

THE SETTING
OF
THE RESURRECTION NARRATIVE
IN
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MATTHEW

PARACKEL KURIAKOSE MATHEW

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
and Research in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Faculty of Religious Studies
McGill University
Montreal.

March 1979

SETTING OF THE RESURRECTION NARRATIVE IN MATTHEW

Parackel Kuriakose Mathew

Ph.D.

Religious Studies

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this Thesis is to examine, by means of the methods of Redaction Criticism, the place of the Resurrection Narrative in the Gospel of Matthew.

The Introduction reviews previous redaction critical works on the Gospel of Matthew.

The Thesis consists of two parts. Part 'A' analyses the Matthean narrative and compares it with parallel narratives in order to determine the amount of redaction that Matthew has added to the tradition. In Part 'B' the narrative has been examined from three points of view : ecclesiological, Christological and polemical. In each case, it was found that the whole of Matthew's Gospel leads up to his final chapter and that the various threads which we have identified are woven together in his concluding verses.

ABRÉGÉ

Le but de cette dissertation c'est d'examiner en utilisant la méthode de la critique rédactionnelle la place du récit de la Resurrection dans l'Evangile selon Matthieu.

L'introduction analyse les oeuvres de la critique rédactionnelle de l'Evangile selon Matthieu précédents.

La dissertation est composée de deux sections. La Section A analyse le récit de Matthieu et la compare avec les récits parallèles pour déterminer le nombre de redactions que Matthieu a ajoutées à la tradition. Dans la Section B le récit est examiné de trois points de vue : ecclésiologique, Christologique et polémique. Dans chaque cas on trouve que tout l'Evangile selon Matthieu s'achemine vers son chapitre final, et que les divers fils que nous avons identifiés sont tissés ensemble dans ses derniers versets.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	i
ABREGE	ii
ABBREVIATIONS	iv
PREFACE	v
Introduction	1
NOTES	12
PART A : THE TEXT	
Chapter I : ANALYSIS OF THE TEXT	15
NOTES	58
Chapter II : A COMPARISON OF THE RESURRECTION	
NARRATIVE OF MATTHEW WITH THOSE OF OTHERS	68
NOTES	109
PART B : THE SETTING OF THE NARRATIVE	
Chapter III : ECCLESIASTICAL SETTING	119
NOTES	164
Chapter IV : CHRISTOLOGICAL SETTING	174
NOTES	208
Chapter V : CONTEMPORARY JEWISH SETTING	216
NOTES	240
Conclusion	245
Bibliography	252

ABBREVIATIONS

ANQ	Andover Newton Quarterly
ASTI	Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute
Bib.Res.	Biblical Research
BTB	Biblical Theology Bulletin
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
Ev.Theol.	Evangelische Theologie
ET (Exp.T.)	Expository Times
Int.	Interpretation
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies
LXX	Septuagint
McCQ	McCormick Quarterly
NTS	New Testament Studies
Nov.Test.	Novum Testamentum
NT	New Testament
OT	Old Testament
Stud.Ev.	Studia Evangelica
TDNT	Theological Dictionary of the New Testament (Kittel, ed.).
Theol.	Theology
Th.Z.	Theologie Zeitschrift
ZNW	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft

PREFACE

No one has so far attempted a redaction critical study of Matt. 27.51-28.20 as a whole. The present thesis recognizes the unity of this section and considers it as the Matthean interpretation of the resurrection of Jesus.

I am immensely grateful to my Professor, Dr. John C. Kirby, under whose supervision and guidance I have been able to complete the present thesis. Without his generosity, constant encouragement and deep affection this study would never have been accomplished.

I wish to thank Dr. George Johnston, who encouraged me to undertake this study and guided me in the initial stages of its preparation.

Miss Norma Johnston and her assistants at the Religious Studies Library have greatly helped me providing me with the facilities to pursue my research. I am deeply indebted to them.

INTRODUCTION

So many questions are still being asked in a critical approach to the Resurrection Narratives in the New Testament that they are valid subjects for further research. Textual study has exposed divergences in the narratives. The various texts do not yield any consistent geographical, chronological or theological data, and therefore any attempt to harmonize the accounts is futile. We can only try to discover how the early Church and the individual New Testament writers understood the Easter 'event'. Primarily, the New Testament accounts bear witness to the resurrection from the standpoint of faith as that faith was expressed during the time of their writing. With each writer's special emphasis, every narrative is basically the writer's own interpretation of the event. From this point of view the present thesis is a redaction-critical attempt to understand the Matthean interpretation of the resurrection tradition and to discover how and why Matthew the author shapes his story in its present form.

Literary Criticism ascribes almost everything in Matthew to his sources: Mark, Q and M. The Evangelist is credited only with the style and manner of compiling them. Formgeschichte investigates the nature and extent of the traditional materials he collected and edited. The Form Critics are interested in grouping similar materials to find a common pre-literary oral form behind them and to ascertain its cultural context in the

life-setting of the community. They hardly go beyond these to determine the Evangelist's own concerns. While Literary Criticism and Form Criticism are more concerned with the common agreement than the differences among the Synoptic Gospels, Redaction Criticism is concerned with looking at the differences in order to determine, if possible, the individual author's theological motivation. Among the Form Critics, Bultmann recognizes the theological motivation of Matthew from the differences between his Gospel and its traditions. Yet he ascribes the motivation ultimately to the "unconscious influence of the Church" on the Evangelist.¹ The Form Critics thus place less than adequate emphasis on the place of the Evangelist as an author in his own right.

Redaktionsgeschichte carries the work of Form Critics a step further. It attempts to deal with the Evangelist primarily as an individual author, who, in the composition of materials, demonstrates his background, thought, theology and the pastoral situation of the community for which he is writing. The redaction consists of the collection, arrangement, composition and interpretation of materials from one definite theological point of view.

Matthew as redactor is an interpreter of tradition. The ultimate historicity of the tradition is not his primary concern. He redacts his sources in such a way as to bring out his own special emphasis and application. Hence, Redaktionsgeschichte tries to identify consistent Matthean themes and interests both in the material special to Matthew and in his redaction of Mark and Q.

Since we are concerned with the factors that determine the nature of the First Gospel, we make a brief review of redaction-critical works on Matthew. The first major step in the application of Redaktionsgeschichte, though not called so until Willi Marxsen coined this word in 1954², is Günther Bornkamm's article, "Die Sturmstillung im Matthäusevangelium" in 1948³ (Matt. 8.23-27). Compared with Mark and Luke where the 'miracle' is predominant, Bornkamm finds that Matthew is recasting the story deliberately into a context of general discipleship in order to illustrate his theology of discipleship.

A more comprehensive redaction-critical investigation by Bornkamm entitled, "End-expectation and Church in Matthew"⁴ examines the composition of Matthew's discourses and finds in them a close connection between Matthean ecclesiology and eschatology as the central motif. He further examines the relevant passages that bear the stamp of Matthean understanding of the Law and of the relationship between Law and Christology and between Christology and ecclesiology. Bornkamm finds Matthew to be an interpreter of tradition, who employs tradition to communicate his theology.

Bornkamm's pupil, Gerhard Barth, entitles his study "Matthew's Understanding of the Law"⁵ and distinguishes Matthean interpretation of the Law from the tradition which Matthew received. He notes Matthew's defence of the Law's abiding validity against antinomian Hellenistic Christian appeal to charismata (see Matt. 7.12, 13, 15), rabbinic misinterpretations

and Pharisaic inconsistency between theory and practice (see Matt.23.1ff). In developing the relation between Law and Christology he finds the exalted Lord speaking through the earthly Jesus and the Easter assurance of the Lord's presence as being brought through the preaching of the commandments (the Law).⁶

Applying the new tool to the miracle stories, Heinz Joachim Held, another pupil of Bornkamm, demonstrates in his chapter on "Matthew as Interpreter of Miracle Stories"⁷ that Matthew retells the Marcan stories by expanding or inserting discourse material and by abbreviating narratives for the instruction of the Church on the importance of the message they convey. The Matthean recasting of the stories is particularly concerned with Christology, faith and discipleship.

