20; Ps 5.7).

It is through this lens, therefore, that Jesus' statements, "something greater than the Temple is here," and, "The Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath," should be read.

3.6.3—The Prophet Son of Man: The Master Interpreter of Sabbath Law

It has commonly been assumed that Jesus refers to *himself* as greater than the Temple (λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι τοῦ ἱεροῦ μείζον ἐστὶν ὧδε).¹⁵⁶ Support for this theory has been garnered from the observation that in the subsequent narrative Jesus deems himself greater than Jonah (12.41) and superior to Solomon (12.42). Even so, the present context suggests that that which is of more appreciable worth than the Temple is the kingdom of God that Jesus and the disciples have been tasked to serve.¹⁵⁷

This conclusion is derived from a reflection on Jesus' comparative accounts.¹⁵⁸ Despite objections to the contrary,¹⁵⁹ David was not allowed to take the bread of presence for the sheer fact that he was the then-future king of Israel. He was justified because he and his men were in dire need of the supplies that their mission required. Likewise, the priests were allowed to breach Sabbath commandments not because they were Aaronic priests, but because they had been charged with the mission to purify the nation so that the people of God could worship, a cultic necessity of the highest order. Hence, each were justified in breaking the Law of Moses because their respective assignments required it.

Thus, when Jesus says, "something greater than the Temple is here," one can assume based on the parallel accounts of David and the priests that who or

156. Bornkamm, "End-Expectation," 35 n. 2; G. Gander, *L'Evangile de l'Englise: Commentaire de l'Evangile selon Matthieu* (Aix-en-Provence: Faculté Libre de Théologie Protestante, 1967); J. M. Hicks, "The Sabbath Controversy in Matthew: An Exegesis of Matthew 12.1-14," *RestQ* 27 (1984): 79-91 (86); B. W. R. Pearson, "New Testament Literary Criticism," in S. E. Porter (ed.), *A Handbook to the Exegesis of the New Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 241-66 (256, 258-59); Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:314; France, *Matthew*, 460-61; Carson, *Matthew*, 282; Evans, *Matthew*, 250.

157. Cf. 1 Cor 3.16-17; 1 Pet 2.5.

158. One might cite the use of the neuter in 12.6, but the neuter is used in 12.41, 42 even though Jesus is the referent. Hence, nothing can rest on the use of the neuter as opposed to the masculine.

159. France, for example, stated, "If David, because of who he was, was entitled to do what no other layman might dare, so too Jesus, because of who he is, has no less authority" (France, *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher*, 170; cf. *idem*, *Matthew*, 459; cf. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:311).

what the disciples and Jesus *serve* is greater than the Temple. D. J. Moo, who is followed by W. D. Davies and D. C. Allison,¹⁶⁰ argues that

if the priests who serve in the Temple on the Sabbath are innocent of wrong-doing, . . . how much more innocent are the disciples, who are “serving” Jesus, “one greater than the Temple.”¹⁶¹

But the disciples were not commissioned to “serve” Jesus, as he came to serve and not to be served (cf. Mk 10.45/Mt 20.28); their purpose was to do the work of the Father,¹⁶² or perhaps, more accurately, to serve the kingdom of heaven (cf. 10.5-15; see especially 10.7).¹⁶³ That which is greater than the Temple, then, is the kingdom of God. If the priests can breach Sabbath law for the maintenance of the Temple, the Son of Man and his disciples have even greater reason to breach Sabbath law to sustain themselves in their mission to proclaim the kingdom.¹⁶⁴

This has a parallel in the account of the reluctant disciple in 8.21-22. There, Jesus, who had immediately prior identified himself as a teacher of the prophetic tradition (cf. 8.18-20), tells the disciple who wishes to be at his father’s burial to neglect his cultural responsibilities as a son and to follow him. As has been mentioned, the man’s absence from the burial ceremony would have shamed his father and caused the disciple to breach the fourth commandment to honor one’s father and mother (Ex 20.12 [cf. Deut 5.16]). Thus, Jesus urged the disciple to follow him, even though by doing so he would violate the Mosaic Law. But it is implied that the man would have been justified because the task of “preaching the good news of the kingdom” (4.23) in which he was to participate was of greater importance than adhering to the letter of the Law.

If, then, that which is greater than the Temple is not Jesus, the emphasis of the dialogue is not on Jesus but rather on the kingdom and the gospel proclamation with which he and the disciples have been tasked to announce. It is important to recognize that at the beginning of the present narrative block, Jesus was described

160. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:313.

161. D. J. Moo, “Jesus and the Authority of the Mosaic Law,” *JSNT* 20 (1984): 3-49 (16-17).

162. Cf. B. Gerhardsson, “Sacrificial Service and Atonement in the Gospel of Matthew,” in R. Banks (ed.), *Reconciliation and Hope: New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology Presented to L. L. Morris on his 60th Birthday* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1974): 25-35 (28); followed by D. Hill, “On the Use and Meaning of Hosea vi. 6 in Matthew’s Gospel,” *NTS* 24 (1978): 107-19 (115).

163. Cf. E. Lohmeyer, *Das Evangelium des Matthäus* (KEK. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962).

164. Plucking grain on the sabbath was necessary for them to maintain the requisite strength to continue on their mission (Evans, *Matthew*, 250).

as the Trito-Isaianic prophet, by whose proclamation “the blind receive their sight . . . and the poor have good news preached to them” (11.5). This “good news” is the message of the imminent kingdom of God (cf. 4.17, 23; 9.35; 10.7; cf. Mk 1.14; Lk 4.43; 8.1; 16.16; Acts 8.12), a kingdom that takes precedence over the Temple (12.6). Because Jesus is the primary prophet of the kingdom, he can decide what is lawful and unlawful to do on the Sabbath. In the case of the disciples’ plucking grain, and in the following Sabbath controversy whence Jesus heals a man’s hand, Jesus chooses a “light” interpretation of the Law (11.30), one that places mercy over sacrifice (12.7; cf. Hos 6.6; Mt 9.12-13). It is by exercising his right as a teacher of the prophetic tradition that the Son of Man shows himself to be the “Lord” of the Sabbath, i.e., the master interpreter of Sabbath law.

3.6.4—Summary and Conclusion

Here, as has been seen earlier, the phrase “Son of Man” is the self-designation employed by Jesus in polemical, public dialogue where he characterizes himself as a prophet or refers to his prophetic mission.¹⁶⁵ This passage is, perhaps, not as explicitly prophetic as previous passages. Prophetic overtones, however, are still present. The Son of Man’s prophetic ministry of proclaiming the presence of the kingdom (cf. 4.17, 23; 9.35; 10.7), both in word and in deed (cf. 11.2-5), justifies his claim that he is “the master of the Sabbath.” Since the kingdom of God and a ministry of mercy take precedence over Sabbath regulations, they are of greater importance and value than the strict observance of the Mosaic Law.

This first Sabbath controversy is paired with another, namely, the account of Jesus healing of the man’s withered hand on the Sabbath (12.9-14). Jesus’ mercy is starkly matched by the objectionable response of the Pharisees, who begin at that moment συμβούλιον ἔλαβον κατ’ αὐτοῦ ὅπως αὐτὸν ἀπολέσωσιν (12.14). It is unlikely that ἀπολέσωσιν should be rendered into English as “to kill.” Matthew 12.24 suggests that the Pharisees attempted to ruin Jesus through the defamation of his character: they claimed that he cast out demons through the power of Satan. Although this certainly could have precipitated an uprising against Jesus, resulting

165. T. W. Manson argues that “Son of Man” should be read collectively: Jesus and his disciples are “Lord” of the sabbath (“The Son of Man in Daniel, Enoch and the Gospels,” *BJRL* 32 [1949-50]: 171-93 [191]). But this is based upon a dubious collective interpretation of “one like a son of man” in Dan 7.13. There is little in the gospels that may be read as suggesting “Son of Man” is a collective term, and nothing in the gospels necessitates such a reading.

in his death by stoning, it is doubtful the religious leaders counted on mob justice to settle their problem with Jesus (at least at this point in the story). Nonetheless, the crowd was central to their plan to defeat Jesus; as 11.20-24 demonstrated, the Son of Man was not winning the hearts of the people because of their doubt, and the Jewish authorities stood ready to capitalize on their unbelief.

—Matthew 12.32, 40—

After a pair of Sabbath controversy stories (12.1-8, 9-14), the Pharisees begin to develop a scheme by which “to destroy” Jesus. Prior to the conflict concerning the proper interpretation of the Law, the Jewish leaders accused Jesus of blasphemy “to themselves” (cf. 9.3-4)¹⁶⁶ or spread the rumor that Jesus casts out demons by the power of Satan (cf. 9.34; 10.25). Now, the scribes and Pharisees confront Jesus directly with their doubt that he performs miraculous works by the power of the Spirit.

Knowing of the Pharisees plans to “destroy him” (12.15a) and wishing to avoid direct confrontation, Jesus withdrew and began to heal the sick (12.15b-c). This withdrawal and healing prompt the narrator to cite LXX Isa 42.1-4 as having been fulfilled (12.15-21 [especially 12.19-20]). Jesus is identified as the Deutero-Isaianic anointed one¹⁶⁷ who brings justice¹⁶⁸ and hope to the nations, particularly to the physically disadvantaged. This was done through “the liberation of the oppressed, the proclamation of the good news, and the humble character of his per-

166. Matthew 12.25 claims that Jesus knew the thoughts of the Pharisees. A similar expression is found in Mt 9.4 where Jesus “sees” (ἰδὼν) that the scribes thought “to themselves” (ἐν ἑαυτοῖς) that Jesus blasphemed. It is possible, though not necessary, that in 9.4 reads the unspoken thought of the scribes. This interpretation is supported by the inclusion of ἐν ἑαυτοῖς. The claims of the Pharisees in 12.24, however, were likely said aloud to Jesus and the crowd. Matthew 12.24 lacks ἐν ἑαυτοῖς or a similar phrase, and εἰδὼς δὲ τὰς ἐνθυμήσεις αὐτῶν (“And knowing their thoughts . . .”) does not necessarily imply supernatural abilities but merely astute observation.

167. Isaiah 42.1-4 was possibly interpreted messianically in pre-Christian Judaism (cf. *Pss Sol* 17.28, 31, 35; *1 En* 39.6, 40.5, 48.4), and may have been read messianically by Matthew, as the addition of ὁ ἀγαπητός (12.18) suggests (cf. Mt 3.17; 17.5; Mk 1.11 [K. Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968), 144; followed by and cited in R. Beaton, “Messiah and Justice: A Key to Matthew’s Use of Isaiah 42:1-4?” *JSNT* 75 (1999): 5-23 (7-8)]).

168. This study agrees with Beaton’s conclusion that κρίσις in 12.18, 20 should be translated “justice” rather than “judgment,” based on the theme of justice in Isa 42.1-4 and the related passage in Isa 51.4-6, as well as “the usage of κρίσις with terms such as νόμος, δικαιοσύνη, σωτήριον, ἔλεος and the phrase εἰς φῶς ἔθνῶν” (“Messiah and Justice,” 13).

son and ministry,”¹⁶⁹ which shined the light of justice on the injustices wrought by what Matthew considered the oppressive Pharisaic *halakah*.¹⁷⁰ But the citation of LXX Isa 42.1-4 serves also to foreshadow the meting out of justice against “this generation” and the establishment of a new “people” comprised of both repentant Jews and converted Gentiles (cf. 21.43). Through Jesus all nations can partake in the blessings of the messianic age (cf. 12.18, 21). The religious leaders, however, will not experience the greatness of the kingdom due to their blasphemy against the Spirit (12.22-50). This repudiation of God will motivate Jesus to reject them and to speak pointedly about the formation of a worldwide kingdom community (13.3-52).

3.7.2—Son of Man: The Spirit-anointed Sign Prophet

The casting out of a demon from a blind and mute man (cf. 12.22; cf. *T Sol* 12.2) is used to set the scene of an extended controversy that extends to the end of Mt 12 and inspires the Parables of the Kingdom in Mt 13. As before (cf. 9.34; 10.25), the scribes and Pharisees assert that Jesus’ power to exorcise has been derived from his allegiance with *Beelzebul*, the prince of demons (cf. 12.24). This time, however, the Jewish leaders are forthright with their slander as they attempt to dissuade the crowds from confessing that Jesus is the “son of David,” i.e., a Solomonic figure or, perhaps, Solomon *redivivus*.¹⁷¹ The question of the crowd, “This cannot be the Son of David, can it?” (12.23),¹⁷² demonstrates once again their hesitancy to believe Jesus’ Spirit anointing when presented with incontrovertible evidence of such empowerment. Although the citizens of Galilee and Gaulanitis have repeatedly seen Jesus’ Spirit-enabled works, and have even been denounced for not accepting his authority (cf. 11.20-24), they still do not confess with certainty his commissioning by God. They show themselves, then, to be among “the wise” from whom the knowledge of the kingdom has been kept (cf. 11.25-27).

169. Beaton, “Messiah and Justice,” 18.

170. Beaton, “Messiah and Justice,” 17-22.

171. Solomon, who is also known by the title “son of David” (cf. *T Sol* 1.7; 5.10), was considered by some during the Second Temple period to be the exorcist *par excellence* (cf. *T Sol* 1.6-7, 10-13; *Jos*, *Wars*, 7.180-85; *Ant* 8.45-49 [E. Eshel, “Jesus the Exorcist in Light of Epigraphic Sources,” in J. H. Charlesworth (ed.), *Jesus and Archeology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 178-85 (180, 183-84)]).

172. Notice the use of μήτι at the beginning of the crowd’s inquiry. This particle is commonly used to express the expectance of a negative answer or the doubt of the person or persons asking the question.

Jesus used logic to thwart the slander of the Pharisees and scribes. He argued that if the Jewish leaders are correct in their assumption that Jesus exorcised demons by Satan's power, one could conclude, cogently, that Satan attempted to impede the advancement of his own kingdom. This is counter-intuitive. Contrarily, Jesus posited that since he has the authority to cast out demons and has expressed this ability openly, it is sound to conclude that he is empowered by the primary enemy of unclean spirits—"the Spirit of God" (12.28).¹⁷³ Hence, the Jewish authorities' attempt to defame Jesus by extension dishonored God. The Pharisees and scribes were ironically at risk of committing the same blasphemy of which they accused Jesus earlier (cf. 9.3). To do so would confirm their unworthiness to act as shepherds of God's people.

Matthew 12.32 reads,

And whoever speaks a word against the Son of Man will be forgiven. But whoever speaks against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven, either in this age or the age to come.

It is not necessary to conclude that τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in this passage refers to Jesus' lowly, human state since blasphemy against him can be forgiven whereas dishonoring words against the Spirit cannot.¹⁷⁴ Blasphemy against the Spirit cannot be forgiven because the power of the Spirit is *readily perceived* through the Son of Man's miraculous works. That is, the Spirit acting through Jesus cannot be disputed since Satan does not cast out demons with whom he is allied. It is ultimately not the deeds of the Son of Man to which the crowds are responding; he is currently acting as a conduit for the power of the Spirit (cf. 9.2). The authority and power of the Son of Man are yet to be revealed (cf. 16.27; 24.29-30; 25.31; 26.64; 28.18).

After sternly warning the Pharisees that blasphemy against the Spirit will not be forgiven, Jesus used agricultural imagery, as well as the stinging appellation "brood of vipers" (cf. 3.7; 23.33), to bring to light the evil nature and intentions of the religious officials (12.33-35). He issued a cautionary note to the Pharisees, sub-

173. The Lukan account reads "finger of God" while the Matthean account reads "Spirit of God." It may be, as J. G. D. Dunn has proposed, that "Spirit" is the earlier reading (*Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament* [New Testament Library. London: SCM, 1975], 44-46), contrary to popular belief. But Carson has rightly suggested, it is a "matter of little consequence since they both refer to the same thing (cf. Exod 8:19; Deut 9:10; Ps 8:3)" (*Matthew*, 1:289).

174. *Contra* Schnackenburg, *Matthew*, 117.

tly warning them that they, like all men, will be judged for every ῥῆμα ἀργὸν (“careless word” [12.36-37]):

But I say to you that on the day of judgment men will have to give an account for every careless word that they will speak. For by your words you will be justified, and by your words you will be condemned.

This ῥῆμα ἀργὸν seems insignificant to the speaker “except for [its] revealing what is in the heart.”¹⁷⁵ In essence, Jesus is giving the leaders a chance to recant; the Pharisees can properly and genuinely respond to Jesus’ Spirit-inspired acts with awe and repentance, or they can speak a “careless word,” seal their blasphemy, and accept the consequent, inescapable judgment.

Instead of repenting and believing that Jesus derived his authority to do miracles and exorcisms from the Spirit’s anointing, the Pharisees and scribes asked for yet another portent of Jesus Spirit-empowerment:

Certain of the scribes and Pharisees replied (ἀπεκρίθησαν)¹⁷⁶ to him, saying, “Teacher, we wish to see a sign from you” (12.38).

A “sign” was often a miraculous event that was intended to support the validity of a prophecy; it was, therefore, an “authenticating miracle” or “proof . . . of divine activity.”¹⁷⁷ The authorities wanted Jesus to perform a sign in their presence to verify immediately that his power was derived from the Spirit. But, as M. D. Hooker has noted, “For those with faith, miracles *are* signs of God’s activity.”¹⁷⁸ That is, they had already seen Jesus act by the “Spirit of God” and, therefore, if they had believed, there would have been no need for another sign. Since the presence of the Spirit in Jesus’ works could not be disputed, the careless speech of the Pharisees revealed the hardened and unenlightened nature of their hearts (cf. 11.25-27). By not

175. Carson, *Matthew*, 1:293.

176. Carson suggests that ἀπεκρίθησαν may be taken to imply that the Pharisees and scribes were replying to Jesus’ warning about a “careless word.” But he asserts that the verb “does not always have its full strength in Matthew (see on 11:25); so it seems best not to insist on the continuance of the controversy” (Carson, *Matthew*, 1:294). Although a break in the text between 12.37 and 12.38 is possible, ἀπεκρίθησαν permits the connection with the previous controversy, and the “careless” but revealing words of the Jewish leaders for a sign makes the connection plausible (cf. 12.36, 38). Additionally, Matthew 12:38-42 is initiated with τότε, which is used in the First Gospel “as a signal of marked continuity” similar to καί (Black, “How Matthew Tells the Story,” 37; cf. *idem*, *Sentence Conjunctions*, 245-53). Therefore, 12.33-37 is not a general concluding statement concerning the wickedness of the religious officials; it connects the account of the Pharisees potential blasphemy of the Spirit with the subsequent request for a sign.

177. Hooker, *Signs*, 5. For the function of signs, see 1 Sam 2.34; 1 Kgs 20.13-14; Isa 7.10-25; b. *Sanh.* 98a.

178. Hooker, *Signs*, 18.

recognizing the Spirit's power and by asking for yet another sign, the Jewish leaders committed unforgivable blasphemy.

Because their request revealed their status as “bad trees” that can only produce “bad fruit” (12.33), Jesus offered this “evil and adulterous generation” (cf. Isa 57.3)¹⁷⁹ a sign they did not expect: the “sign of prophet Jonah” (12.39). This portent functioned as a testament to their divine condemnation and imminent destruction:

For just as Jonah was in the belly of the sea creature three days and three nights, so too will the Son of Man be in the heart of the earth three days and three nights (12.40).

According to Lk 11:29-32, the “sign of Jonah” was the Son of Man himself: “For just as Jonah became a sign to the people of Nineveh, so will the Son of Man be to this generation” (Lk 11.30). Each functioned as a “sign” to their respective audience, though the Lukan account is vague concerning the way or ways in which they were perceived as “signs.” However, the Matthean account is clear: the Son of Man is not the sign; rather, his return from τῆ καρδίᾳ τῆς γῆς, i.e., a tomb or dug grave, is a sign to “this generation” of Jesus’ vindication and the inevitability of divine reprisal. That is, Jonah’s preservation by God in the sea creature *despite his disobedience* was a sign to the Assyrians that God was willing to remove the threat of judgment if repentance was shown. In a similar, but reversed manner, Jesus’ preservation by God in death *because of his innocence* will be a sign to the Pharisees that God’s offer to accept their repentance has been withdrawn.¹⁸⁰ Jesus’ prophetic sign-act assured the religious officials that people outside the Mosaic covenant, such as the men of Nineveh (12.41) or the Queen of Sheba (12.42), may be forgiven, but their “careless word” spoken against the Spirit (12.31-32) guarantees their eternal punishment (cf. 12.32).

To further stress the depravity of “this generation,” Jesus turns the tables on the leaders, who formerly claimed that he was in league with Satan. He asserts that “this generation” is like a man who was occupied by one evil spirit, but is now possessed by seven additional spirits, each more wicked than the first (ἑπτὰ ἕτερα πνεύματα πονηρότερα ἑαυτοῦ [12.43-45]). This progression from minor to greater

179. Carson writes, “‘Adultery’ was frequently used by the OT prophets to describe the spiritual prostitution and wanton apostasy of Israel (Isa 50:1; 57:3; Jer 3:8; 13:27; 31:32; Ezek 16:15, 32, 35-42; Hos 2:1-7; 3.1 et al.)” (*Matthew*, 1:295).

180. E. H. Merrill, “The Sign of Jonah,” *JETS* 23 (1980): 23-30.

possession may have been meant to emphasize the corruption of “this generation” as compared to former generations of God’s people (cf. 23.29-32, 35-36; 27.25). The crimes against God and humanity that brought divine wrath against the generation in the wilderness, the generation that faced the Assyrian deportation, or the generation that endured the exile to Babylon, pale in significance to the iniquities sown by τῆ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ τῆ πονηρᾷ (12.45 [cf. 23.29-32, 35-36]).

Once the religious leaders blasphemed the Spirit and, thereby, expressed their allegiance to ὁ πονηρὸς (cf. 6.13; 13.19, 38), Jesus began to speak in private about the place of the kingdom community amidst a spiritually war-torn world. Similar to anti-social idiosyncrasies exhibited by the prophets of old, Jesus rejected the place of the family, a sacred institution to the Jews. Instead, he elevated the relationships forged by one’s religious convictions over all other social interactions. Jesus abandoned earthly familial connections for a heavenly kinship based on enacting the will of the Father (12.48-50). Discussion of this spiritual family provided the segue from the conflict with the religious leaders to the Parables of the Growing Kingdom (13.3-52).

3.7.3—Summary and Conclusion

The direct conflict between Jesus and the religious leaders has come to a head in just a few short chapters. The scribes and the Pharisees progressed from simply misunderstanding Jesus’ mission (8.19-20) and making secret charges of blasphemy (9.3 [note: ἐν ἑαυτοῖς]), to enacting a plot “to destroy” Jesus (12.14) by defaming his character and denying his Spirit-empowered ministry (12.24; cf. 9.34; 10.25). In doing so, the religious leaders committed the very blasphemy for which they charged Jesus (9.3), the same covenantal transgression for which the Sanhedrin will condemn Jesus to death (26.65).

According to the evangelist, by asking for yet another sign of Jesus’ Spirit-enabled mission, the Jewish officials proved themselves to be unfruitful trees, worthy of the fire (12.33-37; cf. 3.7-12). For their blasphemy Jesus promised only the “sign of the prophet Jonah”—the Son of Man’s death and resurrection (12.39-40). His revivification after “three days and three nights” (12.40) was meant to function as a prophetic sign-act that confirmed that Jesus possessed God’s favor, to the religious leaders’ shame. Through a “careless word” for another sign-act (12.36-37) the Jewish authorities had condemned themselves to destruction (12.41-42; cf. 27.25).

Ironically, the leaders will eventually attempt to conceal the very sign for which they asked (cf. 27.62-66; 28.11-15).¹⁸¹

Once again Jesus has used “Son of Man” of himself in the context of conflict, whence his prophetic mission is denounced and his prophetic prerogatives are exercised. Although healing the mute (12.22) was not mentioned in 11.5 or Isaiah’s description of blessings that will accompany the messianic Jubilee, the anointed prophet of LXX Isa 61.1 is said to come for the purpose of τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν (“restoring sight to the blind” [cf. 12.22]). But not only do his actions confirm his prophetic commissioning, the prediction of his resurrection (12.39-40)—a prophetic sign-act—and his proclamation of eschatological judgment (12.41-42) reaffirm his standing as the prophet of God. Thus, the early “Son of Man” sayings time-and-again portray the Son of Man as an authoritative figure: one who has been sent by God to announce the coming of the kingdom and to prophesy God’s wrath for all those who continue in their unrighteousness. But, as will be demonstrated below, Jesus does not merely announce the kingdom’s presence; in the narrative-future he will reign over the kingdom and establish the kingdom community by right of his status as the authoritative, exalted Son of Man.

—Matthew 13.37, 41—

At the very center of the eight-parable¹⁸² Kingdom Discourse (13.3-52) lies the private explanation of the Parable of the Tares (13.36-43), conspicuously separated from its public counterpart (13.24-30). It is unlikely that the uniquely Matthean parable or corresponding interpretation originated with Jesus. Various scholars have suggested that Matthew or a member of his community based the parable on the Parable of the Growing Seed (Mk 4.26-29),¹⁸³ with the possible influence of John the Baptist’s reference to the eschatological harvest (Mt 3.12/Lk 3.17).¹⁸⁴ The former is suggested by the replacement of the Parable of the Growing Seed with the

181. Garland, *Reading Matthew*, 142.

182. D. Wenham, “The Structure of Matthew XIII,” *NTS* 25 (1978-79): 516-22; cf. Lohmeyer, *Matthäus*, 190-91. B. Gerhardsson argued unconvincingly that there are seven parables in the discourse (“The Seven Parables in Matthew XIII,” *NTS* 19 [1972-73]: 16-37).

183. Jülicher, *Gleichnisreden*, 2:562-63; Gundry, *Matthew*, 276; Senior, *Matthew*, 153; Hultgren, *Parables*, 294.

184. D. R. Catchpole, “John the Baptist, Jesus and the Parable of the Tares,” *SJTh* 31 (1978): 557-70.

Parable of the Tares in Mk's sequence and the extensive shared vocabulary.¹⁸⁵ The exposition on the Parable of the Tares is more surely a Matthean creation than the parable, containing thirty-seven terms common in Matthew's gospel,¹⁸⁶ as well as an emphasis on the Son of Man as the end-times judge, a characteristic feature of Matthew's eschatology (cf. 16.27; 19.28; 25.31-46). Hence, the parable and its allegorical interpretation are distinctive expressions of Matthew's eschatology and christology.

Contained in the explanation are two occurrences of the title "Son of Man" (13.37, 41), the only two christological terms in the discourse. The exposition is the only portion of the Kingdom Discourse to spotlight the role of Jesus in the establishment and advancement of the kingdom and people of God. This may explain why Jesus' allegorical key has been placed at the apex of the chiasm imposed on the discourse by Matthew,¹⁸⁷ as well as why the discourse has been made void of other titles: Matthew desired to place emphasis on the "Son of Man" concept.¹⁸⁸ One can only discover if this suggestion bears weight after an examination of 13.36-43, and even then, it remains speculative. But, at the very least, the placement of the dialogue evinces its importance among the accounts preserved in 13.3-52.

The explanation of the Parable of the Tares reads as follows:

Then he [i.e., Jesus] left the crowd and entered the house. And his disciples came to him, saying, "Explain to us the parable of the tares of the field." He answered, "The sower of the good seed is the Son of Man, the field is the world, and the good seed is the sons of the kingdom. The tares are the sons of the evil one; the enemy who sowed them was the devil. The harvest is the end of the age, and the harvesters are the angels. Therefore, just as

185. Cf. Hultgren, *Parables*, 294.

186. Jeremias, *Parables*, 81.

187. Wenham suggested cogently that the discourse follows a redactor-imposed chiasmic structure ("Structure," 516-22; cf. Carson and Moo, *Introduction*, 139-40):

- a) Parable of the Sower (those who here the word of the kingdom);
- b) Disciples' question and Jesus' answer;
- c) Interpretation of the Parable of the Sower;
- d) Parable of the Wheat and the Tares (contrasting good and evil);
- e) Two parables: Parables of the Mustard Seed and Leaven;
- f) Conclusion of the previous section and the explanation of the Parable of the Wheat and the Tares;
- e) Two Parables: Parables of the Treasure and the Pearl;
- d) Parable of the Dragnet (contrasting good and evil);
- c) Interpretation of the Parable of the Dragnet;
- b) Jesus' question and the disciples' answer;
- a) Parable of the Trained Scribe (those trained for the kingdom).

188. Chiasms were often used to highlight the emphasis of a passage by placing the main point at the center (R. Man, "The Value of Chiasm for New Testament Interpretation," *BSac* 141 [1984]: 146-57 [148-49]).

weeds are gathered and consumed by fire, so will it be at the end of the age: the Son of Man will send out his angels, and they will gather out of his kingdom all causes of offense and all those who practice lawlessness, and will throw them into a furnace of fire. In the fire there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth. Then the righteous will shine like the sun in the kingdom of their Father. He who has ears let him hear.”

It is herein maintained that this private exposition on the Parable of the Tares marks the withdrawal of revelation from the ears of “this generation,” as well as foreshadows its loss of the kingdom to new sons whom the Son of Man will cultivate among the nations. It is in this passage that the reader receives his or her first unambiguous look into both the post-exaltation mission and the eschatological role of the Son of Man. It is also the first time that the reader is informed of how the Son of Man’s role will evolve from primary participant in conflict to resolver of conflict.

3.8.2—Rejection and Revelation in Jesus’ Exposition on the Parable of the Tares

In 13.36 Jesus re-entered “the house” he left after his conflict with the religious leaders (cf. 13.1). The remainder of the discourse is comprised of private dialogue (13.36-52). His retreat into the house, however, does not mark the beginning of Jesus’ exclusive interaction with his disciples in this discourse; Jesus’ apology for the use of parabolic speech and the explanation of the Parable of the Sower (13.10-23) had been spoken in private. The negative manner in which Jesus referred to the crowds (cf. 13.11-17) supports this conclusion, as does the disciples’ question, “Why do you speak to the people in parables?” (cf. 13.10), which gives the impression the crowds were not present. Therefore, it is not merely Jesus’ explanation of the Parable of the Tares that is given in private; all of Jesus’ expositions on “things hidden from the creation of the world” (13.35; cf. Ps 78.2) are given in seclusion, with his disciples alone.

J. Jeremias argued that Jesus used parables to enlighten the crowds, not to conceal information so that they might remain in their hardness of heart.¹⁸⁹ But as others have appropriately recognized,¹⁹⁰ Jeremias’ theory does not adhere to the simple reading of 13.10-17, especially 13.10-12:

189. Jeremias, *Parables*, 13-14.

190. Cf. J. D. Kingsbury, *The Parables of Jesus in Matthew Thirteen* (London: SPCK, 1969), 48-49; B. Van Elderen, “The Purpose of the Parables According to Matthew 13:10-17,” in R. N. Longenecker and M. C. Tenney (eds.), *New Dimensions in New Testament Study* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974), 188.

The disciples came to him and said, “Why do you speak to them [i.e., the crowd] in parables?” He answered them, “To you has been given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it has not been given. Whoever has will be given more, and he will have an abundance. Whoever does not have, even what he does have will be taken away from him.”

The introduction of parabolic dialogue, as well as the confidential bestowal of revelation, function as acts of judgment against outsiders. Jesus herein is depicted by Matthew as withdrawing revelation from the religious leaders and the crowds due to their unbelief and blasphemy (cf. 11.16-30; 12.30-32, 39-45). They are the “wise” from whom the Father has “hidden these things” (11.25); now the Son has chosen to reveal the “hidden things” (13.35; cf. 11.27) to the “little children” (11.25, 27). “This wicked and adulterous generation” (cf. 11.16; 12.39-42, 45), according to the evangelist’s portrayal, has exhibited a hardened, dull heart, commensurate with that expressed by the nation of Israel at the time of Isaiah’s prophetic ministry (cf. 13.14-15; Isa 6.9-10). But the disciples have ears to hear and eyes to see the revelation of God (cf. 13.16, 43); those things that have been hidden from the prophets and righteous men of old are given to the members of the kingdom community as an act of blessing (13.17). Only they will be made privy to the foreordained plans of the Father for the Son of Man and his Church. Therefore, conflict and judgment are themes that pervade the discourse, affecting it on both a structural and theological level.

But this theme of rejection and revelation extends past the bounds of the Kingdom Parables, having lasting ramifications for the Matthean “Son of Man” sayings. Accompanying the discontinuation of revelation in Mt 13 is the disappearance of “Son of Man” from Jesus’ public discourse. In the second half of the gospel “Son of Man” is used by Jesus almost exclusively in private predictions of his passion and resurrection, his exaltation, or his *Parousia*. That is, “Son of Man” is employed primarily where Jesus reveals to insiders his future roles as prophetic sufferer and cosmic suzerain. It will not be until the last “Son of Man” saying in 26.64 that “Son of Man” appears again in public discourse. Like the private “Son of Man” sayings, Jesus’ declaration in 26.64 is revelatory; but like the public sayings, conflict and condemnation, rather than revelation, are emphasized. Jesus discloses that he will soon be seen as the enthroned and authoritative Danielic “one like a son of man” by members of the Sanhedrin. This glorified status testifies to the vindication of the Son of Man and the divine repudiation of “this generation.” Thus, “Son of

Man,” and the revelations that accompany the title, are henceforward reserved primarily for Jesus’ core disciples.

3.8.3—The Son of Man, His Kingdom, and the “sons of the kingdom”

The kingdom that the Son of Man has received is not the Church, as has occasionally been suggested.¹⁹¹ The kingdom of the Son of Man is “the field,” identified earlier as “the world” (13.38).¹⁹² It is a *corpus mixtum* of the “sons of the kingdom” (13.38), who have been sown by the Son of Man (13.37), and the “sons of the evil one,” who have been sown by Satan (13.38-39). “Kingdom” is predominately used in a spacial sense, referring to a realm or region, as in the phrase “kingdom of heaven.”¹⁹³ But “kingdom” can also be used to portray the action of ruling. As with “kingdom of God,” “kingdom of the Son of Man” retains a sense of governance; the “kingdom of the Son of Man,” i.e., the world, is the realm over which Jesus has authority. Just as in Daniel’s night vision, at his exaltation before the Father the Son of Man receives πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς κατὰ γένη (OG Dan 7.14).¹⁹⁴

Matthew is the only evangelist to assign the kingdom of God/the Father (cf. 13.43) to the Son of Man (cf. 16.28; 20.21). The Son of Man’s right to rule over the kingdom, as well as his command over the angels (cf. 13.41; 16.28; 24.31), has possibly been derived by Matthew from his reflection on OG Dan 7.13-14, which was examined briefly in the previous chapter. The correlations between the two texts are primarily thematic; though, one could argue cogently that there is a verbal connection between ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (Mt 13.37, 41) and υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου (OG Dan 7.13). In Old Greek Dan, Yahweh possesses an everlasting kingdom (2.44; 3.33; 6.27) which he presumably shares with the human-like one (7.14; cf. 4.32). Likewise, the Son of Man in Mt is in possession of a kingdom (13.41) that he too shares with

191. Bornkamm, “End-Expectation,” 19; Hultgren, *Parables*, 299.

192. Cf. Luz, *Matthew*, 2:269.

193. J. T. Pennington, *Heaven and Earth in the Gospel of Matthew: Matthew’s ‘Kingdom of Heaven’* (NovTSup 126. Leiden: Brill, 2007), 284-85.

194. The term “kingdom of heaven” does not appear anywhere before Mt, and few early Christian authors used the phrase after Matthew disseminated his gospel. There is not the space here to discuss whether or not Matthew’s concept of the kingdom, like his “Son of Man” concept, has been derived from Dan 2-7. But Wenham, Evans, and most recently Pennington have convincingly argued that Matthew’s conceptions of both “kingdom” and “heaven” have been derived from Dan (D. Wenham, “The Kingdom of God and Daniel,” *ExpTim* 98 [1987]: 132-34; C. A. Evans, “Daniel in the New Testament: Visions of God’s Kingdom,” in J. J. Collins and P. W. Flint (eds.), *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* [Leiden: Brill, 2001], 2:490-527; Pennington, *Heaven and Earth*, 285-93).

the Father (13.43). Probably a consequence of this cosmic sovereignty, the exalted figures of both passages also have dominion over the angelic hosts (OG Dan 7.13; Mt 13.41). When it is taken into account that Matthew specifically cites the Greek version of Dan 7.13-14 twice (cf. 24.30; 26.64) and alludes to it in as many as five other eschatologically-rich pericopae (cf. 13.41; 16.27-28; 19.28; 24.30-31; 25.31; 28.18-20), an allusion to the Danielic night-vision in the present text—Mt 13.37-43—becomes all the more likely.

The identification of an allusion is significant not only for the similarities between the texts but also the notable differences. Old Greek Dan 7.27-28a states that immediately after the judgment of the nations who persecute the “saints of the Most High”—i.e., the suffering Israelites—they will be blessed through the exaltation of their heavenly representative, the “son of man”:

And he will give to the holy people of the Most High the kingdom and authority and the majesty of all the rulers of the kingdoms under heaven, to reign over an everlasting kingdom. And all authorities will be subject to him and will obey him until the destruction of the word (ἕως καταστροφῆς τοῦ λόγου).

Hence, the Israelites, who are being persecuted on earth, are promised exaltation for their sufferings, which they will receive through the elevation of the “son of man,” to whom all peoples are subject (cf. 7.13-14). That is, the blessings of the human-like one are not simply his own but are shared with his people. It is through him that they will be glorified. In a similar manner, the Son of Man of the Parable of the Tares uses his authority to remove all evildoers from his kingdom (13.41-42) so that he might preserve and glorify his “sons” (13.43). But in Mt, the Son of Man’s people are not the Israelites, and his enemies are not the kingdoms of the world. There has, perhaps, been a reversal of the Danielic account. The exposition on the Parable of the Tares uniquely ascribes to the Son of Man a ministry between his exaltation and the *Parousia* (13.37-38).¹⁹⁵ The Son of Man is the one who sows the “sons of the kingdom” in the field of “the world” (13.38). This global focus assumes that Gentiles and repentant Jews will be the new people of God. These people will constitute the new group of stewards placed in charge of the Son of Man’s kingdom on earth (cf. 21.43; 24.31; 28.18-20). They are the replacement of the old “sons of the kingdom” (cf. 21.43)—the faithless from among the Israelites—who will be cast into outer darkness (8.12 [the designation is only used twice in the New Testa-

195. Cf. Kingsbury, “Son of Man,” 196.

ment]) after many are gathered “from the east to the west” into “the kingdom of heaven” (8.11). According to Matthew, then, the persecuted saints are men and women from among “all the nations” (cf. 24.14; 28.19), whereas the persecutors are primarily unrepentant, unbelieving Jews. This turns the account of the beasts and the saints in Old Greek Dan 7 on its head. Matthew 13.38-43 does not contain a straightforward allusion to the prophecy in Dan. Rather, Matthew has altered the prophecy to convey to his ideal audience that the Son of Man represents new “sons of the kingdom” because the old “sons” had rebelled.

As was previously mentioned, since the kingdom belongs to the Son of Man, it is his duty to purify it of “all causes of offense and all those who practice lawlessness” (13.41). This certainly refers to the “sons of the evil one” (13.38; cf. Dan 7.11; Zeph 3.8; Mal 3.2; 4.1; *1 En* 54.6; Mt 3.10, 12; 7.19; 25.41, 46), but it is unclear if Satan and his angelic minions are among those thrown into the “fiery furnace” (13.42).¹⁹⁶ The gospel never presents a clear account of Satan’s destruction. Even at the Eschatological Assize, the Adversary lurks in the background. But his destruction, and that of his angels, is implied in the sentencing of the wicked in 25.41: “Depart from me, you who are cursed, into the eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels” (cf. *1QM* 13.11-12; 15.13-14; 2 Pet. 2.4; *4 Ezra* 8.59-60). Hence, Matthew is unique in describing the Son of Man as the initiator of the eschatological harvest (cf. Jer 51.33; Joel 3.13; *2 Bar* 70.2), the moment at which the kingdom community will experience reward for their sufferings and the definitive end to conflict.

After the Son of Man has purified his kingdom, 13.43 states, “Then the righteous will shine like the sun in the kingdom of their Father” (cf. LXX Dan 12.3). The kingdom of the Son of Man should not be considered a different kingdom than that which is said to belong to his Father (13.43). Matthew does not envisage, as Paul does, the Father’s reception of the Son of Man’s supposedly eternal reign, thereby reversing the prediction of OG Dan 7.14 (cf. 1 Cor. 15.23-28).¹⁹⁷ The Son of

196. The Son of Man’s lordship over the angelic hosts at the eschaton and the term “fiery furnace” or “furnace of fire” do not confirm that Mt is literarily dependent on the *Parables of Enoch* (cf. *1 En* 54.6). The concept of one being destroyed in a “fiery furnace” is found in OG Dan—ἐμβαλοῦσιν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν κάμινον τοῦ πυρός (Dan 3.6)/βαλοῦσιν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν κάμινον τοῦ πυρός (Mt 13.42)—as well as in *4 Ezra* 7.36, which was written around the time Mt was composed. Additionally, as has been suggested in the text above, the Son of Man’s control over the angels has probably been influenced by OG Dan 7.13. Hence, there is no need for the *Similitudes* to function as an intermediary text.

197. G. W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, (Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 85.

Man's rule is not temporary; he does not relinquish his authority to the Father after the realm he formerly controlled is cleansed.¹⁹⁸ The "kingdom of the Son of Man" and the "kingdom of the Father" are one in the same.¹⁹⁹ This variation was likely meant to identify the Son of Man as co-regent of the kingdom with the Father, as opposed to distinguishing the eras of their respective reigns. This is why the Son of Man can rightfully be called the "King" over "the kingdom prepared for you [i.e., the elect] since the foundation of the world" (25.34; cf. 25.40).

3.8.4— Summary and Conclusion

It is not coincidental that the Kingdom Discourse, with its focus on the kingdom's advancement against the onslaught of human and supernatural σκάνδαλα (13.41), is placed after the bitter conflict of Mt 11-12. Just as Jesus was prompted to form the "Twelve" (cf. 10.2-4) when he saw the physical (cf. 9.35, 37; 10.1) and spiritual (cf. 9.35, 37) helplessness of the crowd, Jesus is motivated to detail the formation of the kingdom in response to his being rejected by the religious leaders (e.g., 12.14, 24) and citizens of Northern Galilee (cf. 11.16-24).

The rejection, though, is reciprocal. In an act of repudiation, Jesus began to speak parabolically to outsiders so that they might remain in their ignorance and experience the consequent punishment. The disciples, on the other hand, are not kept in the dark. They are told that it is the Son of Man, the very person the religious leaders have sought to destroy, who will stand as the leader of the Church and the judge of the wicked. According to Matthew, "this generation" has persecuted Jesus and will wrongfully execute him; but his will be the victory. Though he is embroiled in conflict that will culminate in the cross, he will return to bring an end to the conflict he had a hand in starting.

Therefore, the explanation of the Parable of the Tares can be considered both a word of comfort and a stern warning to the hearers. It surely comforted Matthew's community to know that the Son of Man goes before it in its mission to the nations and will punish those who impede the kingdom's progress. But the theme of judgment warns those who read that whoever does not ally with the Son

198. Cf. Luz, *Matthew*, 2:269-70; Nolland, *Matthew*, 561-62.

199. D. A. Hagner, "Matthew's Parables of the Kingdom (Matthew 13:1-52)," in R. N. Longenecker (ed.), *The Challenge of Jesus' Parables* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 102-24 (112).

of Man—Jew or Gentile—will be gathered by his angels and destroyed at the end of the age. By one’s actions, either practicing evil or doing good, one identifies himself or herself as allied with either Satan or the Son of Man.

—Conclusion—

Although the claim that many Jews in the Second Temple period believed that prophecy had ceased has largely been abandoned by modern scholars, it does appear that Jews of this period held “a nostalgic belief that there were no longer any prophets like the prophets of old.”²⁰⁰ That is, there were no longer any prophets recording the authoritative word of the Lord; but that is not to say that prophets were not expected to return.²⁰¹ First Maccabees 4.46 states that Judas and his men stored the stones of the torn down alter “until a prophet should come to tell what to do with them.” Additionally, the Qumran community expected a prophet to accompany two messianic figures at the end of the age (cf. 1QS 9.11). The repeated postulations that Jesus or John was Elijah *reditus*²⁰² imply that the expectance of an end-times prophet was widespread among Jews in the early first century CE.²⁰³ The respective ministries of John and Jesus, cast in the same mold as the prophets of old, would have identified them naturally as prophets widely expected to arise before the eschaton.

It is not simply for the sake of the plot’s progression that the Son of Man engages the religious leaders. This is without nuance. The reason the Son of Man is portrayed as being in conflict with the religious leaders and crowds is because both groups did not believe in the Son of Man’s prophetic commissioning. Additionally, the former group was presumably threatened by the crowd’s initial acceptance of the Son of Man (cf. 7.29; 8.19-20; 9.8) and by his authority in matters of the Law (cf. 7.29; 12.8). “This generation” refused to listen to the Son of Man’s prophetic procla-

200. Hooker, *Signs*, 6.

201. Cf. Deut 18.15-18; Mal 3.1-5; 4.5; Sir 48.10; 1QS 9.11; 4Q175; Jn 1.45.

202. C. E. Joynes rightly highlighted that it is technically incorrect to use “*redivivus*” to refer to Elijah’s advent. He is thought to have “returned” not “resurrected” (“A Question of Identity: ‘Who Do People Say that I Am?’: Elijah, John the Baptist and Jesus in Mark’s Gospel,” in C. Rowland and C. H. T. Fletcher-Louis [eds.], *Understanding, Studying and Reading: New Testament Essays in Honour of John Aston* [JSNTSup 153. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998], 15-29 [16-17]).