Bornkamm's influence comes out strongly in two major redaction critical contributions to Christology by his pupils, Heinz Eduard Tödt and Ferdinand Hahn. In The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition⁸ Tödt points out that Matthew shows interest in the Son of Man's role in judgement when he redacts Mark and Q. In passages peculiar to Matthew he draws upon Jewish apocalyptic and equates Jesus the proclaimer with the Coming Son of Man. Hahn's Titles of Jesus in Christology⁹ is a more general investigation of the theology behind the various Christological titles in the Gospels at their traditional and redactional levels.

A general application of Redaction Criticism with special emphasis on the conclusion of the Gospel is Das Wahre Israel - Studien zur Theologie des Matthäusevangeliums by Wolfgang Trilling.¹⁰ According to his investigation the Matthean concept of salvation-history determines the structure of the Gospel. The Gospel is written with the theological presupposition of 28.16-20, in which vv. 18-20 are the key to the interpretation of the main themes of the Gospel. Matt.28.18-20 deals with the institution of the Church by the exalted Lord. Its theological concepts of universalism, Jesus' lordship and absolute authority in heaven and on earth and the promise of his continuing presence are all deeply rooted in the overall structure of the Gospel. Along with 21.43 and 27.25, this section (28.18-20) indicates that the Matthean motif is to present the Church as the 'True-Israel' that has in the history of salvation replaced the false Israel. Trilling recognizes the influence of the OT on the Gospel and states that the revelation of the OT (see Isa.42.6; 49.6) sets the ground for the Church's understanding of itself as the true Israel and of its vocation as fulfilling the will of God.¹¹ Since the points of distinction between Jewish Christianity and Gentile Christianity are no longer a significant problem for Matthew, Trilling ascribes the Jewish Christian features in the Gospel to the stage of transmission and the Gentile Christian features to the stage of redaction.¹²

Bornkamm agrees with Trilling when he calls the missionary command the key and summary of the whole Gospel,¹³ but does not go as far as to say that the entire Gospel is written on the theological presupposition of Matt.28.18-20.

In Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit, Untersuchungen zur Theologie des Matthäus,¹⁴ Georg Strecker seeks to emphasize the basic unity of tradition and redaction in Matthew, which is provided by the Way of Righteousness that spans from 'the time of the fathers and prophets' through 'the time of Jesus' to 'the time of the Church'. From the time of the Church the Evangelist looks back to the time of Jesus. The time of Jesus was an opportune time for Israel to accept or reject the Way of Righteousness. With Israel's rejection of it, the time of the revelation of the Way of Righteousness continues through the time of the Church. Strecker develops the idea that the Gospel presupposes a change of theological situation in the time of the Church between the first (Jewish-Christian) and second (Gentile-Christian) generations of Christians : in the former, the Parousia is expected and in the latter there is the problem of adaptation to a postponed Parousia. Matthew himself belongs to the second generation and shapes his Gospel accordingly.¹⁵

In Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kirche und Judentum im Matthäusevangelium,¹⁶ Reinhart Hummel claims that Jesus and the Torah are at the centre of distinction between Jews and the Church. The possession of the Torah is the common tie, though in controversy with Judaism the Church is not yet dissociated from the Jewish community. The Church's faith in Jesus as the Messiah and its right understanding and interpretation of the Torah set the contrast between the Church and Judaism. Hence, Matthew deliberately ascribes 'Son of David' to Jesus (cf. 12.22ff) as a messianic.

title of honour and regards Jesus as the messianic interpreter of the Torah.¹⁷ The Church understands the Law as expounded by Jesus in contrast to the "Pharisaic misuse" of the Law (cf. 9.10-13; 12.5-7).¹⁸ Matthew's knowledge of the tension between the Church and Judaism based on two different understandings of the Torah and the Messiah is a leading factor determining the content of the Gospel.

Krister Stendahl's awareness of redaction criticism is shown in his commentary on Matthew.¹⁹ He points out that when Matthew makes use of earlier material he often interprets it by giving it a special emphasis, a different application or a new content. Being within the life of a Church (as a new constituency of Israel) and catering to its needs, the Gospel grew out of a 'school' led by the author (a converted rabbi). Hence, for Stendahl the theological motifs behind the writing of the Gospel are Matthean, but they represent the thought of his community.

According to Rolf Walker,²⁰ Matthew writes a 'life of Jesus' and an 'Acts of the Apostles' in one book, setting forth the history of salvation in three epochs: the 'pre-history of the Messiah', the 'history and call of Israel' and the 'call of the Gentiles'.²¹ In the context of Israel's rejection of the Messiah, Matthew characterizes Israel as a totality of evil with no hope of a future salvation.²² The Church in Matthew stands in contrast to the Israel represented by the "Pharisees and Scribes" (see 3.7; 16.1, 11f). The time of Matthew is the time of the Church and of the Gentile

mission, which, according to Walker, leaves no room for a mission to Israel.

In The Parables of Jesus in Matthew 13 : A Study in Redaction - Criticism,²³ Jack Dean Kingsbury illustrates how Matthew redacts parables to meet the demands of the situation of his Church. Jewish rejection of the Messiah and the Gospel is one of the situations the Church faces. With "knowing and doing God's will" as the unifying thought in the parables, Matthew draws a contrast between the Jews as those who neither know nor do God's will, and the disciples who represent the Church of his day as those who do know and do God's will.

While recognizing the role of Matthew's ecclesiastical and salvation-historical concerns in the Gospel, Kingsbury in his various articles and in his recent book, Matthew : Structure, Christology, Kingdom²⁴ points out that it is the Christology of Matthew that determines the nature of the Gospel. He designates the Gospel as "fundamentally a Christological document"²⁵ and "the Gospel of the Son of God".²⁶ Matthew's Gospel of the Kingdom in developing its concept of salvation-history follows a topical outline of the life of Jesus - Messiah, the Son of God in terms of his identity (1.1-4.16), proclamation (4.17-16.20) and the suffering, death and resurrection (16.21-28.20).²⁷ It is a major objective of Matthew to depict Jesus as the promised Messiah through whose words and deeds God reveals himself to men.²⁸ Hence, Kingsbury sees a salvation-history in Matthew consisting of the time of promise (i.e., the time of Israel.

inaugurated with Abraham) and the time of fulfilment (i.e., the time of Jesus comprehending the ministries of John, Jesus and the disciples). The time of the Church is viewed as a sub-category of the time of fulfilment.²⁹ The earthly Jesus who lived with the disciples continues to reside in the Church. Matthew composes 28.16-20 in the style and thought of the rest of the Gospel. The main link between this section and the rest of the Gospel is Matthew's Son of God Christology.³⁰ Matthew's concern to depict Jesus as the Son of God thus determines the shape and message of it.

Charles E. Carlston identifies Matthew as a traditor, theologian and Churchman.³¹ The passages peculiar to Matthew are designed to answer the initial questions: Who is Jesus? (chapter 1) and where did he come from? (chapter 2). The answers provided for them foreshadow much of what follows in the Gospel. Many central themes are taken up into the climax (28.16-20), which is a key passage determining the Evangelist's special concerns: the Church's nature, Christological ways, mission, hope etc.

The redaction-critical works we have been considering above show how different authors have reached different conclusions with regard to the main motifs in Matthew's Gospel. The diversity of findings indicates that there is more than one Matthean motif behind the collection, arrangement, composition and interpretation of materials in the Gospel. Such themes as his theology of discipleship, Christology, ecclesiology, his understanding and interpretation of the Law, eschatology, instruction of the Church,

salvation-history, the relation between the Church and Israel etc., are indeed some of the Matthean redactional concerns.

With the development of Redaction Criticism there is a growing consensus that Matthew 28.16-20 is the climactic statement that sums up the main concerns of the Gospel which thereby determines its nature. Kingsbury affirms that these verses stem from the Evangelist's hand,³² while many others think they contain pre-Matthean elements.³³ Benjamin Jerome Hubbard's thesis dealing with this question reaches the following conclusions : Matthew has redacted this passage recapitulating several basic themes of the Gospel; he was familiar with a primitive apostolic commission from Gentile missionary sources; the shape of the commission was influenced by a primitive proto-commission, now shared by Matt.28.16-20; Luke 24.36-53 and John 20.19-23. Matthew adds to it certain features of Old Testament commissionings.³⁴ In the absence of a consensus on the origin of Matt.28.16-20, its formation therefore requires further consideration.

Applying Redaction Criticism on the Matthean resurrection narrative as a whole, Norman Perrin in his book, The Resurrection According to Matthew, Mark and Luke,³⁵ deals with the problem of finding an answer to what the Gospel writer is trying to say. Perrin regards the resurrection narratives as the literary expressions of the Evangelists' understanding of what it means to say "Jesus is risen !"³⁶ The narrative process involves taking over traditions from Mark and other accessible sources, editing and compiling

them, and sometimes creating new narratives on the basis of the Evangelist's understanding of the meaning of resurrection.³⁷ The final product is the literary expression of the theological conviction of the author. With this outlook Perrin examines the Matthean redaction of Marcan materials and Matthew's own material and arrives at specific conclusions. The main focus of concern in the narrative is the Church in the world "to the close of the age".³⁸ The resurrection inaugurates the new age, the age of the Church, which is to be brought to an end by the Parousia. The risen One's address to the disciples summarizes the major tenets of Matthean theology and alerts the community to its responsibilities and privileges.³⁹

Our brief survey has indicated that Redaction Criticism as a method of interpretation provides new criteria to determine the background and theology of the Evangelist and his uniqueness in relation to his sources. The aim of the present thesis in applying this method of interpretation is to ascertain this unique emphasis and therefore the theological purpose which Matthew had in mind in his narration of the resurrection story.⁴⁰ Such an enquiry has to start with the final product, which is the text itself. We must therefore analyse the narrative and compare it with parallel narratives in order to determine the extent of tradition and redaction in it and the elements that can be attributed to the author. The enquiry would also help us to determine the special contributions of the Evangelist to the understanding of the meaning and significance of Jesus' Resurrection.

The present thesis consists of two parts :-

Part 'A' reviews the text and its sources and compares their material with parallel narratives. This enables us to distinguish the Matthean from the non-Matthean material in Matthew's redaction of the resurrection narrative.

Part 'B' examines the practical and theological motifs of the author in presenting the narrative in its present form. It investigates the way in which Matthew has arranged his material in order to develop his central motif : the Christ-Church relationship.

NOTES

1. Rudolf Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, (transl. by John Marsh), Oxford: 1963, pp.350-358, esp.p.357.
2. Joachim Rohde, Rediscovering the Teaching of the Evangelists, London: 1968, p.10, where he refers to Willi Marxsen in Montasschrift für Pastoraltheologie, Heft 6, 1954, p.254.
3. first published in Wort und Dienst, Jahrbuch der Theologischen Schule Bethel, NF I, 1948, pp.49-54 and reprinted in G.Bornkamm, G.Barth, and H.J.Held, Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew, (transl.), Philadelphia : 1963. A pupil of Bultmann, Bornkamm sets Bultmann's unacknowledged redaction-critical bent on the move.
4. It is a revised article based on an earlier presentation entitled

"Matthäus als Interpret der Herrenworte" at a theological conference in 1954. The revised essay appears in Bornkamm, Barth, Held, Tradition and Interpretation., See Rohde, Rediscovering, pp.47-48.

5. G.Barth in Tradition and Interpretation, pp.58-164.
6. Barth's suppositions about antinomian opponents and Jesus' teachings and commandments taken in terms of Jewish Law are indeed open to question. See Rohde, Rediscovering, pp.58f, 62f.
7. H.J.Held in Tradition and Interpretation, pp.165-299.
8. Heinz Eduard Tödt, The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition, Philadelphia: 1965.
9. Ferdinand Hahn, Titles of Jesus in Christology, New York: 1969.
10. Wolfgang Trilling, Das wahre Israel - Studien zur Theologie des Matthäusevangeliums, München : 1964.
11. Ibid., pp.87-211.
12. See Ibid.,pp.182, 202f, 212-216.
13. G.Bornkamm, "Der Auferstandene und der Irdische, Matt.28, 16-20" in Zeit und Geschichte, (edit. E.Dinkler), Tübingen: 1964, p.173.
14. Georg Strecker, Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit, Untersuchungen zur Theologie des Matthäus, Göttingen: 1962,
15. See Ibid., pp.35,45-49, 117, 184-188 cf. G.Strecker, "Das Geschichtsverständnis des Matthäus", Evangelische Theologie , 26, 1966, pp.57-74.
16. Reinhart Hummel, Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kirche und Judentum im Matthäusevangelium, München: 1963.
17. Ibid., pp.109-111, 120.
18. See Ibid., pp.55, 71, 75.
19. Krister Stendahl, "Matthew" in Peake's Commentary of the Bible, London: 1962, pp.769ff. cf. K.Stendahl, The School of St.Matthew, Philadelphia: 1968, pp. 24-35.
20. Rolf Walker, Die Heilsgeschichte im ersten Evangelium, Göttingen: 1967.
21. Ibid.,pp.114-115.
22. Ibid., p.122.
23. Jack Dean Kingsbury, The Parables of Jesus in Matthew 13 : A Study in Redaction-Criticism, Richmond: 1969.

24. J.D.Kingsbury, Matthew : Structure, Christology, Kingdom, Philadelphia: 1975.
 "Form and Message of Matthew", Int., 29, 1975, pp. 13-23.
 "The Structure of Matthew's Gospel and his Concept of Salvation-history", CBQ, 35, 1973, pp.451-474.
 "The Title KYRIOS in Matthew's Gospel", JBL, 94, 1975, pp.246-255.
 "The Title 'Son of Man' in Matthew's Gospel", CBQ., 37, 1975, pp.193-202.
 "The Composition and Christology of Matt.28.16-20", JBL., 93, 1974, pp. 573-584.
25. Kingsbury, "Form and Message ...", p.18.
26. Ibid., p.23.
27. Ibid., p.18 and Kingsbury, "The Structure ...", p.474.
28. Kingsbury, "The Structure ...", p.452.
29. Kingsbury, "Form and Message ...", pp.15-16, "The Structure ...", pp.473-474.
30. Kingsbury, "The Composition ...", pp.573, 582.
31. Charles E.Carlston, "Interpreting the Gospel of Matthew", Int., 29, 1975, pp.3-12.
32. Kingsbury, "The Composition ...", p.575.
33. See G.Barth in Tradition and Interpretation, p.131; Strecker, Der Weg., p.210; Bruce J.Malina, "The Literary Structure and Form of Matt.28.16-20", NTS., 17, 1970-71, p.97.
34. Benjamin Jerome Hubbard, The Matthean Redaction of a Primitive Apostolic Commissioning : An Exegesis of Matthew 28.16-20, Montana: 1974, pp.134-136.
35. Norman Perrin, The Resurrection According to Matthew, Mark and Luke, Philadelphia : 1977.
36. Ibid., p.3.
37. Ibid., p.5
38. Ibid., pp.57f.
39. Ibid., p.55.
40. Since the publication of Perrin's latest book took place during the preparation of the present thesis, to a certain extent, our enquiry supplements Perrin's conclusions.

PART A

THE TEXT

Chapter I

ANALYSIS OF THE TEXT

The Resurrection Narrative in the Gospel according to Matthew contains four units : the tradition of the tomb (27.57-61; 28. 1-3, 5-8), the Jewish scandal story (27.62-66; 28.4, 11-15), the appearance to the women (28.9-10) and the Galilean appearance to the disciples (28.16-20). They have three distinctive elements as their basis : the tomb, the scandal and the appearances. Before dealing with each of these units in turn, we give a brief discussion of the peculiar phenomena accompanying the death of Jesus (27.51-54) that include a reference to the resurrection of the saints.

The Peculiar Phenomena Accompanying the death of Jesus (27.51-54).

Matthew's additions to Mark 15.38 are : "... behold ... and the earth shook and the rocks were split; the tombs also were opened, and many bodies of the saints who had fallen asleep were raised, and coming out of the tombs after his resurrection they went into the holy city and appeared to many". He alters the Marcan reading, "And when the centurion who stood facing him saw that he thus breathed his last, he said "Truly this man was the Son of God" (15.39) to "when the centurion and those who were with him, keeping

watch over Jesus, saw the earthquake and what took place, they were filled with awe, and said, "Truly this was the Son of God" (Matt.27.54).