203. Cf. Mt 11.14; 16.14; 27.47; Mk 6.15; 8.28; Lk 1.17; 4.25-26; 9.8; Jn 1.21, 25. See also, Mt 17.3, 10-12; 27.49; Mk 9.4-5, 11-13; 15.35-36; Lk 9.30, 33.

mation of the gospel of the kingdom in word and deed (cf. 4.23-24; 9.35; 10.1; 11.4-5; 12.28). Therefore, Jesus began to foreshadow the Son of Man's appointment of new "sons of the kingdom"—a collective that was to span the world over and include both Jews and Gentiles (cf. 8.11-12; 13.37-38).

This pattern explains why ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is absent in Mt's earliest chapters (cf. Mt 5.11/Lk 6.22): the title could not have appeared earlier than 8.18-22 since direct confrontation between Jesus and the religious officials did not begin until that pericope. Consequently, Kingsbury's conclusion that this delayed introduction signaled the secondary importance of "Son of Man," compared to, for example, υἱὸς θεοῦ and υἱὸς Δαβίδ,²⁰⁴ is flawed. The timing of the title's appearance was necessitated by the context. Further, although it is true that Jesus is shown to be the Davidic Messiah throughout Mt 1-4, it is unwarranted to posit that all one needs to know about Jesus is contained in the first four chapters. Since, without doubt, Jesus is the most developed round character of the Matthean narrative, one should expect the identity of Jesus to be revealed steadily throughout the whole course of the gospel. The delayed appearance of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in the Matthean narrative, therefore, should not be perceived as detracting from its significance to the evangelist and his readers.

As an immediate act of judgment, Jesus withdraws the title "Son of Man," and the revelation that accompanies it, from outsiders. Only the disciples will be blessed with the knowledge of the sufferings of the prophetic Son of Man, his exaltation to the right hand of God, and his return to purify his kingdom. The Sanhedrin will be made aware of the Son of Man's future triumph in 26.64. But this revelation is not given as a blessing but as a curse; the judgment of God that is alluded to in the saying is inevitable. The religious officials and those who side with them will see the Son of Man enthroned at the right hand of Power and coming on the clouds of heaven to the Ancient of Days (cf. 24.29-30). But the Son of Man's approach to the Father is to receive the dominion that the representatives of Israel forfeited because they opposed Jesus and remained unmoved by his message (cf. 21.43).

204. Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story*, 98.

Chapter Four

Conflict, Conflict Resolution, and the Son of Man in Matthew 16-26

—Introduction—

It was mentioned in the introduction that the essence of Matthew's plot is conflict. Conflict drives the narrative forward and creates anticipation for resolution. In the previous chapter, the "Son of Man" sayings from Mt 8-13 were examined for the purpose of determining

- a) how each saying contributes to the evolving Matthean "Son of Man" concept;
- b) how this concept relates to the unfolding conflict between Jesus and those allied with Satan; and,
- c) how the "Son of Man" concept is relevant to the eventual resolution of conflict.

The chapter recorded that whether in sayings that describe the Son of Man's ministry in the narrative-now or in those that speak of his post-exaltation mission, the Son of Man is described either as a prophet embroiled in conflict or an exalted figure who will resolve conflict.

The "Son of Man" sayings of Mt 8-13 are, therefore, not a heterogeneous mixture of statements concerning such things as Jesus' humble servanthood, extraordinary authority, Spirit-empowerment, or future judgment, that can only loosely be placed in the categories of "earthly" and "future" sayings. Matthean redaction has woven the "Son of Man" sayings into a grand tapestry of meaning, sewn into the evolving conflict with "this generation." For Matthew, Jesus was sent as the prophet of God to urge Israel's repentance and restoration (cf. 4.17, 23-25; 9.35-37). Yet, because of the wickedness of heart and constant doubt of the crowd and their leaders (cf. 9.3, 34; 10.25; 11.16-24; 12.14, 24, 33-45; 13.10-23, 38-39, 41-42), the Son of Man turned away from "this generation" and began to prophesy the future establishment of new "sons of the kingdom" (cf. 8.12; 13.37-38; 21.43). This judgmental rejection was expressed most pointedly through Jesus' withdrawal of revelation from those outside his band of disciples by means of both his employment of parabolic discourse and his elimination of "Son of Man" from public dialogue. Jesus revealed only to his "family" (cf. 12.46-50) that the Son of Man is not only an eschatological prophet but is also the eschatological judge, who will return at the end of the age in the power and glory of his Father to purify his kingdom and glorify the righteous (cf. 13.41-43). That is, the Son of Man will one day resolve the conflict in which he has participated from its beginning (cf. 4.1-11; 8.19-20).

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the private “Son of Man” sayings of Mt 16-26, concluding on the last “Son of Man” saying in the gospel: Jesus’ public declaration that he will soon be seen as the exalted Son of Man (26.64). It remains the focus of this study to examine the sayings chronologically to determine a), b), and c) as listed above.

Since the “Son of Man” sayings in the second half of the gospel are mostly revelatory, emphasis is balanced between predictions of conflict’s climax and of the Son of Man’s participation in said conflict’s resolution. This study will attempt to demonstrate that conflict culminates in the Son of Man’s death on the cross, but that conflict resolution comes in stages. It has commonly been assumed that the resurrection is the resolution to conflict. However, according to the Matthean gospel, the alleviation of tensions does not occur within the bounds of the narrative itself. The resurrection marks the fulfillment of the “sign of Jonah” (12.39-40; 16.4), which is not the anticipated resolution, but rather a portent of Jesus’ vindication and of the impending judgment of “this generation.” That is, the “sign of Jonah” vindicates the Son of Man, but it does not end conflict since his enemies have not been destroyed; Satan and his “sons” continue to oppress the Son of Man’s “sons of the kingdom” (cf. 10.16-23; 13.38-39; 16.18; 23.33-35; 24.9-13; 28.15).

In stories that center on a hero who has suffered egregious abuses at the hands of his or her enemy or enemies, one expects that the antagonist will experience reprisal, thereby resolving conflict. Those readers who anticipate divine retaliation against Jesus’ enemies find a satisfactory account in Mt. “This wicked and adulterous generation” is promised a bitter fate in the 70 CE destruction of Jerusalem. Matthew suggests that it is at this moment that stewardship over the kingdom is removed from the people of Israel and given to the Son of Man on behalf of a new people. Based on the Son of Man’s exaltation in 70 CE, the Matthean community assures itself that Jesus will return at the eschaton to end conflict *permanently* by means of swift and violent justice. Therefore, conflict has not been resolved simply through God’s act of resurrecting Jesus, nor is tension alleviated by means of negotiation or diplomacy. According to Matthew, peace, the ultimate alleviation of tension, is found only through the radical annihilation of God’s enemies—that is, unbelieving and unrepentant humans, Satan, and his angels—at the hands of the Son of Man.

4.1.2—Prospectus

This study will start with an exegesis of Mt 16.13 and its context before proceeding chronologically through each of the “Son of Man” sayings until 26.64. As can be seen from the following table, the “Son of Man” sayings after 16.13 fall into four units. Each collection of sayings will be handled as a unit. At the end of this chapter, what evidence has been garnered from an exegesis of the “Son of Man” sayings in Mt 16-26 will be summarized and basic conclusions will be drawn.

<i>Exaltation</i>	<i>Death and Resurrection</i>
Matthew 16.27, 28	
	Matthew 17.9, 12; 22-23
Matthew 19.28	
	Matthew 20.18-19, 28
Matthew 24.27, 30, 37, 39, 44; 25.31	
	Matthew 26.2, 23, 24, 45
Matthew 26.64	

—Matthew 16.13—

Matthew 16.13 states,

When Jesus came into the district of Caesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, “Who do men say the Son of Man is?” And they said to him, “Some say John the Baptist, others say Elijah, and others say Jeremiah or one of the prophets.”

This saying has received a great deal of attention as it is associated with the Matthean form of the Petrine confession of Jesus’ messiahship. Yet, for all the attention it has received, not much has been said about its place in the evolving “Son of Man” concept. In this section, it will be uniquely proposed that this “Son of Man” saying and the response of the disciples together act as a pivot point for the Matthean “Son of Man” concept and the ongoing theme of conflict. This saying simultaneously alludes back to the polemical interactions Jesus had with the religious leaders and crowds in the narrative-past and points forward to the conflict that will culminate in Jesus’ passion, as well as to the Son of Man’s resolution of conflict in the narrative-future.

4.2.2—Matthew 16.13 in Its Broader Context

After the dual use of “Son of Man” in the explanation of the Parable of the Tares (13.36-43), the title “Son of Man” is markedly absent until 16.13. As was mentioned in the previous chapter, Jesus withdrew “Son of Man” and the revelation associated with the term from “this generation” due to their doubt and impenitence (cf. 11.16-24; 12.22-45). This subtle sign of rejection foreshadows the greater condemnation that they will experience in the future. Since the first half of the Fourth Narrative is concerned with Jesus’ public interactions, “Son of Man” is not used. It does not appear again until 16.13, whence Jesus enters the district of Caesarea Philippi and engages his disciples privately.

Before introducing the pericope in which Jesus tests the disciples’ perception of himself and his mission, Matthew removes the Markan account of Jesus’ healing of the blind man (cf. Mk 8.22-26). This omission serves two purposes. First, it eliminates an awkward and perhaps embarrassing healing story that describes Jesus having to heal a man in two stages. Second, this alteration brings the two pericopae concerning the *false teachings* of the Pharisees and Sadducees into a position immediately prior to Peter’s confession of Jesus’ *true identity*. Whether coincidental or purposeful, Matthew’s omission of the Markan healing story changes the flow of the narrative, making Mt 16 mirror more closely the process of rejection and revelation seen earlier in 12.38-13.52:

- a) the Pharisees (and Sadducees [cf. 16.1]) ask for a sign, but Jesus declares that, γενεὰ πονηρὰ καὶ μοιχαλὶς σημεῖον ἐπιζητεῖ, καὶ σημεῖον οὐ δοθήσεται αὐτῇ εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ (cf. 12.39/16.4 [12.39 reads, τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ τοῦ προφήτου]);
- b) the request for a portent is followed by an extended rebuke of Jesus’ enemies (cf. 12.43-45/16.5-12);
- c) subsequent to the repudiation of his opponents, Jesus enters into private discourse with his followers, during which revelations concerning christology and ecclesiology are bestowed by the Father or by Jesus (cf. 13.10-23, 36-52/16.13-17.13).

This restructuring of the text highlights the Son of Man’s conflict with “this generation.” The Jewish religious and national leadership have spread false teachings and, thereby, have led astray the people in their care. Therefore, the revelation that Jesus is “the Christ, Son of the living God” (16.16) will not be given to them. The truth that has been hidden from the righteous and the prophets of old will again only be divulged to the disciples in private. This can be considered an act of judgment against the religious leaders, just as it was an act of judgment for Jesus to use the Kingdom Parables to obscure his message in order to guarantee “the people” would remain in their hardness of heart (cf. 13.11-17; LXX Isa 6.9-10). The

“secrets of the kingdom of heaven” have been given to the receptive disciples (cf. 13.11); therefore, even greater knowledge will be given to them exclusively: “to the one who has, more will be given” (13.12).

4.2.3—The Transposition of “Son of Man” from the First Passion Prediction to Matthew 16.13

After alluding back to the “sign of Jonah” pericope and warning his disciples to be wary of the religious leaders’ caustic influence, Jesus asks the disciples, “Who do men say that the Son of Man is?” This reading diverges from the Markan and Lukan readings (cf. Mk 8.27/Lk 9.18) that preserve the first person singular pronoun as opposed to τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. It is highly likely that the Markan form of the question originated earlier. Matthew, rather than create a “Son of Man” saying *ex nihilo*, has moved τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου of the first passion prediction forward to the discourse-initiating inquiry (16.21; cf. Mk 8.31; Lk 9.22).

What “Son of Man” means according to Matthew is still an issue of debate. But whatever the self-designation might mean, it has been used by Jesus from Mt 8 to 12 *in public* when he refers to his prophetic role. Hence, when the disciples are asked what people, i.e., *the public*, think about the Son of Man, it is natural that the term would recall former public interactions where Jesus presented himself as the prophetic Son of Man. This appellation’s prophetic association may, therefore, be the primary, though not sole, reason Matthew moved the term forward.

Jesus’ question was worded to recall his public interactions earlier in the narrative. But the informed reader is made to recall what Jesus revealed about himself as the “Son of Man” in private as well. Matthew had Jesus inform his disciples in the explanation of the Parable of the Tares that the Son of Man will appear at the eschaton to remove from “his kingdom” all sources of unrighteousness and wrongdoing (13.37-43). Therefore, “Son of Man,” by referring to Jesus’ kingship over the Father’s kingdom, has been used in a messianic context prior to 16.13-20. By placing “Son of Man” prior to his question, “Who do you say that I am?” the earlier revelations concerning the Son of Man can be read, and perhaps *should* be read, as influencing Peter’s response.¹ Additionally, the movement of the designation to the

1. Meier, *Vision*, 109.

fore of the conversation suggests that what is about to be revealed in the following dialogue will help to define more exactly the term “Son of Man.”

Matthew’s alteration further implies that τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is on the same plane as ὁ χριστὸς and ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ in terms of importance.² The term gains significance from its early placement and, therefore, should not be overshadowed by other titles that some suggest have greater theological and christological value.³ One, then, should not ignore the position or significance of “Son of Man.” B. Lindars, for example, ignored the transposition of “Son of Man” since he read the term as a mere circumlocution for “I.”⁴ But while Matthew created “Son of Man” sayings (cf. 10.23; 13.37, 41; 16.28; 19.28; 24.30; 25.31; 26.2), only here does he move the title from one position to another. It appears, therefore, that Matthew promoted “Son of Man” in the text for a reason, and, consequently, that “Son of Man,” for Matthew, carries more weight than the first person singular pronoun or “this man.”⁵

4.2.4—“Who do people say the Son of Man is?”: The Son of Man as a Prophet

The reply of the disciples to Jesus’ first inquiry is enlightening but not surprising. Jesus asked the disciples what the crowds say about the Son of Man’s identity, to which his followers answered,

“Some say you are John the Baptist, others say Elijah, and others say Jeremiah or one of the prophets” (16.14).

The concluding statement, ἢ ἕνα τῶν προφητῶν, implies that whatever nuanced connection Jesus has to each of the three aforementioned figures, the common de-

2. It is interesting to note that there are strong ties between “Son of God” and “Son of Man” already in 4Q246 (cf. 1QSa 2:11-12 [cf. R. E. Brown, *Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave* (ABRL 7. New York: Doubleday, 1994), 1:481]).

3. Meier, *Vision*, 109-10; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:617. Kingsbury, for example, placed “Son of God” above the term “Son of Man” in importance (*Matthew as Story*, 102-03). “Son of God” is an incredibly important term in Matthew’s christology, but it is not more or less important than “Son of Man.” Each designation plays a unique role in classifying Jesus and his mission.

4. Lindars, *Son of Man*, 115-16; cf. Hagner, *Matthew*, 2:467.

5. Gnllka suggested that the Enochic motif of the “son of man’s” hiddenness has influenced this saying (*Matthäusevangelium*, 2:58). That is, Jesus has asked this question to confirm that the identity of the Son of Man has been hidden from the outsiders. This, however, is unlikely, since, as will be discussed below, there is no sure evidence that Matthew is dependent in any way on the *Similitudes*. Further, “Son of Man” is not used to conceal but reveal.

nominator is prophethood.⁶ Above all, the crowds considered Jesus to be a prophet of God like the great prophets of old (cf. 13.57; 21.11; 21.46).

This response is accurate and completely expected given the prophetic overtone of the “Son of Man” sayings used earlier in public discourse.⁷ Further, it was already mentioned in 14.2 that the servants of Herod the Tetrarch thought that Jesus had miraculous powers because he was John the Baptist *redivivus* (cf. 14.10). Jesus’ itinerant mission, his healings, and the suggestion that he was John resurrected (cf. 11.7-15; 14.2) could have encouraged the crowd’s association of the Son of Man with the eschatological prophet Elijah. It is probable that many Jews thought the Tishbite, who had been taken into heaven ante-mortem (cf. 2 Kgs 2.11-12), would one day return to play an integral part in the restoration of Israel (cf. Mt 17.10-13; Mal 4:5-6 [LXX 3:23-24]).⁸ With the death of John the Baptizer, who Jesus claimed was Elijah (cf. 11.14), attention naturally shifted to John’s successor, Jesus.

Matthew adds to the Markan reading the claim that the people identified Jesus specifically as Jeremiah.⁹ Jeremiah’s ministry was characterized by proclaiming the Lord’s impending judgment against Israel and by suffering injustice at the hands of God’s chosen, characteristics that feature prominently in Jesus’ ministry.

Jeremiah prophesied God’s judgment in the form of the Temple’s destruction, as well as the people’s exile and captivity. Jesus, likewise, alluded to the Temple’s destruction in 70 CE (cf. 10.23; 21.33-46; 22.1-14; 23.36; 24.4-35) and prophesied the harsh judgment to befall the wicked at the Great Assize (cf. 11.20-24; 12.39-42; 13.24-30). The reference to Jeremiah, therefore, draws the readers to reflect on the judgmental tone of the Son of Man’s narrative-past and -future ministries. Jesus has already openly condemned the scribes, Pharisees, Sadducees, and citizens of

6. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:619.

7. Contra J. D. Kingsbury, who claimed that the crowds “*incorrectly* identify him . . . as ‘the prophet . . . from Nazareth of Galilee’ (21.9-11)” (“The Rhetoric of Comprehension in the Gospel of Matthew,” *NTS* 41 [1995]: 358-77 [374]).

8. For an in depth discussion of Elijah in Jewish tradition, see the article of M. M. Faierstein (“Why Do the Scribes Say that Elijah Must Come First?” *JBL* 100 [1981]: 75-86) and the response of D. C. Allison Jr. (“Elijah Must Come First,” *JBL* 103 [1984]: 256-58).

9. Jeremiah’s prophecies are alluded to several times in Mt (Mt 7.22/Jer 14.14; 29.13-14; Mt 11.29/Jer 6.16; Mt 21.13/Jer 7.11; Mt 23.34/Jer 7.25-26; Mt 26.28/Jer 31.31-34).

northern Galilee. Soon Jesus' attention will turn toward Jerusalem, her leadership, and her Temple.

Further, the reference to Jeremiah assists in developing the motif of Jesus as the *suffering*, prophetic Son of Man. Jeremiah's suffering was predominately emotional. Not only did he experience the pain of witnessing the destruction of Jerusalem, he was forced to feel the heaviness of the word of God (Jer. 20.9), he regretted that he was a target of mockery and ridicule (Jer 20.7), and he often bore an anguished spirit (Jer 4.19; 9.1; 10.19–20; 23.9).¹⁰ But Jeremiah also experienced physical persecution. Pashhur ben Immer, the chief Temple official, ordered that Jeremiah be beaten and placed in stocks at the upper Benjamin Gate (Jer 20.1-2). Later, he was charged with treason, abused, and placed in a dungeon (Jer 37.11-16), subsequently being imprisoned in a muddy cistern and left to starve to death (Jer 38.6-10). Moreover, for much of his fifty year ministry, Jeremiah remained under arrest, being led in chains to Babylon and eventually to Egypt, against the command of God. Thus, Jeremiah, commonly known as the "Weeping Prophet," is not only the quintessential prophet of judgment, he is the prototypical prophetic sufferer. The Son of Man will be shown in the passion predictions and in the Passion Narrative itself to conform to the type of Jeremiah, the type of a suffering, rejected prophet.

4.2.5—The Son of Man and Peter's Confession

Although the crowd's prophetic perception of the Son of Man is astute, it is also woefully inadequate. In Jesus' earlier exposition on the Parable of the Tares, it was made explicit that the Son of Man is more than a prophet; he is the messianic king and eschatological judge who will one day purify his kingdom. But this information had been kept from outsiders, being given instead to the worthy disciples.

Jesus puts the question to the disciples, "Who do you say that I am?" One should not think that merely because Jesus uses the pronoun "I" that the reply of Peter has no bearing on one's understanding of "Son of Man." Again, by moving the title forward in the narrative, a "cross-contamination" has occurred: what was said earlier about the Son of Man influences the manner in which one reads Peter's con-

10. His anguish is also frequently expressed in what are called his "prayers" or "confessions" (cf. Jer 11.18–23; 12.1–4; 15.10–21; 17.12–18; 18.18–23; 20.7–18).

fession; and conversely, what is stated by Peter further defines what “Son of Man” means according to Matthew.

Peter’s reply goes against the current of their consistent lack of understanding (e.g., 14.13-21; 15.33; 16.5-12). Stepping out as the representative of the Twelve, Peter states, “You are the Christ, the Son of the Living God” (16.16).¹¹ “Christ” (i.e., “Messiah”) and “Son of God” appear together twice in Mt (cf. 26.63) and are used to convey Jesus’ status as the long-awaited Messiah (cf. 1 Sam 7.14; Ps 2.7; 4Q246, Jn 1.49).¹² By stating that Jesus is “the Christ, Son of . . . God,” Peter openly confirms that Jesus is more than a prophet. The crowds, whose hardness of heart disqualified them from receiving further revelation, only considered Jesus to be a prophet like John the Baptist, Elijah or Jeremiah. Peter, on the other hand, has been given greater revelation and has understood it through the inspiration of the Father (“For flesh and blood has not revealed this to you, but my Father in heaven” [16.17]). He affirms that Jesus has been anointed by the Father to be the ruler over Israel and all other nations.¹³ Knowledge of Jesus’ christhood has been given here through privileged, direct revelation to the disciples only, and, therefore, in line with the Matthean theme of rejection and revelation, Jesus orders that it be kept private (cf. 16.20) until the correct time (cf. 28.18-20).¹⁴

Though his messiahship is to remain a secret to outsiders, it is Peter’s confession that provides the bedrock for Jesus’ Church (16.18).¹⁵ It is the formative claim that Jesus, the Son of Man, is God’s anointed leader that unites the Church

11. Describing God as the “living God” was common in the Hebrew Testament and Second Temple Jewish writings (cf. Deut 5.26; Josh 3.10; 1 Sam 17.26; Ps 42.2; Jer 10.10; *Jub Or* 3:763; *T. Job* 37.2; *T. Sol* 1.13 [Evans, *Matthew*, 312]).

12. Jesus’ status as the Davidic Messiah is supported by the Davidic motifs of establishing a new Church/Temple and giving Peter the keys to the kingdom of heaven (cf. 2 Sam 7.4-16; 1 Chr 17.3-15; Isa 22.22 [Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:306]).

13. Although Jesus did not fulfill the role of a political Messiah at his first coming, the Son of Man will be seen by all mankind to be the ruler of the earth, including Israel, at his second advent (cf. 13.41; 16.27-28; 19.28 [M. Bockmuehl, *This Jesus: Martyr, Lord, Messiah* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994), 58-59, 165]).

14. Here one can see the convergence of the Markan Messianic Secret with the Matthean motif of revelation and rejection. The former is taken over by Matthew seamlessly, as it fits his christological and soteriological agendas.

15. The demonstrative pronoun ταύτη seems oddly placed if it refers back to Πέτρος immediately beforehand (M. J. Harris, *Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament: An Essential Reference Resource for Exegesis* [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012], 142). Additionally, as Harris brilliantly stated, “there is antecedent improbability that so significant an edifice as a messianic community, constructed by the Messiah himself, should be erected on so insecure a foundation as a mere mortal, even though Peter was the recipient of divine revelation” (Harris, *Prepositions*, 142).

against those who wish to thwart the redemptive plans of God. That is, the confession that Jesus is the Messiah is the confirmation that one belongs to the “sons of the kingdom” rather than to the “sons of the evil one.” Consequently, those who are loath to profess Jesus’ kingship, such as the religious leaders and many from among the crowds, have, thereby, demonstrated their unworthiness to be counted among the ἐκκλησία.

The Matthean addition of 16.17-19, therefore, signifies that the conflict in which the Son of Man and his community participate is cosmic in scale. Although the tension with “this generation” is most apparent, attacks against the ἐκκλησία are, in fact, the assaults of the “gates of Hades” (16.18), which are “the powers of evil that attempt to overwhelm the church.”¹⁶ As in 13.36-43, these combatants not only include the “sons of the evil one,” but the evil one himself, who actively plants his weeds among the Son of Man’s wheat. Therefore, although Satan plays a background role in Mt, he takes the leading role in the campaign against the Son of Man and his kingdom. This anticipates the two stages of conflict resolution mentioned previously; the punishment of “this generation” is paramount to the alleviation of tension, but absolute peace can only be attained through cosmic judgment.

4.2.6—Concluding Thoughts on the Exegesis of Matthew 16.13

The “Son of Man” saying of Mt 16.13 acts as a pivot point for the Matthean “Son of Man” concept. It unites the “Son of Man” sayings of Mt 8-13 with those of Mt 16-26. By referring to the Son of Man as a prophet, those sayings in the narrative-past that referred to the Son of Man’s prophetic status are recalled,¹⁷ while his death like one of the prophets of old is foreshadowed. Additionally, Matthew’s association of the Son of Man with Jeremiah, aside from alluding to the prophet’s sufferings, refers back to Jesus’ pronouncements of future judgment (11.20-24; 12.38-45) and anticipates his prediction of the Temple’s downfall (21.12-13, 18-22, 33-46; 22.1-14; 23.33-39; 24.4-35; 26.64).

Though the Son of Man has been portrayed as serving God in a prophetic function, it is inadequate to confess that he is merely a prophet, an observation that Peter’s confession makes abundantly clear. The Son of Man’s messianic identi-

16. Evans, *Matthew*, 314.

17. Luz, “Son of Man,” 12.

ty had been implied earlier in Mt (cf. 13.41); but Peter's confirmation of Jesus' divine sonship, a God-inspired act, makes it explicit that Jesus, the Son of Man, is the chosen Messiah. It will become clear as this investigation of the Matthean "Son of Man" sayings continues that the Son of Man is both the prophet who dies in the most ignominious of fashions and the Messiah who will receive a kingdom and universal authority.

This saying reminds the reader of the foundational conflict on which Jesus' story is built. The religious leaders have blasphemed the Spirit by asking for yet another sign of Jesus' divine empowerment (12.22-45). Their hardness of heart will eventually lead them to kill the Son of Man in the city that "kills the prophets and stones those sent to it"—Jerusalem (cf. 23.37)—as their fathers before them had killed the prophets of old (cf. 23.31). But despite the religious leaders' victory, the Father will vindicate his Messiah and destroy "this generation" on his behalf. As will be discussed below, it is subsequent and consequent to this judgment that the Son of Man is exalted. He is, thereby, provided with the necessary power both to expand his ἐκκλησία to "all the nations" (24.14; 28.19) and to preside as judge at the eschaton (16.27; 19.28; 25.31).

—Matthew 16.21—

Matthew 16.21 reads,

From that time Jesus began to show his disciples that he must go to Jerusalem and suffer many things from the elders, chief priests, and scribes, and be killed, and on the third day be raised.

Technically, this is not a "Son of Man" saying, as the designation was moved forward in the text to 16.13.¹⁸ Nevertheless, this passage merits a close inspection since "Son of Man" is used in the other two traditional passion predictions (cf. 17.22-23; 20.17-19), as well as the one that has been created by the Matthean redactor (cf. 26.2). Hence, the passion predictions, even the one in 16.21, provide significant insight into the meaning of Jesus' idiomatic self-designation and its place in

18. C. A. Evans suggests that the reason "Son of Man" does not appear in the first passion prediction is to remove ambiguity concerning Jesus' identification as the Son of Man ("Did Jesus Predict His Death and Resurrection?" in S. E. Porter, M. A. Hayes, and D. Tombs [eds.], *Resurrection* [JSNTSup 186. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999], 82-97; cf. L. W. Walck, "Son of Man in the Parables," 317). But this is improbable based on the observation that earlier "Son of Man" sayings have already implied that Jesus is the Son of Man.

the plot of Mt. These predictions are a constant reminder to the reader that the Son of Man's conflict with the religious leaders continues and that it will eventually culminate in Jesus' execution and resurrection—the “sign of Jonah.”

4.3.2—The First Passion Prediction (Matthew 16.21)

Immediately after blessing Peter and charging the disciples to tell no one what they had heard, the narrator explains that Jesus began to tell the disciples that he must suffer and die in Jerusalem. This verse—the first passion prediction in Mt—is introduced by the phrase, “From that time Jesus began . . .” (Ἀπὸ τότε ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς [16.21]). Kingsbury and others have convincingly suggested that this phrase is a narrative marker introducing the third and final act of the gospel. From this point on in Mt the focus shifts from the works of the Messiah to the passion of the Messiah.¹⁹ The death of the Son of Man, which had been foreshadowed in the “sign of Jonah” prophecy (12.40), takes center stage.

This narrator's aside is similar to Mark's version, though Matthew makes three alterations—aside from the omission of “Son of Man”—designed to elucidate and rectify the Markan reading.

First, Matthew omits ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι (“be rejected” [carrying a future sense in the context]). This verb could have been omitted since the Jewish leaders had already rejected Jesus earlier in the narrative, or because “be rejected” created a redundancy with πολλὰ παθεῖν.

Second, Matthew includes a reference to Jerusalem. To those familiar with the Passion Narrative, the inclusion of “Jerusalem” is easily overlooked. But earlier in the gospel Jerusalem was depicted forebodingly as the city in which Jesus' enemies live and the metropolis out of which his opponents proceed (cf. 2.3; 3.5-11; 15.1). Jerusalem, according to Mt, is “the city that kills the prophets and stone those who are sent to it” (23.37; cf. 23.29-31, 34). The inclusion of “Jerusalem,” therefore, heightens the the suspense for the reader and identifies most clearly the geographical and religious source of the prophetic Son of Man's persecution. It also

19. Kingsbury, *Matthew: S., C., K.*, 89. Kingsbury's suggested structure does not contradict the one originally proposed by B. W. Bacon. The two can be harmonized as long as it is recognized that Bacon's macrostructure outlines the entire Gospel, whereas Kingsbury's microstructure only captures the flow of the narrative.

establishes Jesus' itinerary. Jesus has up until this point in the story been ministering primarily in Galilee. From 16.21 onward, Jesus will slowly be moving toward the capital of the Jewish province.

Third, Matthew, as did Luke (cf. 9.22), changed the Markan *μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστῆναι* to *τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθῆναι*. There is debate over the reason for this alteration. The claim that Jesus arose "after three days," if taken literally, contradicts Mk 14.58; 15.29, as well as the entirety of the Passion Narrative. G. Strecker has pointed out that "after three days" and "on the third day" do indeed have different meanings, as seen from Hos 6.2, and that the latter form better reflects synoptic chronology.²⁰ Therefore, it has been claimed that Matthew and Luke have altered the Markan reading to eradicate any chronological problems the wording may have caused.

Alternatively, some have suggested²¹ that "on the third day" may have been adopted by Matthew and Luke to create an allusion to Hos 6.2, a prophecy concerning the general resurrection (cf. *Tg. Hos 6.2*):

After two days he will revive us; on the third day he will raise us up, that we may live before him.

The reading "on the third day" would, therefore, have originated from the evangelists' reflection on a passage from the Hebrew Testament used by the early Church to substantiate from Scripture the claim that Jesus was raised by God from the dead. The alteration is suggested, then, to have arisen due to theological concerns rather than chronological considerations.

Despite the verbal connection of "on the third day" to Hos 6.2, time-related concerns are more likely to have prompted the Matthean and Lukan readings. As France stated,

It may . . . be misleading to focus on "the third day" when seeking the OT background for Jesus' expectation of resurrection, since the focus in the NT references to "the third day" is not on an OT text but on the fact recorded in the gospels of Jesus' actual time of lying in the tomb. Moreover, if an OT background is to be sought, a much more obvious one is ready to hand in this gospel in the allusion to Jonah in 12:40, where Jonah's "three days and three nights" . . . are explicitly offered as a typological basis for interpreting Jesus' "three days and three nights" in the tomb. But the fact that in all three passion predictions Matthew uses "the third day" rather than echoing the phraseology of LXX Jonah 2:1 . . . suggests that

20. For an alternative view, see V. Taylor, *The Gospel according to St. Mark* (2nd Ed. London: Macmillan, 1972), 378.

21. Cf. B. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations* (London: SCM, 1961), 60-62; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:661; Evans, *Matthew*, 316.

the third-day motif is more a reflection of the actual event than a deduction from scripture.²²

Thus, the alteration should be read as Matthew's response to inconsistencies he found in his Markan source text, not as his reflection on the concept of resurrection in the Hebrew Testament.

4.3.3—Peter's Response to the First Passion Prediction

Upon hearing that Jesus would soon suffer and die at the hands of the religious leaders, Peter breaks social protocol by taking his master aside and rebuking him (16.22-23). His trepidation in response to the passion prediction, in spite of Jesus' claim that he would rise on the third day (cf. 16.22-23; 17.23), demonstrates that the disciples did not understand the full gravity of Jesus' two-part prophecy. They were so affixed on the notion of Jesus' death it evidently never occurred to them prior to the resurrection that Jesus was struggling to alter their eschatological worldview. This conflict caused by the disciples' misunderstanding of Jesus' death and resurrection will eventually precipitate into despair, cowardice, and doubt (e.g., 26.56b, 69-75; 28.17). The juxtaposition of Peter's God-inspired confession and Satan-inspired rebuke leaves the readership to wonder who will win the hearts of the disciples.

4.3.4—Concluding Thoughts on the Exegesis of Matthew 16.21

"Son of Man" does not appear in the first passion prediction, yet this announcement of Jesus' imminent death and resurrection is important to the evolving Matthean "Son of Man" concept. It is the first in a series of formulaic sayings that prophesy the humiliation of the Son of Man at the hands of his Jewish oppressors, which has been heralded in Jesus' prediction of the "sign of Jonah" (cf. 12.39-40; 16.4).

Though it has been common to separate the so-called "earthly" "Son of Man" sayings from those that are categorized as "suffering" sayings, these christological statements belong to the same continuum of meaning. When the public "Son of Man" sayings of Mt 8-12 were examined, it was found that the Son of Man is depicted as fulfilling the role of a prophet: he is an itinerant teacher of the

22. France, *Matthew*, 633-34.

prophetic tradition (cf. 8.20) and spokesperson of God (cf. 9.2, 6) who has been sent by Wisdom after John the Baptist (cf. 11.19) to perform miracles (cf. 9.6-7; 12.28, 31-32; cf. 11.2-5), to anticipate future prophetic sign-acts (cf. 12.39-40), and to prophesy the eschatological condemnation of “this generation” (cf. 11.20-24; 12.39-42). It is a consequence of his prophethood that the Son of Man will suffer and die in Jerusalem.

This conclusion is signaled by the concept in ancient Judaism that all prophets are destined to suffer violent fates: “Den gewaltsamen Tod zu erleiden ist Schicksal des Gerechten . . . wie des Propheten (Jer 2, 30; 11,18ff; 20,2; 1 Kg 18,4.13 usw.).”²³ The *topos* of a rejected and executed prophet has influenced what J. R. C. Cousland called the “prophet-killing motif,”²⁴ seen particularly in Mt 21 and 23. Jerusalem is the city that kills the prophets (23.37) and houses the scribes and Pharisees, who demonstrate themselves to have descended from those who murdered the prophets of old (23.30-32). When Jesus entered Jerusalem and was recognized as “the prophet Jesus, from Nazareth of Galilee” (21.11), her citizens reacted with the same stirring they had displayed when Herod heard that Jesus had been born (cf. 2.3; 21.10).²⁵ This observation, along with the “very frequency of the term [prophet]—three times in Mt 21—can be seen as anticipatory of Jesus’ death.”²⁶

Therefore, the public “Son of Man” sayings of Mt 8-12 are connected by the theme of prophetic suffering to the private “Son of Man” sayings in Mt 16-26 that speak of the Son of Man’s impending death in Jerusalem. The bitter fate that awaits the Son of Man in the capital is the natural consequence of his prophetic status. According to Matthew, Jesus fulfills the type of a prophet and “this generation” fulfills the type of the hard-hearted Israelites. This may be why the Son of Man “must” (δεῖ) go to Jerusalem to die (cf. 16.21): such is the destiny of any prophet sent to the people.

23. Gnilka, *Matthäusevangelium*, 2:83.

24. J. R. C. Cousland, *The Crowds in the Gospel of Matthew* (NovTSup 102. Leiden: Brill, 2002), 223.

25. Cousland, *Crowds*, 223 (cf. 223 n. 81).

26. Cousland, *Crowds*, 223.

—Matthew 16.27-28—

Even though Jesus had alluded to his death and resurrection earlier in the “sign of Jonah” pericopae (12.38-42; 16.1-4), the first unambiguous prediction of his execution follows on the heels of Jesus’ promise to build his Church on Peter’s confession. This serves to temper the disciples’ understanding of Jesus’ messiahship and the responsibilities of the believing community he has come to establish. There are two advents of the Son of Man: he is prophesied to return at the eschaton to restore and rule over the cosmos, but first he must die a prophet’s death in Jerusalem. The exact purpose for his death, other than to be an incidental portent of “this generation’s” punishment or to fill the type of a prophet, has not yet been detailed (cf. 20.28; 26.28). But the disciples are assured that not only Jesus will face distress and death in the pursuit of righteousness; his followers can likewise expect hardship and even martyrdom as a result of their kingdom endeavors. Matthew 16.24-26 reads:

Then Jesus told his disciples, “If anyone would come after me, let him deny himself, take up his cross, and follow me. For whoever would wish to save his life will lose it, but whoever loses his life, for my sake, will find it. What will it profit a man if he gains the whole world and yet forfeits his soul? Or what shall a man give in return for his soul?”

Endurance through trials, though, is not without its rewards. Jesus promises that those who persevere in tribulation for his sake will be greatly recompensed. Jesus states,

For the Son of Man is going to come with his angels in the glory of his Father, and then he will repay each person according to what he has done. Truly, I say to you, there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom (16.27-28).

It is suggested below that these two verses refer to two separate but integrally connected stages of divine retribution and reward: the Son of Man’s adjudication over all men at the eschatological assize (16.27) and his reception of an everlasting kingdom after the destruction of Jerusalem and her Temple in 70 CE (16.28). For Matthew, the judgment against unrepentant Jews in 70 CE grounds the hope that at the end of the age the Son of Man will return to reward and avenge all the righteous, thereby bringing an end to conflict.

4.4.2—The Parousia of the Son of Man (Matthew 16.27)

Matthew significantly alters the reading of Mk 8.38:

For whoever is ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him will the Son of Man also be ashamed when he comes in the glory of his Father with the holy angels.

This passage has been separated by Matthew into two sections. Part A has been moved to the Mission Discourse (10.32-33),²⁷ while Part B and the reference to the Son of Man remain in the Markan order and are submitted to further redaction.

Matthew drops the modifier τῶν ἁγίων from τῶν ἀγγέλων and adds the possessive pronoun αὐτοῦ. The phrase “his angels” appeared earlier in 13.41 and is a common feature of Matthean “Son of Man” sayings that attribute to the Son of Man divine authority (13.41; 16.27; 24.31; cf. 4.6; 25.31). This is one of a few indicators in this text, along with the use of δόξα in correlation with ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου,²⁸ that suggest that Matthew’s “Son of Man” concept is informed by Dan 7, particularly the OG version of Dan 7.13-14.

Furthermore, Matthew significantly adds that the Son of Man “will repay each person according to what he has done.” This may be an allusion to either LXX Ps 61.13 or Prov 24.12, each claiming that God will repay every human according to his or her works, both those under and without the covenant. But it is quite possible that there is no scriptural echo in this statement; it could merely be a summary of the common Jewish conception of the Eschatological Assize (cf. Jer. 17.10; LXX Sir 35.22; T. Job 17.3; Mt 10.42; 25.31-46; Rom 2.6; Rev 2.23; 22.12).²⁹

Kingsbury has posited that where Jesus speaks of his eschatological adjudication over his elect, Matthew uses either no title (13:47-50),³⁰ “my heavenly Father” (18.35), or κύριος (7.21-22; 20.8, 15-16; 24.42, 45-51; 25.1-11, 14-30), as opposed to ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.³¹ He suggested that this demonstrates that “Son of Man” is a self-designation reserved by Jesus for times he speaks of his interactions with his

27. The phrase “this adulterous and wicked generation” may have been dropped because it was used earlier in 12.39 and 16.4.

28. See also τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ in the following verse (16.28).

29. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:676.

30. Even though “Son of Man” is not used in the Parable of the Dragnet, the title was used previously in the explanation of the similar Parable of the Tares (13.37-43). Both of these parables speak of the same eschatological event, though different imagery is used.

31. Kingsbury, “Son of Man,” 199 (cf. 199 n. 11).

opponents, i.e., “the world,” either in this age or the age to come.³² This passage, however, would seem to contradict Kingsbury’s conclusion. The Son of Man is herein described as one who “will repay *each person*” One may posit that “each person” (ἐκάστῳ) has a limited referent, for example, to “this adulterous and sinful generation” (Mk 8.38; cf. Mt 16.4). But there is reason to conclude that ἐκάστῳ has a universal scope in this context. The reference to repayment falls immediately after the call to pick up one’s cross and follow Jesus daily. To not give one’s life, whether literally or metaphorically, in the service of the kingdom means the loss of one’s soul. Therefore, it is to be implied from the context that Matthew concludes recompense at the eschaton will be both for the followers of the Messiah and for those aligned with Satan. Those who suffered on earth for the Christ and his kingdom will be examined then rewarded with eternal life (cf. 13.43; 25.46). Meanwhile, those who have practiced unrighteousness will experience a fiery fate (cf. 13.42; 25.41, 46). Hence, although there certainly is contextual overlap between the christological titles κύριος and ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, Kingsbury’s hypothesis that the former is used when Jesus judges his elect and the latter is used when Jesus judges the world does not stand up under close scrutiny. The Son of Man will judge “each person,” including his elect (cf. 25.31-46), immediately after his *Parousia*.³³

4.4.3—The Coming of the Son of Man in His Kingdom (Matthew 16.28)

Based on the above evidence, 16.27 is a powerful statement of the Son of Man’s role as eschatological judge. Consequently, a significant majority of scholars³⁴ have proposed that 16.28 also refers to the second advent of the Son of Man:

Truly, I say to you, there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom.

Before this hypothesis and others can be critiqued, however, it is imperative to discuss the enigmatic statement, “some who are standing here will not taste

32. Kingsbury, “Son of Man,” 200.

33. From where Matthew derived the Son of Man’s right to judge at the eschaton will be discussed below as his ability to judge is directly associated with his enthronement on “his throne of glory” (19.28; 25.31).

34. Cf. W. C. Allen, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew* (ICC, Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1907), 183; Plummer, *Matthew*, 236-237; F. W. Beare, *The Gospel according to Matthew* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981), 360, 472-73; Gnllka, *Matthäusevangelium*, 2:88-90; L. Sabourin, “Matthieu 10.23 et 16.28 dans la perspective apocalyptique,” *ScEs* 37 (1985): 353-64; Hare, *Matthew*, 197-98; Luz, *Matthew*, 2:387; Carter, *Matthew and the Margins*, 346.

death [i.e., not die (Jn 8.52; Heb 2.9; 2 Esdr 6.26)] until they see . . .” since a proper interpretation of this proclamation will influence the following conclusions. This “unnecessarily heavy”³⁵ worded declaration can be interpreted at least two different ways.³⁶ The statement can be read as implying that the kingdom will be revealed to a choice few within a generation or so subsequent to Jesus’ statement, sometime after one or more of the Twelve have been martyred (cf. 16.24-26). But the claim could also be read to state that some standing there will not die before seeing the Son of Man’s coming. That is, some of the Twelve will be blessed to have seen the Son of Man coming in his kingdom prior to their deaths.³⁷ One can hardly render a verdict concerning which of these is the more accurate reading. But what can be stated with certainty is that the strangely poetic statement confirms that the coming of the Son of Man in his kingdom will occur in the near future (from the perspective of the narrative).

This temporal nearness of his coming has led some researchers to conclude that Jesus refers to his transfiguration “six days later” (17.1).³⁸ This suggestion has the support of proximity, but “the coming of the Son of Man” more naturally refers to an eschatological context.

Tasker and Meier proposed that this passage refers to the resurrection,³⁹ at which time, “He will begin to exercise a world-wide dominion, and in a very real

35. France, *Matthew*, 640.

36. Some have suggested that “taste death” means “experience the second death/eschatological punishment” or “experience spiritual death,” but neither fits the passage well. The former of these interpretations does not read “taste death” in its typical sense, plus it introduces a chronological problem: according to the Eschatological Discourse, the coming of the Son of Man occurs before the eschatological judgment, not after it. The second theory is not much better. J. E. Dallas, who follows the interpretation of Ambrose, suggested in a recent article that “taste death” is used of spiritual death in Jn 8.52, the only other time the term appears in the gospels (“Matthew 16:28: The Promise of Not Tasting Spiritual Death Before the Parousia,” *TrinJ* 30 [2009]: 81-95 [86-87]). But upon further inspection of the passage, the term is found to refer to physical death in Jn 8.52. Jesus claims that those who keep his word will not “see death” (θάνατον οὐ μὴ θεωρήσῃ), i.e., spiritual death. The crowds, misunderstanding Jesus, challenge his claim by responding, “Now we know that you have a demon! Abraham died, as did the prophets, yet you say, ‘If anyone keeps my word, he will never taste death.’” The Jews understood “taste death” to mean physical death. Hence, there is no known example of “taste death” referring to spiritual death. Additionally, spiritual death is not a Matthean concept, but is a component of Johannine and Pauline soteriology.

37. Cf. C. E. B. Cranfield, “Thoughts on New Testament Eschatology,” *SJT* 35 (1982): 49-512 (503); *idem*, *The Gospels According to Saint Mark* (CGTC. New York: Cambridge, 1959), 285-88.