In view of the word 'saints' that appears nowhere else in the Gospels, *ἁγίοις* with reference to Jesus' resurrection being used here alone in the NT, and bodily resurrection (Isa.26.19) as a recognized feature of the Day of the Lord (cf. Dan.12.2), P.A.Micklem supposes that Matthew found a floating tradition of the resurrection of the saints in the Jewish-Christian circles of his day.¹ Since such a tradition has not been identified, the question here is whether it is a Matthean construct.

Matthew's apocalyptic colouring of the death and resurrection of Jesus is evident in his additions to the Marcan original. Matthew introduces the present pericope with his frequent expression, *καὶ ἰδοὺ*,² which he uses here as well as at 28.2 especially to introduce apocalyptic material. He seems to construct his story with direct borrowings from the apocalyptic literature of the OT. A direct dependence of the Matthean text on Ezek. 37.1-14; Isa.26.19 and Dan.12.2 may be suggested by the parallel expressions:-

Matt.27.51 *ἡ γῆ ἐσεισθη*

Ezek.37.7 *σεῖσμός*

27.52 *τὰ μνημεῖα*

37.12a The Lord says: *ἐγὼ*

ἀνεφύθησαν

ἀνοίγω τὰ μνημεῖα ὑμῶν.

27.53 The tombs are opened

37.12b "I will lead you forth from

and many saints are

your tombs and I will bring

raised. Following Jesus'

you into the land of Israel".³

triumph, they came to
the holy city.

Matt.27.52b "... many bodies of	Isa.26.19a Thy dead shall live, their
the saints who had	bodies shall rise. O dwellers
fallen asleep were	in the dust, awake !
raised".	Dan.12.2a And many of those who sleep
	in the dust of the earth
	shall awake.

In Jewish tradition these OT texts have been interpreted eschatologically as referring to the final resurrection in the messianic age.⁴ All three share an expectation of an eschatological salvation. Matthew may be using them for two reasons: The resurrection at the end of time is being fulfilled and its occurrence at the death of Jesus implies that the Messiah's death has soteriological significance.⁵

Matt.27.53 is designed to buttress v.52. The raised up saints come to the holy city (cf. Ezek.37.12b) 'after his resurrection' and appear to many. It is sometimes suggested that the clause, μετὰ τὴν ἔγερσιν αὐτοῦ was interpolated later or that in this clause, αὐτοῦ was substituted for an original αὐτῶν.⁶ These suggestions however lack MS support. Hence, Matthew employs the clause apparently in agreement with the Christian tradition that Jesus is the first-fruits from the dead (1 Cor.15.20).

Matt.27.50-53 could imply that the death and resurrection of Jesus

constitute a single event and that the death and exaltation of Jesus go together.⁷ But within the Gospel narrative such an identification is untenable, because 1) Matthew is familiar with the tradition of the resurrection 'on the third day' (16.21; 17.23; 20.19), which he substitutes for Mark's 'after three days', although once he employs the latter (27.63)⁸; and 2) The Resurrection Narrative, as we shall see, is the climax and key to the rest of Matthew's Gospel, and is clearly distinguished from the Passion Narrative.

According to Mark, the centurion witnessing the death of Jesus exclaims, 'Ἀληθῶς οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος υἱὸς Θεοῦ ἦν (15.39). Here, υἱὸς Θεοῦ, could mean 'a son of God'. Matthew changes the entire tone of the sentence. For him, it is rather a corporate witness by the centurion and those who were with him to the apocalyptic signs, than to the death itself. The Marcan exclamation is changed to an awesome corporate confession: 'Ἀληθῶς Θεοῦ Υἱὸς ἦν οὗτος (Matt.27.54). In the absence of definite article, Θεοῦ Υἱός could of course mean 'a son of God'. But in his redaction of the Marcan original by removing ὁ ἄνθρωπος and placing the demonstrative pronoun οὗτος after ἦν, Matthew intends the phrase to mean, "Truly God's Son was this". In the Matthean redaction the whole pericope leads on to this confession.

Our analysis enables us to see Matt. 27.51b-53 as a Matthean construct and vv. 51a and 54 as thoroughly redactional.

The Tradition of the Tomb.

27.57-61.

The story of the tomb tells how Joseph of Arimathea, after he had received Pilate's permission, buried Jesus' body and how the two women remained sitting opposite to the tomb.

Joseph of Arimathea is described as a rich man who was made a disciple of Jesus. Since Matthew regards the events in Jesus' life as fulfilment of prophecies, it has often been suggested in the past that the mention of *άνθρωπος πλούσιος* at this point may be intended to recall *καὶ τοὺς πλουσίους ἀντι τοῦ θανάτου* (Isa.53.9 LXX). 'The rich' in Isa.53.9b is synonymous with 'the wicked' of v.9a and in the Targum it refers to "those who are rich in possessions they have obtained by violence".⁹ Since Matthew would not qualify Joseph with the sense 'the rich' has in Isa.53.9, in Matthew the reference would be to Joseph's social status.

The use of *παθητεύω* in the passive voice (27.57) instead of the usual noun *παθητής* is significant. Passive verbs are transitive, usually expressed with the agent of the action by *ὑπό* with the genitive. Instead, we have here the dative *τῷ Ἰησοῦ*. Hence it has been suggested that *ἐπαθητεύθη* is intransitive and deponent. K.H.Rengstorff notes that the intransitive non-New Testament use of *παθητεύω* is found only in Matt. 27.57, and the peculiar NT usage is transitive as in Matt.13.52 ; 28.19 and Acts 14.21.¹⁰ F.Blass and A.Debrunner note a development in the use of this

verb : The Hellenistic transformation of the intransitive actives into causatives is represented in μαθητεύειν : it meant first 'to be a disciple' (Plut., Matt.27.57) then became a deponent (Matt.13.52; 27.57) and from this there developed a new active 'to make a disciple of' (Matt.28.19; Acts 14.21).¹¹ These suggestions do not, however, explain the position of the dative in relation to ἐμαθητεύθη.

The dative τῷ Ἰησοῦ could be either an indirect object or a dative of agent. The dative of agent is not absolutely unknown to the NT. There is at least one example in Luke : οὐδὲν ἄξιον θανάτου ἐστὶν πεπραγμένον αὐτῷ (Luke 23.15). Outside the NT there are instances "in the Atticising Clementine Homilies : 3.68 θεῷ ἐστύγεται, 9.21 δαίμοσιν ἀκούεται, 19.23 ἡτύγεται τοῖς ταπεινοῖς".¹² Dative of agent is indeed a rare usage, and may not be the case in Matt.27.57 either.

If the only other two instances of μαθητεύω in Matthew (13.52; 28.19) are transitive, the verb at 27.57 is perhaps the same. Since the dative of agent is a rare usage and it never occurs in Matthew, the Syriac Peshitto version of 27.57 may be taken in support of an early understanding of τῷ Ἰησοῦ as an indirect object. ἐμαθητεύθη as transitive and τῷ Ἰησοῦ as an indirect object of the clause are so understood by this version.¹³

With the transitive verb ἐμαθητεύθη Matthew puts special stress on the 'act' of 'making disciples', which is the central act of the mission

commanded by the risen Lord (28.19).

The story of the burial undertaken by Joseph is concluded at 27.60. In vv.59-60 Matthew adds the adjectives 'clean' (clean linen, 59), 'new' (new tomb, 60) and 'a great' (a great stone, 60) to describe the reverential burial. 'A great stone' also serves to summarize Mark 16.3-4, which Matthew does not repeat in Chapter 28. The women seated opposite to the tomb are witnesses to the burial (27.61).

28.1.