38. S. D. Toussaint, *Behold the King: A Study of Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1980), 209; Schnackenburg, *Matthew*, 164; France, *Matthew*, 641; Keener, *Matthew*, 436-37.

39. R. V. G. Tasker, *The Gospel According to St. Matthew: An Introduction and Commentary* (TNTC 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961), 162; and Meier, *Vision*, 26-41, 120-21.

sense come *in his kingdom*.⁴⁰ Similarly, the co-authors Davies and Allison proposed that this coming is both the resurrection and the *Parousia*.⁴¹ The difficulty with these proposals is that the resurrection and subsequent ascension are not spoken of as an advent, or ἔρχομαι, of Jesus, in early Christian writings, but as his departure (cf. Jn 16.7; Acts 1.9-11).⁴² It is hard to explain how, then, the resurrection is the Son of Man's "coming."⁴³

Similar to the previous interpretations, several scholars have proposed that the event refers generically to Jesus' authority over the Church from his resurrection to his *Parousia*.⁴⁴ The presence of the Son of Man mystically or spiritually with his people could loosely be described as the Son of Man "coming in his kingdom." But again, the "coming of the Son of Man" fits best in an eschatological context.

If Jesus did, in fact, refer to his second coming in 16.28, his prediction is patently false: the twelve disciples "tasted death" before seeing his return in glory. Carter pointed out that it is possible the declaration is non-literal, and, therefore, simply urges the disciples to remain watchful.⁴⁵ The temporal exactness of "will not taste death before," though, may indicate otherwise. A literal reading is certainly the more natural.

It is not only the historical difficulties this "second coming" theory introduces that suggest an alternative interpretation should be sought; this hypothesis is disputed because it produces inconsistencies with the eschatology witnessed in the rest of Mt. According to 24.36, like the angels, Jesus has not been made privy to the time of his own return. That is, even he is in the dark about when the *Parousia* will occur. The Father has retained such sensitive information. For Jesus, then, to give an indication of the time of his *Parousia* would create a contradiction between 16.28 and 24.36. No signs of or information about the time of Son of Man's second advent had been given to men, or even to the Son of Man himself. Further,

40. Tasker, *Matthew*, 162.

41. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:679.

42. Toussaint, *Behold the King*, 209.

43. Since the resurrection is in some ways a "judgment" against the Jews—it simultaneously vindicates Jesus and implicates the Jewish leaders as blasphemers and murders of God's prophet (cf. 12.40; 16.4)—this theory does not invalidated by the same critique as the one mentioned before it.

44. W. Hendriksen, *Exposition of the Gospel According to Matthew* (NTC. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1973), 659-60; Morris, *Matthew*, 434-35.

45. Carter, *Matthew and the Margins*, 346 (cf. Senior, *Matthew*, 193).

13.29-30, 37-43 and 28.18-20—two significant examples of Matthean *Sondergut*—imply that Matthew considered Jesus’ return to be significantly delayed, and, therefore, not within the lifetime of any one of Jesus’ disciples (cf. 24:48; 25:5; 25:19).⁴⁶ As specified by the Parable of the Tares (13.37-43), the “sons of the evil one” are not to be removed from the world immediately, but should be allowed to grow up and intermingle with the “sons of the kingdom.” They will be removed only at the eschaton, an event implied to be sometime in the distant future.⁴⁷ This delay can be seen evermore clearly in what has come to be called the “Great Commission.” There, the Matthean community is informed of its responsibilities as they pertain to conducting the mission to the nations. Since it is likely that Matthew wrote his gospel after the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE, and since 28.18-20 implies that the Gentile mission is still in its infancy, it is difficult to imagine that the Matthean community considered “the end of the age” (cf. 28.20) to be within twenty-to-thirty years of the gospel’s publication. “The projection of the community and its mission out into the nations and the End of time in 28:16-20,” as D. Senior suggests, “seems to belie the kind of immediacy of the End implied in this saying [i.e., 16.28].”⁴⁸

To which ἔρχομαι, then, does the saying in 16.28 refer? It is herein suggested, in accord with a minority group of scholars,⁴⁹ that 16.28 refers to the exaltation of the Son of Man at the 70 CE destruction of the Jerusalem Temple. This interpretation is supported by a several observations from the near and broad contexts. But since much of this theory is based on reading 24.4-35 as predominately referring to the 70 CE ruination of the Temple, this interpretation will be substantiated by later exegesis.

First, should one not identify “the coming of the Son of Man in his kingdom” with Jesus’ second advent, as the evidence suggests, the most likely alternative is to identify this “coming” as the Son of Man’s approach to the Ancient of Days to receive all that was promised in OG Dan 7.13-14, *including an everlasting king-*

46. For a brief discussion of these three verses and their relation to the concept of a delayed *Parousia* in Matthew, see R. T. France, “On Being Ready (Matthew 25:1-46),” in R. N. Longenecker (ed.), *The Challenge of Jesus’ Parables* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 177-195 (179).

47. Cf. D. A. Hagner, “Matthew: Christian Judaism or Jewish Christianity?” in S. McKnight and G. R. Osborne (eds.), *The Face of New Testament Studies: A Survey of Recent Research* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), 263-82 (279).

48. Senior, *Matthew*, 193.

49. R. C. Trench, *Studies in the Gospels* (London: Macmillan, 1867), 198; H. Alford, *The Greek New Testament* (Reprint. Chicago: Moody, 1968), 1.177; Hagner, *Matthew*, 486-87.

dom. It is in this event, immediately subsequent to the destruction of the Temple, that the Son of Man is most clearly seen to “come in his kingdom” prior to the *Parousia*. This theory does posit two different referents for ἔρχομαι in conjoined verses, but as the exegesis of the “Son of Man” sayings in the Eschatological Discourse below will show, the meaning of ἔρχομαι is fluid (cf. 24.30; 25.31).

Second, should the 70 CE destruction of the Temple be in view here, the thematic relationship between 16.27 and 16.28 becomes apparent. Matthew altered the Markan reading of 16.27 by introducing the reference to end-times judgment: καὶ τότε ἀποδώσει ἕκαστῷ κατὰ τὴν πράξιν αὐτοῦ. The destruction of the Temple is intimately connected to the final adjudication of the Son of Man, as it is consequent to the former event that the Son of Man receives authority to judge the nations. Further, the judgment against Jerusalem depicts on a small scale what can be expected in large scale at the Great Assize.⁵⁰ According to the evangelist, those who are lawless and wicked will be weeded out of the Son of Man’s kingdom in the eschatological future (cf. 13.36-43; 25.31-46), just as the unrighteous Jewish leaders were removed from the “vineyard” of God in 70 CE (cf. 21.33-46).

Finally, understanding 16.28 as referring to the destruction of the Temple creates coherence between this saying and the one in 10.23, both of which indicate that the time of the Son of Man’s coming is temporally near to the setting of the narrativized characters. These two sayings—10.23 and 16.28—anticipate additional revelation concerning Jerusalem’s ruination, information that will be provided in the first portion of the Eschatological Discourse (24.4-35).

4.4.4—Concluding Thoughts on the Exegesis of Matthew 16.27-28

As was shown above, Matthew has heavily redacted his Markan source. Among other changes Matthew introduced, he inserted into 16.27 the claim that the Son of Man, when he returns at the end of the age in the glory of his Father, will repay each person according to his or her deeds. He continues the theme of judgment into the following saying (i.e., 16.28), incorporating the Markan reference to the kingdom of God into a second “Son of Man” saying that appears to refer to Jesus’

50. This connection is implied by the structure of the Eschatological Discourse. Immediately after the Temple’s destruction is predicted and the Son of Man’s coming is described, Matthew records in great detail the prediction of the Son of Man’s second advent and the Great Assize that follows on its heels.

coming in his kingdom subsequent to the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE. If the reading of 16.28 suggested above is correct, this is the first time in the gospel that one sees Jesus speaking clearly about a two-stage resolution to conflict: the first in 70 CE and the second after the restoration of the cosmos, both of which center on the power and exalted status of the Son of Man.

The christological sayings serve two purposes in the present context. First, the community of Christ-followers are assured by the evangelist that despite the Son of Man's predicted execution at the hands of his Jewish enemies, holy retribution will be exacted against the enemies of God. Not only will the city of Jerusalem be razed by the Roman military, "this generation" and their leader, Satan, will face the fiery judgment of the Son of Man at the consummation of the age. Second, these sayings function as a source of comfort and a stern warning to the Church. The Son of Man will not only return to repay the wicked for their deeds, he will recompense "each person," including the members of the kingdom-community. The "sons of the kingdom" are expected to face the examination of the one who sowed them among the nations at the Eschatological Assize. The ones who remain steadfast under persecution, even to the point of being martyred, will lose their lives but preserve their souls (16.24-26; cf. 10.22; 24.13). Meanwhile, those who are characterized by wickedness or who do not endure under persecution demonstrate themselves to be among the "sons of the evil one" and, thereby, worthy of eternal condemnation. Thus, the Son of Man is depicted by Matthew as being at the center of cosmic conflict.

—Matthew 17.9, 12, 22-23—

Immediately after Peter, James and John are given a glimpse of Jesus' future glory in the transfiguration, they are quickly reminded that the Son of Man is soon to die in Jerusalem (17.9, 12, 22-23). This prediction serves to further temper the disciples' concept of Jesus' messiahship. Jesus is attempting to convey to his disciples that just as it is necessary for them to figuratively "take up the cross" to receive kingdom blessing (16.24-26), it is required that Jesus literally take up his cross to receive vindication and exaltation. Second, by juxtaposing exaltation with humiliation, anticipation is created for the height of conflict and succeeding resolution.

The reader is made to ponder how the intertwined stories of both the Son of Man and humanity will end—with the victory of Satan or the triumph of Jesus.

4.5.2—John the Baptist and the Son of Man: Martyred Prophets (Matthew 17.9, 12)

Matthew follows the Markan order of events, placing the transfiguration after the pericope concerning the necessity of suffering for Jesus' name's sake (16.24-28). The transfiguration event has God himself reiterate what Peter proclaimed earlier in 16.16, namely, that Jesus is "the Christ, the Son of the living God" (16.16; cf. 17.5). The disciples and the readers, therefore, are twice reminded of Jesus' unique relation both to the Father and to his community of followers.

In accordance with the Markan "Messianic Secret" and Matthew's own motif of rejection and revelation, Jesus tells Peter, James and John not to tell anyone what they experienced until after his resurrection:

As they were coming down the mountain, Jesus commanded them, "Tell no one the vision, until the Son of Man is raised from the dead." And the disciples asked, "Why, then, do the scribes say that Elijah must come first?" Jesus answered, "Elijah does come, and he will restore all things. But I tell you that Elijah has already come, and they did not recognize him, but did to him whatever they pleased. So also the Son of Man will certainly suffer at their hands." Then the disciples understood that he was speaking to them of John the Baptist (17.9-13).

The three disciples, inquisitive about what had just happened, ask Jesus, "Why, therefore, do the scribes say that Elijah must come first?" This question was likely prompted by the appearance of Elijah at the transfiguration (cf. 17.3). Jesus agrees with the scribal tradition that Elijah will play a pivotal role in the restoration of Israel. However, he informs the disciples that Elijah had come, but that the scribes did not recognize him.⁵¹ Rather, they "did to him whatever they pleased" (17.12b). This is a veiled reference to the imprisonment and execution of John the Baptist (cf. 14.1-12), made unambiguous in Mt by the addition of the concluding statement: "Then the disciples understood that he was speaking to them of John the Baptist" (17.13). This clarifies what was vague in Mk, but it also attributes to the disciples the understanding that was lacking in the spiritually blind scribes.

51. Elijah was expected to return at the end of the age to participate in the restoration of Israel (cf. Isa 40.3; Mal 4.5-6; Sir. 48.10; Mt 3.3; 4 Ezra 6.26 [Keener, *Matthew*, 439]).

Matthew removes the confusing “as it is written” statements in Mk 9.12-13 (cf Mt 26.24) and clarifies the related destinies of John the Baptizer and the Son of Man. Matthew 17.12 reads,

But I tell you that Elijah has already come, and they did not recognize him, but did to him whatever they pleased. In this way the Son of Man is also destined to suffer at their hands.

The fact that John and Jesus, as Wisdom’s prophets, would suffer similar fates was foreshadowed earlier in the narrative. Upon completing the Kingdom Discourse (13.1-52), Jesus leaves the seclusion of τὴν οἰκίαν (13.36), presumably in Capernaum, and travels to the synagogue in his hometown (πατρίς), Nazareth (13.53-54; cf. Mt 2.23; Lk 4.23). There, the citizens take offense at him since they do not understand how the lowly son of a carpenter could be such a proficient teacher and miracle-worker (13.54-57). To their disbelief, Jesus replies, “A prophet is not without honor except in his hometown and in his own household” (13.57). It is not accidental that immediately afterwards the readers are told of John’s imprisonment and eventual death on account of his prophetic mission (14.1-12). The readers are led to infer that Jesus will meet a similar demise since both John and Jesus are repudiated prophets (cf. 11.16-19). Matthew 17.12 removes any ambiguity. John the Baptizer fell to the sword due to his prophetic proclamation and actions (14.5; cf. 21.26). So too the Son of Man, who is perceived by the crowds to be a prophet like those of old (cf. 16.13-14; 21.11, 46; 26.68), will be executed in Jerusalem (23.29-39).

Even though John the Baptist suffered under the oppression of the Herodian rulers, Jesus remarks that he suffered “at their hands,” i.e., the hands of the scribes. To Matthew and Mark, the religious leaders are “flat characters,”⁵² and although they may have varied loyalties and theologies, they are “a united front opposed to Jesus” and “can be treated as a single character.”⁵³

4.5.3—The Second Passion Prediction (Matthew 17.22-23)

Jesus’ private interaction with the disciples comes to a close with Jesus’ second prediction of his passion and resurrection:

The Son of Man is about to be delivered into the hands of men, and they will kill him, and he will be raised on the third day (17.22-23).

52. Cf. Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story*, 10; E. M. Forster, *Aspects of the Novel* (New York: Harcourt, 1927), 103-18.

53. Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story*, 18.

The variations between the Matthean and Markan readings are minor, except for the alteration of *μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας* to *τῆ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ*, which was discussed above. This passion prediction does not contribute anything that had not already been made know in the first prediction. But such expansion is not to be expected. This statement marks the termination of the extended conversation Jesus has been having with his disciples outside of Capernaum since 16.13. It succinctly summarizes what had been said about the Son of Man’s approaching passion and puts stress on the Son of Man’s impending sufferings right at the end of the section. This creates anticipation for the passion—the culmination of conflict between the Son of Man and “this generation”—which, in turn, generates an expectancy for the conflict resolution alluded to in 16.27-28.

4.5.4—Concluding Thoughts on the the First Unit of “Son of Man” Sayings

Matthew followed his Markan source closely from Mt 15.1-17.23 (cf. Mk 7.1-9.32). But he made several significant alterations to the Markan “Son of Man” concept, each emphasizing the Son of Man’s role in conflict and conflict resolution. These redactions can be placed in two categories: a) those that refer to the Son of Man’s status as suffering prophet and b) those that characterize Jesus as the future ruler of the heavenly kingdom and the eschatological judge.

In Mk 8.11-12, the Pharisees approached Jesus and requested a sign, to which Jesus replied, “Truly, I say to you, no sign will be given to it [i.e., ‘this generation’].” Matthew altered the Markan reading, having Jesus claim that no sign will be given “this generation” *but the “sign of Jonah”* (16.4). This recalls Jesus’ polemical interaction with the Pharisees at the end of Mt 12, where Jesus promised them that because of their blasphemy they would only receive the “sign of the prophet Jonah”: the resurrection of the Son of Man on the third day after his death. Thus, Matthew introduces the account of Peter’s confession by reminding the reader, first, that divine revelation has been withheld from “this generation” and has instead been given to the disciples (cf. 11.25-27; 13.10-17, 34-35), and, second, that the person Peter announces as the Messiah is the Son of Man who will die a prophet’s death as a sign-act condemning “this generation.”

To draw an even clearer tie between the christology laden discourse of Mt 16 and the public “Son of Man” sayings of Mt 8-12, Matthew transferred “Son of

Man” forward from the first passion prediction (16.21) to the dialogue initiating question, “Who do people say the Son of Man is?” This serves to reiterate that to the crowds and religious leaders Jesus revealed himself as the prophetic Son of Man; it was only in private that Jesus revealed himself as the soon-to-be exalted Son of Man who functions as the leader of the global Christian community and as the eschatological adjudicator (“Who do you say that I am?” [16.15]). Jesus’ prophetic self-revelation to outsiders was not a ploy to hide his true identity. The Son of Man does fulfill the role of a prophet, as the passion predictions continue to suggest. However, he is more than a prophet. The disciples alone are made aware of this because by their acceptance of his prophetic call to discipleship (cf. 8.18-22) they expressed their belief in Jesus’ prophetic commissioning and are, therefore, given more knowledge (cf. 13.12). The crowds and religious officials, however, doubted his prophetic commissioning, as well as that of John the Baptist (cf. 17.10-13), prompting Jesus not only to withdraw further revelation concerning the Son of Man’s future suffering and exaltation, but all revelation concerning himself as the Son of Man *in toto*.

This revelation that Jesus gives exclusively to his disciples concerns both his status as the prophetic sufferer like Jeremiah (cf. 16.14) and his future glories (cf. 16.27-28). Mark 8.38 reads,

For whoever is ashamed of me and my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him will the Son of Man also be ashamed when he comes in the glory of his Father with the holy angels.

In the Markan saying, the Son of Man comes at the eschaton in the glory of the Father, a manifestation of his vindication to those who were ashamed of him, to act as a witness against “this generation” before his Father the judge. For Matthew, however, the Son of Man has himself become the judge. There is no need for a witness to the atrocities of the wicked since the persecuted prophet himself becomes the adjudicator at the Eschatological Assize.⁵⁴ This extends the conflict between the Son of Man and “this generation” into the eschatological future. The rejected prophet Son of Man, who is executed by the “sons of the evil one,” does not cease to be in direct conflict with the unrighteous upon his ascension into heaven. The Son of Man will be seen coming in his kingdom in the near future (from the per-

54. This may be why “Son of Man” does not appear in Mt 10.32-33. There, Jesus is portrayed as the eschatological witness rather than judge. Matthew may have dropped the title to avoid confusion concerning the “Son of Man” eschatological role.

spective of the narrative [cf. 16.28]), at which time he will establish his Church over against the kingdom of Satan (cf. 13.37-38; 16.18-19; 28.18-19). Thus it will remain until he returns again at the end of the age to bring a swift and permanent end to conflict (cf. 13.41-43; 16.27; 19.28; 25.31-46; 28.20).

Hence, Matthew has placed the Son of Man more firmly amid the conflict with “this generation” and Satan. He is the prophetic leader of and the exemplary sufferer for the “sons of the kingdom,” who will play the leading role in the fulfillment of his own prophecies concerning the impending climax of conflict and its resolution.

—Matthew 19.28—

The second passion prediction (17.22-23) and the story of Peter pulling the coin from the fish’s mouth to pay the Temple tax (17.24-27) end the Fourth Narrative. The Fifth Discourse, commonly called the “Community Discourse,” is initiated by the disciples’ question, “Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?” Jesus’ reply challenges his followers’ notion of greatness. He indicates that the one who humbles himself like a child will enter the kingdom and receive the highest honor (18.3-4), implying, conversely, that the individual with the greatest pride will not enter the kingdom. These themes of self-effacement and eschatological reversal are developed later in the text, but not until the account of the wealthy young man’s improper response to Jesus’ call to follow him (19.16-22).

After Jesus once again interacted with children (19.13-15), a man approached Jesus and inquired, “Teacher, what good deed must I do to have eternal life?” Jesus responded in a typical scribal fashion, telling the man that he must keep the commandments to enter life (19.17; cf. Deut 30.11-20; Lev 18.5; Prov 6.23; Mal 2.4-5; Bar 3.9; Rom 7.10; 4 Ezra 14.30; *m. ’Abot* 2.7).⁵⁵ The young man, then, affirmed that he had kept all the cardinal commandments handed down by Moses,

55. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:43 n. 30.

and questioned what more he might lack (19.18-20). Jesus proceeded beyond the mandates of the Law to a new, greater⁵⁶ kingdom ethic,⁵⁷ saying,

if you would be perfect, go, sell what you possess and give to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven. Then come and follow me (19.21).

The young man, unwilling to trade the stability afforded by his money for the instability of a disciple's life, departed shamefully. As Davies and Allison stated, though with minor modification, "As throughout the First Gospel, failure is not [only] failure to believe but failure to obey."⁵⁸

This account demonstrates concretely the self-denial and humility one must necessarily exhibit to enter the kingdom, as well as the self-preservation that bars one from kingdom blessings (cf. 16.24-26). The young man found security in his supposed blamelessness under the Law and in his riches rather than kingdom service. Since he could not humble himself like a child, the kingdom remained closed to him.

This man's actions and Jesus' hyperbole that it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom (19.23-24) prompt Peter to inquire, "See, we have left everything and followed you. What then will we have?" Jesus explains that they will be amply rewarded for their kingdom service at the end of the age,

Truly, I say to you, in the re-creation of the cosmos (παλιγγενεσία), when the Son of Man sits upon his throne of glory (ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ), you who have followed me will also sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel (19.28).

This study submits that although the focus of this passage is on the reward of the disciples, the statement speaks volumes not only about Matthew's ecclesiology and eschatology, but also about his christology. The following "Son of Man" sayings in 20.17-19, 28 should be read alongside the present saying since they belong to a unit focusing on eschatological reversal. Matthew 19.28 shows the reader what type of reward the Son of Man will receive in the future, but 20.17-19, 28 demonstrates that this reward comes at a price: the Son of Man must make himself last among men through death to become first in the kingdom. Both the sacrifice and the exaltation of the Son of Man have positive ramifications for the elect. His sacri-

56. Note Matthew's insertion of the concept of perfection, which may imply that this kingdom ethic can lead to perfection, whereas the old Mosaic ethic cannot (cf. 5.17-20).

57. Carson, *Matthew*, 2:424.

58. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:50.

fice as “a ransom for many” and his enthronement at the eschaton provide the means to vindicate the righteous and end conflict.

In this section, Mt 19.28—a uniquely Matthean “Son of Man” saying—will be examined for the purpose of determining its place in the developing Matthean “Son of Man” concept. It is hypothesized that this saying is one of the strongest indicators that Matthew was aware of and influenced by the OG version of Dan 7. As will be suggested, the concepts of the Son of Man’s enthronement and his authority to judge at the eschaton have been derived from a reflection on the Danielic account rather than the Enochic *Parables*. It is the identification of Jesus as Daniel’s “one like a son of man” that provides Matthew with the scriptural foundation for his eschatological, missiological, and soteriological hopes (the latter two of which will be discussed in greater detail in the following chapter).

4.6.2—The Matthean Redaction of Matthew 19.28

The textual foundation of Mt 19.28 is Q 22.28-30,⁵⁹ which is set by Luke in the account of the Lord’s Supper:

You are those who have stayed with me in my trials, and I assign to you, as my Father assigned to me, a kingdom, that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

It is difficult to determine what portion of this saying came from Q, and what has possibly been added or subtracted by Luke. The only part of the saying that may not have originated in Q is the phrase “eat and drink at my table in my kingdom,” since this fits well the context of Jesus’ pre-execution Passover meal. It can also be reasonably assumed that Luke omitted the modifier “twelve” before “thrones” since Judas, one of the Twelve, was soon to betray Jesus.⁶⁰ The remainder of the saying, however, likely mirrors closely the reading of the Q source.

Matthew alters the reading of Q in a number of significant ways. First, Matthew specifies that the adjudication will occur after the *παλιγγενεσία*. The meaning of this term has been much debated. There are two primary views and a

59. Due to the inexactness of the parallels between the Matthean and Lukan forms of this saying, Streeter posited that Mt 19.28 belonged to M and Lk 22.28-30 belonged to L (*Four Gospels*, 288). However, it is widely believed that both the Matthean and Lukan sayings were derived from the Q source (cf. D. C. Sim, “The Meaning of *παλιγγενεσία* in Matthew 19.28,” *JSNT* 50 [1993]: 3-12 [3]).

60. See Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 100.

small number of minority perspectives.⁶¹ Some scholars simply consider παλιγγενεσία to be equivalent to the Markan phrase “the age to come” (cf. Mk 10.30) that Matthew eliminated.⁶² Meanwhile, others go further and posit that παλιγγενεσία refers to the destruction and re-creation of the cosmos at the end of time,⁶³ an eschatological expectation found in many Jewish and Christian documents around the time of Mt’s composition.⁶⁴ Although the former theory is not necessarily invalid, the latter, more nuanced interpretation is preferred since it takes into account Matthew’s belief that the current world will one day cease to exist (cf. 5.18; 24.35), making way for a regenerated cosmos.⁶⁵ Hence, by the inclusion of παλιγγενεσία it is made evermore apparent that this saying refers to a post-*Parousia* reality.

Second, all mention of kingdoms—“a kingdom” (βασιλείαν without the article) in contrast to Jesus’ “kingdom”—have been eliminated from this saying. For Matthew, the disciples play a special role in the advancement of the kingdom of heaven after Jesus’ resurrection; but only the Son of Man is *given* a kingdom in Mt (13.41; 16.28; 20.21; 24.30): the kingdom of heaven. Hence, according to the Matthean reading, the disciples have the privilege of judging the twelve tribes of

61. There are two minority views that have received substantial attention. Gundry suggested in his commentary on Matthew that παλιγγενεσία refers to the restoration of Israel at the end of the age (*Matthew*, 392). This theory has not been met with wide acceptance, as the term seems to imply cosmic restoration and not merely Israel’s renewal (cf. Evans, *Matthew*, 347 n. 439). Alternatively, J. D. M. Derrett suggested that this term should not be translated “new world” or “re-creation” as it often has been (cf. Tit. 3.5), but “Resurrection,” specifically referring to the general resurrection of the dead at the eschaton (“Palingenesia [Matthew 19:28],” *JSNT* 20 [1984]: 51-58 [54]). However, this understanding of παλιγγενεσία is not represented elsewhere. Further, Derrett proposes that if παλιγγενεσία is to be translated “new world,” “it does not fit in with Matthew’s notions [of eschatology]” (“Palingenesia,” 54; cf. 55), since he assumes that the re-creation of the world must simultaneously include the re-creation of man, which can not occur before judgment (cf. 19.28 [the παλιγγενεσία is initiated, then the judgment occurs]). But it is possible that Matthew considered cosmic renewal to precede judgment, after which Christ-followers will be glorified. If this is the case, Derrett’s objections to interpreting παλιγγενεσία as “new world” are moot.

62. Schweizer, *Matthew*, 389-90; F. W. Burnett, “παλιγγενεσία in Matt 19.28: A Window on the Matthean Community?” *JSNT* 17 (1983): 60-72 (65).

63. Gnilka, *Matthäusevangelium*, 2:172; Beare, *Matthew*, 398; Sim, “Meaning of παλιγγενεσία,” 3-12; Evans, *Matthew*, 347-48.

64. For a complete list with discussion, see Sim, “Meaning of παλιγγενεσία,” 5-6.

65. Sim, “Meaning of παλιγγενεσία,” 7-12.

Israel,⁶⁶ however, they have no continuing authority.⁶⁷ It is the Son of Man who will have “all authority in heaven and on the earth” (28.18).

Third, this is one of six times Matthew creates a “Son of Man” saying in which Jesus is depicted to be an exalted figure. Matthew establishes this exaltation with a prop, adding that the Son of Man will one day sit ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ (cf. 25.31). The Hebrew (כסא כבוד) and Greek (θρόνος δόξης or ὁ θρόνος τῆς δόξης) equivalents are used to refer to earthly seats of honor (1 Sam 2.8; Isa 22.23) or the throne of Yahweh either in the holy of holies (*Pss Sol* 2.19) or in heaven (Jer 14.21; 17.12; LXX Dan 3.54; *1 En* 9.4; *Wisd* 9.10; *T Levi* 5.1).⁶⁸ It is possible that *Wisd* 47.11 uses the phrase to refer to the throne of David and *4Q161* 3.20 employs it to refer to the throne of the Messiah. But as D. D. Hannah suggested, “both [documents] apparently refer to earthly thrones and neither is absolutely certain, either because of a textual variant or due to the fragmentary nature of the text in question.”⁶⁹ It is probable, then, that Matthew refers to Jesus’ enthronement on *the* throne of God, a single-seated throne or bisellium (cf. Mt 26.64; Ps 110.1), not on a separate throne *like* that belonging to Yahweh. The Son of Man’s future enthronement (19.28; 25.31; 26.64), his reception of worship (cf. 28.17), and his personal entourage of angelic hosts (cf. 13.41; 16.27; 25.31) verify that the Son of Man will one day possess God-like sovereignty to the level that he and God will be functionally indistinguishable.

4.6.3—Enthronement and Judgment in the Matthean “Son of Man” Concept

It has been suggested by an increasing number of scholars that the concept of the Son of Man’s enthronement on “his glorious throne” or “his throne of glory” originated in *1 En* 37-71.⁷⁰ There are significant thematic and verbal parallels between

66. Derrett emphasizes that the disciples’ ability to judge is not a “reward” but a “function” of those who follow Jesus (“Palingenesia,” 53-54). Yet, although some may not think of having the responsibility to judge a nation as a blessing, the Son of Man’s prerogative to judge is derived from his being rewarded with “all authority,” and the context implies that the disciples’ enthronement is recompense for their self-sacrificing service.

67. It was thought by some in the Second Temple period that the elect would judge the nations with God (*1QpHab* 4.4; *Wisd* 3.8; 5.1; *Syb Or* 3.780-81; 1 Cor 6.2-3 [Keener, *Matthew*, 602]). Matthew appears to agree with this eschatological outlook, but only the Twelve are said to hold such authority.

68. D. D. Hannah, “The Throne of His Glory: The Divine Throne and Heavenly Mediators in Revelation and the Similitudes of Enoch,” *ZNW* 94 (2003): 68-96 (83-84).

69. Hannah, “Throne of His Glory,” 85.

70. Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter*, 149-82; G. W. E. Nickelsburg, “Review of Milik, *Books of Enoch*,”

the *Similitudes* and Mt 19.28 and 25.31. In *1 En* 62.5 and 69.29, the son of man, an exalted figure modeled after the “one like a son of man” in Dan 7, sits as a Yahweh figure upon the “throne of glory,”⁷¹ from which he judges the wicked and banishes them from his presence. His exalted status is confirmed by the recognition that the “throne of glory” is shared by the “Lord of Spirits” (*1 En* 47.3; 60.2; cf. 61.8-9), the most common title used by the Enochic scribe for Yahweh. This means that Mt and *1 En* 37-71 are the two earliest documents that depict a plenipotentiary taking the seat of God.⁷²

L. W. Walck posited that these parallels strongly suggest the direct influence of the *Parables* on Mt.⁷³ However, proving literary dependence is not a simple task, especially when it is possible to explain the evidence in multiple manners. It is possible, perhaps more so than Walck’s theory, that Matthew derived the Son of Man’s prerogative to judge from his Markan source. According to Mk 14.62 (citing Ps 110.1; Dan 7.13 [cf. Mt 26.64]), Jesus predicts that the Son of Man will be seen by the members of the Sanhedrin sitting on the throne of God, that is, the “throne of glory.” From the enthronement proclamation of Ps 110.1 Matthew may have derived the judicial function of the Son of Man, since “[b]y implication, any indication that Jesus shared Yahweh’s throne would imply that he also participated in Yahweh’s sovereign rule,”⁷⁴ which would include the right to judge at the eschaton (cf. Ps 9.4-9; 110.5-6). But this conclusion is highly speculative, and it does not explain how both the scribe of the *Similitudes* and the author of Mt came to the same con-

CBQ 40 (1978), 411-19 (418); Catchpole, “Poor on Earth,” 355-97; D. W. Suter, *Tradition and Composition in the Parables of Enoch* (SBLDS 47. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1979), 25-29; *idem*, “Weighed in the Balance: The Similitudes of Enoch in Recent Discussion,” *RSR* 7 (1981): 217-21 (218); F. F. Bruce, “The Background to the Son of Man Sayings,” in H. H. Rowdon (ed.), *Christ the Lord: Studies in Christology presented to Donald Guthrie* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1982), 50-70 (66-68); D. C. Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew* (SNTSMS 88. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 120; Hengel, *Studies in Early Christology*, 188; Walck, “Son of Man in the Parables,” 336-37. This conclusion has been convincingly challenged by M. A. Knibb, “The Date of the Parables of Enoch: A Critical Review,” *NTS* 25 (1979): 345-59 (356-57); cf. E. Brandenburger, *Das Recht des Weltenrichters: Untersuchung zu Matthäus 25, 31-46* (SBS 99. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1980), 42-43.

71. There is no possessive pronoun in Classical Ethiopic.

72. W. Horbury has suggested that another enthronement scene of this type is in the *Exag Ezek*, whence Moses is placed upon the divine throne by Yahweh (*Messianism Among Jews and Christians: Biblical and Historical Studies* [London: T & T Clark, 2003], 137-44). This scene, however, is a vision sequence in which the enthronement is not literal but is used as imagery that symbolically communicates the special authority given to the patriarch.

73. Walck, “Son of Man in the Parables,” 336-37.

74. Hannah, “Throne of His Glory,” 79.

clusion that an eschatological figure, modeled after the human-like one of Dan 7, would serve the role of cosmic judge at the end of the age.

Alternatively, both the Matthean and Enochic concepts of the Son of Man's installment on Yahweh's throne and his right to judge the nations may have been derived from the OG version of Dan 7.13-14, the latter from the former. There, the "one like a son of man" is said to be "like the Ancient of Days" in respect to physical appearance, but the similarities extend to magisterial characteristics as well. The "son of man" is given a kingdom, glory, authority, an angelic entourage, the tribes of the earth, and even cultic worship. But what seals his identification as one who shares the divine identity is his enthronement on God's throne-chariot, i.e., his "cloud" that resembles the "great cloud" of Ezekiel's *merkavah* vision (cf. Ezek 1, 10). The heavenly throne is a symbol for "the sole sovereignty of God over all things."⁷⁵ Although "the human-like figure functions in Daniel 7 as part of the restoration brought about by God, rather than as a figure exercising the judgment and restoration,"⁷⁶ his enthronement on God's "throne of glory" allows the respective scribes of the *Parables* and Mt to identify the "son of man" as the eschatological judge. Since the "son of man" is made to share the divine throne, and, thereby God's sovereignty, it follows that the exalted human-like one will exercise such authority to purify his kingdom at his eschatological visitation.

The *Similitudes of Enoch*, therefore, is not the first document in which one finds mention of a plenipotentiary assuming the very throne of Yahweh. Consequently, it does not necessarily follow that Matthew is literarily dependent on the *Parables* for his elevated conception of the Son of Man. Although the *Similitudes* and Mt preserve a similar "Son of Man" concept, there is no hard evidence that Matthew relied on Enochic literature when forming his christology. The similarities suggest, however, that both Matthew and the scribe responsible for *1 En 37-71* relied on the same apocalyptic tradition, plausibly that preserved in OG Dan 7.13-14.

75. R. Bauckham, *Jesus and the God of Israel: "God Crucified" and Other Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity* (Colorado Springs: Paternoster, 2008), 161.

76. R. L. Webb, *John the Baptizer and Prophet: A Socio-Historical Study* (JSNTSup 62. Sheffield: JSOT, 1991), 245. Note that the "son of man" does not appear (7.13) until after the judgment of the beasts (7.11-12). Hence, there is no evidence from the text of Dan 7 to suggest that the human-like one participates in the punishment of the wicked nations.

The conclusion that Matthew relied on OG Dan 7 for his description of Jesus as end-times judge is supported by the comparable courtroom settings described in Jesus' apocalyptic revelation of Mt 19.28 and OG Dan 7. With the Son of Man depicted in Mt as set on "his glorious throne" amid twelve other thrones occupied by the disciples, a scene is set that is reminiscent of OG Dan 7.9:

Then as I looked, thrones were set, and the Ancient of Days took his seat

This is the only time in the Old Testament that the courtroom of Yahweh is described as containing multiple thrones: one or more for unspecified elders or angelic beings, and one occupied by Yahweh (cf. 1 Kgs 22.19). It is possible that Matthew adopted the judgment scene from OG Dan 7 and placed the Son of Man on "his throne of glory" to convey to the reader Jesus' privileged role at the eschaton. Being placed at the center of the courtroom on the heavenly throne of Yahweh implies that the Son of Man plays some part in the evaluation of Israel, likely the active role of a principle judge. Thus, in the same way the Ancient of Days sat in judgment amid multiple thrones over the beastly kingdoms in OG Dan 7.9-12, the Son of Man will sit amid his enthroned disciples to examine the deeds of all people, including Israel, at the Great Assize (cf. 25.31-46).

4.6.4—Concluding Thoughts on the Exegesis of Matthew 19.28

The extended study of 19.28 above has taken the reader down a number of exegetical paths. Matthew 19.28 shows signs of heavy redaction. This "Son of Man" saying was formed from eschatological Q material (22.28-30) that Matthew placed in a Markan scene focusing on discipleship and end-times reward (Mk 10.23-30). The Q source promised the disciples kingdoms and thrones for their loyal service, a reward that was accompanied by the prerogative to judge the nation of Israel. Matthew eliminates any mention of personal kingdoms, as this might challenge Jesus' exclusive right to have dominion over all things (cf. OG Dan 7.13-14; Mt 28.18). Furthermore, he introduces the designation "Son of Man" and places Jesus on "his throne of glory"—Yahweh's own throne—to confirm that even though the Twelve adjudicate, the Son of Man will preside in the authority of the Father over the proceedings.

Once again Matthew has redacted his source text to ascribe to the Son of Man the prerogative to judge the nations (cf. 13.41-42; 16.27). Q 22.28-30 claimed

that the right to judge Israel belongs to the disciples, whereas the privilege of assessing the deeds of all of humanity belongs, presumably, to the Father. Although Jesus is given “a kingdom” like that which is gifted to the disciples, his role and authority at the eschaton is undefined in the Q pericope. In Matthew, however, the Son of Man has been promoted to the divine throne and is given the right to adjudicate.

One should not assume that, like the Q source, Matthew suggests that Jesus takes no part in the examination of Israel. Although it is only stated that the disciples will judge, the Son of Man’s position implies that he acts as the overseer of the heavenly courtroom, like the Ancient of Days in OG Dan 7.9-10. Therefore, according to the Matthean reading, Israel will receive special treatment at the Eschatological Assize, and her primary judge will be the Son of Man. Matthew’s redactional additions, therefore, place the Son of Man at the center of conflict resolution between the twelve disciples—the representatives of the new “sons of the kingdom” (cf. 13.37-38)—and the people of Israel—the former “sons of the kingdom” (cf. 8.12).

It should also not be assumed that the Son of Man, according to 19.28, only interacts with outsiders and has no involvement in the affairs of the Church, as Kingsbury has suggested. According to the context, the disciples’ right to judge Israel is reward for steadfast kingdom service (cf. 19.27). Though the text does not state that their dominion is predicated on the enthronement of the Son of Man, two observations corroborate this theory. First, it was implied in Q 22.28-30 that the Father gave the Twelve the right to sit on thrones and judge, just as he had given them kingdoms. Since it is by means of his enthronement on “his throne of glory” that the Son of Man takes the place of God in this scene, it stands to reason that the Son of Man is the one who empowers the Twelve. That is, the Son of Man temporarily shares dominion over his purified kingdom—i.e., τῆ παλιγγενεσίᾳ—with the Twelve (cf. 13.41-43; 16.28). Second, it is by means of the Son of Man’s authority that the disciples are empowered to conduct a mission to πάντα τὰ ἔθνη (cf. 28.18-20). Thus, a precedent is set: the disciples do not have authority of their own but derive their authority from the Son of Man. If this is the correct reading of the Son of Man’s relationship with the Church generally, and his twelve disciples specifically, *then it is valid to consider the Son of Man to be the leader, and particularly the rewarder, of the righteous sufferer, as he was presented earlier in 16.24-28.* It is subsequent to, and, by implication, consequent to, the Son of Man taking the “throne of glory”

that the disciples are rewarded with twelve thrones. As the representatives of a new people of God (cf. 21.43),⁷⁷ the Twelve, then, take part in the vindication of the Christian community; the disciples are given the responsibility, alongside the Son of Man, to judge both the wicked and the righteous among the nation of Israel after the re-creation of the cosmos. Thereby, Jesus and his closest followers bring an end to the conflict with “this generation.” Those Jews who have done harm to the community of Christ-followers will be sentenced by the apostolic leaders of the Church and the Son of Man alike. In this way, the Matthean community, by means of the Son of Man’s enablement, will have the vindication and reward they have long sought.

Matthew 19.28 not only provides a candid look into the community’s eschatological aspirations, it expresses unambiguously the honorific place of the Son of Man in the community’s design. The Son of Man’s enthronement on Yahweh’s seat proves that he has the right to act as overseer of the Eschatological Assize. Moreover, the prediction that the Son of Man will be placed on the throne hitherto reserved exclusively for Yahweh affirms his divine status. Thus, this is one of the strongest statements of Jesus’ divinity in all the New Testament, and perhaps *the strongest affirmation of Jesus’ divinity placed on his own lips* (cf. 28.19). It is shocking, then, to have this “Son of Man” saying balanced by one of the most poignant expressions of the Son of Man’s self-sacrifice (cf. 20.28).

—Matthew 20.17-19, 28—

The bold statement of Jesus’ future exaltation as the Son of Man is not far separated from the third passion prediction (20.17-19). In an attempt to convey to his disciples the economy of the kingdom, Jesus shares with them the Parable of the Vineyard Workers (20.1-16), which stresses once again that “the last shall be first and the first shall be last” (20.16; cf. 19.30). It is the person who humbles himself or herself who will enter the kingdom and enjoy the honor of eternal life; meanwhile, the one who exhibits pride will not be assured entrance.

77. As Sanders has suggested, “twelve” was likely a symbolic number that “points to ‘all Israel’” (Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 104). They are the representative of a new Israel, though not to the complete exclusion of the ethnic Israel (this will be discussed further in the following chapter).

By reminding the disciples once again of his looming execution in Jerusalem, Jesus sets himself as an example of one who puts himself last. The third passion prediction, then, stands as an introduction to the following pericope, in which Jesus provides a reason for his death: other than to be an incidental portent of “this generation’s” punishment (cf. 12.40; 16.4), or as an expression of the “prophet-killing motif” (cf. 23.29-39), his sacrifice functions as “a ransom for many” (20.28).

It is herein proposed that the “Son of Man” saying in 20.28 is a deliberate inversion of the Danielic account of the human-like figure’s exaltation. Matthew, who proposes a “two-advent” apologetic, confirms that the Son of Man must serve before he is bestowed the right to be served at his exaltation. The Son of Man, thus, embodies the teaching of eschatological reversal (cf. 18.4; 19.30; 20.16; 23.11-12): to become ruler over all things the Son of Man must become a servant to all men. Whereas Jesus has expressed multiple times in the preceding narrative *that* he must die, this is the first unambiguous passage explaining *why* he must die. His death serves as “a ransom for many,” and for his self-humiliation he will be exalted to “his throne of glory.”

4.7.2—The Third Passion Prediction (Matthew 20.17-19)

As Jesus was going up to Jerusalem, he “took the twelve disciples aside by themselves,” and stated:

Behold, we are going up to Jerusalem, and the Son of Man will be delivered over to the chief priests and scribes, and they will condemn him to death, and hand him over to the Gentiles to be mocked, flogged, crucified, and he will be raised on the third day (20.18-19).

Unlike the second passion prediction (17.22-23) that did little more than summarize the previous prophecy (16.21-23), the third passion prediction provides new information about Jesus’ trial and death. Prior to this moment, there was no mention that Gentiles would take part in the execution of Jesus. Further, along with omitting the majority of Mk 10.32 and replacing μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστήσεται with τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθήσεται (cf. Mk 10.34; Mt 20.19), Matthew specifies that Jesus will not just be killed, he will be crucified.

For those living under the shadow of the Roman empire in the first century CE, crucifixion, and the cross that symbolized it, produced not only fear,⁷⁸ but even peace, the latter especially among the higher class.⁷⁹ The cruel art of crucifixion was “the most wretched of deaths”⁸⁰ that could be brought upon non-citizens, or on rare occasion even Roman citizens.⁸¹ When wielded with a firm and consistent hand it was also a means of justice used to establish and maintain *Pax Romana*. It was this form of execution that became the punishment for and, thereby, the prevention of slave uprisings,⁸² military desertion,⁸³ and insurrection.⁸⁴ Thus, those that fell victim to the cross were seen in Greco-Roman culture to be “stripped . . . of the last vestiges of honor, . . . totally shamed.”⁸⁵ They were ones who had suffered a fate befitting their status as outsiders and corrupters of society, unworthy of even a semi-noble death, such as beheading. It was this horrible manner of death that “was the penalty for slaves . . . as such it symbolized extreme humiliation, shame and torture.”⁸⁶

To the Jews, crucifixion was a particularly heinous manner of execution since, according to Deut 21.22-23, one who is hung from a tree is cursed (LXX) or is himself a curse (MT). There is no unambiguous documentary support for the widespread claim that Jews commonly used Deut 21.22-23 in polemics against Christian

78. Josephus mentioned that Titus used crucifixion during the First Jewish War to evoke fear in the Jews barricaded in Jerusalem (cf. *Wars* 5.449-50).

79. Hengel noted that “crucifixion was almost always inflicted only on the lower class (*humiliores*); the upper class (*honestiores*) could reckon with more ‘humane’ punishment. Here we have a real case of ‘class justice’” (M. Hengel, *Crucifixion: In the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of the Cross* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977], 126).

80. Jos, *Wars* 7.203. See also Cicero, who in his speech against Verres calls crucifixion “that most cruel and disgusting penalty” (*In Verrem* 2.5.165).

81. Hengel compiled a handful of sources that record the crucifixion of Roman citizens (cf. *Crucifixion*, 131-37). In most of these cases the cross is symbolic of the crime the victims have committed, namely, forms of treason and acts unbecoming a Roman citizen. But many saw crucifixion of Roman citizens as a heinous act, as Cicero stated: “To bind a Roman citizen is a crime, to flog him is an abomination, to slay him is almost an act of murder: to crucify him is—what? There is not fitting word that can possibly describe so horrible a deed” (*In Verrem* 2.5.66).

82. Cf. Cicero, *In Verrem* 2.5.169; Valerius Maximus, 2.7.12; Tacitus, *Histories* 4.11; cf. 2.72; Appian, *Bella Civilia* 1.120 (See further, Hengel, *Crucifixion*, 143-55).

83. Cf. Livy 30.43.13.

84. Cf. Plutarch, *Moralia* 554a/b.

85. R. L. Webb, “The Roman Examination and Crucifixion of Jesus: Their Historicity and Implications,” in D. L. Bock and R. L. Webb (eds.), *Key Events in the Life of the Historical Jesus: A Collaborative Exploration of Context and Coherence* (WUNT 247. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 669-773 (696).

86. Hengel, *Crucifixion*, 154.

worship of Jesus.⁸⁷ But it is clear that Christians were concerned with the implications of Jesus' crucifixion in light of the Torah mandate, and struggled to understand the connection between the contradictory elements of the Son of Man's humiliation⁸⁸ and glorification.⁸⁹

Matthew inserts a reference to crucifixion to make sure the reader understands the extent of the Son of Man's self-debasement in his quest to ransom his people. He is not like the Gentile masters who tyrannically rule over their countrymen (cf. 20.25), exalting themselves and humbling others, as they will do with Jesus at his trial and execution (cf. 20.19). The Son of Man is the one who humbles himself as a servant by drinking the cup of suffering (cf. 20.23; 26.39, 42). He serves the kingdom and the righteous by bearing the cross according to the plan of God (cf. 26.24, 39, 42, 54).

4.7.3—The Advent of Humiliation and Suffering

Prompted by Jesus' earlier promise of enthronement after the re-creation of the cosmos, James and John ask Jesus through their mother (notice Jesus' plural reply in 20.22) to receive honorable positions next to Jesus' throne. To correct the arrogance of the brothers and quell the anger of the other ten disciples against them, Jesus once again reminds his followers of the concept of eschatological reversal (20.26b-27):

But whoever might wish to be great among you must become your servant, and whoever might wish to become first among you must become your slave

To illustrate his point, Jesus ends the conversation with the Twelve by stating (20.28),

even as the Son of Man came not to be served but to serve, and give his life a ransom for many.

87. See K. S. O'Brien, "The Curse of the Law (Galatians 3.13): Crucifixion, Persecution, and Deuteronomy 21.22-23," *JSNT* 29 (2006): 55-76 (57-58).

88. Although the cross was not always perceived as a "curse," it was considered a shameful event that stained the Christian faith. This is perhaps best seen in a *graffito* carved between the late first and late third centuries on a wall in Roman Palatine. It depicts a man named "Alexamenos" worshipping a donkey hung on a cross (cf. G. H. R. Horsley, "A Crucified Donkey," in *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity* [North Ryde, Australia: Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, Macquarie University, 1987], 4:137, §34). Literary parallels can be found in the writings of Tacitus (*Hist* 5.3-4) and Josephus (*Ag Ap* 2.80), who bear witness to pagan mockery of Jews for worshipping an ass. As one burdened with the cross, pagans found it fitting to depict Jesus as a beast of burden.

89. See Acts 5.30; 10.39; 13.29; Gal 3.13; 1 Pet 2.24; Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 10.3; 32.1; 38.1; 89.2; 90.1; Tertullian, *Adv. Iud.* 10.1; cf. Jn 19.31.

Matthew drops the Markan καὶ γὰρ (cf. Mk 10.45) and replaces it with ὡσπερ (“even as”). This makes it more clear that Jesus is presenting himself as an example to the disciples; if they wish to be first, they must become servants of one another, as the Son of Man is the servant of “the many” (cf. Phil 2.5-11).

C. F. D. Moule,⁹⁰ C. K. Barrett,⁹¹ M. Hooker,⁹² and recently J. D. G. Dunn⁹³ have suggested that the concepts of servanthood and suffering on behalf of others alludes to Dan 7 rather than another Old Testament passage such as Isa 53. They theorized that the “one like a son of man” was a symbolic representation for the righteous people of Israel.⁹⁴ Hence, since the “holy ones of the Most High” suffered, it is supposed that the Son of Man is destined to suffer on behalf of the elect. This hypothesis is based on the theory that the “one like a son of man” is a collective entity who represents “the holy ones” in the same manner as the four beasts represent four kings (MT) or four kingdoms (OG and Θ).

Such an assumption, however, is invalid. The story of the four beasts and the arrival of the human-like figure are separated in Dan 7 by the seer’s account of the convening of the heavenly court. When the Ancient of Days arrives, he is described using anthropomorphic terms. Likewise, when the son of man comes to the throne of Yahweh, he is not described as an animal as the kings/kingdoms were, nor is he compared to the beasts who stand as collective entities. Rather, the “son of man” is portrayed with human-like and divine-like qualities that associate him more closely with the Ancient of Days—*who is not himself a symbol*—than with the four beasts from the sea. Further, during the interpretation provided by the angel in Dan 7.17-27, the son of man is not identified as “the saints of the Most High.” He is possibly even distinguished from them in 7.27b, marked by a change from the

90. C. F. D. Moule, “From Defendant to Judge—and Deliverer: An Enquiry into the Use and Limitations of the Theme of Vindication in the New Testament,” *SNTS* 3 (1952): 40-53; cf.

91. C. K. Barrett, “The Background of Mark 10:45,” in A. J. B. Higgins (ed.), *New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of T. W. Manson* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959), 1-18.

92. M. D. Hooker, *Jesus and the Servant* (London: SPCK, 1959), *passim*.

93. J. D. G. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered: Christianity in the Making* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 1:805-18.

94. Cf. G. S. Duncan, *Jesus, Son of Man: Studies Contributory to a Modern Portrait* (New York: Macmillan, 1949), 135-53; Manson, “Son of Man in Daniel,” 171-93; O. Cullman, *The Christology of the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1959), 140-41; E. Schweizer, “The Son of Man Again,” *NTS* 9 (1962-63): 256-61 (256-57); Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology*, 95; cf. C. M. Tuckett, *Christology and the New Testament: Jesus and His Earliest Followers* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2001), 114-15.

third person plural to the second person singular.⁹⁵ The human-like figure “is associated with ‘the holy ones of the Most High’ insofar as they too are said to receive a kingdom, but there is no one-to-one equation, such as we have with the beasts and kings . . . the ‘one like a human being’ is a symbol of the same order as the Ancient of Days—a mythic-realistic depiction of a being who was believed to exist outside the vision.”⁹⁶ Certainly, the son of man is the heavenly representative of the suffering saints, but it is an oversimplification of the complex imagery of Dan 7 to suggest that the “one like a son of man” in 7.13 is a symbolic representation of the Israelite people. Yahweh and the “son of man” vindicate the suffering righteous, but the human-like figure, according to all versions of Dan 7 (as well as *1 En* 37-71; *4Q246*, *4 Ezra*), does not take part in their tribulation.

Mark 10.45 and Mt 20.28 do not depend on Dan 7 for the notion of the Son of Man’s suffering; but these passages may show the authors’ awareness of and reflection on the Old Testament passage. Mark relies on the MT Dan 7.13-14 for his “Son of Man” sayings rather than the OG version as Matthew does when he alters the Markan reading or creates an allusion to Daniel’s vision. According to the Aramaic, the human-like figure receives, among other honors, the right to be served (יִפְלְתוֹן) by all the peoples of the earth. The OG version of 7.14 translates יִפְלְתוֹן with λατρεύουσα, which is consistently used in OG Dan to refer to the worship of gods or Yahweh (LXX Dan 3.12, 14, 18, 95; 4.37; 6.17, 21, 27; 7.14). This cultic understanding of service does not appear in Mk 10.45, and consequently, not in Mt 20.28 either. Mark translates יִפְלְתוֹן with διακονέω, meaning simply “to serve” or “to wait on.” This claim that the Son of Man came to serve others and not for others to serve him, therefore, “inverts what is said of the Son of Man in Dan 7:13-14, who approaches the Ancient of Days to receive royal power, ‘that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve him.’”⁹⁷

95. Caragounis understood the second person singulars to refer back to the Most High, who he then identified as the “one like a son of man,” since he considered it a “gross blunder” to suggest that “dominions”—i.e., the oppressive kings who are represented as horns—might be captive to “the pious Jews” (*Son of Man*, 63-67, 69). However, 7.27 may contain a prime example of the type of eschatological reversal Jews were expecting in the end of days: those who once oppressed the people of God will one day be under the thumb of their former subjects.

96. Collins, *Daniel*, 305.

97. Evans, *Matthew*, 354.

This reversal is part of an apologetic that is witnessed in Mk and perfected in Mt. To illustrate this schema, it is beneficial to examine a similar apologetic in Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho* (ca. 155-160 CE),⁹⁸ "the first surviving Christian writing to tackle fully the issues which separated Christians and Jews in the period after the 'parting of the ways.'"⁹⁹ Trypho, a Jew who is perhaps not a living adversary but Justin's "literary mouthpiece,"¹⁰⁰ voices his protestation to Justin,

Sir, these and other similar passages of Scripture compel us to await One who is great and glorious, and takes over the everlasting kingdom from the Ancient of days as Son of man. But this your so-called Christ is without honour and glory, so that he has even fallen into the uttermost curse that is in the law of God, for he was crucified.¹⁰¹

Justin defends his Christ-devotion against Trypho's attacks in two manners. His first tactic is to appeal to Scripture. He claims that Jesus was the servant of Yahweh spoken of in Isa 52-53 and, therefore, his humiliation was in accord with the sovereign plan of God. Second, Justin suggests that there are two advents of Jesus.¹⁰² The first coming was his incarnation as a humble servant of the Lord, who goes to the cross as it was written of him. His second visitation, meanwhile, is yet to be seen, as it is the eschatological coming of the Son of Man, whence his shame will be replaced with glory.

G. Stanton has suggested that this "two-advents" apologetic, which explains how the antithetical themes of humiliation and exaltation can be held together in christology, likely took its final form in Mt and was passed on to the early Church fathers. As did Justin, Matthew defends the "two-advents" schema by appealing to Jewish Scripture and by positing that the Son of Man will one day return in glory.

Concerning the first claim that Matthew used Scripture to support his apologetic, it is noteworthy that Mk 10.45/Mt 20.28 arguably preserve an allusion to LXX Isa 53.12. The evidence in this verse for such an echo is scant. There is only

98. Although the *Dialogue* was probably not written until five to ten years before Justin's martyrdom in 165 CE, the discussion with Trypho is set soon after the second Jewish Revolt in 135 CE.

99. Cf. G. Stanton, "The Two Parousias of Christ: Justin Martyr and Matthew," in M. C. De Boer (ed.), *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Martinus de Jonge* (JSNTSup 84. Sheffield: JSOT, 1993), 183-195 (183).

100. O'Brien, "Curse of the Law," 61.

101. Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 32.1; translation by Stanton, "Two Parousias," 185.

102. According to Stanton, this was a common tactic in early Christian apologetics as is witnessed in Origen's dialogue against Celsus the Jew (*Contra Celsum* 1.56) and lines 23-26 of the *Muratorian Canon* ("Two Parousias," 188, 195 n. 2).

one possible verbal correspondence between the documents. Both LXX Isa 53.12 and Mk 10.45 refer to the people of God as “the many” (πολλῶν). J. Jeremias professed that πολλῶν is “a veritable keyword in Isa. 53,”¹⁰³ a term the use of which France suggested is unexpected unless an allusion was intended.¹⁰⁴ To the contrary, however, πολὺς is used in close proximity to Mk 10.45/Mt 20.28 to refer to the kingdom-bound righteous: “But many (πολλοὶ) who are last will be first and the first will be last” (cf. Mk 10.31/Mt 19.30). Therefore, πολλῶν alone is not enough to establish that an allusion to LXX Isa 53.12 exists.

An argument for the presence of an allusion can be made, though, based on other definitive echoes of LXX Isa 53 in Mk and Mt.¹⁰⁵ The first allusion to Isa 53.12 is in the formula citation of Mt 8.17, which functions as the conclusion to a triad of miracle stories:

This was to fulfill that which was spoken by the prophet Isaiah: “He took our illnesses and bore our diseases.”

K. D. Litwak, who divided the Isa 53 citations and allusions in the New Testament into three categories, placed Mt 8.17 with those passages that use Isa 53 as part of a “passion apologetic.”¹⁰⁶ He suggested that Jesus takes the diseases of others onto himself by means of his death for their sins; that is, “The fundamental point the evangelist makes here is that Jesus’ suffering is redemptive.”¹⁰⁷ This conclusion, however, attributes more meaning to the citation than the context or the wording of the citation allow. There is nothing in the citation’s near setting that suggests Jesus is healing people by destroying their infirmities through his sacrificial death. Isaiah 53.4 is simply cited as scriptural testimony to Jesus’ ability to heal people of their afflictions. The passion is not implied. Further, should this citation have been

103. W. Zimmerli and J. Jeremias, *The Servant of God*, (SBT 20. London: SCM, 1957), 95.

104. R. T. France, “The Servant of the Lord in the Teaching of Jesus,” *TynBul* 19 (1968): 26-52 (36).

105. France suggested that thematic parallels are enough to assure the researcher that an allusion is present, but this is doubtful. He claimed that even if there are no verbal echoes, “δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν is a perfect summary of the central theme of Isaiah 53, that of a vicarious and redeeming death” (France, “Servant of the Lord,” 36). Although his summation is certainly correct, it is not enough to determine with any level of certainty that the saying of Jesus makes an allusion to LXX Isa 52-53. The concept of human sacrifice had already been introduced into Judaism by the attempted sacrifice of Isaac by Abraham, and the “atoning” value of martyrs’ deaths for the sins of many was well-documented. Hence, this saying could have arisen from loose traditions about the sufferings of righteous men for their people rather than directly from the description of the Isaianic Suffering Servant.

106. K. D. Litwak, “The Use of the Quotations From Isaiah 52:13-53:12 in the New Testament,” *JETS* 26 (1983): 385-394 (388).

107. Litwak, “Quotations,” 388.

referring to Jesus' forgiveness of sins through the crucifixion, it is notable that Matthew translated the הלינו with the equivalent word ἀσθενείας rather than with ἁμαρτίας as the LXX reads. It is unlikely, then, that Matthew intended this citation to refer to the passion, and, therefore, it has little bearing on his possible understanding of the "Son of Man" saying in Mk 10.45, except possibly to demonstrate that Matthew was familiar with Isa 53.12.

The other allusion to Isa 53 in 26.28, however, is of greater worth to the present study. Matthew 26.27-28 reads,

And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks he gave it to them, saying, "Drink of it, all of you, for this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins."

Even though "pouring out" evokes Levitical atonement practices (cf. Lev 4.7, 18, 25, 30, 34), the concept of a person pouring himself out for the sins of many recalls the redemptive actions of the Servant of Yahweh in Isa 53.12: "he poured out his soul to death . . . he bore the sins of many." Unlike Mk 10.45/Mt 20.28, this passage is a clear allusion to the Isaianic Suffering Servant account. If this conclusion is valid, it would be difficult to maintain that Matthew would not have read the statement "and give his life a ransom for many," that shares verbal and thematic parallels with Mt 26.28, through the same scriptural lens.

If Matthew, then, considers "and to give his life a ransom for many" to allude to LXX Isa 53.12, this scriptural perspective on the death of the Son of Man provides a defense for the Son of Man's humiliation. That is, Matthew asserts that the Son of Man, who will be exalted, can suffer the utmost humiliation because such shamefulness was God-ordained. The Son of Man, by experiencing the utmost humiliation, is merely being obedient to the Father by adhering to his soteriological plans. It is the Father's prerogative to replace his shame with honor.

Second, like the Justinian model, the Matthean apologetic proposes that the Son of Man will receive great honor to replace the humiliation he incurred during his first advent. But unlike the Justinian formula, the Son of Man regains and increases honor in two separate stages. The first is the coming of the Son of Man to the Ancient of Days after the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE. The Son of Man is given sovereignty in heaven and on earth to the shame of his Jewish persecutors, i.e., "this generation." The second stage, i.e., the second advent of the Son of Man at the end of the age to which Justin referred, is the moment at which the Son of

Man will be seen by all nations to possess divine glory and honor. But even though the Matthean scheme is more nuanced than that of Justin, the end result is the same: the tension caused by the Son of Man's humiliation is made inconsequential by his exaltation to "his throne of glory."

Hence, by inverting the description of the human-like one in Dan 7.14 and by appealing to the Suffering Servant account of Deutero-Isaiah, Mark and Matthew have found a way to give equal weight to the claims of the Son of Man's humiliation and exaltation. It is implicitly confirmed that the Son of Man will receive extraordinary honor, but not during his earthly ministry. Before he can be served (Dan 7.14), he must himself become a servant. To support this suggested line of causation, the evangelists appeal to Isa 53.12; it is, thereby, clarified that the Son of Man can experience the shame of the cross because such a destiny had been foreordained by God.

4.7.4—Concluding Thoughts on the Second Unit of “Son of Man” Sayings

Although conflict with “this generation” certainly lies in the background of the “Son of Man” saying in 20.28 since the Son of Man's death at the hands of his enemies is alluded to, conflict itself is not the focal point. The emphasis of the saying is to critique the disciples' understanding of the concepts of servanthood and eschatological reversal. After Jesus promised that they would occupy thrones at the eschaton, the focus of the Twelve shifted from the humility necessary for discipleship (cf. 19.27) to their future glories. To convey to his followers the depths of self-debasement one must achieve to be honored with a heavenly throne, Jesus uses his own impending death as an example: the Son of Man has come in his first advent to sacrifice himself for the elect. It is a consequence of his servanthood that he will be enthroned with Yahweh, but his eye remains on the ransoming of his people and not on his eventual exaltation.

Therefore, in Mt 19.28; 20.17-19, 28 the Son of Man is not primarily depicted as a judge who ends conflict—though that conception of Jesus is contained in the “Son of Man” saying of 19.28. Matthew once again shines the spotlight on the Son of Man as the leader of and prototypical example for the members of the Christian community. The “Son of Man” sayings flow with the current of conflict in Mt. But as these sayings elucidate, conflict has positive, as well as negative, consequences.

The Son of Man is the one who will examine and punish the wicked; but this destruction is matched with creation, namely, the inauguration of a kingdom and its people, in part, through his sacrificial death. This Church is the righteous collective that the Son of Man commissions to bring the gospel to the nations (28.18-20), an act of violence against the kingdom of Satan.

Now that Matthew has conveyed to the reader *that* the Son of Man will suffer and *why* the Son of Man must die, he specifies what will happen to those who execute Jesus and what this sacrificial death will earn Jesus and his elect.

—Matthew 24.27, 30, 37, 39, 44; 25.31—

Conflict between Jesus and his enemies becomes stronger the closer he comes to his trial and death. This increase in conflict is seen as soon as Jesus enters Jerusalem, whence he proceeds immediately to purge the Temple of the money changers and merchants (21.12-17). This is the first of a collection of prophetic acts and speeches that Matthew uses to foreshadow God’s approaching wrath against “this generation.”

The religious leaders attempt to meet Jesus’ repudiation with physical aggression, hoping to incarcerate him, thereby removing him from the crowd over whom he held sway (cf. 21.46a). But because “the people held him to be a prophet” (21.46b; cf. 21.11) the chief priests and Pharisees avoided violence and sought instead “to trap him in his words” (22.15). The leaders’ goal was to shame Jesus publicly in an attempt to win back the people’s hearts. It was most certainly hoped that by winning in the court of public opinion the religious leaders would be free to exercise any means necessary to quell Jesus’ ministry (cf. 12.14, 24).

To ensnare him, the author recounts that a series of questions concerning the laws of Moses and the Romans were presented to Jesus by unlikely allies¹⁰⁸—the Herodians (cf. 22.16-22), the Sadducees (cf. 22.23-33), and the Pharisees (cf. 22.16-22, 34-40)—each of whom Jesus answers with legal excellence. To confound the Pharisees and put their scheme to rest, Jesus poses a question of his own con-

108. Again, the enemies of Jesus are flat characters in Mt. Although historically these religious groups likely had little contact, here they are described as being united by one goal: the elimination of Jesus (cf. Kingsbury, “Developing Conflict,” 60-62, 66).

cerning the lineage of the Messiah that they are unable to answer (22.41-45). The silencing of Jesus' opponents opens the door for a grand speech that can be divided into four segments:

- a) a word to the disciples and the crowd, warning them not to be self-exalters like the scribes and Pharisees (23.2-12);
- b) the proclamation of seven "woes" against the scribes and Pharisees, meant to reveal their internal corruption despite their external righteousness (23.13-32);
- c) the pronouncement of a curse against "this generation" (cf. 23.36) for all the prophetic blood that has been or ever will be spilt in Jerusalem, including Jesus' own blood (23.33-36); and,
- d) Jesus' lament that Jerusalem did not accept him and, therefore, is left devoid of the divine presence or divine blessing (23.37-39).

The Pharisees are only mentioned one more time in Mt (cf. 27.62). From this point in the gospel forward, the Temple officials will be Jesus' primary opponents.

It is this conflict, which stretches three complete chapters, that grounds Jesus' final discourse with his disciples about the comings of the Son of Man (Mt 24-25). Matthew eliminated the Markan story of the widow (Mk 12:41-44), "thereby fusing the apocalyptic discourse directly onto the previous condemnation of the scribes and Pharisees."¹⁰⁹ His woes against the religious leaders, and his exiting of the Temple to begin a private discourse, mark Jesus' condemnation of "this generation." As Meier stated, Jesus here turns to "the new people of God, the church, the group which follows him out of the Temple, away from Judaism."¹¹⁰

The "Son of Man" sayings that depict Jesus' exaltation (cf. 10.23; 16.27-28; 19.28) have been building toward this *tour de force*. It will be suggested that the first half of the discourse, excluding the disciples' question (24.3), is concerned with the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE and the Son of Man's subsequent exaltation (24.4-35). Meanwhile, the second half of the discourse pertains to the *Parousia* and Eschatological Assize of the Son of Man (24.36-25.46). The "Son of Man" sayings in these two sections will be examined separately, and the conclusions from each analysis will be synthesized in the conclusion.

109. Senior, *Matthew*, 265.

110. Meier, *Vision*, 167.

4.8.2—The Disciples’ Question and the Structure of the Eschatological Discourse

Upon leaving the Temple for the final time, Jesus reveals to the disciples privately that the beautiful Temple he recently exited would soon lie in ruin, hyperbolically predicting that “no stone will be left upon another” (24.2).¹¹¹ This prophecy functions as the climactic conclusion to the previous narrative and provides the impetus for the disciples’ question in 24.3b that commences the Eschatological Discourse (i.e., 24.4-25.46).

The disciples draw Jesus aside, questioning him,

Tell us, when will these things happen, and what will be the sign of your coming and the end of the age? (εἰπέ ἡμῖν, πότε ταῦτα ἔσται καὶ τί τὸ σημεῖον τῆς σῆς παρουσίας καὶ συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος;)

Due to the dual use of καί, it may appear that this is a tripartite question, inquiring when the destruction of the Temple will occur, what will be the sign of the *Parousia*, and what portents will accompany the end of the age. But as France has observed, “coming” and “end of the age” are governed by one article (as well as a single interrogative pronoun) and, therefore, refer to the same event.¹¹² Is this, then, a two-part question or do the disciples equate the fall of the Temple with Jesus’ *Parousia* at the end of the age? There are indications that the disciples are asking two separate, but related, questions.¹¹³ Mark’s reading (Mk 13.4) places the two events in parallel with one another by the twice-used “these things” (ταῦτα):

Tell us, when will these things happen, and what will the sign be when all these things are about to be finished?

Matthew, on the other hand, removes the parallel by using more exact language. “These things” in the first half of the Matthean inquiry, which in context refers to the destruction of the Temple, are made distinct from the latter “things,” i.e., “your coming and the end of the age.” To make this distinction clearer, Matthew introduces the term *Parousia* for the first time in the gospel;¹¹⁴ it is a *terminus techni-*

111. Some of these stones, anywhere from five tons to four hundred tons a piece, still stand to this day (Keener, *Matthew*, 562).

112. R. T. France, *The Gospel According to Matthew: An Introduction and Commentary* (TNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985), 337.

113. J. A. Gibbs, *Jerusalem and Parousia: Jesus’ Eschatological Discourse in Matthew’s Gospel* (St. Louis: Concordia Academic, 2000), 170-74.

114. Matthew is the only one of the Gospel writers that employs the term *Parousia*. The Apostle Paul is the first recorded author to use *Parousia* to refer to Jesus’ visitation at the end of the age (1 Thess 2.19; cf. 1 Cor 15.23; 1 Thess 3.13; 4.14; 5.23; Jas 5.7, 9; 2 Pet 1.16; 3.4, 12; 1 Jn 2.28). Matthew may have adopted the word from Pauline literature, or it may have been part of common Christian vernacular

cus for the end-times visitation of the Son of Man to earth, and is used to distinguish the Son of Man's second coming to judge the world from his "coming on the clouds."

In agreement with a minority, but quickly growing group of scholars, this dissertation assumes that the disciples' inquiries in 24.3 supply a template for the structure of the Eschatological Discourse. That is, Jesus provides an answer to the disciples' former question in the first portion of his prophecy and responds to the disciples' latter question in the second part of the discourse. The macrostructure of the Eschatological Discourse, therefore, breaks down as follows:

- a) the two questions of the disciples (24.3);
- b) the desolation of the Temple and the coming of the Son of Man accompanied by signs (24.4-35);
- c) the second advent of the Son of Man at "the end of the age" not accompanied by signs (24.36-25.46).

Allowing 24.3 to function as the organizing principle of the discourse provides several distinct advantages. First, this reading provides a simplistic demarcation between the portion of the discourse that speaks of the destruction of the Temple (24.4-35) and the part of the discourse that is concerned with Jesus' arrival and role during the eschaton (24.36-25.46). This should not be taken to mean that one should ignore the relationship of the sections merely for the sake of order and clarity. Rather, as A. I. Wilson has commented, this structure "avoids the complications of continually switching back and forth between references to the judgment on Jerusalem and references to the *Parousia*. This is not to say that we ignore the theological connection between the two events, but it allows us to recognize connection without confusion."¹¹⁵

Second, it allows 24.4-13, 15-25, 32-35 to bear the same exegetical weight as 24.36. Matthew 24.4-13, 15-25 lists signs that precede the destruction of the Temple and the Son of Man's going up to the Ancient of Days (cf. 24.29-31). These signs are to be read in the same manner one reads the life-cycles of a fig tree to know when the seasons will change (cf. 24.32-33). Meanwhile, 24.36 confirms that the second advent of the Son of Man is at a "day and hour no one knows: not the angels of

by the time Matthew composed his Gospel in the 80's CE. To date, the fullest study of the term has been done by J. Plevnik, *Paul and the Parousia* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997).

115. A. I. Wilson, *When Will These Things Happen?: A Study of Jesus as Judge in Matthew 21-25* (Paternoster Biblical Monographs. Bletchley: Paternoster, 2004), 134.

heaven, or even the Son, but only the Father.” Additionally, the following parables make explicit that the *Parousia* of the Son of Man will not be accompanied by indicators. The παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is comparable to the suddenness of the flood that took the generation of Noah (24.37-39) or the appearance of a thief in the night (24.43-44). Should one suggest that all or most of 24.26-31 describes events associated with the *Parousia*, one must either ignore the signs in 24.4-13, 15-25, 32-33 or disregard the repeated claim that the Son of Man’s *Parousia* will not be accompanied by portents (cf. 24.36-25.30). By recognizing that the coming of the Son of Man in 24.30 is a different event from the *Parousia*, sense is made of the “sign” language throughout the discourse.

Third, aside from the “sign” language, this structure makes the most sense of the *Parousia* and the “day” language in the discourse. As mentioned before, the second question the disciples posed to Jesus concerned his *Parousia* (cf. 24.3, 27, 37, 39), which they considered to mark “the end of the age.” Excluding 24.3, prior to 24.36 this *terminus technicus* is only used once in 24.27. There, Matthew calls attention to the unmistakable nature of Jesus’ second coming to assure the disciples that his will not be a clandestine *Parousia*. This aside functioned to assure the post-70 CE Christian community that the Son of Man did not return to earth during or immediately after the Temple’s destruction unnoticed by many of his followers. His 70 CE ἐρχόμενον (24.30) was not a coming to earth but a going to heaven. The eschatological return of the Son of Man, conversely, will be a highly noticeable visitation, being as easily recognized as lightning (cf. 24.27) or scavenging birds gliding over carrion (cf. 24.28). Other than in 24.27, then, the term *Parousia* is withheld until after the break between 24.35 and 36, to be used in reference to Jesus’ visitation at the eschaton (cf. 24.37, 39). Moreover, “those days” is used to describe the period of tribulation leading up to and announcing the Son of Man’s approach to the Ancient of Days (cf. 24.19, 22, 23, 29): “Immediately after the tribulation of those days . . . [t]hey will see the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven” (24.29). However, in 24.36, Matthew conspicuously switches from “those days,” which are accompanied by signs, to the singular “that/the day” which has no portents (cf. 24.36, 42, 50; 25.13). It would appear, then, that the “coming of the Son of Man on the clouds” immediately after the destruction of the Temple in “those days” is different from “that day,” the latter referring to the visitation of the Son of Man for cosmic judgment, i.e., the “Day of the Lord.”

Due to the merits of the above reading, this study proceeds with the assumption that 24.4-35 refers to the destruction of the Temple by the Romans in 70 CE, while 24.36-25.46 alludes to Jesus' *Parousia* and involvement in the judgment of humans, demons, and Satan.

4.8.3—The Coming of the Son of Man on the Clouds of Heaven (Matthew 24.30)

After detailing what portents will signal the “abomination of desolation” (24.4-13) and describing the θλίψις μεγάλη that will herald the first destruction of Herod's Temple (24.16-25), Matthew recounts the coming of the Son of Man to the Ancient of Days after Jerusalem's siege (24.29-31). The passage reads,

Immediately after the tribulation of those days the sun will be darkened, and the moon will not give its light, and the stars will fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens will be shaken. Then will appear in heaven the sign of the Son of Man, and then all the tribes of the land will mourn, and they will see the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. And he will send out his messengers with a loud trumpet call, and they will gather his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other.

Historically, the majority of interpreters do not consider this passage to give an account of happenings surrounding the final moments of Herod's Temple.¹¹⁶ This is due, in part, to the stark apocalyptic imagery throughout this subsection, especially the cosmic catastrophe that precedes the Son of Man's approach.¹¹⁷ Although foreign to modern readers, such imagery was commonly employed in predictions of military conquest in the ancient world. The best examples of this type of prophetic language are found in Isa and Ezek. Concerning the destruction of Babylon, the author of Isa anticipates that “the stars of the heavens and their constellations will not give their light. The sun will be dark at its rising, and the moon will not give its light” (Isa 13.10; cf. 13.13). This imagery is witnessed again in the prediction of Edom's downfall: “and all the stars shall fall like leaves from a vine” (Isa 34.4). Writing of God's wrath against Egypt, Ezek states, “When I blot you out, I will cover the heavens and make their stars dark; I will cover the sun with a cloud, and the moon shall not give its light. All the bright lights of heaven I will make dark over you, and bring darkness on your land, declares the Lord God” (Ezek

116. There are more scholars who read 24.29-31 as referring to the *Parousia* of the Son of Man than can be mentioned in this footnote. For a fair and comprehensive summary of evangelical futurist readings, see D. L. Turner, “The Structure and Sequence of Matthew 24.1-41: Interaction with Evangelical Treatments,” *GTJ* 10 (1989): 3-27 (17-21).

117. So it is with Meier, *Vision*, 170-72.

32.7-8). It is, of course, absurd to suggest that the respective authors of Isa or Ezek believed that *literally* earth-shattering events would accompany the ruination of these empires. As in Matthew, this hyperbolic, figurative language was used to convey artistically the magnitude of the destruction that was to befall political entities. Since 24.4-35 describes in prophetic form the time leading up to and including the Roman assault on Jerusalem, such imagery is not unnatural or unexpected.

After the cosmic imagery, the tribes are said to mourn at “the sign of the Son of Man” (24.30a). Unfortunately, Matthew introduced this enigmatic phrase to his Markan source material without explanation. Hence, numerous interpretations have been proposed for this phrase, far more than can adequately be handled in this study. In an attempt to narrow the field of potentially acceptable theories, based on the above-mentioned conclusions only hypotheses that posit that this sign accompanied the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE will be considered. Theories that consider this portent to announce the *Parousia* (an *unannounced event* [cf. 24.36-25.30]) will not be examined.¹¹⁸

A. J. B. Higgins, as well as some early exegetes (cf. *Apoc Pet* 1; *Epistula Apostolorum* 16), suggested that this “sign” was a celestial figuration in the form of Jesus’ cross.¹¹⁹ Higgins pointed to Josephus’ claim to have seen a sword-shaped star in the sky during the siege of Jerusalem (*Wars* 6.53). It is by this symbol, Higgins posited, that the unbelieving Jews recognized the one whom they have pierced.¹²⁰ But Josephus stated that he recognized it only as a sword. There is no indication it was recognized as a cross or that it was associated with Jesus who was executed some forty years earlier. If this was the symbol at which the tribes were to mourn, that was not the response exhibited.

Perhaps the genitive τοῦ υἱοῦ should be interpreted epexegetically.¹²¹ This would render the translation, “the sign *that is* the Son of Man,” i.e., the “sign” seen in the heavens *is* the Son of Man.¹²² Higgins and Sim claim that this interpretation

118. See, for example, K. K. Kim, “The Signs of the Parousia: A Diachronic and Comparative Study of the Apocalyptic Vocabulary of Matthew 24:27-31” (AUSS PhD Dissertation, 1994), 196; Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology*, 104-05.

119. A. J. B. Higgins, “The Sign of the Son of Man (Matt. XXIV, 30),” *NTS* 9 (1962-63): 380-82; Cf. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetics* (1961), 126.

120. Higgins, “Son of Man,” 382.

121. S. Brown, “The Matthean Apocalypse,” *JSNT* 4 (1979): 2-27 (13).

122. Brown claimed that this theory is supported by the “sign of Jonah” pericopae (12.40; 16.4). It is

cannot be valid because the order of events does not allow it: appearance of the “sign” — the mourning of the tribes — coming of the Son of Man. But despite claims to the contrary, this reading is still possible. It is possible that Matthew introduces “the sign of the Son of Man,” makes a comment about the peoples’ response, and then retrospectively explains what exactly the tribes saw. Therefore, the exegetical reading remains an interpretively viable option.

Alternatively, it is possible that “in heaven” modifies “Son of Man” and not “the sign.” This would mean that “the sign” could be anything on earth or in heaven, including the 70 CE conquest of Jerusalem. That is, the destruction of the Temple may have been the sign on earth that the Son of Man was approaching the Ancient of Days in heaven to receive, among other rewards, a kingdom and universal sovereignty. This certainly makes sense in context; but there is no way to determine definitively that this interpretation is valid or invalid.

Either of these latter two theories may correctly identify the enigmatic “sign of the Son of Man.” The text simply provides too little evidence for the researcher to make a solid conclusion. Nevertheless, the reader can be assured that whatever the sign was, it was an emotionally devastating symbol to “all the tribes of the land.”

Matthew 24.30 contains two clear allusions to the Jewish Scripture. At the sign of the Son of Man, the author states that “all the tribes (or “clans” [cf. LXX Zech 12.12-14]) of the land will mourn.” Commonly the phrase translated here “tribes of the *land*” is rendered “tribes of the *earth*,” as it is semantically possible for τῆς γῆς to have either meaning. However, “land” is the preferred translation for two reasons. First, the text suggests that the destruction of Jerusalem is the focus of 24.4-35 and, therefore, it is more likely that the tribes of “the land,” i.e., the nation of Israel, are mourning rather than the whole of civilization. Second, the statement καὶ τότε κόψονται πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς appears to be an allusion to LXX Zech 12.12: καὶ κόψεται ἡ γῆ κατὰ φυλὰς φυλάς (“And the land shall mourn

suggested that the Son of Man was a “sign” to the people at his resurrection, just as he was a “sign” at the destruction of the Temple (Brown, “Matthean Apocalypse,” 13). But this is not comparing apples-to-apples. If “the sign of the Son of Man” is the Son of Man himself, it is simply his presence that is the sign. Meanwhile, the Son of Man’s presence is not the “sign of Jonah,” it is his death followed by resurrection in three days. Hence, “the sign of the Son of Man” is a person, whereas the “sign of Jonah” is a complex event that happens to involve the same person. Thus, the “sign of Jonah” does not help one interpret what “the sign of the Son of Man” means.

according to tribe”).¹²³ In Zech it is not the tribes or clans of the earth that mourn; rather, it is the tribes of Israel who grieve and repent upon seeing the one whom they pierced (cf. LXX Zech 12.10). Hence, τῆς γῆς should be interpreted nationally in 24.30 instead of globally.

Matthew continues, “and they (i.e., the tribes of Israel) will see the Son of Man coming upon the clouds of heaven (ὃν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ¹²⁴ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ) with power and great glory.” This is the first unambiguous citation of OG Dan 7.13 in Mt: καὶ ἴδου ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἦρχετο (OG Dan 7.13). This approach of the human-like figure is not from heaven to earth but from earth to heaven to receive authority and an everlasting kingdom.¹²⁵ The “one like a son of man” in OG Dan 7 does not play an active role in the earlier judgment of the four kingdoms, who are represented by beastly figurations. When the “son of man” arrives, the kingdoms have already been subjugated to the Ancient of Days and their authority has been seized (OG Dan 7.12). *The “one like a son of man” is the passive receptor of the fallen nations’ authority on behalf of the persecuted children of Israel* (cf. OG Dan 7.17-18; cf. Mt 21.43).

When read through the lens provided by the Danielic account, the Son of Man’s coming in Mt 24.30 is not for judgment, but occurs *after* judgment (cf. 24.29), for the reception of kingdom-stewardship.¹²⁶ The kingdom that the Son of Man receives subsequent to the 70 CE judgment of “this generation” is the kingdom over which the Jewish leaders had once been placed as stewards:

I tell you, therefore, that the kingdom of God will be taken away from you and given to a people producing its fruits (21.43).

Matthew portrays “this generation” as having forfeited the blessings of the kingdom of God and as having gone so far as attempting to impede actively the growth of the kingdom. Therefore, from his perspective, they play the role of the wicked kingdoms in Daniel’s night-vision. That is, according to Matthew, the Son of Man

123. R. H. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew’s Gospel* (SNT 18. Leiden: Brill, 1967), 53.

124. Note how Matthew changes Mark’s ἐν νεφέλαις to ἐπὶ νεφελῶν, conforming the saying to the OG reading of Dan 7.13.

125. G. B. Caird, *New Testament Theology* (Completed and Ed. by L. D. Hurst. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 377; J. A. T. Robinson, *Jesus and His Coming* (London: SCM, 1957), 45 n. 2.

126. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 361; France, *Matthew*, 923; Webb, *John the Baptizer*, 245; Garland, *Reading Matthew*, 239-40.

receives glory, worship, authority, and a kingdom once “this wicked and adulterous generation” has been judged and stripped of its authority. The Son of Man’s approach to the Ancient of Days (24.30) after the Temple’s destruction (24.29) is for the purpose of claiming the kingdom that God’s people forfeited by killing his Son. The evangelist claims that by means of the people’s unrighteousness, they show themselves to be no different than the pagan nations that have held them in captivity for centuries—together the nations over whom the Son of Man holds dominion (OG Dan 7.14; Mt 28.18; cf. 24.14).

Matthew perceives this reception of authority and corresponding enthronement at the right hand of the Father as that which grounds the Son of Man’s right to act as judge at the Eschatological Assize. The act of enthronement is not detailed in OG Dan 7.13-14. But the Danielic vision was commonly interpreted as an enthronement scene by early exegetes.¹²⁷ This conclusion is supported by the depiction of the son of man as having been seated on God’s throne-chariot and by the Ancient of Days’ conferment of power to the human-like one in 7.14. As was discussed earlier, it is the enthronement of the Son of Man upon the very throne of God that confirms he possesses the sovereignty necessary to act on the Father’s behalf. Since the Son of Man receives a kingdom consequent to his enthronement, the author and his community are assured that the Son of Man can and will exercise his prerogative to judge in the eschatological future.

Therefore, the destruction of the Temple and the exaltation of the Son of Man it signified function in a similar manner as the “sign of Jonah.” Just as the death and subsequent resurrection of the Son of Man was a sign to “this generation” that they would soon face God’s wrath, to the Matthean community the fall of Jerusalem and the enthronement of the Son of Man act as portents of the Son of Man’s return for the purpose of purifying his kingdom. Matthew’s post-70 CE audience is encouraged to find comfort as opposed to sadness in the events of 70 CE, for by them and the resurrection the Son of Man is vindicated. The ruination the Temple and the holy city in which it once stood together indicate to the community that the Son of Man has been elevated to the right hand of the Father and will re-

127. Cf. 4Q246, 1 En 37-71; Mk 14:62; Mt 19:28; 25:31; 26:64; Lk 22:69; Jn 12:34; 4 Ezra 7; 13; *m. Sanh.* 38b; *Num. Rab.* 13.14; *’Aggadot Bēr’ešit* 23.1; *Midr. Haggadol Gen.* 49.10 (P. M. Casey, *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7* [London: SPCK, 1979], 80).

turn to end conflict before rewarding the righteous sufferer.¹²⁸

4.8.4—The Parousia and Great Assize of the Son of Man (Matthew 24.27, 37, 39, 44; 25.31)

As has been discussed above, there is a distinct division in the Eschatological Discourse between 24.35 and 24.36. Matthew 24.4-35 is replete with portents indicating the imminence of the Temple's ruination and the Son of Man's subsequent "coming upon the clouds of heaven." The Matthean community is told to look for false messiahs and prophets (24.4-5, 11, 23-26), wars (24.6-7), famines (24.7), earthquakes (24.7), general persecution (24.9-10), general lawlessness (24.12), and "the abomination of desolation" (24.15). These signals of impending judgment are read in the same way an arborist reads a fig tree to know the seasons (24.32); "these things" (cf. 24.3, 33) can be charted by those who are attentive.

However, unlike determining the time of the Temple's demise, calculating the time of the Son of Man's *Parousia* is impossible. Matthew 24.36 reads,

But concerning that day and hour no one knows, not even the angels of heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father.

The phrase "that day and hour" refers back to "your visitation (σῆς παρουσίας) and the end of the age," since it is in 24.37 that Jesus begins to speak of ἡ παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. The eschatological "coming" of the Son of Man is distinguished from his former "coming" in that the latter is not accompanied by signs (cf. 24.39, 42-44, 50; 25.13). Not much is revealed about the Son of Man's future visitation in 24.37-25.30, except that it will be sudden and without warning.¹²⁹ The only recourse for the Christian community is to remain watchful for his *Parousia*, which will be as surprising and quick as lightning (cf. 24.27). Those who are not prepared will be swept away in judgment, as had the wicked generation during the time of Noah (24.37-39). It is the theme of watchfulness in relation to the Son of Man's *Parousia* that concerns 24.37-25.30.¹³⁰

128. Further, as Wright has mentioned, the destruction of the Temple confirms that Jesus was a God-appointed prophet and the representative of Israel (*Jesus and the Victory of God*, 362).

129. It is possible that the Parable of the Ten Virgins (25.1-13) is a veiled reference to the Messianic Banquet

130. All of Mt 25 is Matthean *Sondergut*. Matthew 25:14-30 has a possible parallel in Lk 19: 12-27, but as France has remarked, the differences are just as startling as the similarities (France, "On Being Ready," 178). Matthew has expanded on the Markan warning concerning watchfulness (Mk 13.32-37) by adding a pair of parables (24.45-25.30) and an apocalyptic vision of the Son of Man's

Unlike the other Synoptic writers, Matthew provides a predictive account of the Eschatological Assize:¹³¹

When the Son of Man comes in his glory, and all the angels with him, then he will sit on his throne of glory. Before him will be gathered all the nations, and he will separate people one from another as a shepherd separates the sheep from the goats.

As in 19.28, the Son of Man is said to preside like a “king” (25.34, 40)¹³² on “his glorious throne” or “his throne of glory” at the initiation of the Great Judgment. As was discussed in the exegesis of 19.28, the Son of Man’s enthronement on the seat of Yahweh is the source of his authority to judge the nations, since being seated on God’s very throne is the strongest possible indicator of Jesus’ reception of Yahweh’s dominion.

According to this apocalyptic vision, it is a person’s watchfulness for the Son of Man’s return, and primarily the actions that are in accordance with such alertness, that determine whether he or she will be placed among the sheep to the right or the goats to the left (25.33).¹³³ Those acts of blessing done for the “the least of these” are done to the Son of Man who will repay (25.34-40; cf. 16.27). But as 10.42 specifies, it is not simply the act of kindness that precipitates reward. Jesus claimed at the conclusion of the Mission Discourse that if anyone gives as little as a cup of water to one of “these little ones *because he is my disciple,*” he will be reward-

universal judgment.