Based on the source, Mark 15.42-16.1, Matt.28.1 seems to belong with 27.57-61. The names 'Mary Magdalene' and 'the other Mary', already mentioned in 27.61 are repeated in 28.1 because of the break caused by the insertion of 27.62-66. These two women visit the tomb early on the first day of the week. The 'other Mary' would be the mother of James and Joseph. Matthew introduces her in apparent dependence on Mark: Mark 15.40 — Matt.27.56, and Mark 15.47 — Matt.27.61. But Matt.28.1 and Mark 16.1 do not quite agree. Matthew's own usage 'the other' in 28.1 is derived from 27.61, which looks further back to 27.56, where the other Mary is obviously the mother of James and Joseph (if James and Joseph are the same). Mark 15.47 presumably influences Matthew to leave out Salome. The leading figure, however, is Mary Magdalene, whose name is particularly specified. In Matthew the women's purpose is to 'see' the tomb, instead of Mark's 'to anoint' the body. Matthew who uses ὁράω and βλέπω a number of times, prefers

θεωρέω - here as well as at 27.55.¹⁴ Probably θεωρέω assumes the sense, 'to witness'. Matthew seems to say that these women who were witnesses to Jesus' death and burial (27.55f,61) were also witnesses to the opening of the grave, though not to the actual resurrection.

28.2-3.

This passage is peculiar to Matthew in the NT. In an attempt to describe the 'how' of the resurrection, Matthew introduces an angel of the Lord rolling back the stone. Rolling back the stone and opening the grave, as Matthew seems to suggest, may have occurred while the women were watching. If so, he will have the following purpose : to show that Jesus' body was not in the tomb, and consequently Jesus was already raised before the opening of the grave. The Evangelist also guards against the idea of body-stealing by bringing the women to witness the actual opening of the grave (cf. the Jewish scandal story).

Matthew's story includes a great earthquake and an angel of the Lord, described in apocalyptic language. The appearance of the angel of the Lord is like lightning, following the description of the angel's face in Daniel 10.6; his garment is white as snow like that of the Ancient of Days in Daniel 7.9 (Theodotion, καὶ τὸ ἔνδυμα αὐτοῦ ὥσει χιτῶν λευκόν).¹⁵ Besides a literal dependence on Daniel, Matthew obviously shares with him a general stock of apocalyptic language. For instance, the appearance of the angelic creatures of Ezekiel's vision is described as a flash of lightning

(Ezek.1.14). Lightning is associated with theophanies (Exod. 19.18; Psalms 18.14; 77.18). A snow-white garment is also associated with such visions and manifestations (cf. Enoch 71.1; Mark 9.3; Matt. 17.2; Acts 1.10; Rev.15.6; 19.14).

The angel of the Lord is a messenger-figure in the OT, and the OT sees him as the personal representation of Yahweh himself.¹⁶ Sometimes Yahweh and the angel of the Lord are used interchangeably (Gen.16; Exod.3). An earthquake accompanies the descent of the angel of the Lord in Matt.28.2, following the biblical concept that the presence of Yahweh sometimes causes earthquakes.¹⁷ Matthew introduces the angel of the Lord in his infancy and resurrection stories. In 1.20-21 and 2.19-20 the angel of the Lord appears to Joseph in a dream with a message. In 28.2-3,5-7, as Matthew presents it, he directly appears to the women and gives them a message together with manifest evidence of it.

Since the angel of the Lord is a symbolic figure that stands for God, the Evangelist intends to say that God himself is active in the resurrection of Jesus.

28.5-7.

Matt.28.5 takes up the angel and women story of vv.1-3. But the connection between vv.3 and 5 is not smooth. The presence of ἀποκριθεῖς at v.5 could imply that a question put to the angel by the women preceded

v.5. Since that question cannot be identified, and vv.2-3 form a special story, we conclude that either something is missing between vv.1 and 5¹⁸ or the phrase 'αποκριθεῖς is an erratic intrusion.

Matt.28.5-7 is, for most part, dependent on Mark 16.6-7. Matthew tones down Mark's ἐκθαμβέω to φοβέω. As in 1.20, the message of the angel in 28.5 intends to dispel fear: μὴ φοβηθῆς to Joseph (1.20) and μὴ φοβεῖσθε ὑμεῖς to the women (28.5). Both announce events of central importance; one, the birth and the other, the resurrection. ὑμεῖς in v.5 is to emphasize a distinction between the experiences of the women and the guards (cf.v.4). The women need not be afraid, whereas the guards are shocked and paralyzed. The angel of the Lord tells the women that Jesus is risen, as he said (v.6). καθὼς εἶπεν is a reference to the predictions in 12.40; 16.21; 17.9,23 and 26.32, which the Evangelist assumes to be known to the women as well.

The angel of the Lord charges the women with two messages (v.7): 1) 'Ἠγέρθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν, which refers back to v.6; and 2) προὔγει ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν ὄψεσθε, which is taken over from Mark 16.7b. By changing καθὼς εἶπεν of Mark 16.7 and with the repetition of ἰδοὺ in ἰδοὺ εἰπὼν ὑμῖν, Matthew adds special emphasis on the second message that is placed between them. The rôle of the symbolic figure, 'the angel of the Lord' from being a messenger is changed to that of the source of the message. In word as in appearance, then, Matthew

says that God's action is here manifest. In v.7 we observe a shift of emphasis from a resurrection-report to the Galilean appearance. The rest of the story in vv.8-10,16-20 follows up this emphasis.

28.8.

The text states that it was with mixed feelings of fear and joy that the women ran to meet the disciples. The presence of μεγάλη in conjunction with φόβος (v.8) very probably makes the latter reverential. Whatever uncertainty may be implied in Mark's τρόμος καὶ ἔκστασις Matthew attempts to remove it by combining φόβος with χαρὰ μεγάλη. The reverential fear or awe and the great joy are also probably intended to provide an occasion of worshipping the risen Lord, and thus are included as a setting for 28.9-10.

Whether the women did pass on their message or not is not specified. Jesus' meeting with the disciples need not however be dependent on the women's report, because the place of meeting had already been appointed to the disciples (see 28.16). But in ἀπελθεῖσαι ταχὺ (v.8) following ταχὺ πορευθεῖσαι (v.7)¹⁹ the repetition of ταχὺ may well be intended to show that their obedience was immediate and complete. ὄψεσθε in v.7 which refers to an expected appearance fits in with ἰδόντες (v.17) as its fulfilment. The shift of emphasis from a resurrection-report to the announcement of an expected Galilean appearance in v.7 and the report of such an appearance in vv. 16f together affirm that Matthew intends

this story in vv.16f to be the fulfilment of the announcement in v.7.

Matthew redacts Mark 16.8 in such a way as to provide a necessary link between the tomb and appearance stories.

The Jewish Scandal Story : The Story of the Guard at the Tomb (Matt.27.62-66; 28.4, 11-15).

The story appears for the first time in Matthew, where it is given in three parts.

There are features and vocabulary peculiar to this story. Such terms as πλάνος, πλάνη, ἀσφαλίζειν, κουστωδία and σφραγίζειν do not appear elsewhere in the Gospels. ἡ ἐπαύριον is used nowhere else in Matthew. Instead of Matthew's usual expression, τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ (16.21; 17.23; 20.19), μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας is used at 27.63. The story is a unified whole and it provides hardly any link in the sequence of the Matthean resurrection narrative. The story was later known to Justin Martyr (c.A.D. 150) and Tertullian (c.A.D. 200). Similar stories are reported in different forms in the apocryphal Gospels of Peter and Nicodemus.²⁰ The peculiar features and vocabulary and the existence of apocryphal stories support opinions favouring the existence of a pre-Matthean form of the story.²¹ Since such a form has not been traced and Matthew's is the earliest available story, we cannot determine the extent of any traditional form here.

The story includes certain improbabilities : 1) The Pharisees and the chief priests remember Jesus' prediction that he would rise again after three days, whereas the disciples do not remember; 2) The chief priests arrange a conspiracy with the elders on the Sabbath, specifically one that involves contact with pagans; 3) Bribery is a secret arrangement and hence, the knowledge of others that the chief priests bribe the guards who are already at their disposal;²² 4) the Roman guards admitting to be asleep on duty at the risk of punishment by the Roman authorities, since "to sleep on duty was a capital offence in the Roman army"²³; and 5) Pilate taking seriously the Jewish fear that Jesus would rise again. The obvious conclusion based on these improbabilities within the structure of the story as a whole is that the Evangelist is not so much concerned with accuracy in minute details as to bring out his specific motifs. We therefore turn to consider the Matthean setting and motifs of the story.

The setting of the story is indicated by Matthew 28.15. In the statement, "This story has been spread among Jews to this day", 'this day' refers to the time of Matthew and 'this story' refers to the scandal: "His disciples came by night and stole him away" (28.13). The absence of the definite article between $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha$ and $\iota\omega\delta\alpha\iota\tau\iota\varsigma$ in v.15 may imply, as Matthew seems to suggest, that this scandal has been spread among Jews, but not universally (the Jews), i.e., those Jews with whom Matthew and his community had contact. As in the rest of the Gospel, the Jews with whom Matthew (and his community) is in dialogue must mainly be

Pharisees. They are therefore the main target of the story. Since the chief priests have a major role already in the Passion story, they are also included in the scandal story (27.62).

Matthew introduces 'Pharisees' here alone in his Passion-Resurrection narrative. This and his unusual expression 'after three days' for Jesus' resurrection can best be explained as a link that Matthew makes between his present story and Jesus' dialogue with the Pharisees (and the scribes) in Matt.12.38-41, where he has Jesus say : "As Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale, so will the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth" (v.40).²⁴ In this connection, Matthew takes 'after three days', to include the three days and three nights, as more appropriate than his own usual expression 'on the third day'.

In his development of the story a possible dependence of Matthew on Daniel is indicated by the parallel between the description of the sealing (σφραγίσαντες, Matt.27.66) of the stone laid against the door of the grave and the sealing (ἐσφραγίσατο) of the stone laid against the mouth of the lion's den (Dan. 6.17).²⁵ The time specification, τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον, ἥτις ἐστὶν μετὰ τὴν Παρασκευὴν is a vague way of describing the Sabbath. Παρασκευὴ as 'Preparation' was the regular name for Friday.²⁶ Mark explains the term to his readers (Mark 15. 42) whereas Matthew leaves the term unexplained indicating that it is

known to his readers. There is a conscious attempt to avoid mentioning 'the Sabbath' and it is assumed that the addressees would be familiar with this circumlocution. ὁ πλάνους is found as a Jewish designation for Jesus. "According to later Talmudic tradition, Jesus was one who deceived and led astray Israel".²⁷ κοινῶς ἰδῆ is a Latinism. It appears nowhere in the LXX, the Apocrypha or Classical Greek. It occurs in a papyrus of A.D. 22 (Oxy.Pap. ii.290.20), and hence was known to the Jews.²⁸

Matthew develops the story with expressions that are typical of his usage. κελεύω with aorist infinitive for 'command' or 'order' of individuals who have authority (27.64)²⁹, the passive or middle voice of συνάγω in the sense of 'to be gathered' or 'assemble' (28.12)³⁰, κλέπτω (27.64; 28.13)³¹, συμβούλιον λαμβάνειν (28.12)³², ἀργύρια in the plural (28.12,15)³³ and ὁ ἡγεμών (28.14)³⁴ are all expressions that are typical of the Evangelist. He repeats the phrase, μέχρι τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας (28.15) from 11.23. ἰδοὺ (28.11) as a demonstrative particle is frequently used in the Gospel. The expression, καὶ ἐστὶ ἡ ἔσχατε... χεῖρων τῆς πρώτης (27.64) recalls γίνεται τὰ ἔσχατα... χεῖρονα τῶν πρώτων in 12.45. With one exception (Rom.3.13, which is from Psalm 5.9), τάφος for 'tomb' is used only by Matthew in the NT (27.61,64,66; 28.1; 23.27,29). From the vocabulary it is evident that much of the language of the story is due to Matthew himself.

Matthew obviously aims his story at Jewish opponents and works it out from the scandal of body-stealing. He wants to tell his opponents, who belong to a generation after Jesus' death, that body-stealing is a wrong allegation, because 1) the tomb was sealed and upon burial a guard had been set to watch over it (27.62-66); 2) the guards were present at the resurrection and had an experience of becoming like dead (28.4) and 3) they were bribed to spread a rumour (28.11-15).

The Appearance to the Women (28.9-10).

In form the story of the appearance to the women has much in common with that of the appearance to the Eleven in vv.16-20 : Jesus appears, those to whom he appears recognize him, recognition leads to worship and Jesus commissions them to a task. C.H.Dodd includes these two stories as clear instances of the 'Concise Type' stories that took their form in the community around five basic elements :

- A. The situation (Jesus' followers bereft of their Lord),
- B. The appearance of the Lord,
- C. Greeting (but not in vv.16-20),
- D. Recognition; and
- E. The word of command.

For Dodd 'concise' stories are more or less matter-of-fact accounts that belonged to the tradition of the Church. This type avoids features not essential to a bare report, allowing only minor expansion by the narrator. ³⁵

According to Dodd's Form Critical analysis the present story is to be

regarded as a community construct. However, no two 'Concise' stories agree exactly in the number and order of elements. A closer look at the content and language of vv.9-10 will show that the present story is full of Matthean features.

In v.9, which contains the first four elements mentioned above, the two key-terms, *χαίρετε* and *προσεκύνησαν* are familiar Matthean terms. *χαίρε* as greeting occurs twice before (26.49; 27.29) as addressed to Jesus. Following the reverential act expressed by *ἐκράτησεν αὐτοῦ τοὺς πόδας, προσκυνεῖν* must be more than a mere act of reverence. Matthew uses *προσκυνεῖν* a number of times, mostly in the sense of worship.³⁶ F. Neirynck rightly says that it is in connection with *προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ* that the gesture of holding Jesus' feet is to be understood.³⁷ This gesture of reverence is an act of worship.

Matthew constructs 28.10 as a revised version of the angel's message (28.5b,7) :-

The word of command (E)

- | <u>28.5b,7</u> | <u>28.10</u> |
|---|--|
| 1. Μὴ φοβεῖσθε ὄμεις | Μὴ φοβεῖσθε - |
| 2. καὶ ταχὺ πορευθεῖσαι εἰπατε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ | ἐπάγετε ἀπαγγεῖλατε τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου |
| 3. ὅτι ... ἰδοὺ προάγει ὄμεις εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν ὄψεσθε. | ἵνα ἀπέλθωσιν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, καὶ ἐγὼ με ὄψονται. |

The imperative, "Do not be afraid", after the women had worshipped the risen One, is illogical. Here, Matthew simply repeats the angel's words of v.5b. The reference to the disciples as 'brethren' is first put on Jesus' lips by Matthew. As the Matthean resurrection narrative progresses from 28.7 through 28.10 to 28.16 we notice that the Evangelist identifies "his disciples" as "the Eleven disciples", whom the risen Lord designates as "my brethren".

We conclude that the story in 28.9-10 is a Matthean construct with materials from his narratives of the angelophany (i.e., theophany) to the women and the Galilean appearance to the Eleven.³⁸

The Christophany to the women introduces only what the angelophany has already done. The task entrusted to the women in v.7 does not change in v.10. The repetition of the message of the angel of the Lord is to emphasize the Galilean appearance to the Eleven. Matthew does not intend to convince the women of Jesus' resurrection, for he has already introduced them as believing the message that Jesus is raised. Their joy is a believing response. Neither is the story required to provide a proper transition from 28.1-7 to 28.16-17, for it is already provided by v.8. In view of these factors, only his motives can explain Matthew's composition of vv.9-10.

Norman Perrin notices two concerns in the story : 1) For Matthew, the resurrection is such that the risen Lord can appear to the women and

commission them to a particular responsibility, and 2) the great significance he attaches to the appearance in Galilee.³⁹ In the story, however, the appearance is secondary to the commission. The only concern of the commission is the Galilean appearance, the importance of which is the same even in the absence of the present story. Therefore, Matthew must have other concerns. The women have been privileged to witness the crucifixion, burial and Easter-morning events, whereas the disciples are kept away from these occasions. Matthew apparently wants to give the women the privilege of being witnesses to a Christophany as well. The empty tomb and Galilean appearance stories closely follow the intentions of the Evangelist's source, Mark. Neither of these was an occasion to introduce the special designation of the disciples as "my brethren" on the lips of Jesus. Hence, another obvious concern of the story is to introduce this designation.