131. Jeremias called this a “parable” since the pericope contains a parabolic simile comparing the Son of Man to a shepherd separating goats and sheep (*Parables*, 206). However, a parabolic comparison embedded in a larger account does not make the entire account a “parable.” The shepherd analogy is simply apocalyptic imagery (cf. France, “On Being Ready,” 190). Alternatively, D. L. Turner suggested that 25.31-46 is an extended commentary on Dan 7.13-27 (*Matthew*, 611). This is certainly possible, but such a claim may be overreaching. It seems best to agree with Nolland that this is not a parable or a commentary, but simply “an account of the judgment that makes use of a comparison” (*Matthew*, 1035-36).

132. The Son of Man is addressed by the narrator twice as “king” at the beginning and at the end of his proclamation to the kingdom-bound sheep on his right. This appellation, therefore, acts as an *inclusio*; once the righteous have inherited the kingdom (24.34) the Son of Man can rightly be called the “king.” Based upon this designation as well as other less remarkable features, Jeremias and Sim have suggested that Matthew has here used a preexisting account of the great assize and has redacted it for his purposes. It is proposed that “king” is a remnant of that original source and has not likely been added by Matthew (Jeremias, *Parables*, 206; Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology*, 125). However, seeing as the Son of Man is uniquely ascribed a kingdom in Mt, and 25.31-46 tells the story of his people’s entrance into that kingdom, it is not strange that Matthew might refer to the Son of Man here, for the first time, as “king.”

133. The position at the right hand was commonly seen as a place of honor (cf. Mt 22.44; 26.64; 1 Kgs 2.19), while a position at the left hand was considered a place of shame (cf. Mt 6.3; 27.38; 1 Kgs 22.19 [D. L. Turner, *Matthew*, 608]).

ed (10.42b). It is the blessing of one of Jesus' followers *precisely because he is a follower of Jesus* that imbues the act with meaning and kingdom efficaciousness.

Those who do not help the community of believers, meanwhile, are considered by Matthew to be among the allies of Satan and his angels, for whom the "eternal fire" was prepared (25.41; cf. 13.41-42). Whether the judgment against Satanic dominions is concurrent with the destruction of wicked humans or at another time, the reader is not told. But 25.41 assures the reader that destruction in "eternal fire" awaits demonic forces as well as the unrighteous among humankind (25.46). According to Matthew, the cosmic battle that has stood as a shadow behind Jesus' conflict with the religious leaders will one day end with the Son of Man, the Father, and the "sons of the kingdom" as the victors. The Son of Man will come with his angelic hosts to purify the world of Satanic influence—a bloody resolution to conflict resulting in a purified kingdom (13.40-43).

4.8.5—Concluding Thoughts on the Exegesis of Matthew 24.27, 30, 37, 39, 44; 25.31

Despite not knowing when the *Parousia* will occur, Matthew suggests that his community can be assured that the Son of Man will return to judge, punish, and reward. The guarantors of this eschatological coming are the related destruction of Herod's Temple and the Son of Man's subsequent exaltation. The destruction of the Temple was a concrete indicator for Matthew's post-70 CE audience of the Son of Man's reception of authority and a kingdom. According to the evangelist, the blessing of having stewardship over God's kingdom, which had belonged exclusively to Israel, has now been given to the Son of Man on behalf of his "new people" (21.43; cf. 13.38). It is by this sovereignty and enthronement that the Son of Man has the prerogative to evaluate the deeds of men at the Great Assize (cf. 16.27). The author contends that similar violence to that which "this generation" experienced in 70 CE will befall all those who oppress the righteous, including Satan and his angelic forces, who play a subtle but important role in the development of conflict.

The "abomination of desolation" and the Great Assize are presented as gruesome events that are intended to generate fear in the wicked and, counterintuitively, a sense of comfort in the righteous. As was stated earlier, both 10.23 and 16.28 refer to the Son of Man's reception of authority and of a kingdom. In both passages, mention of the Son of Man's "coming" to the Ancient of Days appears im-

mediately after Jesus has urged the community of believers to persevere in times of tribulation (10.17-22; 16.24-27). This is not by coincidence. Matthew is reminding his community that it is through God's judgment against "this generation," which they have seen expressed in the Roman conquest of Jerusalem in 70 CE, that the Son of Man is vindicated and given the right to reign over an everlasting kingdom (cf. OG Dan 7.13-14). Having the enemy of God placed under the Son of Man's feet as he sits on the divine throne (cf. Ps 110.1; Mt 26.64) confirms that he possesses the dominion necessary to bring an end to conflict in the eschatological future. This resolution of tension is paired with the vindication and recompense of the righteous, who have persevered under the heavy hand of wicked. Therefore, by referring back to God's violent retribution against "this generation" in 70 CE and forward to the fiery fate that will be meted out by the Son of Man against all evildoers, Matthew conveys to his community that it can rest assured that "eternal life" will belong to its members (25.46).

These promises are given immediately prior to the commencement of the Passion Narrative. This prediction of the Son of Man's future exaltation and victory starkly contrasts the Son of Man's sufferings in the narrative-now. With Jesus' execution looming on the horizon—the climax of conflict in the Matthean story of Jesus—anticipation heightens for the resurrection and the beginning of conflict resolution so vividly described in the Eschatological Discourse.

—Matthew 26.2, 24, 45—

As conflict increases towards its bitter climax, the occurrence of "Son of Man" greatly increases. Jesus' self-designation is used five times in Mt 26 alone (cf. 26.2, 24 [x2], 45, 64), the first four of which appear in contexts that pertain to the Son of Man's suffering and death. These four will be examined together, after which the last "Son of Man" statement (26.64) will be analyzed on its own.

The "Son of Man" sayings in 26.2, 24, 45 do not greatly contribute to the developing Matthean "Son of Man" concept. It is here posited that the purpose of these sayings is to recapitulate much of what was predicted prior about the Son of Man's execution.

4.9.2—The Fourth Passion Prediction (Matthew 26.2)

Matthew ends the Eschatological Discourse and begins the Passion Narrative with the characteristic phrase: Καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς πάντας τοὺς λόγους τούτους (26.1; cf. 7.28; 11.1; 13.53; 19.1). The narrator has used the words τοὺς λόγους τούτους to mark the end of discourses earlier (17.28; 19.1), but this is the first time he uses the inclusive adjective πάντας. It is probable, then, that πάντας τοὺς λόγους τούτους refers back to all the discourses preserved in the gospel, not merely the final Fifth Discourse. This indicates that all of Jesus' revelatory and didactic speeches have ended. All that remains is for Matthew to conclude Jesus' story.

The statement at the end of the final discourse is balanced by an introductory formula used to initiate the last narrative. Matthew 26.1-2 reads,

And when Jesus finished all these sayings, he said to his disciples, "You know that after two days the Passover is coming, and the Son of Man will be delivered up to be crucified."

This proclamation is an expansion on the declarative statement of Mk 14.1¹³⁴ that has been placed into the direct speech of Jesus. The latter half of the verse is a condensed version of the previous three passion predictions, especially 20.18-19. It has the core characteristics of a passion prediction—"the Son of Man + delivered over + crucified"—except it lacks the resurrection formula καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθήσεται (cf. 16.21; 17.23; 20.19).¹³⁵ Despite this alteration in the pattern, 26.2 should be considered a passion prediction as D. Senior recognized: "The economy of detail makes sense here because the prediction is the inaugural statement of the Passion itself: the series of actions implied in Matthew's curt παραδίδοται εἰς τὸ σταυρωθῆναι will be vividly defined in the extended narrative which follows."¹³⁶ Therefore, this study assumes that 26.2 is, in fact, a fourth passion prediction, though it does not share the exact style of the first three predictions.

The reader is informed of the chief priests' and elders' intentions (26.3-5) immediately after Jesus prophesies that he will be killed in a matter of days. The religious officials wish to subdue Jesus for execution, but 26.5 expresses their fear of a riot if the trial and punishment took place during the festival. At the time,

134. Mark 14.1 reads, "It was now two days before the Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread."

135. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:438.

136. D. Senior, *The Passion Narrative According to Matthew: A Redactional Study* (BETL 39. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1975), 21.

Jerusalem was filled with Jews celebrating their ancestors' deliverance from Egyptian captivity. At least some of these people thought of Jesus as a prophet (21.11, 46), the Son of David (21.9; 21.15; cf. 21.42), or both, and would, therefore, protest his persecution. Even those who did not sympathize with Jesus may take offense at his being put to death on or around a high holiday, especially upon a Roman cross, a symbol of Israel's current "captivity" under the Roman Empire. It would not be a prudent tactic for the religious leaders to make a move to silence Jesus while all eyes were on Jerusalem and her festivities.

By placing the final passion prediction on the lips of Jesus and pairing it with an account of the religious leaders' reluctance to kill him, Jesus is portrayed as the director of his own fate. As J. T. Carroll and J. B. Green colloquially wrote, "Jesus is the one seated in the director's chair."¹³⁷ It is according to the plan of God that he goes to die in Jerusalem. Although the grim actions of the Jewish leaders hide it well, Jesus and the Father are in control of what lies ahead.

4.9.3—The Son of Man Goes to the Cross "as it is written of him" (Matthew 26.24)

The concept that Jesus' execution is orchestrated by God is expressed in the pair of "Son of Man" sayings that happen to fall within the same verse, 26.24. To account for the context in which these sayings appear, the whole pericope (26.20-25) will be cited:

When it was evening, he reclined at table with the Twelve. And as they were eating, he said, "Truly, I say to you that one of you will betray me." And they were exceedingly sorrowful and began to say to him one after another, "Is it I, Lord?" He answered, "He who has dipped his hand in the dish with me will betray me. The Son of Man goes as it is written concerning him, but woe to that man by whom the Son of Man is handed over! It would have been better for that man if he had not been born." Judas, who would betray him, replied, "Is it I, Rabbi?" He said to him, "You have said so."

Matthew eliminated the Markan "as it is written" sayings that referred to Jesus' and John's deaths after the transfiguration scene (Mk 9.12-13; Mt 17.9-13). It is possible that this was done to remove ambiguity; at that point in the narrative, Matthew had not discussed where, in fact, it was written that the Son of Man must suffer. However, by this point in the gospel LXX Isa 53.12 had already been alluded to in the claim that Jesus has come "to give his life a ransom *for many*" (20.28). That Matthew here refers to this Isaianic text is supported by another allusion to LXX

137. Carroll and Green, "His Blood on Us and Our Children," 43.

Isa 53.12 in the immediate context of Mt 26.20-25. After having identified the bread of the Passover meal as a symbol for his body, Jesus passed around a cup of wine, stating, “Drink of it, all of you, for this is my blood of the covenant *that is poured out for the many for the forgiveness of sins*” (26.27b-28). It is gathered from Matthew’s use of Scripture that Jesus experienced shame and death for the purification of the elect. Because his death was in accordance with the soteriological plan of the Father, Jesus is subsequently resurrected, the first step in the process of turning his shame into glory.

4.9.4—The Hour Has Come (Matthew 26.45)

After finishing the Passover meal with his disciples, Jesus retreated to the Garden of Gethsemane for a time of prayerful reflection on his forthcoming self-sacrifice (26.36-46). Meanwhile, Jesus’ betrayer, Judas, drew near with a company of men sent from the chief priests and scribes to subdue Jesus (26.47). Knowing that his soon-to-be captors would arrive shortly, Jesus approached Peter, James and John, who forewent prayer for sleep, and stated,

Sleep and take your rest later. See, the hour is at hand, and the Son of Man is betrayed into the hands of sinners. Arise, let us be going. See, my betrayer is at hand.

For the Son of Man, the time of prayer is over. As Carson aptly stated, “The hour of the Passion is near: it is too late to pray and gain strength for the temptations ahead The sleepers for whom he would die have lost their opportunity to gain strength through prayer. By contrast Jesus has prayed in agony and now rises with poise and advances to meet his betrayer.”¹³⁸ Rather than run as his disciples will (26.56), Jesus allows himself to be captured according to the will of God, knowing well that this path would eventually lead him to drink from the dreaded cup of suffering and wrath (20.22; 26.39, 42, 44).

4.9.5—Concluding Thoughts on the Third Unit of “Son of Man” Sayings

The “Son of Man” sayings in 26.2, 24, 45 do little more than stress that the conflict in which the Son of Man and the religious leaders have engaged since the first “Son of Man” saying will inevitably end in the Son of Man’s death. The plots of the religious officials to stop Jesus from speaking against them and their interpretations of

138. Carson, *Matthew*, 2:545.

the Law has evolved from defamation to assassination. To maintain their authority, lest Jesus win the hearts of the people, the Jewish leadership must stop him, even if it means appealing to their Roman overlords.

Although it appears that the religious officials will soon succeed in their devilish schemes, the reader knows from the Eschatological Discourse and the frequent references to the Son of Man's resurrection that such victory is short-lived. The leaders act according to their depravity but within the will of God. It is God's desire that the Son of Man be sacrificed as "a ransom for many" (20.28) for "the forgiveness of their sins" (26.28; cf. 1.21). But just as Judas is responsible for his actions despite God's foreordination (26.24), the Jewish authorities are accountable for their execution of God's anointed prophet (cf. 21.43), even though it adheres to the soteriological will of the Father. As the next and final "Son of Man" saying confirms—this time in public—"this wicked and adulterous generation" will receive divine reprisal for their sins (26.64; cf. 24.4-35).

—Matthew 26.64—

After being captured by the mob of men sent by the chief priests and scribes, Jesus is taken before the Sanhedrin for examination. Unable to convict him using honest testimony, Matthew claims that the religious leaders employ disreputable tactics (cf. 26.59) by knowingly accepting the false statements of two witnesses (cf. Deut 19.15) who alleged that Jesus said, "I am able to destroy the Temple of God and to rebuild it in three days" (26.61; cf. 27.40; Jn 2.19). Angered that Jesus did not respond to such accusations despite an order to explain himself (26.62), the high priest exclaims,

I put you under oath before the living God, tell us if you are the Messiah, the Son of God.

This shift from issues of the Temple to an inquiry about Jesus' messiahship is likely prompted by texts such as Zech 6.2 and 2 Sam 7.13-14 that promised that an anointed royal figure of the lineage of David would one day come to Israel and build a house for God.¹³⁹ Supposed claims to destroy and rebuild the current Herodian Temple would likely have recalled such Jewish messianic tradition.

139. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:528.

Jesus replies to the high priest's interrogation, saying,

You have said so. But I say to you, soon you will see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of Power and coming on the clouds of heaven (26.64).

Here it will be suggested that Jesus' answer confirms to the Sanhedrin that he is the Son-of-Man-like Messiah who will be given universal authority after the destruction of Herod's Temple in 70 CE. This, the last of the Matthean "Son of Man" sayings, anticipates a bloody conclusion to Jesus' conflict with "this generation." Ironically, the tribunal that sought to condemn Jesus falsely will themselves be condemned for their murder of God's Son.

4.10.2—An Exegesis of Matthew 26.64: The Last "Son of Man" Saying

Jesus gives the high priest the immensely debated answer, "You have said so" (ὁὐ εἶπας [26.64a]). The question arises, why did Matthew not preserve the simple and direct "I am" of Mk 14.62? Suggested answers abound. D. R. Catchpole claimed that Jesus' reply was "reluctant or circumlocutory in formulation."¹⁴⁰ That is, it was not a negation, but neither was it an absolute affirmation; the response is best considered a "qualified affirmation."¹⁴¹ But this conclusion is doubtful. The response, "You have said so," can be interpreted as a "qualified affirmation," as it likely is in 27.11. But it does not necessarily carry this connotation. After Judas asks Jesus the question, "Is it I, Rabbi?" (26.25), referring to his imminent betrayal, Jesus replies ὁὐ εἶπας. There is no indication that this is not an absolute affirmation; Judas is indeed the one who will deliver Jesus to his enemies. Additionally, every element of the Matthean form of Peter's confession (16.16) is present in the high priest's oath: "Messiah," "living God," "Son of God."¹⁴² Even though Caiaphas did not believe Jesus was the long-awaited Christ, there is nothing in this oath that Jesus would not gladly affirm (cf. 16.17-19). Hence, there is no readily apparent reason for Jesus to qualify his answer and, therefore, ὁὐ εἶπας does not likely express hesitation.

The exact reason for Matthew's alteration of his Markan source is unknown. It may be that Matthew wished to conform Jesus' answer to the one given to Pilate

140. D. R. Catchpole, "The Answer of Jesus to Caiaphas (Matt. xxvi. 64)," *NTS* 17 (1970-71), 213-26.

141. F. D. Bruner, *Matthew: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2007), 2:???. France, *Matthew*, 1026.

142. Cf. Luz, "Son of Man," 15.

in 27.11.¹⁴³ Or, perhaps, the response σὺ εἶπας was given to incriminate Caiaphas who knows the truth about Jesus and yet ignores it.¹⁴⁴ Or, instead, Evans' theory that suggests Jesus' "I am" in Mk 14.62 may "strike Jewish readers as presumptuous" (cf. *b. Sanh.* 93b) might be valid.¹⁴⁵ But whatever hypothesis one considers acceptable, all reasonable theories confirm that Jesus' answer is certainly not a negation, as Caiaphas' reaction evinces (26.65-66).

Matthew's Jesus confirms that he is indeed the Messiah, Son of God, by alluding to two messianic texts: LXX Ps 110.1 and OG Dan 7.13-14. Matthew 26.64 reads,

Jesus said to him, "You have said so. But I say to you, soon you will see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of Power and coming on the clouds of heaven."

The temporal marker, ἀπ' ἄρτι, like σὺ εἶπας, is enigmatic. The words are commonly rendered into English as "from now on," which implies that they refer not to an event but to a state of being. In accord with this reading, Carson suggested that ἀπ' ἄρτι refers to the psychological state of the high priest and the court trying Jesus for blasphemy: the members of the arbitration board will know who Jesus really was after his death and resurrection.¹⁴⁶ This is possible, but what follows ἀπ' ἄρτι concerns not a state but an event: the coming on the clouds of the enthroned Son of Man. Recognizing this, Davies and Allison suggested that instead of ἀπ' ἄρτι, one could read the word ἀπαρτί, which means "certainly" (cf. Jn 13.19; Rev 14.13).¹⁴⁷ Although this word fits the context, it lacks textual support. Alternatively, they proposed that ἀπ' ἄρτι could also mean "in the future"—"Jesus will no longer be seen as he is now; rather he will be seen when he comes in glory, seated on a throne and riding on the clouds."¹⁴⁸ This proposal makes the most sense given the context and the presence of the future tense verb ὄψεσθε. Sometime "in the future" the high priest and the court will see the Son of Man enthroned with the Father. But this

143. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:529.

144. Gundry, *Matthew*, 545.

145. Evans, *Matthew*, 442.

146. Carson, *Matthew*, 2:555.

147. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:530.

148. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:530; cf. A. Sand, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (RNT 1. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1986), 541; Schweizer, *Matthew*, 499.

study has rendered ἀπ' ἄρτι as “soon” (i.e., “in the *near* future”) due to the event to which ἀπ' ἄρτι refers.¹⁴⁹

Jesus does not speak here of his resurrection.¹⁵⁰ Rather, prior exegesis would suggest that the event to which Jesus refers is the exaltation of the Son of Man subsequent to the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE.¹⁵¹ In 24.30, the Son of Man is said to come to the Ancient of Days “upon the clouds”—i.e., God’s very throne—to receive authority and an everlasting kingdom. Jesus here assures the Sanhedrin that they will “see” this event, as will all of “this generation” (23.36; 24.34; cf. 11.16; 12.39, 41-42, 45; 16.4; 17.17), in that they will experience the destruction requisite for the Son of Man’s promotion. Thus, ἀπ' ἄρτι is translated “soon” because Jesus refers to an event that will happen within a generation, before at least some in the courtroom perished (see the temporal indicators in 10.23 and 16.28).

Although Jesus cited LXX Ps 110.1 earlier in the narrative (22.44), this is the first and only time LXX Ps 110.1 is alluded to alongside OG Dan 7.13. The Septuagintal version Ps 110.1 reads,

The Lord said to my lord, “Sit at my right hand, until I make your enemies your footstool.”

This is a natural pairing of Jewish Scripture. In both passages, plenipotentiaries are depicted as seated on Yahweh’s throne and both figures are passive recipients of authority procured through Yahweh’s judgment. This dual allusion more clearly conveys to the reader that the Son of Man is made to share the throne of the Father at his post-70 CE exaltation. It is this enthronement that secures his right to act as the leader of the righteous, and as Matthew uniquely proposes, to judge the nations at the Great Assize.

One should not perceive an inconsistency with Matthew’s combination of enthronement and movement, as does Brown: “one cannot sit and come at the same time.”¹⁵² As was stated previously, Yahweh’s throne is occasionally depicted as having wheels (cf. Ezek 1.15-21; MT and θ Dan 7.9) or is given the attribute of movement (cf. LXX Ps 103.3; LXX Isa 19.1; OG Dan 7.13). Thus, the Son of Man can

149. Cf. Bruner, *Matthew*, 2:668.

150. Contra L. Gaston, *No Stone on Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels* (NovTSup 23. Leiden: Brill, 1970), 389; Garland, *Reading Matthew*, 270, 272.

151. France, *Matthew*, 1027-28.

152. Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 504.

simultaneously sit at the right hand of Power¹⁵³ and come upon the clouds of heaven without logical inconsistency. Further, even though L. Gaston interpreted 26.64 to refer to the resurrection, he accurately commented that “since the two texts [i.e., Ps 110.1; Dan 7.13] refer to one event, the order in which they are cited is irrelevant.”¹⁵⁴

4.10.3—The Purpose and Consequence of Jesus’ Proclamation

The self-designation “Son of Man” is once again employed in public in a polemical context; that is, while revelatory, Jesus’ declaration functions as a condemnation. According to Matthew, Jesus does not prophesy for the sake of the Sanhedrin’s repentance or as an act of blessing; this prediction is an ironic proclamation of God’s impending judgment, akin to a taunt. Not only is Jesus claiming to be God’s anointed, which the high priest and the court clearly did not believe, his strong affirmation of messianic identity using LXX Ps 110 and OG Dan 7 implies that the Sanhedrin’s examination was a judicial farce. To the evangelist, they have made themselves the enemies of the Son of Man and God, and for it, they will eventually be made a proverbial footstool for the vindicated and glorified Son of Man.

Because of Jesus’ seemingly audacious and self-aggrandizing claim, the high priest charges him with blasphemy and, as later legal tradition considered requisite, he tore his garment as a sign of mourning (cf. *m. Sanh.* 7:5).¹⁵⁵ Bock adds to this charge the element of Jesus’ “cultural blasphemy.”¹⁵⁶ That is, Jesus is thought to blaspheme God by dishonoring the Temple, the Temple cultus, and its attendants (cf. Exod 22.28). This legal sentence, though, is ironic on two levels. First, the suggestion that Jesus is the one who is committing blasphemy is almost comical in light of the Sanhedrin’s acceptance of false witness for the purpose of executing God’s anointed Messiah and prophet. From the perspective of the evangelist, the Temple authorities have exercised their religious power for shameful, God-dishonoring purposes. Second, the last time Jesus used “Son of Man” of himself in public was when he charged the religious leaders with blaspheming the Spirit by whom

153. “Power” was an honorific circumlocutory designation for God used in Judaism (*1 En* 1:4; *b. Sabb.* 87a, 88b; *b. ‘Erub.* 54b; *b. Yeb.* 105b [Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:529]).

154. Gaston, *No Stone on Another*, 389-90.

155. France, *Matthew*, 1029.

156. Bock, *Blasphemy*, 111-12.

he is empowered (12.39-40). For this blasphemy, Jesus promised them the “sign of Jonah,” which will mark the Son of Man’s vindication and his enemies’ doom. The high priest’s accusation of blasphemy will precipitate Jesus’ death and subsequent resurrection, thus fulfilling Jesus’ prediction.

4.10.4—Concluding Thoughts on the Exegesis of Matthew 26.64

As has been suggested, the Matthean “Son of Man” sayings are marked by conflict and the anticipation for resolution. This tension is perhaps best witnessed here in 26.64, whence Jesus claims to be the soon-exalted Danielic “son of man” while his Jewish captives are on the brink of victory. The “as it is written” sayings confirmed for the reader that Jesus acts according to the plan of God. Even though the situation may seem bleak, because he is obedient to his Father, the reader knows that his predictions will be fulfilled: he will be raised from the dead, “this generation” will feel the weight of God’s wrath, and the kingdom authority that the people and their leaders hold will be taken away and given to the Son of Man for his Church.

Therefore, Matthew has designed 8.20 and 26.64 to form an *inclusio* around the Matthean “Son of Man” sayings. Jesus’ statement to the scribe in 8.20 not only contains the first use of “Son of Man” in the gospel, it is Jesus’ first polemical dialogue with a religious leader in Mt. Likewise, 26.64 is not only the last “Son of Man” saying in the gospel, it is the last polemical dialogue with the religious leaders in Mt. Hence, from the first saying until the last, the Son of Man is depicted in Mt as being at the center of conflict with “this generation.”

—Conclusion—

Though “Son of Man” only appears once in polemical speech throughout the second half of Mt, Matthew’s Son of Man never ceased to be at the center of conflict. Even the prolonged use of “Son of Man” in private is a signal of continuing conflict. After Jesus’ rejection by the people of northern Galilee (cf. 11.20-24) and the blasphemy of the Pharisees against the Spirit (cf. 12.31-32, 38-45), Jesus withdrew revelation from the hardened of heart (cf. 11.25-27; 13.10-15) and gave knowledge of “hidden things” only to the disciples (cf. 11.25-27; 13.16-17, 34-35). Matthew means this to be an explicit act of judgment against “this generation.” The reciprocal rejection of the religious leaders and crowds by Jesus motivated the withdrawal of

“Son of Man” from public discourse, as well as the revelation that accompanied it. It was not for those outside the kingdom community to know God’s plans concerning the Son of Man’s sacrificial death, exaltation, or eschatological adjudication.

But since the disciples were meant to know such things, the reader is made privy to the narrative-present and narrative-future destinies of the Son of Man. Concerning the former, Matthew continues to describe the Son of Man as a prophet of God. Although Jesus’ is condemned to death by the Sanhedrin after admitting that he is a Messiah like the Danielic “one like a son of man” (cf. 26.64-65), the Son of Man dies like the prophets of old in Jerusalem: the city that kills the prophets and stones those sent to her (cf. 16.13-14, 21; 23.37-39). This execution, as well as the subsequent resurrection of the Son of Man, together function as a prophetic sign-act, marking the divine repudiation of “this generation” by means of the direct action of God. From the vantage point of the evangelist, it signals to the religious leaders and to the people who doubted Jesus’ commissioning that God’s wrath will befall them within a generation of the prophetic gesture (cf. 23.36; 24.34).

But Matthew is not simply interested in portraying the Son of Man as a prophet. Though his role during his first advent was to fulfill the type of a suffering prophet of judgment, his role between the advents and his function at his return are of a different, more exalted order. As has been alluded to in this chapter and will be expanded upon in the next, the Son of Man is not given authority or a kingdom over which to rule until immediately after the 70 CE destruction of Jerusalem. Matthew has conformed his portrayal of the Son of Man to the description of the human-like one in OG Dan 7. That is, like the “one like a son of man” in Daniel’s apocalyptic vision, who receives the authority of the nations after they have been punished, Matthew contends that it is not until God’s wrath is exacted in 70 CE that the kingdom of God is taken away from “this generation” and is presented to the Son of Man on behalf of his new “people” (21.43; 22.7-14). It is with this new-found dominion that the disciples are empowered to “make disciples of all nations” (28.19; cf. 28.18). Unique to Mt, the Son of Man participates in the mission to the Gentiles, sowing the “good seed,” i.e., the “sons of the kingdom” in the field of the world (13.37-38). This establishment of the global community is an exercise of the

Son of Man's universal authority, as well as an act of aggression against Satan and his "sons of the evil one" (cf. 13.37-38; 16.18).

Hence, although the climax of conflict was in the Passion Narrative, according to Matthew conflict continues past the bounds of the narrative and will continue until the second advent of the Son of Man. At that time, the Son of Man will return to judge both the righteous and the unrighteous, repaying each person according to his or her deeds (cf. 16.27; 25.31-46). Thus, the Son of Man, the one who came to prophesy God's curse against the wicked from among the people of Israel, will return to exact judgment, thereby bringing an eternal end to conflict (cf. 25.46).

In the next chapter, this study turns toward examining the Matthean epilogue: Mt 28.16-20. The last three verses in particular have been heavily influenced by the preceding "Son of Man" concept, and although not containing the title "Son of Man," this passage speaks volumes about Matthew's understanding of Jesus as the exalted Son of Man and the ever-present leader of the community.

Chapter Five

The Exaltation of the Son of Man in Matthew 28.18 and Conflict

—Introduction—

It is difficult to imagine a more fitting conclusion to the first gospel than the one provided in 28.16-20:

The eleven disciples went into Galilee to the mountain that Jesus had directed them. And when they saw him, some worshipped and others doubted.¹ Jesus came and spoke to them, saying, “All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me. Go, therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you. And behold, I am with you all the days until the end of the age.”²

As Davies and Allison aptly wrote: “One expects much from an ending, and in this Matthew meets expectations.”³ As the finale of a brilliant narrative, the gospel’s epilogue has received a great deal of attention. This, of course, should not surprise. Aside from being the capstone on an impressive work, it is here that various Matthean themes converge, including, but not limited to, teaching, discipleship, and Gentile inclusion.⁴ Further, it is this passage that has provided the scriptural foundation for the mission and ministry of the Matthean community and the modern ἐκκλησία since at least the Middle Ages.⁵

1. “Worshipping” and “doubting” are antithetical actions in Mt (cf. 14.31, 33). Hence, προσεκύνησαν, οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν cannot refer to actions of the Eleven as a whole. This translation reflects a two-group interpretation.

2. This study will deal with the final form of this pericope. It does not concern this study to differentiate between supposed reconstructions of a hypothetical source text and Matthew’s redaction. Doing so is seemingly futile: if Matthew did not construct the epilogue *ex nihilo*, he has edited his source so thoroughly that it is impossible, or nearly so, to distinguish between the original and redacted versions without a copy of the source. However, though a foundational source may have existed, the present author is inclined to agree with J. D. Kingsbury that Matthew composed the conclusion (cf. “The Composition and Christology of Matt 28:16-10,” *JBL* 93 [1974]: 573-84).

3. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:678.

4. Cf. H. Hendrickx, *The Resurrection Narratives of the Gospels* (Rev. Ed. London: G. Chapman, 1984), 63; O. Brooks, “Matt. xxviii. 16-20 and the Design of the First Gospel,” *JSNT* 10 (1981): 2-18; Garland, *Reading Matthew*, 270. Harrington stated, “It is possible to view Matt 28:16-20 as a summary of the whole Gospel” (*Matthew*, 416).

5. Pennington wrote, “Matthew has long been recognized as ‘the Gospel of the Church,’ both for its famous ecclesiological passages and because of its central importance in the life of the Church throughout her history” (*Heaven and Earth*, 89). This sentiment is tempered by Luz who pointed out that the early Church did not read 28.18-20 as pertaining to their mission but rather to the mission of the Eleven (cf. Justin, *1 Apol* 31.7; Aristides, *Apol* 2.8; *Act Thom* 1; Eusebius, *Hist* 3.1.1-2). He suggested this is due to the nature of primitive missions. The early Church did not have an international program of evangelization; the gospel was generally proclaimed “locally from house to house” (Luz, *Matthew*, 3:626). It is unlikely, however, that Matthew and his community considered this commissioning merely to apply to Jesus’ closest band of followers. Earlier mission discourses appear to speak past this core to a larger post-resurrection community (e.g., 10.17-22, 40-42; 23.34;

But for all the research published about the proper exegesis of this cherished pericope and the application of its missional requirements, not enough has been stated about its relation to the Matthean “Son of Man” concept. The importance of 28.16-20 to one’s understanding of Matthew’s interpretation of Jesus’ self-designation is often either accepted without question and elaboration, or is outrightly denied. A few scholars have attempted to study the relationship between the “Son of Man” sayings and the epilogue; but what work has been produced, as will be seen below, is notably poor.

The purpose of the present chapter is to defend the bold assertion that Jesus’ statement ἐδόθη μοι πάντα ἐξουσία ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ [τῆς] γῆς assumes the past reality of God’s judgement against Jerusalem and the subsequent exaltation of the Son of Man. That is, it is herein claimed that Matthew has linked 28.18-20 to 24.30 and 26.64—both of which describe the Son of Man’s reception of power and a kingdom after the 70 CE destruction of the Temple—through the motif of received ἐξουσία and an allusion to OG Dan 7.13-14. This exaltation empowers the Matthean community and provides the *raison d’être* for its mission to the nations. Additionally, it assures the community that the Son of Man has the requisite authority to sow the “sons of the kingdom” in anticipation for the eschatological harvest “at the end of the age,” whence he will put an end to conflict.

To establish the validity of this interpretation, it must be found logically consistent with the gospel’s prophetic material, missiology, and salvation-history. Further, it must be found that this theory uniquely proposed here explains the available evidence better than competing theories. Therefore, this chapter will analyze the three most prominent readings of 28.18, each of which propose a different timeframe for the Son of Man’s reception of πάντα ἐξουσία. As will be demonstrated, the current readings of Jesus’ claim to universal power create inconsistencies with other aspects of Matthew’s theology or are not internally coherent. Alternatively, the theory exclusively suggested in this study will thereafter be shown to fit well the theology of Mt, in particular its christology, eschatology, and missiology.

24.9-14; 25.40, 45), referred to as “these little ones” or “the least of these” (cf. 10.42; 25.40, 45), who perceived that it was their duty to go to the nations. Cf. D. Cortés-Fuentes, “The Least of These My Brothers: Matthew 25:31-46,” *Apuntes* 23 (2003): 100-09.

—The Son of Man’s Reception of Universal Authority: Opposing Theories—

Opinions vary greatly about when Jesus received “all authority in heaven and upon the earth.” Three theories will herein be examined, after which time the later half of this chapter will be dedicated to establishing the validity of the theory that Jesus received cosmic sovereignty after the fall of Jerusalem in 70 CE.

5.2.2—Resurrection and Enthronement in Matthew and Other New Testament Documents

It is often accepted without question that Jesus received $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha \ \acute{\epsilon}\xi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ at his resurrection or ascension.⁶ Since these events were not far separated, and could perhaps be considered a single phenomenon, they will here be treated as one episode. But assuming for a moment that 28.18 should be read as promoting the concept that the Son of Man was enthroned in the early 30’s CE, it is worth noting that it is improbable that Matthew would have identified the time of Jesus exaltation with the ascension. The assumption of Jesus into heaven is implied in 23.39, but the direct mention of the ascension, as has often been noted, is likely avoided to stress Matthew’s unique “God-with-us” motif (cf. 1.23; 18.20).⁷ The resurrection, meanwhile, features prominently in Matthew’s story of Jesus, and is, therefore, the more likely candidate for the time of Jesus’ promotion. Nevertheless, as was mentioned above, since few authors have so demarcated the resurrection from the ascension, they will be henceforth referred to simply as the “resurrection event,” unless distinguishing the events is necessary to present a clear case.

The following citations from the works of Davies and Meier are representative of the majority-held interpretation of 28.18 and the surrounding context:

There can be little question that in xxviii. 16ff. we are to recognize the scene of a *proleptic parousia* or more precisely the description of *the enthronement of the Son of Man*,⁸ in which he

6. Due to length constrictions, a full bibliography cannot be provided. The following works are representative of the majority on the subject: Lindars, *Jesus Son of Man*, 120-21; Caragounis, *The Son of Man*, 189; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:683; R. G. Harris, *Mission in the Gospels* (London: Epworth, 2004), 58-59 (see Harris’ interesting definition of “proleptic *Parousia*” using science fiction terminology). This view point is most succinctly expressed by J. Schniewind: “But now at the resurrection Jesus is installed in the power and dominion of the Son of Man” (*Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* [NTD 2. Göttingen, 1950], 279).

7. Cf. U. Luz, *The Theology of the Gospel of Matthew* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 31-33; D. D. Kupp, *Matthew’s Emmanuel: Divine Presence and God’s People in the First Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), *passim*.

8. This scene does not describe Jesus’ enthronement, but rather assumes the enthronement of

sends forth envoys to summon the nations to his obedience. *Through the Resurrection*, Jesus of Nazareth . . . has now been given the authority of the Son of Man triumphant⁹

By the death-resurrection he [i.e., Jesus] has been exalted to God's right hand as the Son of Man, the cosmocrator who has authority over heaven and earth. The prophecy of Daniel 7:13 and the prophecy of Jesus in 26:64 are now fulfilled. *From now on* (cf. the *ap' arti* in 26.64) the exalted Son of Man sits at God's right hand, sharing his cosmic rule. And from now on, the Son of Man comes to his church in a proleptic parousia.¹⁰

These claims that the Son of Man received $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha$ $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ at his resurrection are certainly understandable, as this miracle was commonly associated with Jesus' exaltation in several early Christian writings.

Paul in his Epistle to the Romans created common christological ground with his audience by stating that Jesus "was appointed the Son of God in power"¹¹ according to the Spirit of holiness *by his resurrection from the dead. . .*" (Rom 1.4; cf. 8.34). J. R. D. Kirk, commenting on this passage, argued that "the resurrection is not merely a declaration of what has always been the case, but does itself constitute a change in status and/or function for Jesus."¹² Further along in his study, Kirk comments, "though born of David's seed, he is not enthroned, that is, designated Son of God,¹³ until his resurrection."¹⁴ For Paul, then, resurrection is the moment of Jesus' exaltation.

This interpretation comports with the christology ascribed to Paul in the Acts of the Apostles (13.30-33). In a synagogue in Antioch, Paul proclaimed that through the resurrection God fulfilled the Psalmic prophecy: $\upsilon\acute{\iota}\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ $\mu\omicron\upsilon$ $\acute{\epsilon}\hat{\iota}$ $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}$, $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\omega}$ $\sigma\acute{\eta}\mu\epsilon\rho\nu$ $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\eta\kappa\acute{\alpha}$ $\sigma\epsilon$ ("You are my Son, today I have begotten you" [LXX Ps 2.7]).

Jesus in the recent past (cf. P. Perkins, "Matthew 28:16-20, Resurrection, Ecclesiology and Mission," in E. H. Lovering, Jr. (ed.), *SBLSP* 1993 [Atlanta: Scholars, 1993]: 574-88 [574]). This is merely one reason why the arguments of J. Jeremias and O. Michel that the 28.18b-20 is an example of an ancient enthronement hymn lack credibility (J. Jeremias, *Jesus' Promise to the Nations* [London: SCM, 1967], 38-39; O. Michel, "Der Abschluss des Matthäusevangeliums. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Osterbotschaft," *EvT* 10 [1950-1951]: 16-26 [21-22]).

9. W. D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964), 197-98 (emphasis mine).

10. Meier, *Vision*, 212.

11. The phrase "in power" likely modifies "Son of God" rather than "appointed." If the passage read, "[Jesus] was appointed in power to be the Son of God. . .," it would sound tautological, since Jesus is already called "his Son" in Rom 1.3: "the Son. . . was appointed in power to be the Son" (cf. D. J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans* [NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996], 48-49).

12. J. R. D. Kirk, *Unlocking Romans: Resurrection and the Justification of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 41.

13. This study parts ways slightly with Kirk, in that it is suggested here that Paul's Jesus does not become the "Son of God" at the resurrection but the "Son of God in power." The status change is not from "not-Son-of-God" to "Son-of-God," but from humbled to exalted Son of God (cf. Phil 2.6-11).

14. Kirk, *Unlocking Romans*, 42 (emphasis mine).

That is, it is through the resurrection that his status as God's royal envoy was realized (cf. Acts 10.42; 11.29). Although not as explicit as in Paul's speech, the connection between Jesus' resurrection and the enthronement can also be seen in Heb 1.3b-5a (cf. Heb 5.5):

After making purification for sins, he sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high, having become as much superior to angels as the name he has inherited is more excellent than theirs. For to which of the angels did God ever say, "You are my Son, today I have begotten you?"

Closely related, early Christians associated Jesus' enthronement with his ascension, or considered it to have occurred immediately thereafter. Peter stated in his speech before the Jews and proselytes gathered in Jerusalem for Pentecost that because of the resurrection (cf. οὐρανός in 2.33) Jesus has been exalted to the right hand of the Father (cf. LXX Ps 110.1), presumably in the ascension. The author of 1 Pet, likewise, claimed that the Father "raised him [i.e., Jesus] from the dead and gave him glory, so that your faith and hope are in God" (1 Pet 1.21). Although this passage is not unambiguous about the distinction between these actions—raising from the dead and giving glory—in the third chapter the author explicitly separates these events by the ascension:

Baptism, which corresponds to this, now saves you, not as a removal of dirt from the body but as an appeal to God for a good conscience, *through the resurrection of Jesus Christ, who has gone into heaven and is at the right hand of God*, with angels, authorities, and powers having been subjected to him (1 Pet 3.21-22).

The resurrection and ascension, according to the author of the First Petrine Epistle, are together the first step in a process towards Jesus' exaltation (cf. Eph 4.10; Mk 16.19).

The association of the resurrection with the enthronement of Jesus could be labeled "standard" for New Testament authors if there were not indications that Matthew associated the Son of Man's enthronement with another event.

J. A. T. Robinson suggested that "as a climax to the Gospel, it [i.e., 28.16-20] is so completely out of line with the rest of Matthew's eschatology that I cannot believe that he himself created it."¹⁵ Robinson believed that because of Matthew's poor redaction, the evangelist accidentally preserved two competing theories concerning the time of Jesus' exaltation. He recognized that if it is inferred from 28.18 that Jesus received complete sovereignty over all creation in the early 30's CE, dis-

15. Robinson, *Jesus and His Coming*, 131-32.

parity is formed between this account and previous exaltation scenes that prophesy Jesus received “all authority” at what Robinson thought to be the *Parousia*. Although Robinson wrongly suggested that 24.30 and 26.64 referred to the *Parousia*, his recognition of discontinuity remains valid. Based on the exegesis of 24.30 and 26.64 presented in the previous chapter, Jesus’ sovereignty over all things became official when he presented himself before the Ancient of Days after the Temple’s desolation. Therefore, should one assume that 28.18 claims Jesus was given “all authority” in the early 30’s CE, one consequently creates disparity between the epilogue and earlier prophecies.

There are additional indications that the resurrection, according to Matthew, is not the moment of the Son of Man’s exaltation.

First, the theory that the resurrection is the moment of the Son of Man’s enthronement forces one to read 26.64b in an abnormal manner: “from now on (ἀπ’ ἄρτι), you will see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of Power and coming on the clouds of heaven.” Both Matthew and Luke insert ἀπ’ ἄρτι at the beginning of the proclamation found in Mark 14.62. Ἀπ’ ἄρτι, when combined with the future verb ὄψεσθε, conveys the idea of temporal nearness. Hence, the verse was translated in the previous chapter, “soon, you will see.” Commenting on this passage and its relation to 28.18b, Sim suggested that the word “soon” should be read as supporting the equation of Jesus’ resurrection with his enthronement at the right hand of God. Sim commented,

In the context of the gospel narrative ἀπ’ ἄρτι does not refer to the time of speaking but is a clear reference to the resurrection and its aftermath. By redacting in this manner, Matthew makes the point that immediately (or perhaps almost immediately in view of 28.18-20) after his resurrection Jesus will be seated at the right hand of God On his [i.e., Matthew’s] view, the risen Jesus who has been given all authority (28:18) is now seated at God’s right hand. *As the second half of this verse explains, it is this very figure who will return at the eschaton on the clouds of heaven.*¹⁶

Sim hinted at, but did not appear to recognize, a flaw in his argumentation. By claiming that Jesus is seated next to God on the throne immediately upon his resurrection, Sim must arbitrarily create temporal division between Jesus’ enthronement and his coming on the clouds. The separation of these events is not at all apparent in 26.64 and seems forced. Hence, 26.64b should, in fact, dissuade one from considering the resurrection to be Jesus’ exaltation.

16. Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology*, 95-96 (emphasis mine).

Second, the resurrection-as-enthronement interpretation is in tension with Matthew's *Heilsgeschichte*. This will be discussed at much greater length below, but here it will suffice to give a brief summary of the argument. Matthew 10.5-6 depicts Jesus commanding the newly-formed Twelve that they are only to minister to "the lost sheep of Israel," to the neglect of the Gentiles and Samaritans. The shift in the mission of the disciples from the Jews to "all the nations" (24.19) is repeatedly expressed to occur with the "coming of the Son of Man" and the fall of Jerusalem in 70 CE (cf. 10.23; 21.33-46; 22.1-14; 24.14, 29-31; 28.18-20). With the wicked among Israel having been judged and Jesus having been exalted to the right hand of God, the Matthean community is assured both of Jesus' desire to move the boundary lines of the disciples' mission outward and the existence of the empowerment necessary to succeed in said mission. This scheme does not allow for the exaltation of Jesus to be in 30 CE or thereabouts. Thus, it is improbable that the resurrection was considered by Matthew to be the moment of the Son of Man's exaltation and, thereby, the initiation of the Gentile mission, unless Matthew is an incredibly inept editor—of his climactic pericope, no less.

These complications do not conclusively invalidate the resurrection-as-enthronement reading. However, when read together, one is provided with sufficient reason to explore other interpretive options.

5.2.3—The Crucifixion of Jesus as a Parody of Exaltation

Not only have scholars suggested that the resurrection event is the moment of Jesus' enthronement, E. Schweizer¹⁷ pushed this one step back when he proposed that Jesus' crucifixion is to be identified as his elevation to power. This theory has found recent expression in an article by J. Marcus, who suggested that the crucifixion, according to the synoptic tradition, functioned as a parody of exaltation.¹⁸ He posited that "[t]he central irony in the passion narratives of the Gospels is that Jesus' crucifixion turns out to be his elevation to kingship."¹⁹ Marcus claims that, much like their Johannine counterpart, the synoptic gospels equate the raising up of Jesus on the cross with the raising up of the Christ to the throne. This exaltation-through-

17. Schweizer, *Matthew*, 499-500; cited in F. D. Bruner, *Matthew: The Churchbook, Matthew 13-28* (Rev. Ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 688.

18. J. Marcus, "Crucifixion as Parodic Exaltation," *JBL* 125 (2006): 73-87.

19. J. Marcus, "Crucifixion," 73 (emphasis mine).

crucifixion motif, Marcus posited, was derived by the early Church from the Roman culture out of which it sprang. To justify his claim, Marcus looked at a handful of texts that he claimed evince such a motif.

The text discussed at greatest length by Marcus is from Artemidorus, an interpreter of dreams, writing in the late second century CE:

It is also auspicious for a poor man [to dream of being crucified]. For a crucified man is raised high [ὑψηλός] and his substance is sufficient to keep [τρέφει] many birds. But it [a dream of being crucified] means the betrayal of secrets. For a crucified man can be seen [ἐκφανής] by all. . . . But it means freedom for slaves, since the crucified are no longer subject to any man [ἀνυπότακτοι]. . . . To dream that one has been crucified in a city signifies a magisterial position [ἀρχή] that corresponds to the place where the cross has been set up (*Oneirocritica* 2.53).²⁰

Marcus proposed that this text contains proof that crucifixion was seen as exaltation by at least one author in Roman society. But this conclusion is not without its difficulties. One may argue that this text's late composition casts doubt on its relevance to the first century Christian understanding of crucifixion. But far more troubling to Marcus' case is the nature of the document's subject matter. Here we have an interpretation of a dream oracle. Actual crucifixion is not herein depicted; rather, it is the presence of crucifixion in the dreams of slaves that is the focus of analysis. Hence, Artemidorus does not claim that actual death on a cross is a form of exaltation; he suggests that when crucifixion is witnessed in a *vision* it functions as a portent of a servant's future social ascent. Since this passage speaks only of visionary crucifixion and not the physical act of being hung on a cross until expiration, it does not assist Marcus in making his case.

Marcus wrote further of the use of high crosses to shame victims who expressed improperly lofty pretensions, citing in particular the execution of a Roman citizen by Galba (Suetonius, *Galba* 9.1). Although Marcus is correct that the executed man's cross is more lofty than the rest and painted white so that it might ironically be the man's throne, this is a unique account belonging to a collection of atrocities committed by Galba and, consequently, cannot be used to demonstrate a widespread belief that crucifixion was a parody of enthronement.

20. R. J. White, *The Interpretation of Dreams, Oneirocritica by Artemidorus: Translation and Commentary* (NCS. Park Ridge: Noyes, 1975); cited in J. Marcus, "Crucifixion," 75.

Finally, Marcus moved to the passion narrative to support his case. There he argued that

the anonymous soldier who scrawled “king of the Jews” on the placard [above the cross] must have thought that describing a crucifixion as a royal display was a good joke. I am suggesting that this joke was not just an accident or a private inspiration, but reflected a common understanding of crucifixion as enthronement.²¹

However, his previous examination of Roman literature does not support his conclusion that such mockery “reflected a common understanding of crucifixion as enthronement.” It is perhaps better to consider the placard to be a Roman insult against both Jesus, for his frailty and seeming defeat, and the Jews, who see before them crucified a befittingly lowly king.

Thus, Marcus is to be commended for thoroughly demonstrating that crucifixion was occasionally used in the Roman empire to shame those who sought to exalt themselves beyond their societal place. However, he has not supported his theory that it was commonplace in the first century CE to consider crucifixion a parody of enthronement. Nor has he, thereby, provided substantial reason to view Jesus’ death as parodic exaltation in the synoptics. In John’s gospel, Jesus symbolically and paradoxically reigns from the cross by being “lifted up” (John 3:14; 8:28; 12:32, 34). For the synoptic gospels, however, such is not the case. The cross is not a throne but a place of shame and intense pain that the Son of Man must endure prior to vindication and enthronement.

5.2.4—Universal Authority and Jesus’ Preexistence

It has occasionally been suggested that Mt 28.18 echoes Mt 11:27 either inclusively or exclusively of OG Dan 7.13-14. Matthew 11.25-27 reads,

At that time Jesus declared, “I thank you, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that you have hidden these things from the wise and understanding and revealed them to infants. Yes, Father, for so it was pleasing to you. *All things have been handed over to me by my Father, and no one knows the Son except the Father, and no one knows the Father except the Son and anyone whom the Son chooses to reveal him.*”

Supposing that there is an allusion to 11.27 in 28.18 does not of necessity preclude a coexisting allusion to OG Dan 7.13-14.²² However, supposing an intratextual corre-

21. J. Marcus, “Crucifixion,” 83-84.

22. Cf. J. P. Meier, “Two Disputed Questions in Matt 28.16-20,” *JBL* 96 (1977): 407-24 (411); Geist, *Menschensohn*, 117-18. Geist suggested that the influence of Dan 7.14 on 28.18 was secondhand. He suggested that Mt 9.6 and 11.27 relied on the Danielic vision and that 28.18, in turn, was influenced by these early statements of Jesus.

lation may imply, as some have posited, that the Son of Man's reception of "all authority" is based on his "familial" relationship to the Father, was in his possession prior to his incarnation, and is expressed in his role as the revealer of divine truth.²³

The point of possible parallel between 11.27 and 28.18 is Jesus' statement, Πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μου. It has been proposed that by receiving from the Father "all things" (πάντα), Jesus has been made lord over heaven and earth, a governance matching that possessed by God (11.25). G. Osborne, for example, posited that πάντα is "all-inclusive of the cosmic authority wielded by the Son as seen in 28:18."²⁴ But πάντα does not refer to Jesus' universal sovereignty in 11.27; according to the context, "all things" is limited to knowledge,²⁵ i.e., "these things" that have been hidden from the wise and understanding (11.25). What the content of this knowledge is has not been clearly defined. "These things" possibly refers to "the eschatological significance of the miracles" (cf. 11.2-6),²⁶ or more likely, "the things of revelation, to which he referred in v. 25, the things hidden from the wise but revealed to the simple."²⁷ That which is divulged is the knowledge of God that leads to familial intimacy. This is supported by the observation that after he claims to be blessed by his Father, "Jesus proceeds to speak, and to speak exclusively, of the knowledge of God."²⁸ That is, Jesus immediately explains what "all things" refers to: his unique knowledge of the Father garnered from his unique position as the Son. Hence, 11.25-27 refers to a facet of Jesus' ontological authority, whereas 28.18 refers to his bestowed authority sometime post-resurrection.²⁹

Based on this, there is no reason to conclude that 11.27 and 28.18 are connected in any significant way. Even though the Son, according to 11.27, has the

23. Osborne, *Matthew*, 440; cf. Schniewind, *Matthäus*; Hammerton-Kelly, *Pre-existence*, 68-69; S. Brown, "The Two-fold Representation of the Mission in Matthew's Gospel," *ST* 31 (1977): 21-32 (23-24); Lenski, *Matthew's Gospel*, 1171; Carter, *Matthew and the Margins*, 258; Nolland, *Matthew*, 471;

24. Osborne, *Matthew*, 440.

25. A. M. Hunter, "Crux Criticorum—Matt. XI.25-30—A Reappraisal," *NTS* 8 (1962): 241-49 (246); Carson, *Matthew*, 1:277; Turner, *Matthew*, 303; Keener, *Matthew*, 346; Luz, *Matthew*, 2:166; Morris, *Matthew*, 293; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:276-77.

26. Turner, *Matthew*, 303; cf. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:276-77.

27. Evans, *Matthew*, 246. "All things" should not be identified as "all divine knowledge," as Carson suggested (*Matthew*, 1:277), but simply "divine knowledge." Matthew 24.36, for instance, puts a limit on what the Son knows.

28. Hunter, "Crux Criticorum," 246.

29. Hunter, "Crux Criticorum," 246; France, *Matthew*, 445; Morris, *Matthew*, 293.

authority to delegate knowledge of the Father to whomever he chooses, this is a far cry from the dominion expressed in 28.18. As Luz rightly stated, “To be sure, more is at issue in Matt 28:18, viz., all ‘power’ in heaven and on earth.”³⁰

5.2.5—Conclusion

Hitherto, three theories concerning the time of Jesus’ reception of “all authority” have been examined. The suggestion that Jesus has been in possession of universal sovereignty from eternity-past because of his divine sonship was shown to be based on a poor reading of Mt 11.27 and a questionable connection to the epilogue. Additionally, the theory that Jesus’ crucifixion was paradoxically his enthronement was found to be unconvincing. This was predominately due to the observation that the cross for the synoptic writers was a place of torture Jesus endured with the hope of future exaltation, but it was not itself Jesus’ enthronement at the right hand of God. The only reading of Jesus’ claim to have received “all authority” that showed promise was the hypothesis that Jesus was endowed with such power at the resurrection event. Yet, even though one can find this miraculous incident interpreted in such a way elsewhere in the New Testament, this understanding of the resurrection does not comport with Matthew’s theology expressed earlier in the narrative. Since these three theories have failed to produce a persuasive reading 28.18, room has been made to suggest a fresh interpretation of Jesus’ statement of authority.

—The Reception of Authority and the Destruction of the Temple—

It was mentioned in the introduction of this chapter that the goal of this study is to provide an interpretation of 28.18 that is internally consistent and congruous with the whole of Matthew’s gospel. To begin, 28.18 will be analyzed for possible correlations to the exaltation sayings in 24.30 and 26.64. If a connection can be established, it is reasonable to accept that Matthew considered Jesus’ reception of $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha$ $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\acute{\alpha}$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\acute{\omega}$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota$ $[\tau\eta\varsigma]$ $\gamma\eta\varsigma$ to have occurred when he approached the Father $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota$ $\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$ $\nu\epsilon\phi\epsilon\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\omicron\upsilon$, an event that took place immediately after Herod’s Temple fell in 70 CE. This study will turn to the implications of this theory,

30. Luz, *Matthew*, 2:166.

not only for one's reading of the "Great Commission," but more broadly for the Matthean "Son of Man" concept. To anticipate the results, it is claimed that the evangelist believes that the Son of Man's procurement of power in the wake of "this generation's" judgment both empowers the disciples' to proclaim the gospel amongst the nations in the face of oppression and assures the Matthean community that the Son of Man will return at the eschaton to bring a permanent end to conflict through the Great Assize.

5.3.2—The Son of Man and the Destruction of the Temple

Following his Markan source, Matthew twice records Jesus citing OG Dan 7.13: once in the Eschatological Discourse (24.30) and again during Jesus' trial before the Sanhedrin (26.64). In both of these pericopae, Jesus predicts that he, the Son of Man, will come in the near future ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. These accounts were discussed in the previous chapter, where it was posited that Daniel's prophetic vision was Matthew's guide to understanding the Son of Man's exaltation. Through the lens of the seer's recollection, the majority perspective that asserts that 24.30 and 26.64 refer to the *Parousia* is seen to be untenable. The direction of the Son of Man's travel and the time of said travel that are determined when one reads 24.30 and 26.64 against their Danielic background do not suggest an end-of-time interpretation of "coming on the clouds of heaven."

Concerning the direction of travel, according to the MT and OG versions of Dan 7.13, the human-like one does not proceed from heaven to earth to exact judgment. Judgment has already occurred when the "son of man" approaches the Ancient of Days. The human-like one presents himself before the Yahwehic figure to be enthroned and given various honors such as glory, authority, worship, and an everlasting kingdom. Hence, given the direction of travel in the scriptural source text behind 24.30 and 26.64, it is more probable that "this is not a coming from heaven to earth, but of earth to heaven—there is no *Parousia* here."³¹ Jesus, the Son of Man, after the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE, approaches the Father to be seated on the "throne of glory" and to receive the universal authority due his posi-

31. Caird, *New Testament Theology*, 377.

tion. Hence, Matthew describes the Son of Man as coming *up to the Father* for exaltation rather than *down to humankind* for judgment.³²

Pertaining to the issue of timing, Mt 24.30 implies that the moment of the Son of Man's reception of universal authority occurred immediately after the fall of Herod's Temple. The timeframe of the events in the Eschatological Discourse were discussed in the previous chapter. Assuming, then, that 24.4-29 refers to the tumultuous period leading up to and culminating in the fall of Jerusalem, the series of events therein confirm that the Son of Man experienced exaltation subsequent to, and by implication consequent to, the judgment of "this generation" (24.30).

Matthew clarifies that it was "immediately after (Εὐθέως . . . μετὰ) the distress of those days" (24.29)—i.e., the "great distress" (24.21)—that the Son of Man approached the Ancient of Days for exaltation. The θλίψις μεγάλη was initiated by the τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως, a clear reference to Daniel's "abomination that desolates" (Dan 12.11), made more sure by the Matthean addition, "spoken of through the prophet Daniel" (Mt 24.15; cf. Mk 13.14). The "abomination" originally referred to the religious travesties perpetrated by Antiochus IV Epiphanies in 167 BCE (cf. Dan 8.13; 9.27; 11.31), particularly his desecration of the Temple by erecting "a desolating sacrilege on the altar of burnt offering" (1 Macc 1.54; cf. Jos., *Ant.* 12.253). But what atrocity occurred during the Roman siege of Jerusalem that could have been labeled the "abomination of desolation" is a matter of debate. The suggestion that this refers to Gaius' attempt to erect a statue of himself in the Temple (ca. 40 CE) fails to convince since his order was never acted upon as he was assassinated soon after the command was given (ca. 41 CE). The suggestion that the "abomination" was the entrance of the victorious Roman soldiers into Herod's Temple (cf. Jos., *War* 6.316) also fails to convince because placing the "desolation" at the end of the city's fall does not allow enough time for Christians to flee (cf. 24.16-23).³³ More persuasive is the suggestion that the "abomination" was caused by the Zealots in 67 or 68 CE. Josephus claimed that they defiled the most holy place by their unlawful entrance into the Temple, further polluting it with blood

32. Nor does the Son of Man exact judgment on "this generation" from heaven. By the time he has been exalted and enthroned the destruction of Jerusalem had already passed. Just as in OG Dan 7.13, the Son of Man does not appear before the Father until after God has exercised his authority to judge the wicked on his behalf.

33. Of note, Luke alters the reading of Mk 13.14 to more clearly identify the "desolation" as the Roman securing of the Temple precinct (Lk 21.20).

spilt through riotous violence (Jos., *War* 4.150-57, 196-207).³⁴ This most certainly could have been called “the abomination of desolation” as the Temple was, thereby, rendered unclean. Additionally, the act would have been seen as especially heinous—a true abomination—since it was committed by the Jews themselves, rather than ignorant Gentiles.

If, then, the “abomination of desolation” occurred sometime in late 67 CE or early 68 CE, and this event was followed by an undefined period of exceeding tribulation for those living in Jerusalem, it is almost certainly the cosmic imagery in 24.29, which is symbolic of God’s militaristic wrath (cf. Isa 13.10, 13; 34.4; Ezek 32.7-8), that marks the fall of the Temple. Since it is not until after these “cosmic signs” appeared that the “sign of the Son of Man” became visible, the text implies that the Son of Man’s presentation before the Father came on the heels of the Roman conquest of Jerusalem.³⁵ It is, therefore, not only the fall of the Temple that causes “the tribes of the land” to mourn according to Matthew (cf. 24.30, 34); through the concrete expression of God’s punishment in the fall of Jerusalem, the Jews who doubted the teaching and status of Jesus perceive his vindication and enthronement as the Son of Man. Consequently, Jesus’ claim in 26.64 that the Sanhedrin would soon “see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of Power and coming on the clouds of heaven” was validated. According to the author, the Temple’s destruction functioned as a visible signal on earth of the Son of Man’s reception of dominion and a kingdom in heaven. It was in this event that the Son of Man could truly have been seen “coming in his kingdom” (16.28).

Matthew 28.18 is, therefore, found to have been placed in the same christological continuum with previous exaltation sayings that depict the Son of Man receiving universal dominion in 70 CE. Jesus’ statement, ἐδόθη μοι πᾶσα ἐξουσία ἐν οὐρανῶ καὶ ἐπὶ [τῆς] γῆς, is not a proleptic experience of a future elevation to power. Jesus’ declaration is a product of Matthew’s reflection on God’s chastisement of “this generation,”³⁶ the physical portent of which had been witnessed by the post-70 CE Matthean community in the Temple’s desecration.

34. Keener, *Matthew*, 576-77; France, *Matthew*, 913.

35. Tasker, *Matthew*, 226-27.

36. See S. Brown, “The Matthean Community and the Gentile Mission,” *NovT* 22 (1980): 193-221 (217).

—An Allusion to Old Greek Daniel 7.13-14 in Matthew 28.18-20—

The above conclusion is supported by the presence of an allusion to OG Dan 7.13-14 in Mt 28.18-20. This is not, of course, the first study to recognize this echo, as its existence is suggested in countless commentaries. However, few authors have afforded this scriptural reference extensive discussion, particularly when questioning how this allusion relates to the two earlier citations of OG Dan 7.13 (cf. 24.30; 26.64). Rather than assume the presence of an allusion, the intent of this section is to defend its existence against detractors. Should an allusion to OG Dan 7 exist, such evidence lends additional support to the theory that Matthew believed Jesus received “all authority” in 70 CE, since the scriptural echo creates another connection between Jesus’ declaration of authority in 28.18 and the scriptural citations in 24.30 and 26.64.

To begin examining the Matthean epilogue for a possible allusion to OG Dan 7, those scholars who have theorized that Mt 28.18-20 alludes to Old Testament passages other than OG Dan 7.13-14—H. Frankemölle,³⁷ B. J. Malina,³⁸ R. H. Smith³⁹ and T. L. Donaldson⁴⁰—will be given a hearing. Meanwhile, those who have expressed doubt concerning the existence of a Danielic allusion and have not suggested another extra-textual source—A. Vögtle,⁴¹ W. Trilling,⁴² F. Hahn,⁴³ J. D. Kingsbury,⁴⁴ D. R. Bauer,⁴⁵ J. Gnilka,⁴⁶ P. Perkins,⁴⁷ and J. A. Gibbs⁴⁸—will have their

37. H. Frankmölle, *Jahwebund und Kirche Christi: Studien zur Form- und Traditionsgeschichte des “Evangeliums” nach Matthäus* (NTAbh 10. Münster: Aschendorff, 1974), 43-61.

38. B. J. Malina, “The Literary Structure and Form of Matt. xxviii. 16-20,” *NTS* 17 (1970): 87-103.

39. R. H. Smith, *Easter Gospels: The Resurrection of Jesus according to the Four Evangelists* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1983), 78.

40. T. L. Donaldson, *Jesus on the Mountain: A Study in Matthean Theology* (JSNTSup 8. Sheffield: JSOT, 1985), 170-90 (esp. 176-77).

41. A. Vögtle, “Das christologische und ecclesiologische Anliegen von Mt. 28.18-20,” in F. L. Cross (ed.), *Studia Evangelica II: Papers Presented to the Second International Congress on New Testament Studies* (TU 87. Berlin: Akademie, 1964), 266-94.

42. W. Trilling, *Das Wahre Israel: Studien zur Theologie des Matthäus-Evangeliums* (SUNT 10. München: Kösel, 1968), 22-23.

43. F. Hahn, *Mission in the New Testament* (Trans. by F. Clarke. SBT 47. London: SCM, 1965), 66.

44. Kingsbury, “Composition,” 573-84.

45. Bauer, *Structure of Matthew’s Gospel*, 111-12.

46. Gnilka, *Das Matthäusevangelium*, 2:508.

47. Perkins, “Matthew 28.16-20,” 582.

48. Gibbs, *Jerusalem and Parousia*, 153.

position challenged indirectly through the following defense of an allusion's presence.

5.4.2—Possible Non-Danielic Allusions in Matthew 28.18-20

Frankmölle, Malina and Smith suggested that Mt 28.18-20 is formed on the pattern of “royal decree,” exemplified in LXX Gen 45.9-11 and LXX 2 Chr 36.23. However, the similarities are scant. In LXX Gen 45.9-11 Joseph is made lord over Egypt, providing him with power that he uses to help others. This has minor parallel with the Matthean epilogue, but the structural and thematic similarities are weak, and there is no shared vocabulary. As for LXX 2 Chr 36.23, Smith claims, “Both in pattern and content the final words of Matthew’s Gospel closely resemble the decree of Cyrus.”⁴⁹ The passage reads:

Thus says Cyrus, king of Persia, “The kingdoms of the earth have been given to me by the Lord God of heaven, and he has ordered me to build him a house in Jerusalem in Judah. Whoever is among you of all his people, the Lord his God will be with him. Let him go up.”

The only verbal similarities are forms of $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ and $\tau\eta\varsigma\ \gamma\eta\varsigma$ used to describe the limits of Cyrus’ reign. Meanwhile, $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\theta\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$, a key word in Mt 28.18, does not appear. Concerning possible structural similarities, Smith proposed that Cyrus’ edict falls into three sections, which parallel the triadic structure of Mt 28.18-20: a) a claim (LXX 2 Chr 36.23b/Mt 28.18b); b) an order (LXX 2 Chr 36.23c/Mt 28.19-20a); and c) a promise (LXX 2 Chr 36.23d/Mt 28.20b). Yet, as E. Krentz aptly recognized, the supposed correlations are not exact: the claim in LXX 2 Chr 36.23b is far more limited than that in Mt 28.18b, the order in LXX 2 Chr 36.23c is given to the speaker whereas the order issues from the speaker in Mt 28.19-20a, and LXX 2 Chr 36.23 is a blessing whereas Mt 28.20b is a statement of fact or a promise.⁵⁰ The only correspondence between the two texts are weak thematic parallels, incapable of supporting the existence of an allusion to “royal decrees” in the Matthean epilogue.

Alternatively, Donaldson explicitly followed Vögtle and Kingsbury in suggesting that 28.18 does not contain an allusion to Dan 7.14. He argued, rather, that the enthronement conception that underlies the passage is not Danielic but is de-

49. Smith, *Easter Gospels*, 78; cited in E. Krentz, “Missionary Matthew: Matthew 28:16-20 as Summary of the Gospel,” *CurTM* 31 (2004): 24-31 (26).

50. E. Krentz, “Missionary Matthew,” 26-27; cf. Bauer, *Structure of Matthew’s Gospel*, 112-13.

rived from eschatological Zion traditions (LXX Ps 2; LXX Isa 2.2-3; 25.6; 56.7; etc.). Donaldson claimed that

each of the three segments of the saying of the risen Lord in vv. 18-20 resonate with themes drawn from the eschatological traditions associated with Mount Zion, and so . . . the mountain reference in v. 16 leads us into the theological heart of the passage.⁵¹

There are two primary difficulties with this interpretation. Although it recognizes the importance of the “mountain” setting, it ignores the geo-political location of the meeting place (cf. 28.16). Should the emphasis of the passage have been on the theological importance of Zion, one would have expect this discourse to have taken place in the Temple precincts or on the Mount of Olives. But this is not what one finds in the text; Jesus designates a mountain outside of Judea, in “Galilee of the Gentiles” (cf. Mt 4.15; cf. 26.32; 28.7, 10).⁵² For Matthew, Jerusalem (cf. 23.37-39), her Temple (cf. 23.37-24.35; 27.51), her leaders (cf. 12.1-50; 23.13-39; 26.64), and her people (cf. 23.37-39; 27.24-26) have all been condemned to destruction. The mission to “this generation” did not achieve the desired results. Therefore, the focus is no longer Jerusalem in the Matthean epilogue but the ends of the earth. This leads naturally to the second objection: Mt 28.18-20 does not describe the nations coming to Zion (or Christ) for salvation, a defining attribute of eschatological Zion traditions. Rather, the congregation of the exalted Son of Man goes outward from Galilee, and Jesus with them, to proclaim the gospel to “all nations.” Donaldson attempted to alleviate the tension his reading created by suggesting that the participle πορευθέντες in 28.19 is not the emphasis of the commission. He claimed that although the disciples are told to go, the passage does not record their obedience and, therefore, a picture is painted of an ἐκκλησία that gathers the nations to the Anointed One enthroned on Zion.⁵³ But how are the followers of Christ to gather the nations without going to them? Whether the outward movement is the emphasis of Jesus’ command as compared to “making disciples” is of little consequence to Donaldson’s argument. The disciples are simply told πορευθέντες οὐν μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη; even if the act of making disciples is more important than the act of going, this observation does not negate Jesus’ order to go. Hence, using Donaldson’s language, Mt 28.18-20 is “centrifugal” rather than “cen-

51. Donaldson, *Jesus on the Mountain*, 180.

52. Cf. G. H. Boobyer, “Galilee and Galileans in St. Mark’s Gospel,” *BJRL* 35 (1952-53): 334-48.

53. Donaldson, *Jesus on the Mountain*, 184-85.

tripetal.”⁵⁴ The followers of Jesus move away from Galilee to spread the word of the kingdom; πάντα τὰ ἔθνη do not come to Zion to be made disciples of Christ.

5.4.3—Matthew’s Allusion to Old Greek Daniel 7.13-14 in Matthew 28.18-20

Does Mt 28.18-20, then, as many researchers have suggested,⁵⁵ contain an echo of OG Dan 7.14? Vögtle,⁵⁶ who has received a sizable following, argued against the presence of an allusion based on the lack of verbal parallel between 28.18-20 and the Aramaic form of Dan 7.14. However, he did not take into account Matthew’s preference for the OG reading⁵⁷ and its depiction of the human-like one’s extraordinary glorification. The claim that the Matthean epilogue—specifically 28.18-20—contains an allusion to Daniel’s apocalyptic vision is supported by numerous verbal and thematic parallels, each of which will be discussed below.⁵⁸

First, both OG Dan 7.14 and Mt 28.18-20 share characteristic vocabulary: ἐδόθη—used as a *passivum divinum*—and ἐξουσία. To this short list may be added πάντα τὰ ἔθνη; OG Dan 7.14 reads: καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ . . . πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς κατὰ γένη. Forms of πάντα τὰ ἔθνη have appeared three other times in Mt (cf. 24.9, 14; 25.32), each in the Eschatological Discourse, with which 28.18-20 shares various parallels.⁵⁹ Thus, Matthew may have chosen πάντα τὰ ἔθνη to conform the vocabulary of 28.19 to that used in the final discourse. But Matthew may have also been aware of the Danielic parallel and incorporated πάντα τὰ ἔθνη to strengthen the allusion. This possibility is made more plausible when it is recognized, first, that the

54. Donaldson, *Jesus on the Mountain*, 183-84.

55. An exhaustive list of authors and their respective works cannot here be listed. Only a small handful of important studies are mentioned: Davies, *Setting*, 197-98; France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, 142-43; J. P. Meier, “Salvation History in Matthew: In Search of a Starting Point,” *CBQ* 37 (1975): 203-15 (210-12); J. Schaberg, *The Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit: The Triadic Phrase in Matthew 28:19b* (SBLDS 61. Chico: Scholars, 1982), 111-41; W. D. Davies and D. C. Allison, Jr., “Matt. 28:16-20: Texts Behind the Texts,” *RHPR* 72 (1992): 89-98.

56. Vögtle, “Mt. 28.18-20,” 266-94. Meier did a more thorough job critiquing Vögtle’s theory than is allowed here (“Two Disputed Questions,” 413-14).

57. The position that Matthew relied on the OG Dan for his depiction of the Son of Man is also held by H. D. Zacharias (“Old Greek Daniel and Matthew’s Son of Man,” *BBR* 21.4 [2011]: 453-65 [cf. especially 462-63]).

58. Bruner suggested that there is also a structural parallel between the two passages: OG Dan 7.14a/Mt 28.18; OG Dan 7.14b/Mt 28.19a; OG Dan 7.14c/Mt 28.19b; OG Dan 7.14d/Mt 28.20 (*Matthew*, 2:689). This supposed similarity, however, is not exact and is, therefore, unconvincing.

59. Cf. V. Balabanski, “Mission in Matthew against the Horizon of Matthew 24,” *NTS* 54 (2008): 161-75.

Eschatological Discourse has also been influenced by Daniel’s vision (see especially 24.30; 25.31), and, second, that the prediction of the human-like one’s reception of πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς κατὰ γένη (OG Dan 7.14) is made manifest through the disciples mission to πάντα τὰ ἔθνη.

Further, the similar use of αἰώνιος in OG Dan 7.14 and αἰῶνος in Mt 28.20, both being derived from the stem αἰών, may be considered verbally parallel. In Dan, αἰώνιος is used in together with ἐξουσία to describe the eternity of the human-like being’s reign. Although not appearing in apposition, αἰῶνος, in conjunction with ἐξουσία, serves the same function in the Matthean epilogue. Jesus’ claim, ἐγὼ μεθ’ ὑμῶν εἰμι πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος, is a promise to the Christian community of his lasting presence. Yet, it is his presence with them through his authoritative empowerment that is the focus of 28.18b and 28.20b.⁶⁰ Thus, Jesus’ declaration that he is with his followers “until the end of the age” serves to delineate the temporal extent of Jesus’ ἐξουσία.⁶¹

Forms of οὐρανός and γῆ are present in both OG Dan 7.13-14 and Mt 28.18, but they do not appear together in the Danielic account, nor do the authors use them in the same manner. Hence, it is unlikely that Matthew is *verbally* dependent on OG Dan 7.13-14 for ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ [τῆς] γῆς. But, as will be suggested below, the Matthean phrase captures well, in condensed form, the parameters of the human-like one’s power according to Daniel’s vision.

To the recognition of the similar use of vocabulary can be added the analogous word order: ἐδόθη + dative pronoun + ἐξουσία. Matthew 28.18b contains an additional adjective, πᾶσα, subsequent to the dative pronoun, that is used to modify ἐξουσία. Although the modifier is not present in OG Dan 7.14a, forms of πᾶς are frequent in both texts, occurring twice in OG Dan 7.14 and four times in Mt 28.18-20, being used in both texts to stress the universality of the exalted figure’s dominion. It is possible, then, that πᾶσα has been used in Mt 28.18 to condense the Danielic depiction of the new-found sovereignty of the “one like a son of man.” The Old Greek version of Dan 7.13 depicted the exalted representative of the saints traveling upon God’s throne-chariot, sharing the physical characteristics of the An-

60. Similarly, Davies and Allison noted, “Here the dominate sense may not be so much that of divine promise as of divine assistance” (*Matthew*, 3:687; cited in P. Foster, *Community, Law and Mission in Matthew’s Gospel* [WUNT 2/2. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004], 223, 243 n. 93).

61. For a discussion concerning the use of ἕως, see the exegesis of 16.28 in the previous chapter.

cient of Days, and receiving God’s angelic entourage, *each of which confirm of his heavenly ascendancy*. Meanwhile, OG Dan 7.14 allocated to him an everlasting kingdom, the nations of the earth, and cultic worship, *each of which characterize the “son of man” as one who possesses all earthly authority*. Therefore, *πάσα ἐξουσία ἐν οὐρανῶ καὶ ἐπὶ [τῆς] γῆς* perfectly describes the power bestowed upon the human-like one according to OG Dan 7.13-14. Jesus, *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, has been given the same authority as his visionary counterpart, the one *ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου*.

There are also several thematic similarities between the passages. As has been mentioned, the repeated use of the word *πάς* in both texts stresses the universal scope of the Son of Man’s authority. The dominion given to the human-like one and to Jesus, the Son of Man, has spacial and temporal superiority over any authority otherwise conveyed upon a figure by God. Second, both passages describe the transference of heavenly and earthly power from a divine figure to an exalted being,⁶² implied by the authors’ identical use of the *passivum divinum*, *ἐδόθη*. Third, the exaltation of the respective figures has an impact on *πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*, a group that arguably includes both Israelites and Gentiles in Dan and Mt.⁶³ Fourth, the proper response of *πάντα τὰ ἔθνη* is to worship the exalted beings. In Dan, this is done through ritual acts of service (captured by the verb *λατρεύουσα*). In Mt, the Son is worshipped by baptizing newly-made disciples in the name he shares with the Father and Spirit, as well as through the passing down of his teachings to further generations of followers.⁶⁴ It is by this mission that the authority of the Son of Man is announced to *πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς κατὰ γένη* (OG Dan 7.14); the kingdoms of the earth have the sovereignty of the Son of Man made known to them through the disciples mission to all nations.

To this list of thematic parallels has occasionally been added the claim that a triad of characters appears in both passages. In her published dissertation, J. Schaberg argued that the Ancient of Days, the human-like one, and the “standing

62. Davies and Allison, citing Schaberg (*Matthew 28:19b*, 114), posited that a further parallel is seen in the conferment of power on the divine figures of Dan and Mt “after a struggle and victory” (*Matthew*, 3:683). However, despite claims to the contrary, the human-like one is portrayed as a passive figure in Dan 7, and is not said to play an active part in subduing the four beasts. Hence, the motif of struggling is only present in Mt.

63. This will be discussed further below.

64. Although not likely connected with the allusion to OG Dan 7.14, according to 28.17a, the disciples, or a portion thereof, are described as worshipping (*προσεκύνησαν*) Jesus upon his approach.

ones,” i.e., the angelic hosts, had evolved into the triadic Father, Son and Holy Spirit of Mt 28.19.⁶⁵ There are reasons, however, to doubt the validity of this interpretation. In Daniel’s vision, the angels were not characters in the traditional sense, but collectively functioned as a prop. That is, they were used by the author to substantiate the authority of the beings they served.⁶⁶ In OG Dan 7.10, thousands-upon-thousands of beings presented themselves before the Ancient of Days (παρειστήκεισαν αὐτῷ) and served him (ἐθεράπευον αὐτὸν). These creatures are never explicitly identified by the seer, but their standing position in the court of God is characteristic of angelic beings.⁶⁷ After the punishment of the beasts had been meted out by the heavenly court (7.12) and the human-like one arrived on the clouds (7.13), the OG version, unlike the Aramaic, claims that the angels who once served the Yahwehic figure approach the “one like a son of man.” This conveyance of the celestial hosts for the purpose of highlighting the authority of the figure to whom they attend marks them as props rather than characters.

An additional reason to dismiss Schaberg’s theory is that there is scant evidence in Jewish or Christian literature of the Second Temple period that angels were given divine status or worshipped as divine.⁶⁸ As celestial beings, angels claim an elevated position, but are, nonetheless, servants of God of a far lower, wholly-other ontological class than the Holy Spirit.⁶⁹ Schaberg’s hypothesis does not accord with what is known of first century CE angelology and theology, and, therefore, should be set aside as speculative.

It is also important to recognize, against the claims of Schaberg, that Matthew may be referring to a pre-existing baptismal formula (cf. Acts 2.38; 8.16; 10.48; 19.5; Rom 6.3; Gal 3.27; *Did* 7.1, 3; 9.5). If so, the probability that this triad evolved from a reading of Daniel’s night-vision decreases substantially.⁷⁰

65. Schaberg, *Matthew 28:19b*, 286-90.

66. This is true also for other “triads” to which Schaberg calls attention (e.g., Mt 13.32, 36-43; 25.31-43; Mk 8.38; Lk 12.8-9; Jn 1.51 [*Matthew 28:19b*, 286]).

67. The angels are commonly described as standing (cf. Bauckham, *Jesus and the God of Israel*, 163).

68. Bauckham, *Jesus and the God of Israel*, 11.

69. Bauckham, *Jesus and the God of Israel*, 15 n. 31.

70. Cf. Evans, *Matthew*, 485-86.

But even without Schaberg's supposed parallel, the suggested allusion in Mt 28.18-20 fits all seven of R. Hays' criteria for identifying such literary phenomena:⁷¹

- a) the Matthean alteration of Markan citations of Dan 7.13 to more closely resemble the OG form, for example, suggests the *availability* of OG Dan 7 to Matthew;
- b) the *volume* of the echo is high since Mt 28.18-19 has up to six words in common with OG Dan 7.14 and multiple thematic similarities;
- c) there is a *recurrence* of allusions to or citations of OG Dan 7 throughout Matthew (cf. 10.23; 13.41; 16.27-28; 19.28; 24.30; 25.31; 26.64), so an allusion in Mt 28 is not surprising;
- d) this allusion has *thematic coherence* with Matthean prophetic texts and christology;
- e) it is *historically plausible* that Matthew and his community would have made use of the Danielic night-vision for their understanding of Jesus' exaltation;
- f) a brief scan of the Great Commission's *history of interpretation* yields numerous references to scholars who have recognized an allusion to Dan 7 in the Matthean epilogue; and
- g) the proposed allusion provides a *satisfying* interpretation to the passage in Matthew's gospel.

Hence, it is sound to conclude that Matthew intended the informed reader to recognize the allusion to OG Dan 7.13-14 in Mt 28.18-19, especially since Jesus, at the climax of his pre-Passion dialogue, cited OG Dan 7.13 in judgment against his enemies (cf. 26.64).

—The Non-appearance of “Son of Man” in 28.18-20—

Although this study is at a critical juncture, it is helpful to take a brief detour to question the non-appearance of the term “Son of Man” in Mt 28.16-20, and to consider the bearing, if any, this observation has on one's understanding of the Matthean “Son of Man” concept.

H. E. Tödt, one of the most brilliant minds to ponder the “Son of Man” debate, concluded that without “Son of Man” there could be no reference to the “Son of Man” concept in Mt 28.18-20:

But what is alluded to? It is enthronement alone, not the concept of the Son of Man; for if an allusion to this concept had been intended, it would not have been possible to omit the name Son of Man.⁷²

This claim, however, is unjustifiably restrictive. Every time an allusion to or citation of OG or MT Dan 7 has appeared in the Matthean narrative prior to the epilogue, it is used to develop the reader's understanding of Jesus as *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* (cf. 13.41; 16.27, 28; 19.28; 20.28; 24.20; 26.64). Although the meaning *ὁ*

71. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 29-32.

72. Tödt, *Son of Man*, 288; cf. P. T. O'Brien, “The Great Commission of Matthew 28:18-20—A Missionary Mandate or Not?” *ERT* 2 (1978): 254-67 (259); Hare, *Son of Man*, 129; Donaldson, *Jesus on the Mountain*, 176-77.

υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου that was held by the historical Jesus remains a mystery, it is clear from Matthew's use of the term that by the end of the first century CE ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου was being interpreted against Daniel's vision; Jesus was identified as the seer's unidentifiable figure enthroned upon the clouds. Therefore, any reference to the exaltation of the human-like being evokes the Matthean "Son of Man" concept, whether the title is present or not.

Additionally, Matthew's Jesus refers to himself as ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου the four times prior to 28.18 that Jesus is either depicted as being enthroned or forecast to be enthroned in the narrative-future (cf. 19.28; 24.30; 25.31; 26.64). Of course, 28.18-20 is not an enthronement account. Yet, the claim to possess "all authority" in 28.18 assumes the past reality of the Son of Man's enthronement and, consequently, recalls previous enthronement predictions. Hence, even without the presence of Jesus' self-designation ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, the "authority" saying of 28.18 is thematically bound to the gospel's "Son of Man" concept.

Here one could provide an extensive list of arguments from silence why the term "Son of Man" is missing, but such an analysis would further detour this study. Only the most simple suggestion will be mentioned, the one that is considered the most plausible in the opinion of the present author.⁷³ In a previous chapter it was suggested that the Kingdom Discourse is devoid of any christological designation aside from ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου to place emphasis on this lone title. In like manner, Matthew may have made 28.18-20 void of any explicit reference to ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου or θεοῦ υἱὸς so that stress might fall squarely on the christologically-rich center⁷⁴ of the dialogue: βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος. It is the singular ὄνομα that the the Father, Son and Spirit share that is the focus of the commissioning scene.

Having given the absence of "Son of Man" from the Matthean epilogue a brief treatment, this chapter now turns toward examining Matthew's *Heilsgeschichte*. It is the purpose of this analysis to determine the thematic coherence of the claim that the Son of Man received "all authority" in 70 CE with Matthew's sal-

73. For other possible reasons why ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου does not appear in the Matthean epilogue, see Kim, "Son of Man," 100-01; Perkins, "Matthew 28.16-20," 578.

74. D. Hill finds a chiasmic structure in 28.18b-20, the center of which is the baptismal formula: v. 18b (A); v. 19a (B); v. 19b (C); v. 20a (B¹); v. 20b (A¹) ("The Conclusion of Matthew's Gospel: Some Literary-Critical Observations," *IBSt* 8 [1986]: 54-63 [59]).

vation-history, as the mission to a new people is at the heart of the First Gospel's concluding scene.

—Matthew 28.18-20 and Matthean *Heilsgeschichte*—

Based on the resurrection-as-enthronement interpretation, the majority of scholars have posited that Mt has a two- or three-stage *Heilsgeschichte* centering on the resurrection. That is, because many read the resurrection as the moment Jesus received the authority necessary to empower the mission to the nations, it has frequently been supposed that Jesus' revivification marks the end of one era in Mt's salvation-history and the beginning of another.

But as was demonstrated above, the validity of the resurrection-as-enthronement reading should be doubted as it creates inconsistencies with other prophetic accounts elsewhere in the gospel. Furthermore, as is developed here, by supposing that the time of Jesus' exaltation and, thereby, the initiation of the Matthean community's mission, was in the early 30's, one proposes a reading of the Great Commission that contradicts Matthew's *Heilsgeschichte*.

The intent of this section is to demonstrate that Mt has a three stage salvation-history centering on the Son of Man's enthronement subsequent to the 70 CE destruction of Herod's Temple. It is herein suggested that Matthew's community used the spiritual and political ramifications of Jerusalem's fall, and to a greater extent the exaltation of Jesus, to justify their abandonment of a Israel-centric ministry for a mission to both Jews and Gentiles.

5.6.2—The Destruction of the Temple, the Son of Man's Exaltation, and the Inclusion of the Gentiles

At the beginning of the Mission Discourse (10.5-6), Jesus instructs the Twelve not to go to the Gentiles or Samaritans, but only to τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἴκου Ἰσραήλ (“the lost sheep of the house of Israel” [10.6b; cf. 15.24]). Even though Jesus, on occasion, acquiesces to perform miracles for Gentiles (cf. 8.5-13, 28-34; 15.21-28), Jesus is never described as pursuing a Gentile-inclusive ministry. The mission to πάντα τὰ ἔθνη is predicted or alluded to in Mt (cf. 8.11-12; 13.37-38 [note that the “field” is the “world”]; 24.14, 31; 26.13; 28.19-20), but there is no evidence that the

pre-exaltation Jesus ever participated in this international undertaking. Hence, the text indicates that an exclusive mission to the Jews was practiced by Jesus and that the mandate prohibiting the proclamation of the gospel to the Gentiles stood even after his death.

Yet, there are various indications in the gospel that the exclusively Jewish ministry did come to an end, but not immediately subsequent or consequent to the resurrection. Rather, the shift from an exclusive to inclusive ministry came after the exaltation of the Son of Man in 70 CE.

According to Mt 10.23, which belongs to the collection of Matthean *Sondergut*, Jesus predicted that the conclusion of the exclusively Jewish mission (cf. 10.5-16) would coincide with the Son of Man's coming:

Ὅταν δὲ διώκωσιν ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ, φεύγετε εἰς τὴν ἑτέραν· ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ τελέσητε τὰς πόλεις τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

As was discussed briefly in a previous chapter, *τελέω* can either refer to the end of the disciples fleeing or to the end of their mission. On the one hand, the verse could be rendered, “you will not finish *fleeing from those persecuting you* in the towns of Israel until the Son of Man comes.”⁷⁵ This takes into account the prediction's proximity to the claim that the disciples will be forced by persecution to flee from town-to-town according to the first half of the verse. On the other hand, one could render the verse, “you will not finish *your mission* to the cities of Israel until the Son of Man comes.” This is also a legitimate reading since “towns of Israel” is a verbal link with 10.5-6, in which the disciples are commanded to limit their mission to “the lost sheep of the *house of Israel*.” Since both of these options are equally viable, one may be inclined to agree with Davies and Allison, who conclude that “one can hardly render a verdict.”⁷⁶ However, it may not be necessary to practice “either/or” exegesis. Both of these readings essentially convey the same meaning: there will not be a shortage of places in Israel to proclaim the coming kingdom before the Son of Man comes and, therefore, his coming will cut short the disciples' mission. Hence, in whichever way one chooses to read the phrase “finish the towns of Israel,” the conclusion is the same: *the Son of Man's coming marks a decisive, but unexplained shift in the disciples' mission.*

75. Cf. Foster, *Community*, 223.

76. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:191.

This is developed more extensively in Mt 24, where the coming of the Son of Man is described with greater detail. In 24.9-13, Jesus describes the persecution his followers will face in their future mission and reveals to the Twelve that their chief aim is to proclaim the gospel to the whole of the inhabited world:

And this gospel of the kingdom will be preached in the whole world as a testimony to all nations, and then the end will come (24.14).

This verse does not refer, as France suggested,⁷⁷ to the pre-70 CE ministry of Jesus' disciples. It is inconsistent with what is known of early Christian missions to suppose that by 70 CE the Church had evangelized the "whole world," even if ὅλη τῆ οἰκουμένη referred merely to those people within the geo-political boundaries of the Roman empire. Rather, 24.14 informs the reader of the mission of Matthew's community to the Gentiles.⁷⁸ It was by staying vigilant for the "abomination of desolation" (24.15), which introduced a time of "great distress" (24.21) in Jerusalem, that the Matthean community was able to preserve themselves for the worldwide proclamation of the gospel. This is the best way to understand Matthew's addition of οὖν at the beginning of 24.15: from the perspective of Jesus, the Church will be commissioned to disseminate the gospel to "all the nations" (24.14; cf. 28.19), *therefore*, they must remain watchful for their cue to evacuate εἰς τὰ ὄρη in hopes of self-preservation (24.16).

This interpretation of 24.14-15 is supported by the sequence of events described shortly thereafter in 24.29-31. After the wrath of God had befallen "this generation" in the form of the Temple's destruction (cf. 23.36; 24.34)—represented by the cosmic imagery in 24.29—and subsequent to the Son of Man's reception of authority, 24.31 describes through prophetic imagery the inclusion of the Gentiles:

And he [i.e., the Son of Man] will send his angels with a loud trumpet call, and they will gather his elect from the four winds, from one end of the heavens to the other.