The Appearance to the Eleven (28.16-20).

28.16-17.

The Eleven (the Twelve reduced to Eleven with the death of Judas, 27.3-10) went to Galilee, where Jesus had directed them. The reader gets the impression that Matthew intends the women to have communicated the message, when this story is read as a continuation of v.8 (and v.10).

In this single narrative of a Galilean appearance in the Synoptic Gospels, Matthew shows special interest in Galilee once again. It was

already anticipated in Mark 16.7. After being called out of Egypt, Jesus was brought to Galilee (Matt.2.15 cf. Hos.11.1), where he spent his early life (2.22f). He began his public ministry in Galilee (4.12-17 cf. vv.23, 25) which, Matthew believes, is in fulfilment of Isa.9.1-2 with its special reference to 'Galilee of the nations'. After being raised Jesus goes to Galilee, leading the disciples there to be sent forth on mission. Galilee is for Matthew the scene of revelation (cf.21.43; 23.37-39). Jesus affirms his universal authority revealing it to the Eleven in Galilee.

Although the 'mountain' of this Christophany is not identified, Matthew locates it in Galilee. According to Ernst Lohmeyer, in Matthew's Gospel it is obviously the place of revelation (5.1; 15.29; 17.1; 24.3 cf. 14.23) just as it is in the OT.⁴⁰ At the Temptations the kingdoms of the earth were shown and promised from a mountain (4.8). The risen Lord now affirms from the mountain that all authority on earth and in heaven has been given to him. Due to its revelatory significance, the mountain for Matthew is theological rather than a geographical spot.⁴¹

Matthew shows little interest in narrating the manner of the Lord's appearance. In contrast to 28.9f, Jesus at 28.17 does not identify himself with a greeting. All that we are told about the appearance is that the disciples saw him. ἰδόντες implies that the appearance was already expected (vv.7,10). In the experience of the disciples revelation and recognition happen together, the immediate expression of the latter is worship.

In addition to what has been said about προσκυνέω at 28.9f, the term deserves further attention here. "When the NT uses προσκυνεῖν, the object is always - truly or supposedly - divine".⁴² Among the Synoptists Matthew uses this term thirteen times, while Mark and Luke each use it only twice.⁴³ The Matthean preference for προσκυνεῖν is seen in the editorial changes he makes on Marcan texts. H.Greeven notes that Matthew has altered or expanded his Marcan original at least in five passages to describe the gesture of those who approach Jesus as PROSKYNESIS.⁴⁴ Greeven thinks it is very probable that in Matt.27.29 the PROSKYNESIS of the soldiers (Mark 15.19) is removed because elsewhere in Matthew the word always expresses true adoration.⁴⁵ With this preference for PROSKYNESIS Matthew represents a tradition that did not regard worshipping the risen Lord or even the historical Jesus as contrary to 'worshipping only the Lord your God'.

The purpose of οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν in such a short verse as 28.17, after recognition and worship, involves problems for many. Blass and Debrunner state that at 28.17 "no differentiation is indicated at the beginning of the sentence, but with the appearance of οἱ δὲ it becomes evident that what was said first did not apply to all".⁴⁶ Granted, we are left to believe that those who recognized did worship but that there were some who did neither. Without οἱ μὲν preceding οἱ δὲ the above sense cannot be easily held; i.e., some worshipped and others doubted. It suggests that some may not have worshipped. I.P.Ellis refers to commentators

from Jerome to Lagrange, who have proposed that here the aorist of **διστάζω** should be understood as a pluperfect, so that the disbelief precedes the worship (they worshipped but some of them had previously doubted).⁴⁷ This applies only if **ἐδίστασαν** can be regarded as a pluperfect. That **οἱ δέ** refers to some others than the Eleven⁴⁸ is mere conjecture. Verses 16-17 being a continuous sentence, the clause introduced by **οἱ δέ** obviously should refer to some of the Eleven. It is unusual that Matthew would characterize the disciples under the dim colour of an absolute doubt. Hence, we must consider what Matthew exactly means by **διστάζω** in the present context.

In the NT Matthew alone employs the term **διστάζω** (28.17; 14.31). It is never used in the LXX. So Ellis gathers its meaning from Classical and Koine Greek usage. In Plato (Theaetetus 190a; Ion. 534e; Laws 897b; Sophist 235a) "**διστάζω** denotes the state of uncertainty and inability to make a decision from the evidence presented to one."⁴⁹ In Aristotle (Nicomachean Ethics 1112²) "it means hesitation to make decisions for the same reason".⁵⁰ Moulton and Milligan give two instances from the Papyri⁵¹, where the meaning is not to know one way or the other when cases or points are presented.⁵² In short, **διστάζω** implies perplexity or uncertainty. Matthew must be sharing this meaning with Classical and Koine Greek. The Eleven did worship but some of them were perplexed about what they saw.

In Matthew's own usage at 14.31 and 28.17, **διστάζω** and **προσκυνέω** are associated. Mark 6.45-52, the source of Matt.14.22ff, is sometimes regarded as a transposed or displaced post-resurrection story.⁵³ Matthew follows the Marcan story with its Galilean context, but makes a significant addition, vv.28-31, with the Matthean themes of 'little faith', 'doubt' and 'worship'. The antithesis between 'little faith - doubt' and 'worship' implies uncertainty, which is a constant element in Matthew. In such parables as of the wheat and tares (13.36-43), the dragnet (13.47-50) etc., uncertainty or tension continues till sorting is done at the end. Hence, uncertainty in Matthew has an eschatological connotation.

In the Gospel, the disciples are the ones who are given understanding, and it is they who doubt and worship (14.28-31 and 28.16-17). "In Peter's case it is confidence which gives way to sudden panic".⁵⁴ In 28.17 some of the disciples are perplexed though they worship. This uncertainty must not be taken in the sense of **ἀπιστεύω**. Ellis says, "In Matthew's eyes, doubt which is uncertainty can be predicated of a disciple".⁵⁵ Matthew here intends to say that the disciples' reaction to the vision was not uniform. Some of those who responded to the vision in worship still maintain an element of uncertainty. It is perhaps best expressed by Augustine-George who says that for Matthew some of the Eleven had first some difficulty in believing, but their final belief was free from doubt.⁵⁶ The Evangelist makes no apologetic attempt to overcome this difficulty.

Rather, he simply proceeds to Jesus' words.

We conclude that for Matthew the post-resurrection appearance is such that it does not necessarily call for absolute certainty. Matthew ascribes absolute certainty to the exalted Lord's words rather than to a visionary experience. The Lord's words demand obedience.

Matthew 28.18-20 : The Apostolic Commission.

In the context of 28.16-17 Matthew introduces his great text, 28.18-20. Matt.28.18b-20 consists of : the claim to authority by the risen One (v.18b), the apostolic commission (vv.19-20a) and the promise of his continuing presence (v.20b). The original unity of these parts is a matter of dispute. Following Otto Michel, many believe that, prior to the Matthean composition, these three parts were independent of each other.⁵⁷ E.Lohmeyer and W.Trilling are among those who defend an original unity.⁵⁸ Both groups believe in the pre-Matthean existence of the text in some form. There is another group that regards it as a genuinely Matthean creation.⁵⁹ Without strictly following any of these positions, we turn to a fresh look at the composition of the text.

The Apostolic Commission is introduced by προσελθὼν ἐλάλησεν λέγων (18a). προσέρχομαι as applied to Jesus is used only twice in the Gospel (28.18a; 17.7), both times in passages peculiar to Matthew. There are striking parallels between

them in form and content.⁶⁰ A comparison of these passages is offered below.

	<u>28.17-18,20</u>	<u>17.6-7</u>
Context	Resurrection	Transfiguration
1. Perception	when they (the Eleven) saw him	when the disciples heard this
2. Awesome response	they worshipped him	they fell on their faces
3. Perplexity	but some doubted	they were filled with awe
4. Approach	προσελθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς λέγων	προσηλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἀψάμενος αὐτῶν εἶπεν
5. Word of Comfort	All authority has been given me ...I am with you always.	Rise and have no fear.