At first glance this seems to refer to the eschaton, whence, according to Mt 13.41, the angels gather humans for annihilation (cf. *1 En* 54.6; 63.1). However, rather than leaving the righteous in the restored "kingdom of the Father" (13.40, 43; cf. 19.28) and gathering the unrighteous for destruction, τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ collect the

77. France, *Matthew*, 908-09.

78. Matthew portrayed Jesus as speaking past the narrative audience to the Christians of his community at least once before (cf. 10.16-22).

elect for preservation. It is, therefore, possible that Matthew refers to a different gathering in 24.31, namely, the gathering of the Gentiles.

R. V. G. Tasker,⁷⁹ N. T. Wright,⁸⁰ J. A. Gibbs,⁸¹ and A. I. Wilson⁸² have suggested the possibility that Jesus here refers to human “messengers,” i.e., the disciples, gathering the Gentiles. Semantically, it is perfectly acceptable to translate ἄγγελος as “messenger” should the context suggest it. For example, Matthew used the term to refer to John the Baptist in 11.10. There is, therefore, precedence to render ἄγγελος with “human messenger” instead of “otherworldly, angelic figure” in the Matthew’s gospel. Although the above theory cannot be ruled out, the related interpretations of S. Brown⁸³ and R. T. France⁸⁴ seem more plausible given the evidence: τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ are the heavenly counterparts of the Twelve and the Christian community.

Of the twenty times ἄγγελος appears in the Mt, eighteen times it unambiguously refers to the angelic hosts of heaven, one use refers to John, and the final use of the term is in the passage currently under discussion. Additionally, of the six uses of ἄγγελος in Mk, all, including the parallel to Mt 24.31 (Mk 13.27), appear to refer to angelic beings. Therefore, it is statistically improbable that τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ refers to human messengers as opposed to angels in 24.31, especially since ἄγγελος is used three times in the near context to refer to the hosts of heaven (cf. 24.36; 25.31, 41). This conclusion finds further support in Matthew’s alteration of Mk’s “the angels” to “his angels” in 24.31. As was discussed above, Matthew changed τῶν ἀγγέλων τῶν ἀγίων in Mk 8.38 to τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ in Mt 16.27, possibly to mirror the presentation of the “standing ones” to the human-like figure in OG Dan 7.13. It is plausible, then, that Matthew also altered the Markan reading in 24.31 for the same reason. But no matter the motivation, the alteration suggests that Matthew considered the τοὺς ἀγγέλους of Mk 13.27, like τῶν ἀγγέλων τῶν ἀγίων in Mk 8.38, to be celestial beings.

79. Tasker, *Matthew*, 227.

80. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 363.

81. Gibbs, *Jerusalem and Parousia*, 201-04.

82. Wilson, *When Will These Things Happen?*, 158.

83. Brown, “Matthean Apocalypse,” 13.

84. France, *Matthew*, 927-28.

It seems possible, if not probable given that 24.4-35 refers largely to the fall of the Temple, that 24.31 depicts the involvement of the angelic hosts in the mission to the nations. The “twelve legions of angels” (26.53) are sent out to empower the Twelve disciples⁸⁵ and the Christian community to gather the Son of Man’s elect “from one end of heaven to the other.”⁸⁶ This phrase is equivalent to “from the east to the west” (cf. Isa. 11.12; Mk 13.27), which was used in 8.11-12 to refer to the gathering of the Gentiles (cf. Isa. 11.12). The authority that was bestowed upon the Son of Man by the Ancient of Days proceeds by means of angelic involvement with the community to “all the nations” (cf. 18.10; 28.18, 20). According to Matthew, the Gentiles from among the nations will be “gathered” (ἐπισυνάξουσιν) to the Son of Man since the inhabitants of Jerusalem have refused “to be gathered” (ἐπισυναγαγεῖν [23.37]).⁸⁷

5.6.3—The 70 CE Initiation of the Gentile Mission according to Matthew 21.28-22.14

It should be noted that the triad of parables in 21.28-22.14, which have been cited frequently as advocating the Matthean community’s mission to the Gentiles (cf. 21.43), were not mentioned above. This is due to the ambiguous picture the parables paint of the inclusion of outsiders. In order to work through some of the interpretive problems 21.28-22.14 poses, it is helpful to examine the passage retrospectively through the lens of Mt 24 rather than prospectively towards the Eschatological Discourse.

Rather than beginning with the Parable of the Two Sons (21.28-32)—which seems to be a logical place to start—for the purpose of understanding how the parabolic trio influences one’s understanding of the Matthean community’s participation in the Gentile mission, it is better to start the investigation with the verse at the center of the debate:

On account of this [i.e., the rejection of the “cornerstone” (cf. 21.42)], I say to you that the kingdom of God will be taken from you and will be given to a people (ἔθνεϊ) who will produce its fruits (21.43).

85. Although only “eleven disciples” are mentioned in 28.16, since Judas had killed himself prior to Jesus’ passion (27.5), it remains proper to refer to them as “the Twelve,” as they represent the reconstituted twelve tribes of Israel. “Twelve” is an ideal number, witnessed by the eschatological placement of “twelve thrones” at the Great Assize (19.28).

86. Brown, “Matthean Apocalypse,” 13.

87. Gibbs, *Jerusalem and Parousia*, 202.

Questions surround the meaning and referent of the word ἔθνη. As for the meaning, the term should not be translated “Gentiles.” The plural form of ἔθνος is used frequently in Mt to refer to the Gentiles. Meanwhile, the singular only appears one other time, in Mt 24.7, where the context rules that the term is better translated in a manner inclusive of all ethnicities, such as with the English “people (group)” or “nation” (cf. 1 Pet 2.9). That is the reading herein adopted, as can be seen from the translation provided above.

Yet, although a quick word study can arrive at an adequate translation of ἔθνη, the composition of the group to which this word refers remains a mystery. Stanton concluded that Matthew used ἔθνη to denote a “‘third race’ (*tertium genus*)” consisting of Jews and Gentiles with equal standing before God.⁸⁸ This ethnic interpretation has garnered extensive support, but does the context justify this conclusion? The path to finding a satisfying answer is difficult.

At the conclusion of the Parable of the Two Sons, Jesus tells “the chief priests and elders of the people” (21.23)—a group that appears to have contained Pharisees (cf. 21.45)—that “the tax collectors and prostitutes are entering the kingdom of God ahead of you” (21.31). It stands to reason that this statement should inform one’s reading of 21.43 and its description of the new ἔθνη: 21.31 and 21.43 appear in the contexts of parables that employ vineyard imagery (cf. 21.28), are connected by the juxtaposition of two “peoples-of-God,” and contain a common reference to the “kingdom of God.” Therefore, the context compels one to read ἔθνη as denoting those on the fringe of Jewish society, the “sinners” from among Israel whom Christ has come to call (cf. 9.12-13).

It is still possible, though, that ἔθνη is not exclusively reserved for the “tax collectors and prostitutes.” Matthew may have had the Gentiles in mind when he claimed that a new people would become the custodians of the kingdom on earth. Like the “tax collectors and prostitutes,” the Gentiles were on the fringe of Jewish society, and could be collectively considered a flat character with others among the πονηροῦς, a term used to describe the ἔθνη in 22.10, as well as the tax collectors and Gentiles in 5.45b-47. The latter reads,

88. Stanton, *Gospel for a New People*, 11-12; cf. G. N. Stanton, *The Gospels and Jesus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 67; G. Strecker, *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit: Untersuchung zur Theologie des Matthäus* (3rd Ed. FRLANT 82. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), 33.

... for he makes his sun rise upon the evil and the good, and rains upon the righteous and unrighteous. For if you love those who have loved you, what reward do you have? Do not the tax collectors do likewise? And if you greet only your brother, what more are you doing? Do not the Gentiles do the same?

This passage implies that the tax collectors and Gentiles belong to the same group, referred to here as the *πονηρούς* and the *ἀδίκους* (cf. 22.10), separate from the kingdom ethic-following *δικαίους* Jesus has called his audience to be. The close relationship between the tax collectors and the Gentiles is witnessed again in 18.17b:

... and if the [offending member of τῆ ἐκκλησίας] refuses to listen even to the Church, let such a one be to you as a Gentile and tax collector.

This is an appeal for the Christian community to treat those who have committed an offense for which they will not repent as one who is on the social and spiritual fringe of society. This is done not to ostracize the former disciple, as is commonly (and sadly) assumed by many modern congregations. Instead, by considering the fallen member to be like a tax collector and Gentile, the community of believers recognizes that the offender is among the people group in most need of evangelization (cf. 9.9-13; 11.19; 21.32).⁸⁹

Therefore, “tax collectors and prostitutes” in 21.32 is a way of referring to social and spiritual outsiders—the *πονηρούς*—with whom the Gentiles are closely associated in Jewish thought. One would not have expected Gentiles to have received direct mention in 21.32, as Jesus is recorded as talking to the religious leaders in a pre-Gentile inclusion context. But the post-70 CE reader of Matthew’s gospel would likely have placed the Gentiles among the *ἔθνει* along with tax collectors and prostitutes since the mission to the Gentiles was thoroughly underway from the Matthean community’s perspective. If this assumption is correct—that Matthew and his community would have considered the Gentiles to have a place among the *ἔθνει*—the triad of parables in 21.28-22.14 could be read as supporting the theory that the Gentile inclusive mission did not begin for the Matthean community until the Son of Man’s reception of “all authority in heaven and upon the earth” in 70 CE.

The Parables of the Wicked Tenants and of the Wedding Banquet depict Jerusalem’s fall as the bitter expression of God’s wrath against the religious leaders

89. The observation that in 18.17b the Gentiles are purported to be the focus of evangelistic outreach suggests that this pericope has been written from the perspective of the post-70 CE Matthean community.

and “this generation” (cf. 22.7; 23.36; 24.34). According to the latter parable, having been twice insulted, a king furiously raised an army “and destroyed those murderers and burned their city” (22.7),⁹⁰ a clear reference to the Temple’s destruction.⁹¹ It is at this judgment that “those wretches” are brought “to a wretched end” (21.41), and the “kingdom of God,” according to the Parable of the Wicked Tenants, is taken away from the religious leaders and given to a new ἔθνει (21.43). Likewise, according to the Parable of the Wedding Banquet, it is only after the city is burned that the servants of the king are sent to gather “all the people they could find, both bad (πονηρούς) and good” (22.10) to replace the unworthy guests who had just been executed.

Therefore, the Roman conquest of Jerusalem is characterized by the evangelist as being a pivotal point in the creation of a new people. How so if the tax collectors and prostitutes had entered the kingdom before Jesus’ death (21.31)? Based upon the evidence collected throughout Mt, it is not far-fetched to conclude that the ruination of the Temple was perceived as formative for the ἔθνει *because it was at this time the Gentiles were actively pursued by the Matthean community for inclusion alongside the repentant from among the people of Israel*. It is at this juncture that the tax collectors and prostitutes, with the Gentiles, officially became the ἔθνει, and received the stewardship of the kingdom of God (21.43).

According to Matthew, Jesus ordered his followers to go only to the “house of Israel,” a mission protocol Jesus exemplified. This restriction was paired, however, with a promise that the disciples would not exhaust the Israelite cities in which they might share the gospel until the Son of Man came. This implies that the disciples would be tasked to complete an Israel-exclusive mission until such time as ἔλθῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (10.23). This “coming” is confirmed by 24.29-31 to be the Son of Man’s approach “upon the clouds of heaven” to the Father to receive a kingdom and dominion seized from “this generation” in 70 CE (cf. 21.43). From the perspective of the Matthean community, it was at the very moment of the Son of Man’s exaltation—the “coming in his kingdom” (16.28)—that the exclusively Jewish

90. This has no parallel in Lk 14.15-24.

91. The imagery of a burnt city, no doubt, referred to the Roman siege of Jerusalem in 70 CE. Josephus often mentioned the fiery fate of the city (e.g., *Wars* 6.165-68, 177-85, 190-92, 228-35, 250-84, 316, 346, 353-55, 407, 434), and commented that, “You would indeed have thought that the temple mount . . . was boiling over from its base, being everywhere one mass of flame” (*Wars* 6.275 [cited in Evans, *Matthew*, 377]).

mission ended. It was replaced by an inclusive mission to “all the nations” (24.14; cf. 28.19), a task for which the elect have been preserved (cf. 24.16, 22). This does not mean that the Matthean community ceased having contact with or caring about the people of Israel when the Temple fell and the Son of Man was given dominion over all things. Israel is most certainly among πάντα τὰ ἔθνη in 28.19,⁹² since the designation was employed in 24.9 to refer to a Jew-Gentile collective (cf. 10.17; 24.14; 25.32; Mk 13.13). By suggesting that Israel is not among the πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, “one improperly restricts the dominion of the exalted Son of Man.”⁹³

However, a change in the Matthean community’s mission is indicative of a change in Israel’s perceived status. To Matthew, Israel is no longer the people of God. Their right to function as stewards in the kingdom was taken away in 70 CE and given to the Son of Man, who in turn has shared this blessing with a new “people” who will not only preserve but expand his kingdom (21.43; 28.19-20). It appears, therefore, that Matthew considers himself and his community to belong to this “new people” that cannot rightly be called “Jewish” or “Gentile.” As Stanton suggested, the Matthean community identifies itself as a “third race” that does not distinguish between Jews and Gentiles. The only distinguishing marks between certain people groups that the Matthean community recognizes are Christological. Either a person confesses Jesus to be the Messiah and observes his teaching, thereby becoming a member of the new people, or one remains an outsider. Matthew’s Christianity may have a pronounced Jewish flavor, but it is something new: Judaism fully realized in and through Jesus the Christ.

92. Cf. J. P. Meier, “Nations or Gentiles in Matthew 28.19?” *CBQ* 39 (1977): 94-102; Stanton, *Gospel for a New People*, 158; A. J. Saldarini, *Matthew’s Christian-Jewish Community* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 43, 81; Perkins, “Matthew 28:16-20,” 584; H. Kvalbein, “Hat Matthäus die Juden aufgegeben? Bemerkungen zu Ulrich Luz’ Matthäus-Deutung,” *TBei* 29 (1998): 301-14. *Contra* R. Walker, *Die Heilsgeschichte im ersten Evangelium* (FRLANT 91. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967), 111-13; D. R. A. Hare and D. J. Harrington, “‘Make Disciples of All Gentiles’ (Mt 28.19),” *CBQ* 37 (1975): 359-69; Luz, *Theology*, 139-40. Additionally, Plummer (*Matthew*, 429), Vögtle (“Mt. 28.18-20”), Trilling (*Das Wahre Israel*, 26-28), B. J. Hubbard (*The Matthean Redaction of a Primitive Apostolic Commissioning: An Exegesis of Matthew 28.16-20* [SBLDS 19. Missoula: Scholars, 1974], 83-84), and Bauer (*Structure of Matthew’s Gospel*, 112) claim that πάντα τὰ ἔθνη in Dan 7.14 does not include Israelites. However, there is no reason to assume this unless one holds the untenable position that the human-like figure is a collective, symbolic being who represents the nation of Israel. Although πάντα τὰ ἔθνη may not always include Jews in OG Dan (cf. 3.7, 37), it does in OG Dan 3.2, 6.26, and possibly 4.37. As *universal authority* is being conferred of the human-like one, it is logical that πάντα τὰ ἔθνη includes Israelites.

93. P. Stuhlmacher, “Matt 28:16-20 and the Course of Mission in the Apostolic and Postapostolic Age,” in J. Ådna and H. Kvalbein (eds.), *The Mission of the Early Church to the Jews and Gentiles* (WUNT 127. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 17-43 (27).

5.6.4—Concluding Thoughts Concerning Matthew 28.18-20 and Matthean *Heilsgeschichte*

This *Heilsgeschichte* fits very well with the interpretation of 28.18 uniquely suggested in this study. Jesus, who Matthew associated with the representative figure of OG Dan 7.13-14 by means of an allusion in 28.18, declares to his disciples that, like the human-like one, he has received universal sovereignty from the Father. This Danielic allusion and the motif of exaltation link 28.18 to 24.30 and 26.64, where the Son of Man is described as being enthroned and endowed with power after the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE. The “kingdom of God” that Matthew’s Jesus predicted would be taken away from “this generation” (cf. 21.43; 22.7-10; 23.33-39; 24.34) has been given to the Son of Man on behalf of his elect. The disciples are tasked to announce its coming to all peoples, after which time the Son of Man is promised to return so that he might restore the kingdom as an inheritance for the persecuted saints.⁹⁴

Whether οὐ̅ν in 28.19 was in the autograph of 28.19 or not,⁹⁵ the relationship between the “authority” saying and the commissioning scene is self-evident: the Gentile mission can now begin to expand the kingdom to the nations since the Son of Man has received the requisite power to initiate it. As R. C. H. Lenski stated,

Therefore, οὐ̅ν has a peculiar force here; it draws a conclusion from the gift of all authority bestowed upon Christ; it puts all this power and authority behind the command to evangelize the world. This οὐ̅ν shows how what otherwise would be absolutely impossible, now becomes gloriously possible, yea, an assured reality.⁹⁶

94. Gaston (*No Stone on Another*, 478-79) suggested dubiously that Mark conflated 13.26 and 14.62, and, thereby, saw the resurrection and the Son of Man’s *Parousia* in 70 CE as the same event. He extrapolated from this that the Matthean epilogue is a conflation of the same two events, and that Matthew followed Mark in believing that the *Parousia* of the Son of Man occurred in 70 CE and initiated the Gentile inclusion (*No Stone on Another*, 483-87). Although similar to what is suggested here, there are several marked differences. First, the manner by which he arrived at this conclusion is substantially flawed. There is no indication that Mark or Matthew combined the *Parousia* (cf. Mk 13.26/Mt 24.30) and the resurrection (cf. Mk 14.62/Mt 26.64) into one event. In fact, it is likely that both Mk 14.62/Mt 26.64 and Mk 13.26/Mt 24.30 refer to the coming of the Son of Man in 70 CE and not to either the resurrection or the *Parousia*. Second, though Gaston suggested that Matthew and Mark conflate the resurrection and *Parousia*, he still claimed that Jesus’ exaltation happened at the resurrection (*No Stone on Another*, 389, 403), unlike what is herein argued. Third, Gaston strangely collapses the Son of Man’s judgment at the *Parousia* into the resurrection event and the 70 CE destruction of the Temple (*No Stone on Another*, 486), thereby making the punishment of “this generation” in 70 CE an expression of the final judgment. Hence, this study offers needed improvements on Gaston’s theory.

95. οὐ̅ν is not represented in ⋈ A f³ TR bo^{pt}, whereas it is present in B W Δ Θ f¹ lat sy sa mae bo^{pt}.

96. R. C. H. Lenski, *The Eisenach Gospel Selections* (Columbus: Lutheran Book Concern, 1928), 580.

As the triadic formula in 28.19 insinuates, the Son of Man and the Spirit share the same enabling role in Mt (cf. 10.20);⁹⁷ Jesus' authoritative presence equips the Matthean community to proclaim the word of his reign to πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς κατὰ γένη whom he had been given (OG Dan 7.14; cf. Mt 24.14; 28.19). Jesus did not participate in a Gentile mission during his time on earth; but now, according to Matthew, he functions as the one who sows the "good seed that is the sons of the kingdom" in the field of the world (13.37-38). As long as his authority and angelic servants remain with the Church, he is truly with them "until the end of the age" (28.20).

—The Son of Man and the Split between the Matthean Community and "this generation" —

Brown, who concluded by different means that the Gentile mission commenced in 70 CE,⁹⁸ sought to explain why the Matthean community avoided direct Gentile evangelization for nearly forty years.⁹⁹ He concluded that the pre-70 CE Matthean community existed in Palestine and had close ties with the Jewish community in which it was based. It was not until after the destruction of the Temple and the escalation of Palestinian religious conflict that the Matthean community separated itself from the Jews and came to reside in Antioch (cf. Mt 4.24).¹⁰⁰ It was this tension with the Jews and the community's new setting amongst the Gentiles that brought the necessity of Gentile and Matthean community relations. "[G]entile Christianity had begun and was now solidly entrenched"¹⁰¹ in Syria, making the transition for Matthew's community more natural.

97. See the redactional reconstruction of the pre-Matthean commissioning suggested in Hubbard, *Matthean Redaction*, 122-23, and Davies and Allison, "Matt. 28:16-20," 95.

98. Brown, "Matthean Community," 213-14; cf. Walker, *Die Heilsgeschichte*, 111.

99. Brown, "Matthean Community," 214-19.

100. W. Grundmann stated, "Since Matthew's gospel probably belongs to the Syrian church, this place name [i.e., Syria] designates its geographical location and connects this church directly with Jesus' ministry" (*Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* [ThHK 1. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1968], 113; cited and translated in Brown, "Matthean Community," 214 n. 95). The observation that Mt was written in Greek may also suggest a provenance outside Palestine.

101. Brown, "Matthean Community," 214.

Although this socio-historic reconstruction has explanatory power, it fails to recognize interlaced theological reasons for the Gentile mission that are within the text of Mt itself.

First, for Matthew, the destruction of the Temple was more than a simple consequence of war; the fall of Jerusalem was a signal to Matthew and his community that the favor of God was no longer with the hard-hearted Jews and their leaders. The Roman conquest was a physical indication that the exclusive mission to Israel did not have ideal results. “This generation”¹⁰² refused to repent (cf. 3.1-2; 4.17; 21.31-32; 23.37-39), blasphemed the Spirit (cf. 12.22-38), killed the prophets and the prophetic Son of Man (cf. 21.33-46; 23.35-36; 27.25), and persecuted the followers of Christ (cf. 10.5-22; 16.24-26; 23.29-38; 24.9-13; 28.15). For these sins, the exclusive mission to Israel was brought to an end prior its completion (cf. 10.23). The Jews had been given missional priority due their status as the chosen stewards of the kingdom. But Rome’s victory over Jewish forces in 70 CE was perceived by the Matthean community to be a concrete expression of God’s disappointment with the doubting and unrepentant majority in Israel. According to the evangelist, the wicked tenants of God’s vineyard had been brought to a “wretched end,” their right to the kingdom of God had been taken away, and the way had been made for new tenants to cultivate the kingdom (cf. 21.41, 43). From Matthew’s point of view, this provided justification for a mission to πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. It is through the proclamation of τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦτο (26.13) among the peoples of the earth that the new kingdom community is established.

Second, Matthew justified the delay of and the current necessity for a Gentile mission by claiming that the Son of Man and, therefore, his community, had not been empowered to evangelize the Gentiles until after the destruction of the Temple. Jerusalem’s siege was a physical indication to the Matthean community that authority was in the process of being transferred from one power to another. “This generation” lost the kingdom of God (cf. 21.43), and it was given instead to the Son of Man (cf. OG Dan 7.14, 27) on behalf of his “sons of the kingdom” (13.38). Without the Son of Man’s reception of “all authority in heaven and on earth,” Matthew’s audience had no assurance that a mission to the nations would have been successful, or was even permissible (cf. 10.5-6). But the fulfilled prophecy of

102. Cf. Mt 11.16; 12.39, 41-42, 45; 16.4; 17.17; 23.36; 24.34.

the Temple's fall supported Matthew's claim that Jesus received universal authority. This fulfillment and the Son of Man's elevation to kingship over the entire world together motivated the Matthean community to proclaim the gospel to Gentiles and assured it of eventual success before the "end of the age" (24.14; 28.20). If God was willing to destroy Jerusalem and take away the kingdom from its former stewards for the benefit of the ἐκκλησία, the Matthean community can be confident that the now-exalted Son of Man will stop anyone who impedes its mission (cf. 8.11-12; 13.37-38; 21.43).

The exaltation of the Son of Man, however, meant more to the Matthean community than mere empowerment; the Son of Man's authority is the *raison d'être* of the worldwide mission. It is the task of the community to spread the word of Jesus' lordship to the nations. In recognition of such sovereignty, every new disciple is to be baptized into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit (28.19). Although Jesus could be called God's Son prior to his exaltation (e.g., 1.23; 2.15; 3.17; 11.25-27; 17.5; 24.36),¹⁰³ it is through the Son of Man's enthronement on the "glorious throne" and his reception of dominion that this relationship is truly expressed. The 70 CE destruction of the Temple and the Son of Man's corresponding exaltation confirmed to the Matthean community that Jesus is not the Son of Man who will receive divine authority in the eschatological future. Rather, he is the one who has already been made Lord of the cosmos. It is the goal of spreading the knowledge of Jesus' reign that drives the community forward to all nations.

The recognition of the Son of Man's exaltation further provided Matthew's community with comfort. Its ability to succeed in its task is not its own; the Son of Man does the hard work of sowing the seed (cf. 13.37-38). But moreover, comfort is found in the promise that the Son of Man will one day return to punish or bless outsiders based on how they have treated the "little ones/least of these" (10.40-42; 25.31-46). The phrase συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος (cf. 28.20) is used three other times in Mt, each in the context of detailing the Great Assize (cf. 13.40, 49; 24.3). Just as the destruction of the Temple was the guarantor of the Son of Man's exaltation to the right hand of Power, so the Son of Man's reception of πᾶσα ἐξουσία is a guarantor

103. References to "Son of God" are not included here since "Son" and "Son of God" are not synonymous in Mt. "Son" refers to Jesus' close relationship with the Father, and likely his divinity. Meanwhile, "Son of God" appears to be a messianic title, as is suggested by its hendiadys-like statements, "the Messiah/Christ, Son of (the living) God" (16.16; 26.63).

that he possesses the divine prerogative to eliminate evil and reward good. The Matthean community can rest assured that the Son of Man will return at the eschaton and, then, put an end to the conflict between himself and Satan.

—Conclusion—

In light of the above study, the quote from Davies and Allison cited at the beginning of this chapter rings evermore true: “One expects much from an ending, and in this Matthew meets expectations.”¹⁰⁴ Apparent discrepancies between the “authority” motif of the epilogue and the rest of the Matthew’s gospel are herein demonstrated to have been introduced by poor readings of Mt’s prophetic material. The picture painted of the Son of Man’s exaltation is clear. According to Matthew, the Son of Man did not receive “all authority in heaven and on earth” at his death or resurrection, nor has he possessed it from before his incarnation. Rather, when the epilogue is read with an eye toward the previous narrative it becomes apparent that Matthew places the moment of the Son of Man’s exaltation immediately after Jerusalem fell into the hands of the Roman military. According to the evangelist, it was at that instant that the Son of Man was enthroned at God’s right hand and was given, among other blessings, an everlasting kingdom on behalf of the new people of God.

When such passages as Mt 13.37-43; 16.28; 21.43; and 24.30-31 are read together, the picture of the Son of Man’s exaltation and the subsequent formation of a new kingdom people resembles closely the elevation of the human-like one and his relationship with the “saints of the Most high” described in Dan 7. Daniel described the human-like one as receiving authority and an everlasting kingdom (7.14, 27b) on behalf of the people of God (7.22, 26-27a), which was first seized by the Ancient of Days from those who persecuted his elect (7.11-12, 22, 26-27a). Matthew has followed this pattern in describing the Son of Man’s ascension to power. However, he turns it on its head by equating “this generation” with the beasts from the sea, who have their kingdom-dominion stripped from them and given to a “Son of Man” on behalf of the ἔθνη, the new “sons of the kingdom.” That

104. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:678.

is, “this generation” of wicked and adulterous Jews have been equated with the oppressive kingdoms of the earth. Meanwhile, the Gentiles, alongside the repentant Israelites—who are together the people from among πάντα τὰ ἔθνη—have taken their place as the elect ἔθνει of God, unified through the authority of the Son of Man.

Therefore, the power the Son of Man acquired at his coronation was not meant simply to enable him to end conflict in the eschatological future through cosmic judgment and re-creation (cf. 19.28; 25.31), though this is the ultimate result of his exaltation. The Son of Man exercises his authority to establish a new kingdom-people. The Matthean Son of Man does not merely ascend into the heights of heaven and wait to return as judge at the Eschatological Assize. Matthew is unique among the evangelists in ascribing to the Son of Man a mission between his advents (cf. 13.36-43); the Son of Man remains with his people and goes before them, empowering them to go to the nations to replicate disciples, himself sowing the good seed.

Therefore, because he was empowered through Jerusalem’s destruction—the first stage in conflict resolution—the Son of Man, who engaged “this generation” during his first advent, continues to participate in conflict alongside the Church he came to establish. Through his ever-present authority, he leads the disciples, and specifically the Matthean community, into the field of the world, as they struggle against the “gates of Hades” (16.18), that is, Satan, his angels, and the “sons of the evil one.” This conflict, at which the Son of Man is center, will carry on until the completion of the disciples’ mission to “all the nations” (cf. 24.14). At that time, the Son of Man will return in glory with his angels to gather out of his kingdom all causes of wickedness and every evildoer, both human and supernatural (cf. 13.41-42). These will experience eternal punishment (cf. 3.11; 7.22-23; 8.11-12; 11.20-24; 12.39-42; 13.41-42, 49-50; 16.27; 25.31-46) while the perseverant followers of the Son of Man will receive eternal life in the purified kingdom (cf. 5.10; 8.11-12; 13.41-43; 16.24-27; 19.28; 25.31-46; 26.29), the final stage in conflict resolution.

Chapter Six

Conclusion

—Summary—

It was stated in the Introduction that the intent of this dissertation was to demonstrate that the Son of Man is described in Mt as being at the center of the formative conflict that forced the split between “this generation” of Israel and the Matthean community and initiated the Gentile-inclusive mission. According to the evangelist, the Son of Man is not engaged in aimless conflict; he confronts and destroys his enemies for the sake of promoting his universal reign and establishing his Church, i.e., the “sons of the kingdom” (13.38), among the nations (cf. OG Dan 7.14; 24.14; 28.18-20). It is his authority over the kingdom of God, given subsequent to and consequent to the judgment of God against Israel in 70 CE, that enables the global mission of the disciples, provides the *raison d’être* for their mission, and assures the Christian community that the Son of Man will return at the eschaton to bring a final end to conflict.

In support of this thesis, it was confirmed that from the first use of the “Son of Man” in Jesus’ earliest encounter with the religious leaders (cf. 8.20) until the last use of “Son of Man” in Jesus’ final statement to the Jewish officials (cf. 26.64), the Son of Man is depicted by Matthew as being embroiled in conflict with “this generation.” This conflict precipitated the destruction of the Temple (cf. 24.3-35), the physical sign of the Son of Man’s exaltation (cf. 16.28; 24.30; 26.64), two events that together justified the termination of the Matthean community’s exclusively Jewish mission (cf. 10.23; 28.18-20) and signified the need to proclaim the gospel to the Gentiles (cf. 8.11-12; 21.43; 24.30-31; 28.18-20). Based on the vindication of Jesus by means of his resurrection and the fall of Jerusalem, the Christian community can be assured that the Son of Man has the requisite power to establish his “sons of the kingdom” despite Satan’s oppression (cf. 13.37-43; 16.18; 28.18-20), and that he will return at the end of the age to destroy his enemies and, thereby, purify his kingdom (cf. 13.41-43; 16.27; 19.28; 25.31-46).

This dissertation has made several contributions to the “Son of Man” debate as it pertains to the Matthean gospel, the most prominent of which are detailed below.

First, this dissertation provided a fresh reading of the first Matthean “Son of Man” saying and the first polemical comment made to a religious leader in the gospel: “Foxes have holes, birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man has nowhere to lay his head” (8.20). Although the controversy underlying the saying has been recognized previously, it was first proposed in this study that the source of conflict was a scribe’s misunderstanding of the Son of Man’s prophetic commissioning. It was likewise shown that this misperception quickly evolved into the religious leaders’ and crowds’ disbelief of the Son of Man’s prophethood, attested by the conflict that motivated the public “Son of Man” sayings of Mt 8-12. By Matthew uniquely portraying the Son of Man as a repudiated prophet of judgment, the public “Son of Man” sayings in the first half of the gospel form a continuum of meaning with the sayings in the second half of the gospel that identify the Son of Man as the leader of the kingdom community who suffers a prophet’s death in Jerusalem.

Second, this is the first study to suggest that the withdrawal of “Son of Man” and the revelation that accompanied the designation from public discourse starting in 13.37 was an act of judgment against “this wicked and adulterous generation” who doubted his prophetic commissioning and blasphemed the Spirit (cf. 11.20-24; 12.22-45). According to the evangelist, for their repudiation of God’s spokesperson and Spirit, what revelation “this generation” had been given was taken from them and more was given to the disciples (cf. 13.11-17). Thereby, the disciples were confirmed to be the “little children” blessed with knowledge by Jesus and the Father, whereas the religious leaders and unbelieving crowds were the “wise” from whom knowledge was kept (cf. 11.25-27).

Third, this dissertation uniquely proposed that the Son of Man’s reception of authority and a kingdom subsequent to and consequent to the destruction of the Temple was the deliberate reversal of Daniel’s visionary account. In OG Dan 7, the beasts from the sea, who represent the kingdoms of the earth, have their authority stripped from them (OG Dan 7.11-12) and given to the human-like one for the sake of the persecuted Israelites (OG Dan 7.13-14, 27). However, according to the Eschatological Discourse, “this generation” of hard-hearted Jews (cf. 21.41, 43; 22.7; 23.36; 24.3, 29-30, 34) have the kingdom of God taken away from them (cf. 8.11-12; 21.43; 24.29-30) and given to the Son of Man (cf. 13.41; 16.28; 24.30) on behalf of a new, ethnically-diverse “people” (21.43; cf. 5.10; 8.11-12; 24.14, 30-31; 28.18-20), the “sons

of the kingdom,” whom they persecute (cf. 5.10; 10.5-25; 16.18, 24-26; 23.29-39; 24.9-13; 28.15).

Fourth, this dissertation provided a re-reading of Mt 28.16-20 that took into account the portrayal of the exalted Son of Man throughout the Matthean narrative. It was suggested that Jesus did not have “all authority in heaven and on earth” from his preexistence, nor did he receive such dominion at his death or resurrection. Rather, this study proposed that the Son of Man was given universal authority after God’s punishment of Jerusalem in 70 CE. Matthew considered the fall of the capital to the Roman military a physical expression of God’s reprisal against “this generation” and of the elevation of the Son of Man to power. Hence, the ruination of the Temple signaled to the Matthean community that God had passed judgment on the wicked among Israel, which implied that the restrictive missional command of 10.5-6 was no longer valid. The mission exclusively to the Jews did not achieve its desired result since many from among the “lost sheep of the house of Israel” refused to repent and recognize their Messiah. Further, the events of 70 CE indicated that the Son of Man had been made sovereign over all things by the Father. The authority of the Son of Man provided the reason for the community’s mission, as it was necessary to spread word of the Son of Man’s dominion to the nations. Additionally, it assured the Matthean community that they would succeed in their mission, ushering in the end of the age, the purification of the kingdom, and the end to conflict (cf. 24.14).

Fifth, this study suggested that not only is the Son of Man at the center of conflict, according to Matthew, he is at the center of conflict resolution. Matthew is unique in ascribing to the Son of Man a mission between his exaltation and his *Parousia*. This mission pertains to the establishment of the “sons of the kingdom” in the world, itself an act of aggression against Satan, who seeks to establish his own “sons” (cf. 13.37-38). Hence, conflict is not resolved at the resurrection, according to Matthew’s gospel. Conflict reaches its end in the destruction of all evildoers—human and supernatural—at the hand of the Son of Man and his angels (cf. 13.41-42; 16.27; 25.31-46). The Son of Man does not play the passive role of a witness in Mt as he does in Lk and Q (cf. 12.8). He takes the place of the Father, enacting judgment through the Eschatological Assize. Conflict ceases only when the

wicked are destroyed and the perseverant righteous are rewarded with eternal life (cf. 13.43; 25.46).

Finally, the following section of this chapter will propose a unique answer to the question concerning what ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου meant according to Matthew.

—The Meaning of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου according to Matthew—

A corollary question this dissertation asks is, “What does the designation ‘Son of Man’ mean according to Matthew?” Although the consistent double determinative form of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in the synoptic tradition suggests it was a known quantity, the varied settings in which the term is employed indicates otherwise. This is likely due to the gradual evolution of the term in Jesus’ speech, or what Bock labelled “gradual exposure.”¹ It is plausible, as L. W. Hurtado has proposed, that the Aramaic equivalent of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, whatever that may have been, was “a particularizing form of an idiomatic expression with broad inherent meaning,”² used by Jesus to identify himself “as a particular human being,”³ perhaps one with a “special role and mission.”⁴ However, *contra* Hurtado, it is also plausible that Jesus was the first person to associate ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου with the כִּבְר אֱנוֹשׁ/ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου of Dan 7.13-14.

Hurtado posited that while it is plausible that Jesus alluded to Dan 7.13-14 when on trial before the Sanhedrin, there is no connection between Jesus’ use of “Son of Man” and the Danielic night-vision.⁵ He supposed that a suggestion to the contrary would imply that the term “Son of Man” was a title, and that if the expression were a title, one would expect to read of its common confessional use. However, D. Bock challenged his conclusion, positing that Jesus did relate the term

1. D. L. Bock, “Did Jesus Connect Son of Man to Daniel 7?: A Short Reflection on the Position of Larry Hurtado,” *BBR* 22 (2012): 399-402 (400).

2. L. W. Hurtado, “Summary and Concluding Observations,” in L. W. Hurtado and P. L. Owen (eds.) *Who Is This Son of Man? The Latest Scholarship on a Puzzling Expression of the Historical Jesus* (LNTS 390; London: T. & T. Clark, 2011), 158-77 (167).

3. Hurtado, “Summary,” 168.

4. Hurtado, “Summary,” 175.

5. Hurtado, “Summary,” 171 (158-77); cf. *idem*, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 290-306.

to the Danielic text, but only late in his ministry. He contended that Jesus began using the term as Hurtado has suggested, but that Jesus eventually, toward the end of his career, associated the expression with Dan 7.13-14.⁶ The primary reason Bock finds

it hard to accept Hurtado's proposal that Jesus used this title but did not connect it to any Scripture is that, in Hurtado's view, we have a Jesus who reflected biblically on his mission, appealing to specific texts, and yet in the case of this expression, which so closely connects to a major eschatological setting of the Hebrew Scriptures, no such connection appears. That seems most unlikely.⁷

Even if Jesus eventually interpreted "Son of Man" by his reading of Dan 7.13-14, Bock suggests that there is no reason to expect "Son of Man" should have become a confessional title. Since the term "was enigmatic, it became absorbed in other, clearer confessions, especially the related idea of Jesus' being Lord through the more-often cited and conceptually related Ps 110:1."⁸

This conception of the term's evolution explains well the varied use of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in the hypothetical Q source and Mk. In the former, "Son of Man" is used ten times, five times to refer to Jesus during his earthly ministry (cf. 6.22; 7.34; 9.58; 11.30; 12.10) and an equal number to refer to Jesus' actions in the future (cf. 12.8, 40; 17.24, 26, 30).⁹ Since there is no passion in Q, there are no references to the Son of Man's death or resurrection. Meanwhile, Mk uses the term fourteen times, three of which may be classified as future-referring (cf. 8.38; 13.26; 14.62), while eleven refer to Jesus during his earthly mission and are connected by the theme of repudiation (cf. 2.10, 28; 8.31; 9.9, 12, 31; 10.33, 45; 14.21 [x2], 41).¹⁰ Of the collective twenty-four "Son of Man" sayings, only four show signs of having been influenced by Dan 7.13, all of which are in Mk (cf. 8.38; 10.45; 13.26; 14.62).

These statistics are to be expected should "Son of Man" have been a simple idiomatic self-designation employed by Jesus to refer to his special mission that was only used once to associate Jesus with the Danielic human-like one. The scribe responsible for Q, having been unaware of the connection of "Son of Man" to Dan 7,

6. Bock, "Did Jesus Connect Son of Man to Daniel 7?" 400-01.

7. Bock, "Did Jesus Connect Son of Man to Daniel 7?" 401.

8. Bock, "Did Jesus Connect Son of Man to Daniel 7?" 402.

9. Robinson claimed that the first four "Son of Man" sayings refer to Jesus during his earthly ministry, whereas the later six sayings can be categorized as future-referring ("Son of Man," 405; cf. Foster, "Q's Two-Stage Son of Man Christology," 84). In contrast to Robinson, it is suggested here that 12.10 belongs in the former category.

10. Tuckett, "Present Son of Man," 58-81.

portrayed Jesus as using the term to refer to himself in relation to his unique mission, both present and future (from the perspective of Jesus). Mark describes the designation as being employed in a similar manner. “Son of Man” is used to refer to Jesus in his present and future ministries, though Mark has a considerable emphasis on portraying the Son of Man as one for whose ministry of suffering is central. In each saying that refers to the Son of Man in the eschatological future, Dan 7.13 is either cited (cf. 13.26; 14.62) or alluded to (cf. 8.38). This demonstrates that Mark was aware of the connection Jesus made between ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου and the כְּבָר אֲנִי/ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, and considered Jesus to fulfill the role of the “one like a son of man” in the eschatological future. Yet, “Son of Man” had not taken on the form of a title in Mark’s gospel, as it still referred to Jesus simply as a human who has a unique mission.

It appears that the concept of an exalted, Danielic “Son of Man” appealed to Matthew, whose gospel exhibits numerous traits commonly associated with apocalyptic eschatology.¹¹ Glazener was correct when he asserted that Matthew’s addition of six future-referring “Son of Man” sayings (13.37, 41; 16.28; 19.28; 24.30; 25.31) does not prove that his emphasis was on the Son of Man’s future glories to the neglect of Jesus’ earthly ministry. It does, however, suggest that Matthew, likely due to his thoroughgoing apocalypticism, was concerned with presenting the Son of Man as a preeminently-exalted figure, like the enthroned and glorified son of man in OG Dan 7.13-14. This conclusion is supported by the parallels between Dan 7.13-14, particularly the OG version, and the future-referring “Son of Man” sayings in Mt:

- a) Matthew altered the Markan citations of Dan 7 to mirror the reading of OG Dan 7.13 (ἐν [Mk 13.26] and μετά [Mk 14.62] are changed to “upon [ἐπὶ] the clouds of heaven” [cf. OG Dan 7.13; Mt 24.30; 26.64]);
- b) Matthew describes the Son of Man as being seated on Yahweh’s throne (cf. Mt 19.28; 25.31; 26.64) like the “one like a son of man,” who is depicted as being mounted on God’s throne-chariot (cf. OG Dan 7.9, 13);
- c) Matthew portrays the Son of Man as commanding angelic forces (cf. Mt 13.41; 16.27; 24.31), reminiscent of the “son of man’s” reception of Yahweh’s entourage of “standing ones” (OG Dan 7.10, 13);
- d) Matthew accords to the Son of Man kingly authority (cf. Mt 28.18; 25.34, 40) like that which is given to the human-like one of Daniel’s vision (cf. MT/OG Dan 7.14);
- e) Matthew ascribes to the Son of Man the right to rule over all the tribes of the earth (cf. Mt 13.37-38; 25.32; 28.18-20), a prerogative of the exalted figure in Dan 7 (cf. OG Dan 7.14);

11. Cf. Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology*, *passim*.

- f) Matthew describes the Son of Man as the object of worship (cf. Mt 28.17, 19), worship being the proper response of the nations to the “one like a son of man” (cf. MT/OG Dan 7.14);
- g) Matthew ascribes to the Son of Man an imperishable kingdom (cf. Mt 13.41; 16.28; 20.21; 25.34, 40) identical to that ascribed to the “son of man” in Daniel’s visionary experience (MT/OG Dan 7.14); and,
- h) Matthew accords the Son of Man the right to judge at the eschaton (cf. Mt 16.27; 19.28; 25.31), which does not have a direct parallel in OG Dan 7.13-14, but has possibly been derived from the depiction of the human-like figure’s enthronement in OG Dan 7.13.

This confirms that of the thirty Matthean “Son of Man” sayings, two contain a direct citation of OG Dan 7.13 (cf. 24.30; 26.64), while six contain allusions to the Danielic vision (cf. 13.41; 16.27, 28; 19.28; 20.28; 25.31).¹² Although not a “Son of Man” saying, the allusion to OG Dan 7.14 in Mt 28.18-20 can be appealed to in support of the claim that Matthew was aware of and relied on the “Son of Man” tradition preserved in the OG version of Dan 7. Therefore, nearly one-third of the “Son of Man” sayings in Mt refer to Jesus as the exalted, Danielic Son of Man, and of these eight sayings, four have been introduced by Matthew, while three have been altered by Matthew to more closely mirror OG Dan 7.13-14.

Based on these findings, it is possible that Matthew placed this emphasis on describing the Son of Man as fulfilling the role of the “son of man” in OG Dan 7.13-14 because he interpreted ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου as a title for the exalted Danielic figure. One should not conclude that it is, therefore, necessary or permissible to read every “Son of Man” saying through the lens of Daniel’s vision, as though, for example, 8.20 should be read, “Foxes have holes, birds of the air have nests, but the exalted and enthroned Son of Man has nowhere to lay his head.” Matthew has tempered his concept of the Son of Man by means of the “two-advent” apologetic he received from Mk. Although the repudiated and suffering Jesus can be referred to as the Son of Man because his fortunes will be reversed by God at his exaltation, it is proper to recognize and maintain the stages of the Son of Man’s mission.

This supposed reconstruction of Matthew’s understanding of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου explains why the title is used by Matthew’s Jesus to refer to his conflict with Satan and the “sons of the evil one.” Matthew considered the Son of Man’s

12. There may be as many as eight “Son of Man” sayings that allude to OG Dan 7. One may include 13.37 due to its emphasis on depicting the Son of Man as the representative of the elect (cf. OG Dan 7.14, 27) and its proximity to Mt 13.41. Additionally, 10.23 may be included since it refers to the coming of the Son of Man on the clouds of heaven in 24.30.

primary role to be the eschatological judge who brings a permanent end to conflict. He has, therefore, used the theme of conflict to bind the “Son of Man” sayings and the stages of the Son of Man’s mission together so as to create a unified “Son of Man” concept. Additionally, this may explain why Matthew took pains to describe the Son of Man as the prophetic spokesperson of God during his first advent. In an attempt to bridge the gap between those sayings that refer to the Son of Man’s pre-glorified state and those that refer to his post-glorified state, Matthew described the Son of Man as a prophet who announces judgment, as a prophet whose death guarantees the judgement of “this generation,” and as the eschatological judge who exacts the judgment he himself prophesied.

Therefore, it is the conclusion of this study that Matthew’s understanding of the designation ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου is measurably different than that held by the Historical Jesus. *It is in Mt that Jesus’ enigmatic self-referential idiom first became a title employed by Matthew’s Jesus to refer himself as Daniel’s “son of man.”* He is the representative of the righteous who must suffer and die at the hands of his enemies on their behalf. But it is due to his voluntary suffering that he is found worthy to be exalted by God. He uses his new-found authority to empower the disciples in their mission to the nations and to bring a final end to conflict at his glorious *Parousia*.

Bibliography

- M. H. Abrams, *A Glossary of Literary Terms* (4th Ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1981).
- W. F. Albright and C. S. Mann, *Matthew* (ABC 26. New York: Doubleday, 1971).
- H. Alford, *The Greek New Testament* (Reprint. Chicago: Moody, 1968), vol. 1.
- W. C. Allen, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew* (ICC. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1907).
- D. C. Allison Jr., "Elijah Must Come First," *JBL* 103 (1984): 256-58.
- , *The Intertextual Jesus: Scripture in Q* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2000).
- , *Constructing Jesus: Memory, Imagination, and History* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010).
- W. Ameling, "Die jüdischen Gemeinden im antiken Kleinasien," in R. Jütte and A. P. Kustermann (eds.), *Jüdische Gemeinden und Organisationsformen von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart* (Aschkenas Beiheft 3. Vienna: Böhlau, 1996), 29-55.
- S. Bacchiocchi, "Matthew 11:28-30: Jesus' Rest and the Sabbath," *AUSS* 22 (1984): 289-316.
- B. W. Bacon, "The 'Five Books' of Matthew against the Jews," *Exp* 15 (1918): 56-66.
- T. D. Baker, *Matthew 27:25: "His Blood Be Upon Us": Are the Jewish People Racially Condemned for the Death of Christ* (Bloomington: iUniversity, 2008), Google Books, 9 November 2015.
- V. Balabanski, "Mission in Matthew against the Horizon of Matthew 24," *NTS* 54 (2008): 161-75.
- W. Baldensperger, "Die neueste Forschung über den Menschensohn," *TRu* 3 (1900): 201-10, 243-55.
- J. Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961).
- C. K. Barrett, "The Background of Mark 10:45," in A. J. B. Higgins (ed.), *New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of T. W. Manson* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959), 1-18.
- R. Bauckham, "For Whom Were the Gospels Written," in R. Bauckham (ed.), *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 9-48.
- , *Jesus and the God of Israel: "God Crucified" and Other Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity* (Colorado Springs: Paternoster, 2008).
- D. R. Bauer, *The Structure of Matthew's Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (JSNTSup 31. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988).
- F. W. Beare, *The Gospel according to Matthew* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981).
- R. Beaton, "Messiah and Justice: A Key to Matthew's Use of Isaiah 42:1-4?" *JSNT* 75 (1999): 5-23.

- R. D. Bergen, *1, 2 Samuel: An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture* (NAC 7. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1996).
- H. D. Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount* (Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995).
- M. F. Bird, "Bauckham's The Gospel for All Christians Revisited," *EuroJTh* 15 (2006), 5-13.
- M. Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1967).
- S. L. Black, *Sentence Conjunctions in the Gospel of Matthew: καί, δέ, τότε, γάρ, οὖν, and Asyndeton in Narrative Discourse* (JSNTSup 216. SNTG 9. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002).
- , "How Matthew Tells the Story: A Linguistic Approach to Matthew's Narrative Syntax," in D. M. Gurtner and J. Nolland (eds.), *Built Upon the Rock: Studies in the Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 24-52.
- E. P. Blair, *Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1960).
- J. Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 56-66* (AB 19b. New York: Doubleday, 2003).
- C. Blomberg, *Matthew: An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture* (NAC 22. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1992).
- G. Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007).
- D. L. Bock, "Elijah and Elisha," in J. B. Green, et al. (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* (Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity, 1992), 203-06.
- , *Blasphemy and Exaltation in Judaism and the Final Examination of Jesus: A Philological-Historical Study of the Key Jewish Themes Impacting Mark 14:61-64* (WUNT 2/106. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998).
- , "Did Jesus Connect Son of Man to Daniel 7?: A Short Reflection on the Position of Larry Hurtado," *BBR* 22 (2012): 399-402.
- M. Bockmuehl, *This Jesus: Martyr, Lord, Messiah* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994).
- , "Let the Dead Bury Their Own Dead' (Matt 8:22/Luke 9:60): Jesus and the Halakhah," *JTS* 49 (1998): 553-81.
- G. H. Boobyer, "Galilee and Galileans in St. Mark's Gospel," *BJRL* 35 (1952-53): 334-348.
- G. Bornkamm, "End-Expectation and Church in Matthew," in G. Bornkamm, et al. (eds.), *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew* (Trans by P. Scott. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963), 15-51.
- D. Bosch, *Die Heidenmission in der Zukunftsschau Jesu: Eine Untersuchung zur Eschatologie der synoptischen Evangelien* (ATHANT 36. Zürich: Zwingli, 1959).
- R. C. Branden, *Satanic Conflict and the Plot of Matthew* (SBL 89. New York: Peter Lang, 2006).
- S. G. F. Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church* (London: SPCK, 1951).
- E. Brandenburger, *Das Recht des Weltenrichters: Untersuchung zu Matthäus 25, 31-46* (SBS 99. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1980).

- O. Brooks, "Matthew xxviii. 16-20 and the Design of the First Gospel," *JSNT* 10 (1981): 2-18.
- R. E. Brown, *Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave* (ABRL 7. New York: Doubleday, 1994), vol. 1.
- R. E. Brown and J. P. Meier, *Antioch and Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity* (New York: Paulist, 1983).
- S. Brown, "The Two-fold Representation of the Mission in Matthew's Gospel," *ST* 31 (1977): 21-32.
- , "The Matthean Apocalypse," *JSNT* 4 (1979): 2-27.
- , "The Matthean Community and the Gentile Mission," *NovT* 22 (1980): 193-221.
- F. F. Bruce, "The Oldest Greek Version of Daniel," *OTS* 20 (1977): 22-40.
- , "The Background to the Son of Man Sayings," in H. H. Rowdon (ed.), *Christ the Lord: Studies in Christology Presented to Donald Guthrie* (Leicester: InterVarsity, 1982), 50-70.
- F. D. Bruner, *Matthew: Christbook, Matthew 1-12: A Commentary* (Rev Ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007).
- , *Matthew: The Churchbook, Matthew 13-28* (Rev Ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007).
- E. Buck, "Anti-Judaic Sentiments in the Passion Narrative According to Matthew," in P. Richardson, with G. Granskou (eds.), *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity: Paul and the Gospels* (Studies in Christianity and Judaism 2. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1986), 165-80.
- R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (Trans. by K. Grobel. 2 vols. New York: Scribner's, 1951).
- F. W. Burnett, "παλιγγενεσία in Matt 19.28: A Window on the Matthean Community?" *JSNT* 17 (1983): 60-72.
- R. A. Burridge, "About People, by People, for People: Gospel Genre and Audiences," in R. Bauckham, "For Whom Were the Gospels Written," in *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 113-45.
- , *What are the Gospels?: A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography* (2nd Ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004).
- G. B. Caird, *New Testament Theology* (Completed and Ed. by L. D. Hurst. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994).
- C. C. Caragounis, *The Son of Man: Vision and Interpretation* (WUNT 38. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986).
- J. T. Carroll and J. B. Green, "'His Blood on Us and Our Children': The Death of Jesus in the Gospel according to Matthew," in J. T. Carroll and J. B. Green (eds.), *The Death of Jesus in Early Christianity* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995), 39-59.
- D. A. Carson, "Do the Prophets and the Law Quit Prophesying Before John? A Note on Matthew 11.13," in C. A. Evans and W. R. Stegner (eds.), *The Gospels and the*

- Scriptures of Israel* (JSNTSup 104. SSEJC 3. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 179-94.
- , "Matthew 11:19b/Luke 7:35: A Test Case for the Bearing of Q Christology on the Synoptic Problem," in J. B. Green and M. Turner (eds.), *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ: Essays on the Historical Jesus and New Testament Christology* (I. H. Marshall Festschrift. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 128-46.
- , *Matthew 1-12* (EBC. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995), vol. 1.
- , *Matthew 13-28* (EBC. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995), vol. 2.
- D. A. Carson and D. J. Moo, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (2nd Ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005).
- W. Carter, *Matthew: Storyteller, Interpreter, Evangelist* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996).
- , *Matthew and the Margins: A Socio-Political and Religious Reading* (JSNTSup 204. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000).
- P. M. Casey, *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7* (London: SPCK, 1979).
- , "The Jackels and the Son of Man," *JSNT* 23 (1985): 3-22.
- D. R. Catchpole, "The Answer of Jesus to Caiaphas (Matt. xxvi. 64)," *NTS* 17 (1970-71): 213-26.
- , "John the Baptist, Jesus and the Parable of the Tares," *SJTh* 31 (1978): 557-70.
- , "The Poor on Earth and the Son of Man in Heaven: A Re-appraisal of Matthew 25:31-46," *BJRL* 61 (1979): 355-97.
- S. Chatman, *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978).
- B. Chilton, "Son of Man: Human and Heavenly," in C. M. Tuckett, *et al.* (eds.), *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck* (BETL 100C. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 1:203-18.
- K. W. Clark, "The Gentile Bias in Matthew," *JBL* 66 (1947), 165-72.
- M. Cogan, *1 Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 10. Doubleday: New York, 2000).
- A. Y. Collins, "The 'Son of Man' Tradition and the Book of Revelation," in J. H. Charlesworth, *et al.* (eds.), *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 536-68.
- J. J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to the Jewish Matrix of Christianity* (New York: Crossroad, 1984).
- , *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993).
- , *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 1995).

- , "The Nature of Messianism in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in T. H. Lim (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000), 199-217.
- H. J. B. Combrink, "The Structure of the Gospel of Matthew as Narrative," *TynBul* 34 (1983): 61-70.
- D. Cortés-Fuentes, "The Least of These My Brothers: Matthew 25:31-46," *Apuntes* 23 (2003): 100-09.
- J. R. C. Cousland, *The Crowds in the Gospel of Matthew* (NovTSup 102. Leiden: Brill, 2002).
- C. E. B. Cranfield, *The Gospels According to Saint Mark* (CGTC. New York: Cambridge, 1959).
- , "Thoughts on New Testament Eschatology," *SJT* 35 (1982): 497-512.
- J. M. Creed, *The Gospel according to St. Luke* (London: Macmillan, 1930).
- O. Cullman, *The Christology of the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1959).
- J. E. Dallas, "Matthew 16:28: The Promise of Not Tasting Spiritual Death Before the Parousia," *TTJ* 30 (2009): 81-95.
- W. D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964).
- W. D. Davies and D. C. Allison Jr., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew* (ICC. 3 vols. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988-1997).
- , "Matt. 28:16-20: Texts Behind the Texts," *RHPR* 72 (1992): 89-98.
- G. W. Derickson, "Matthew's Chiastic Structure and Its Dispensational Implications," *BSac* 163 (2006): 423-37.
- J. D. M. Derrett, "Palingenesia (Matthew 19:28)," *JSNT* 20 (1984): 51-58.
- S. J. DeVries, *1 Kings* (2nd Ed. WBC 12. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2003).
- A. A. DiLella, "The Textual History of Septuagint-Daniel and Theodotion-Daniel," in J. J. Collins and P. W. Flint (eds.), *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (VTSup 82. Leiden: Brill, 2001), 2:586-607.
- T. L. Donaldson, *Jesus on the Mountain: A Study in Matthean Theology* (JSNTSup 8. Sheffield: JSOT, 1985).
- G. S. Duncan, *Jesus, Son of Man: Studies Contributory to a Modern Portrait* (New York: Macmillan, 1949).
- J. G. D. Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament* (NTL. London: SCM, 1975).
- , "The Question of Anti-semitism in the New Testament Writings of the Period," in J. D. G. Dunn (ed.), *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways, A.D. 70 to 135* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 175-211.
- , *Jesus Remembered: Christianity in the Making* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), vol. 1.

- , *The Parting of the Ways Between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity* (2nd Ed. London: SCM, 2006).
- J. Dupont, “‘Vous n’aurez pas achevé les villes d’Israël . . .’ (Mat. X 23),” *NovT* 2 (1958): 228-44.
- A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (Trans. by G. Vermes. Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1973).
- A. Edersheim, *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* (8th Rev. Ed. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1912), vol. 2.
- P. F. Ellis, *Matthew: His Mind and His Message* (Collegeville: Liturgical, 1974).
- J. A. Emerton, “The Origin of the Son of Man Imagery,” *JTS* 9 (1958): 225-42.
- E. Eshel, “Jesus the Exorcist in Light of Epigraphic Sources,” in J. H. Charlesworth (ed.), *Jesus and Archeology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 178-85.
- P. F. Esler, “Community and Gospel in Early Christianity: A Response to Richard Bauckham’s ‘Gospels for All Christians,’” *SJT* 51 (1998), 235-48.
- C. A. Evans, “Did Jesus Predict His Death and Resurrection?” in S. E. Porter, M. A. Hayes, and D. Tombs (eds.), *Resurrection* (JSNTSup 186. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 82-97.
- , “Daniel in the New Testament: Visions of God’s Kingdom,” in J. J. Collins and P. W. Flint (eds.), *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 2:490-527.
- , *Matthew* (NCBC. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012).
- M. M. Faierstein, “Why Do the Scribes Say that Elijah Must Come First?” *JBL* 100 (1981): 75-86.
- L. Feldman, *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993).
- A. Feuillet, “Le fils de l’homme de Daniel et la tradition biblique,” *RB* 60 (1953): 170-202.
- , “Les origines et la signification de Mt 10, 23b,” *CBQ* 23 (1961): 182-98.
- J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke I-IX* (AB 28. London: Yale University Press, 2007), vol. 1.
- F. J. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity: The Acts of the Apostles* (London: Macmillan, 1920), vol. 1.
- E. M. Forster, *Aspects of the Novel* (New York: Harcourt, 1927).
- P. Foster, *Community, Law and Mission in Matthew’s Gospel* (WUNT 2/2. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004).
- , “The Pastoral Purpose of Q’s Two-Stage Son of Man Christology,” *Bib* 89 (2008): 81-91.
- R. T. France, “The Servant of the Lord in the Teaching of Jesus,” *TynBul* 19 (1968): 26-52.
- , *Jesus and the Old Testament: His Application of Old Testament Passages to Himself and His Mission* (London: Tyndale, 1971).

- , *The Gospel According to Matthew: An Introduction and Commentary* (TNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985).
- , *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher* (Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity, 1989).
- , "On Being Ready (Matthew 25:1-46)," in R. N. Longenecker (ed.), *The Challenge of Jesus' Parable* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 177-95.
- , *The Gospel of Matthew* (NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007).
- H. Frankmölle, *Jahwebund und Kirche Christi: Studien zur Form- und Traditions-geschichte des "Evangeliums" nach Matthäus* (NTAbh10. Münster: Aschendorff, 1974).
- E. Ferguson, *Backgrounds of Early Christianity* (3rd Ed. Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 2003).
- G. Gander, *L'Évangile de l'Église: Commentaire de l'Évangile selon Matthieu* (Aix-en-Provence: Faculté Libre de Théologie Protestante, 1967).
- D. E. Garland, *Reading Matthew: A Literary and Theological Commentary* (Macon: Smyth & Helwys, 2001).
- L. Gaston, *No Stone on Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels* (NovTSup 23. Leiden: Brill, 1970).
- , "The Messiah of Israel as Teacher of the Gentiles," *Int* 29 (1975), 25-40.
- H. Geist, *Menschensohn und Gemeinde: Eine redaktionskritische Untersuchung zur Menschensohnprädikation im Matthäusevangelium* (FzB 57. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1986).
- B. Gerhardsson, "The Seven Parables in Matthew XIII," *NTS* 19 (1972-73): 16-37.
- , "Sacrificial Service and Atonement in the Gospel of Matthew," in R. Banks (ed.), *Reconciliation and Hope: New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology Presented to L. L. Morris on his 60th Birthday* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1974), 25-35.
- , "Der Weg der Evangelientradition," in P. Stuhlmacher (ed.), *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien* (WUNT 28. Tübingen: Mohr, 1983), 79-102.
- J. A. Gibbs, *Jerusalem and Parousia: Jesus' Eschatological Discourse in Matthew's Gospel* (St. Louis: Concordia Academic Press, 2000).
- C. Glazener, *An Investigation of Jesus' Usage of the Term Son of Man: A Possible Interpretive Key to the Gospel of Matthew* (SWBTS PhD Dissertation, 1974).
- C. Y. Glock and R. Stark, *Christian Beliefs and Anti-Semitism* (New York: Harper & Row, 1966).
- J. Gnllka, *Das Matthäusevangelium* (HTKNT. 2 vols. Freiburg: Herder, 1988).
- J. E. Goldingay, *Daniel* (WBC 30. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1989).
- M. Goodman, "Jewish Proselytizing in the First Century," in J. Lieu, et. al. (eds.), *The Jews among the Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 53-78.
- H. B. Green, "The Structure of St. Matthew's Gospel," *StEv* 4 (1968): 47-59.
- J. B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997).

- M. Green, *The Message of Matthew: The Kingdom of Heaven* (The Bible Speaks Today. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1988).
- I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* (AGJU 14. Leiden: Brill, 1980).
- W. Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (ThHK 1. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1968).
- R. A. Guelich, *The Sermon on the Mount: A Foundation for Understanding* (Waco: Word, 1982).
- R. H. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel* (SNT 18. Leiden: Brill, 1967).
- , *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982).
- , "A Responsive Evaluation of the Social History of the Matthean Community in Roman Syria," in D. L. Balch (ed.), *Social History of the Matthean Community: Cross-Disciplinary Approaches* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991).
- D. A. Hagner, *Matthew 1-13* (WBC 33a. Dallas: Word Books, 1993), vol. 1.
- , *Matthew 14-28* (WBC 33b. Dallas: Word Books, 1995), vol. 2.
- , "Matthew's Parables of the Kingdom (Matthew 13:1-52)," in R. N. Longenecker (ed.), *The Challenge of Jesus' Parables* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 102-124.
- , "Matthew: Christian Judaism or Jewish Christianity?" in S. McKnight and G. R. Osborne (eds.), *The Face of New Testament Studies: A Survey of Recent Research* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), 263-82.
- F. Hahn, *Mission in the New Testament* (Trans. by F. Clarke. SBT 47. London: SCM Press, 1965).
- R. G. Hammerton-Kelly, *Pre-existence, Wisdom, and the Son of Man* (SNTSMS 21. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973).
- D. D. Hannah, "The Throne of His Glory: The Divine Throne and Heavenly Mediators in Revelation and the Similitudes of Enoch," *ZNW* 94 (2003): 68-96.
- D. R. A. Hare, *The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel According to St. Matthew* (SNTSMS 6. Cambridge: Cambridge, 1967).
- , *The Son of Man Tradition* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990).
- , *Matthew* (Interpretation. Louisville: John Knox, 1993).
- , "How Jewish is the Gospel of Matthew?" *CBQ* 62 (2002), 264-77.
- D. R. A. Hare and D. J. Harrington, "'Make Disciples of All Gentiles' (Mt 28.19)," *CBQ* 37 (1975): 359-69.
- D. J. Harrington, *The Gospel of Matthew* (SP 1. Collegeville: Liturgical, 1991).
- M. J. Harris, *Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament: An Essential Reference Resource for Exegesis* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012).
- R. G. Harris, *Mission in the Gospels* (London: Epworth, 2004).

- R. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989).
- H. Hendrickx, *The Resurrection Narratives of the Gospels* (Rev. Ed. London: G. Chapman, 1984).
- W. Hendriksen, *Exposition of the Gospel According to Matthew* (NTC. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1973).
- M. Hengel, *Crucifixion: In the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of the Cross* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977).
- , *The Charismatic Leader and His Followers* (New York: Crossroad, 1981).
- , *Studies in Early Christology* (2nd Ed. London: T & T Clark, 2004).
- J. M. Hicks, "The Sabbath Controversy in Matthew: An Exegesis of Matthew 12.1-14," *RestQ* 27 (1984): 79-91.
- A. J. B. Higgins, "The Sign of the Son of Man (Matt. XXIV, 30)," *NTS* 9 (1962-63): 380-82.
- , "Is the Son of Man Problem Insoluble?" in E. E. Ellis and M. Wilcox (eds.), *Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honour of Matthew Black* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1969), 70-87.
- D. Hill, "On the Use and Meaning of Hosea vi. 6 in Matthew's Gospel," *NTS* 24 (1978): 107-19.
- , *The Gospel of Matthew* (NCB. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981).
- , "The Conclusion of Matthew's Gospel: Some Literary-Critical Observations," *IBS* 8 (1986): 54-63.
- M. D. Hooker, *Jesus and the Servant* (London: SPCK, 1959).
- , *The Son of Man in Mark: A Study of the Background of the Term "Son of Man" and Its Use in Mark's Gospel* (London: SPCK, 1967).
- , "Is the Son of Man Problem Really Insoluble?" in E. Best and R. McL. Wilson (ed.), *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament Presented to Matthew Black* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 155-68.
- , *The Signs of a Prophet: The Prophetic Actions of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1997).
- , "'Who Can This Be?': The Christology of Mark's Gospel," in R. N. Longenecker (ed.), *Contours of Christology in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 79-99.
- W. Horbury, *Messianism Among Jews and Christians: Biblical and Historical Studies* (London: T & T Clark, 2003).
- G. H. R. Horsley, "A Crucified Donkey," in *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity* (North Ryde: Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, Macquarie University, 1987), 4:137.
- B. J. Hubbard, *The Matthean Redaction of a Primitive Apostolic Commissioning: An Exegesis of Matthew 28.16-20* (SBLDS 19. Missoula: Scholars, 1974).

- B. Huggins, "Equus asinus" (Website: http://animaldiversity.org/accounts/Equus_asinus), 22 September 2015.
- A. J. Hultgren, *The Parables of Jesus: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000).
- A. M. Hunter, "Crux Criticorum—Matt. XI.25-30—A Reappraisal," *NTS* 8 (1962): 241-49.
- L. W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003).
- , "Summary and Concluding Observations," in L. W. Hurtado and P. L. Owen (eds.) *"Who Is This Son of Man?" The Latest Scholarship on a Puzzling Expression of the Historical Jesus* (LNTS 390; London: T. & T. Clark, 2011), 158-77.
- S. P. Jeansonne, *The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 7-12* (CBQMS 19. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association, 1988).
- J. Jeremias, *Jesus' Promise to the Nations* (London: SCM, 1967).
- , "Die älteste Schicht der Menschensohn-Logien," *ZNW* 58 (1967): 159-72.
- , *New Testament Theology: The Proclamation of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1971).
- , *The Parables of Jesus* (2nd Rev. Ed. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall, 1972).
- C. E. Joynes, "A Question of Identity: 'Who Do People Say that I Am?': Elijah, John the Baptist and Jesus in Mark's Gospel," in C. Rowland and C. H. T. Fletcher-Louis (eds.), *Understanding, Studying and Reading: New Testament Essays in Honour of John Aston* (JSNTSup 153. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 15-29.
- A. Jülicher, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu* (2nd Ed. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1899. Reprinted, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963), vol. 2.
- L. E. Keck, "Toward the Renewal of New Testament Christology," *NTS* 32 (1986): 362-77.
- H. C. Kee, "Jesus: A Glutton and Drunkard," *NTS* 42 (1996): 374-93.
- T. J. Keegan, "Introductory Formulae for Matthean Discourses," *CBQ* 44 (1982): 415-30.
- C. Keener, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999).
- F. G. Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible: Ezekiel, Daniel, Esther* [London: Emery Walker, 1937], vol. 7.
- G. D. Kilpatrick, *The Origins of the Gospel according to St. Matthew* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1946).
- K. K. Kim, "The Signs of the Parousia: A Diachronic and Comparative Study of the Apocalyptic Vocabulary of Matthew 24:27-31" (AUSS PhD Dissertation, 1994).
- S. Kim, "The 'Son of Man'" as the Son of God (WUNT 30. Tübingen: Mohr, 1983).
- J. D. Kingsbury, *The Parables of Jesus in Matthew Thirteen* (London: SPCK, 1969).
- , "Structure of Matthew and the Concept of Salvation History," *CBQ* 35 (1973): 451-74.

- , "The Composition and Christology of Matt 28:16-10," *JBL* 93 (1974): 573-84.
- , *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1975).
- , "The Title 'Son of Man' in Matthew's Gospel," *CBQ* 37 (1975): 193-202.
- , "Observations on the 'Miracles Chapters' of Matthew 8-9," *CBQ* 40 (1978): 559-73.
- , "The Verb *Akolouthein* ('to Follow') as an Index of Matthew's View of His Community," *JBL* 97 (1978): 56-73.
- , "The Figure of Jesus in Matthew's Story: A Literary-Critical Probe," *JSNT* 21 (1984): 3-36.
- , "The Developing Conflict between Jesus and the Jewish Leaders in Matthew's Gospel: A Literary-Critical Study," *CBQ* 49 (1987): 57-73.
- , *Matthew as Story* (2nd Ed. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988).
- , "On Following Jesus: The 'Eager' Scribe and the 'Reluctant' Disciple (Matthew 8:18-22)," *NTS* 34 (1988): 45-59.
- , *Conflict in Mark: Jesus, Authorities, Disciples* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989).
- , "The Plot of Matthew's Gospel," *Int* 46 (1992): 347-56.
- , "The Rhetoric of Comprehension in the Gospel of Matthew," *NTS* 41 (1995): 358-77.
- G. D. Kirchhevel, "The 'Son of Man' Passages in Mark," *BBR* 9 (1999): 181-87.
- J. R. D. Kirk, *Unlocking Romans: Resurrection and the Justification of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008).
- J. Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth: His Life, Times, and Teaching* (Trans. by H. Danby [ed.] London: Allen and Unwin, 1925).
- M. A. Knibb, "The Date of the Parables of Enoch: A Critical Review," *NTS* 25 (1979): 345-59.
- C. H. Kraeling, "The Jewish Community at Antioch," *JBL* 51 (1932), 130-60.
- E. Krentz, "Missionary Matthew: Matthew 28:16-20 as Summary of the Gospel," *CurTM* 31 (2004): 24-31.
- S. Kreuzer, "Papyrus 967: Bemerkungen zu seiner buchtechnischen, textgeschichtlichen und kanongeschichtlichen Bedeutung," in M. Karrer and W. Kraus (eds.), *Die Septuaginta—Texte, Contexte, Lebenswelten* (WUNT 219. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 64-82.
- D. D. Kupp, *Matthew's Emmanuel: Divine Presence and God's People in the First Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).
- A. Lacocque, *The Book of Daniel* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1979).
- S. Légasse, "L' 'antijudaïsme' dans l'Évangile selon Matthieu," in M. Didier (ed.), *L'Évangile selon Matthieu: Rédaction et Théologie* (Gembloux: Duculot, 1972), 417-28.
- R. Leivestad, "Exit the Apocalyptic Son of Man," *NTS* 18 (1971-72): 243-67.

- , *Jesus in His Own Perspective: An Examination of His Sayings, Actions, and Eschatological Titles* (Trans. by D. E. Aune. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1987).
- R. C. H. Lenski, *The Eisenach Gospel Selections* (Columbus: Lutheran Book Concern, 1928).
- , *The Interpretation of St. Matthew's Gospel* (Columbus: Wartburg, 1943).
- X. Léon-Dufour, "Vers l'annonce de L'Église: Matthieu 14,1-16,20," in J. Guillet, et al. (eds.), *L'homme devant Dieu: Mélanges offerts au Père Henri de Lubac* (Paris: Aubier, 1963), 1:37-49.
- I. Levinskaya, *The Book of Acts in Its Diaspora Setting* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), Vol. 5.
- B. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations* (London: SCM, 1961).
- , *Jesus Son of Man: A Fresh Examination of the Son of Man Sayings in the Gospels in Light of Recent Research* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983).
- O. Linton, "The Parable of the Children's Game," *NTS* 22 (1976): 159-79.
- K. D. Litwak, "The Use of the Quotations From Isaiah 52:13-53:12 in the New Testament," *JETS* 26 (1983): 385-94.
- E. Lohmeyer, *Das Evangelium des Matthäus* (KEK. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962).
- C. H. Lohr, "Oral Techniques in the Gospel of Matthew," *CBQ* 23 (1961): 403-35.
- J. Lust, "Daniel 7.13 and the Septuagint," *ETHL* 54 (1978): 62-69.
- U. Luz, "The Son of Man in Matthew: Heavenly Judge or Human Christ," *JSNT* 58 (1992): 3-21.
- , *The Theology of the Gospel of Matthew* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).
- , *Matthew 8-20: A Commentary* (Trans. by J. E. Crouch. Hermeneia, Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2001), vol. 2.
- , *Matthew 1-7* (Trans. by J. E. Crouch. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), vol. 1.
- R. Maddox, "The Function of the Son of Man according to the Synoptic Gospels," *NTS* 15 (1968): 45-74.
- M. Maher, "'Take My Yoke Upon You' (Matt. XI. 29)," *NTS* 22 (1975): 97-103.
- B. J. Malina, "The Literary Structure and Form of Matt. xxviii. 16-20," *NTS* 17 (1970): 87-103.
- , *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1981).
- R. Man, "The Value of Chiasm for New Testament Interpretation," *BSac* 141 (1984): 146-57.
- T. W. Manson, "The Son of Man in Daniel, Enoch and the Gospels," *BJRL* 32 (1949-50): 171-93.

- J. Marcus, "Crucifixion as Parodic Exaltation," *JBL* 125 (2006): 73-87.
- I. H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke* (NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978).
- S. McKnight, *A Light among the Gentiles: Jewish Missionary Activity in the Second Temple Period* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991).
- R. T. McLay, *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003).
- A. H. McNeile, *The Gospel according to St. Matthew* (London: MacMillan, 1915).
- T. J. Meadowcroft, *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel: A Literary Comparison* (JSOTSup 198. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995).
- J. P. Meier, "Salvation History in Matthew: In Search of a Starting Point," *CBQ* 37 (1975): 203-15.
- , "Nations or Gentiles in Matthew 28.19?" *CBQ* 39 (1977): 94-102.
- , "Two Disputed Questions in Matt 28.16-20," *JBL* 96 (1977): 407-24.
- , *The Vision of Matthew: Christ, Church, and Morality in the First Gospel* (New York: Paulist, 1978).
- , "Matthew, Gospel of," *ABD* (1992) 4:22-41.
- M. J. J. Menken, *Matthew's Bible: The Old Testament Text of the Evangelist* (BETL 173. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2004).
- E. H. Merrill, "The Sign of Jonah," *JETS* 23 (1980): 23-30.
- J. R. Michaels, "The Itinerant Jesus and His Hometown," in B. Chilton and C. A. Evans (eds.), *Authenticating the Activities of Jesus* (NTTS 28/2. Boston: Brill, 1999), 177-93.
- O. Michel, "Der Abschluss des Matthäusevangeliums. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Osterbotschaft," *EvT* 10. (1950-51): 16-26.
- M. M. Mitchell, "Patristic Counter Evidence to the Claim that 'The Gospels Were Written for All Christians,'" *NTS* 51 (2005), 36-79.
- J. B. Modica, "Jesus as Glutton and Drunkard: The 'Excesses' of Jesus," in S. McKnight and J. B. Modica (eds.), *Who Do My Opponents Say that I Am? An Investigation of the Accusation against Jesus* (London and New York: T & T Clark, 2008), 50-75.
- J. A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (ICC. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1927),
- , *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Kings* (ICC. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1950).
- D. J. Moo, "Jesus and the Authority of the Mosaic Law," *JSNT* 20 (1984): 3-49.
- , *The Epistle to the Romans* (NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996).
- L. Morris, *The Gospel according to Luke: An Introduction and Commentary* (TNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974).
- , *The Gospel according to Matthew* (PNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992).

- C. F. D. Moule, "From Defendant to Judge—and Deliverer: An Enquiry into the Use and Limitations of the Theme of Vindication in the New Testament," *SNTS* 3 (1952): 40-53.
- , *An Idiom Book of the Greek New Testament* (2nd Ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959).
- , *The Birth of the New Testament* (2nd Ed. London: A & C Black, 1966).
- , *Essays in New Testament Interpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982).
- J. H. Moulton and N. Turner, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1963), vol. 3.
- R. H. Mounce, *Matthew: A Good News Commentary* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1985).
- M. Müller, *The Expression "Son of Man" and the Development of Christology: A History of Interpretation* (London: Equinox, 2008).
- J. Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind* (London: SCM, 1959).
- J. Neusner, et al. (eds.), *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).
- G. W. E. Nickelsburg, "Review of Milik, Books of Enoch," *CBQ* 40 (1978): 411-19.
- J. Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew* (NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005).
- K. S. O'Brien, "The Curse of the Law (Galatians 3.13): Crucifixion, Persecution, and Deuteronomy 21.22-23," *JSNT* 29 (2006): 55-76.
- P. T. O'Brien, "The Great Commission of Matthew 28:18-20—A Missionary Mandate or Not?" *ERT* 2 (1978): 254-67.
- J. M. O'Connor, "The Structure of Matthew XIV-XVII," *RB* 82 (1975): 360-84.
- , *Matthew* (ECNT 1. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010).
- R. Otto, *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man: A Study in the History of Religion* (Trans. by F. Filson and B. Lee-Woolf. 2nd Ed. Cambridge: James Clarke and Co., 1943 [2011 reprint]).
- J. A. Overman, *Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism: The Social World of the Matthean Community* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990).
- , *Church and Community in Crisis: The Gospel according to Matthew* (The New Testament in Context. Valley Forge: Trinity, 1996).
- M. Pamment, "The Son of Man in the First Gospel," *NTS* 29 (1983): 116-29.
- B. W. R. Pearson, "New Testament Literary Criticism," in S. E. Porter (ed.), *A Handbook to the Exegesis of the New Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 241-66.
- J. T. Pennington, *Heaven and Earth in the Gospel of Matthew: Matthew's "Kingdom of Heaven"* (NovTSup 126. Leiden: Brill, 2007).
- P. Perkins, "Matthew 28:16-20, Resurrection, Ecclesiology and Mission," in E. H. Lovering, Jr. (ed.), *SBLSP 1993* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1993): 574-88.
- J. Plevnik, *Paul and the Parousia* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997).

- U. Plisch, *The Gospel of Thomas: Original Text with Commentary* (Trans. by G. S. Robinson. Freiburg: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2008).
- A. Plummer, *An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew* (TC. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1982).
- M. A. Powell, "The Plot and Subplots of Matthew's Gospel," *NTS* 38 (1992): 187-203.
- , "Toward a Narrative-Critical Understanding of Matthew," *Int* 46 (1992): 341-46.
- B. Przybylski, "The Setting of Matthean Anti-Judaism," in P. Richardson, with G. Granskou (eds.), *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity: Paul and the Gospels* (Studies in Christianity and Judaism 2. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1986), 181-200.
- K. Pusey, "Jewish Proselyte Baptism," *ExpTim* 95 (1984), 141-45.
- J. L. Resseguie, *Narrative Criticism of the New Testament: An Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005).
- B. E. Reynolds, "The 'One Like a Son of Man,'" *Bib* 89 (2008): 70-80.
- D. Rhoads, "Narrative Criticism and the Gospel of Mark," *JAAR* 50 (1982): 411-34.
- D. Rhoads, et. al., *Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel* (2nd Ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999).
- R. Riesner, *Jesus als Lehrer: Eine Untersuchung zum Ursprung der Evangelien-Überlieferung* (WUNT 2/7. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981).
- J. A. T. Robinson, *Jesus and His Coming* (London: SCM, 1957).
- J. M. Robinson, "The Son of Man in the Sayings Gospel Q," in C. Heil and J. Verheyden (eds.), *The Sayings Gospel Q: Collected Essays by James M. Robinson* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005), 405-25.
- L. Sabourin, "Matthieu 10.23 et 16.28 dans la perspective apocalyptique," *ScEs* 37 (1985): 353-64.
- A. J. Saldarini, *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994).
- A. Sand, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (RNT. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1986).
- E. P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985).
- , *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 BCE-66 CE* (London: SCM, 1992).
- J. Schaberg, *The Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit: The Triadic Phrase in Matthew 28:19b* (SBLDS 61. Chico: Scholars, 1982).
- W. Schenk, "'Den Menschen' Mt 9,8," *ZNW* 54 (1963): 272-75.
- E. J. Schnabel, *Early Christian Mission: Jesus and the Twelve* (Downers Grove: Inter Varsity, 2004), Vol. 1.
- R. Schnackenburg, *The Gospel of Matthew* (Trans. by R. R. Barr. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002).
- J. Schniewind, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (NTD 2. Göttingen, 1950).

- H. Schürmann, "Zur Traditions- und Redaktionsgeschichte von Mt 10, 23," *BZ* 3 (1959): 82-88.
- A. Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* (New York: Macmillan, 1959).
- E. Schweizer, "The Son of Man Again," *NTS* 9 (1962-63): 256-61.
 -----, *Matthäus und seine Gemeinde* (Stuttgart: KBW, 1974).
 -----, *The Good News According to Matthew* (Trans. by D. E. Green. Atlanta: John Knox, 1975).
- A. F. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism* (SJLA 25. Leiden: Brill, 1977).
 -----, "Two Powers in Heaven' and Early Christian Trinitarian Thinking," in S. T. Davis, et al. (eds.), *Trinity: An Interdisciplinary Symposium on the Trinity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 73-95.
- D. Senior, *The Passion Narrative According to Matthew: A Redactional Study* (BETL 39. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1975).
 -----, *Matthew* (ANTC. Nashville: Abingdon, 1998).
- D. C. Sim, "The Meaning of *παλιγγενεσία* in Matthew 19.28," *JSNT* 50 (1993): 3-12.
 -----, "The Gospel of Matthew and the Gentiles," *JSNT* 57 (1995), 19-48.
 -----, *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew* (SNTSMS 88. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).
 -----, *The Gospel of Matthew and Christian Judaism: The History and Social Setting of the Matthean Community* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998).
 -----, "The Gospels for All Christians? A Response to Richard Bauckham," *JSNT* 84 (2001): 3-27.
- M. Smith, "No Place for a Son of Man," *Forum* 4 (1988): 83-107.
- J. M. Smith, *Why Βίος? On the Relationship between Gospel Genre and Implies Audience* (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015).
- R. H. Smith, *Easter Gospels: The Resurrection of Jesus according to the Four Evangelists* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1983).
- G. N. Stanton, "The Gospel of Matthew and Judaism," *BJRL* 66 (1984), 264-84.
 -----, *The Gospels and Jesus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989).
 -----, *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992).
 -----, "The Two Parousias of Christ: Justin Martyr and Matthew," in M. C. De Boer (ed.), *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Martinus de Jonge* (JSNTSup 84. Sheffield: JSOT, 1993), 183-95.
- K. Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968).
- G. Strecker, *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit* (3rd Ed. FRLANT 82. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971).
- B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (London: Macmillan, 1925).

- L. T. Stuckenbruck, "One like a Son of Man as the Ancient of Days' in the Old Greek Recension of Daniel 7,13: Scribal Error or Theological Translation?" *ZNW* 86 (1995): 268-76.
- P. Stuhlmacher, "Matt 28:16-20 and the Course of Mission in the Apostolic and Postapostolic Age," in J. Ådna and H. Kvalbein (eds.), *The Mission of the Early Church to the Jews and Gentiles* (WUNT 127. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 17-43.
- M. J. Suggs, *Wisdom, Christology, and Law in Matthew's Gospel* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970).
- D. W. Suter, *Tradition and Composition in the Parables of Enoch* (SBLDS 47. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1979).
- , "Weighed in the Balance: The Similitudes of Enoch in Recent Discussion," *RSR* 7 (1981): 217-21.
- H. B. Swete, *The Old Testament in Greek* (4th Ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1912), vol. 3.
- C. H. Talbert, *Matthew* (PCNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010).
- R. V. G. Tasker, *The Gospel According to St. Matthew: An Introduction and Commentary* (TNTC 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961).
- T. M. Taylor, "The Beginnings of Jewish Proselyte Baptism," *NTS* 2 (1955-56): 193-98.
- V. Taylor, *The Gospel according to St. Mark* (2nd Ed. London: Macmillan, 1972).
- G. Theissen, "Jesus as an Itinerant Teacher," in J. H. Charlesworth and P. Pokorný (eds.), *Jesus Research: An International Perspective: The First Princeton-Prague Symposium on the Current State of Studies on the Historical Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 98-122.
- G. Theissen and A. Merz, *The Historical Jesus: A Comprehensive Guide* (Trans. by John Bowden. London: SCM, 1998).
- J. Theisohn, *Der auserwählte Richter: Untersuchungen zum traditionsgeschichtlichem Ort der Menschensohngestalt der Bilderreden des Äthiopischen Henoch* (SUNT 12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975).
- H. E. Tödt, *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition* (Trans. by D. M. Barton. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965).
- S. D. Toussaint, *Behold the King: A Study of Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1980).
- R. C. Trench, *Studies in the Gospels* (London: Macmillan, 1867).
- W. Trilling, *Das Wahre Israel: Studien zur Theologie des Matthäus-Evangeliums* (SANT 10. 3rd Ed. München: Kösel, 1968).
- C. M. Tuckett, "The Present Son of Man," *JSNT* 14 (1982): 58-81.
- , "The Son of Man in Q," in M. C. De Boer (ed.), *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge* (JSNTSup 84. Sheffield: JSOT, 1993), 197-215.
- , *Christology and the New Testament: Jesus and His Earliest Followers* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2001).

- D. L. Turner, "The Structure and Sequence of Matthew 24.1-41: Interaction with Evangelical Treatments," *GTJ* 10 (1989): 3-27.
 _____, *Matthew* (BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008).
- L. E. Vaage, "The Son of Man Sayings in Q: Stratigraphical Location and Significance," *Semeia* 55 (1992): 103-29.
- B. Van Elderen, "The Purpose of the Parables According to Matthew 13:10-17," in R. N. Longenecker and M. C. Tenney (eds.), *New Dimensions in New Testament Study* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974), 180-90.
- S. Van Tilborg, *The Jewish Leaders in Matthew* (Leiden: Brill, 1972).
- T. J. VanderWeele, "Some Observations Concerning the Chiastic Structure of the Gospel of Matthew," *JTS* 39 (2008): 669-73.
- G. Vermes, *Jesus the Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospels* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981).
 _____, *The Religion of Jesus the Jew* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993).
 _____, "The Son of Man Debate Revisited (1960-2010)," *JJS* 61 (2010): 193-206.
- A. Vögtle, "Das christologische und ecclesiologische Anliegen von Mt. 28.18-20," in F. L. Cross (ed.), *Studia Evangelica II: Papers Presented to the Second International Congress on New Testament Studies* (TU 87. Berlin: Akademie, 1964), 266-94.
- L. W. Walck, "The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and the Gospels," in G. Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 299-337.
 _____, *Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and in Matthew* (JCTCRS 9. London: Continuum, 2011).
- R. Walker, *Die Heilsgeschichte im ersten Evangelium* (FRLANT 91. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967).
- J. T. Walsh, *1 Kings* (Berit Olam. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1996).
- R. L. Webb, *John the Baptizer and Prophet: A Socio-Historical Study* (JSNTSup 62. Sheffield: JSOT, 1991).
 _____, "The Roman Examination and Crucifixion of Jesus: Their Historicity and Implications," in D. L. Bock and R. L. Webb (eds.), *Key Events in the Life of the Historical Jesus: A Collaborative Exploration of Context and Coherence* (WUNT 247. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 669-773.
- D. Wenham, "The Structure of Matthew XIII," *NTS* 25 (1978-79): 516-22.
 _____, *The Rediscovery of Jesus' Eschatological Discourse* (GP. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984).
 _____, "The Kingdom of God and Daniel," *ExpTim* 98 (1987): 132-34.
- R. J. White, *The Interpretation of Dreams, Oneirocritica by Artemidorus: Translation and Commentary* (NCS. Park Ridge: Noyes, 1975).
- A. I. Wilson, *When Will These Things Happen?: A Study of Jesus as Judge in Matthew 21-25* (PBM. Bletchley: Paternoster, 2004).

- B. Witherington, *Matthew* (SHBC 19. Macon: Smyth & Helwys, 2006).
- C. Wolff, "Humility and Self-denial in Jesus' Life and Message and in the Apostolic Existence of Paul," in A. J. M. Wedderburn (ed.), *Paul and Jesus* (London: T & T Clark, 1989), 145-60.
- N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Christian Origins and the Question of God. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), vol. 2.
- H. D. Zacharias, "Old Greek Daniel and Matthew's Son of Man," *BBR* 21.4 (2011): 453-65.
- D. Zeller, "Die Bildlogik des Gleichnisses Mt 11 16f./Lk 7 31f.," *ZNW* 68 (1977): 252-57.
- J. Ziegler, *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum 16/2: Suzanna, Daniel, Bel et Drago* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954).
- W. Zimmerli and J. Jeremias, *The Servant of God* (SBT 20. London: SCM, 1957).