The form in both passages recalls Daniel's description of the effect of his vision on himself (Dan.10.9-12) :

Context	Daniel's apocalyptic vision of a man (angel).
1. Perception	When I heard the sound of his words (v.9)
2. Awesome response	I fell on my face (v.9)
3. Approach	a hand touched me (v.10a)
4. Perplexity	set me trembling on my hands and knees (v.10b)
5. Word of Comfort	Fear not, Daniel (v.12).

We notice a slight alteration of order in Matthew, where in contrast to Dan. 10.10, perplexity precedes approach. Matt.17.6-7 seems to be dependent on Dan.10.9-12. While Matthew follows Danielic vocabulary to a great extent in 17.6-7, the differences in 28.17-18,20b are redactional, recapitulating several major themes of the Gospel.⁶¹ The 'word of comfort' (number 5) undergoes complete change with words of Christological importance (= the authority and presence of the risen Lord). 28.17-18,20b is obviously Matthew's own construct based on the form he has already employed at 17.6-7.

The Word of Comfort : 28.18b,20b.

28.18b : The Claim of Authority.

The basis of the mission (vv.19-20a) is that the Apostles are commissioned by the Lord who is endowed with **πᾶσα ἐξουσία** .

Karl Barth states : "According to the 'therefore' (**οὖν**), this affirmation of power is the objective presupposition on the part of Jesus for the immediately following imperative",⁶² **μαθητεύσατε** .

This affirmation becomes more forceful according to certain MSS (θ 1604, SyP) which make an addition to 28.18, **καθὼς ἀπεστείλεν με**

ὁ Πατήρ καγὼ ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς .

Almost the same phrase

occurs in John 20.21.

In view of the passive **ἐδόθη** at 28.18, **πᾶσα ἐξουσία**

is an endowment. But neither the text nor the Gospel specifically points to a time when it was given to Jesus. The aorist ἐδόθη may not refer to an immediate past like the moment of the resurrection, because a nearly similar affirmation of Jesus at a moment of self-revelation at 11.27 (Q - the Cry of Jubilation) has also been rendered with an aorist, παρέδοθη . Scholars often find in Matt.28.18f a reference to Dan.⁶³ 7.13f. When Matthew recasts ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐξουσία (Dan.7.14 LXX) on the lips of Jesus, he is simply retaining the aorist passive.

Among the appearance stories Matthew alone has Jesus say, 'Ἐδόθη μοι πᾶσα ἐξουσία ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς . James M. Reese calls attention to the fact that Matthew uses the term 'authority' always in relation to Jesus.⁶⁴ Two of these instances, 9.8 and 28.18, are without parallels in the other Synoptics. Reese notes that 9.8 focusses attention on the ongoing expression of Jesus' authority which is not limited to his earthly existence, and the transfer of authority which is uppermost in the intention of Matthew comes to explicit expression at 28.18.⁶⁵ In the absence of the term 'authority', 11.27 almost slips away from Reese's consideration. Since ἐδόθη in 28.18 as well as in 11.27 is derived from Matthew's sources and it is a reverential passive in both cases, it is not the transfer of authority but Jesus' claim to authority that is uppermost in the intention of Matthew.

Matt.28.18 presents an occasion when Jesus affirms in the presence of

the disciples what he already had in his earthly ministry : "All things have been delivered to me by my Father" (11.27), "He was teaching them as one who had authority" (7.29), "The Son of Man has authority on earth to forgive sins" (9.6) and in 21.23-27, by implication, Jesus speaks of his authority from heaven. Thus already 'authority' characterised Jesus' teaching and ministry. The authority that the earthly Jesus exercised in a limited sphere has now been affirmed as limitless : ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς . 'Heaven and earth' is a favourite Matthean combination.⁶⁶ 'Εν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς defines the πᾶσα of πᾶσα ἐξουσία , and it is already used in Matthew's version of the Lord's Prayer (6.10).

28.20b : The Promise of Continuing Presence.

The 'word of comfort' ends with a promise of Jesus' continuing presence. The closing words, "And lo, I am with you always, to the close of the age", are characteristically Matthean. καὶ ἰδοὺ is frequent in Matthew. 'Εγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν fulfills the μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ θεός , the meaning of Ἐμμανουήλ in 1.23. In Genesis 28.15, Judg. 6.12 and Hagg. 1.13 'I am with you' is the affirmation of God's presence. In Matt. 28.20b the presence is promised by the One who is endowed with all authority, the One who has already promised his disciples ἐκεῖ εἰμι ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν where two or three assemble 'in relation to' him (18.20). We notice the Evangelist's disposition to regard Jesus' authority and presence as divine, and to present the same Jesus as making

identical promises before and after the resurrection.

With the exception of Heb.9.26, **συντέλεια** occurs in the NT only in Matt.13.39f,49; 24.3 and 28.20, and always in association with **αἰών**. **αἰών** in the NT is often an age with eternal quality. H.B. Swete says, "In St. Matthew's phrase **ὁ αἰών** is doubtless the course of the world considered as a whole; while **ἐπὶ τῇ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων** in Heb. 9.26 looks back over the earlier ages consummated by the age of the Incarnation, the Evangelist's **ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος** points on to the completion of the whole post-Incarnation space of the world's history at the **Παρουσία**".⁶⁷ In Heb.9.26 the plural of **αἰών** is used apparently to divide the course of the pre-Incarnation history into periods, while in Matthew's usage **αἰών** in the singular takes the pre- and post-Incarnation history as a single whole. Matthew sees a distinction only between this AEON and the age to come when he says in 12.32 that whoever speaks against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven **οὔτε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι**. Since the AEON of history is a single whole, **ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος** must be the time before the age to come.

In **πᾶσαι αἱ ἡμέραι** preceding **ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος**, a future is implied between the present and the end of the age. It is the supreme assurance, **ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι** "in the strength of which the future is to be faced".⁶⁸

Since the additional phrases, 'heaven and earth' and 'end of the age', are Mattheanisms, we conclude that the Evangelist has composed the 'word of comfort' : "All authority has been given me; I am with you always"⁶⁹ from Dan.7.14; Matt.11.27 (Q); 1.23 (Isa.7.14); 18.20 and scriptural affirmations of God's immediate presence (Gen.28.15; Judg.6.12; Hagg.1.13 etc.)

The Apostolic Commission : 28.19-20a.

The Apostolic Commission is set within the 'Word of Comfort'. The apostles are commissioned to act on the basis of the ἐξουσία given to Jesus (cf. οὐν) and on the assurance of Jesus' promise, "I am with you always". The mission, μαθητεύσατε is to continue till the age to come when the present AEON ends.

In the text under consideration, in co-ordinate relationship to the imperative μαθητεύσατε, we find three participles, πορευθέντες, βαπτίζοντες and διδάσκοντες which in effect become imperatives.

Although the participles used as imperatives are practically absent elsewhere in Matthew, A.T.Robertson refers to several such instances in the NT and believes that they are decided by their contexts.⁷⁰ The imperative use of participles in commands, laws and religious precepts is, according to David Daube, the result of Hebrew influence.⁷¹ In Matt.28.19-20a the context that decides the participles as imperatives is the

Lord's command, μαθητεύσατε. The three participles in turn magnify the force of μαθητεύσατε. In the absence of the usual missionary expressions, εὐαγγελίζων, κηρύσσειν, μαρτυρεῖν etc., μαθητεύσατε in conjunction with the three participles conveys the Matthean theology of mission with a special force. For Matthew, μαθητεύσατε is the aim of the mission, which is accomplished by 'going', 'baptizing' and 'teaching'. These three actions seem to manifest the Church of Matthew as missionary, sacramental and didactic.

Having acquired the force of imperatives, the three participles in the Matthean thought require action. The action specifically required by the Lord is relative to the key-word μαθητεύσατε, which is itself relative to the divine ἐξουσία. Because Jesus has received ἐξουσία, the disciples are to go and μαθητεύειν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη.

The text holds within it two groups : 1) those who are already 'disciples of Jesus' and 2) the world of the nations from which further disciples are to be made for Jesus. πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, being the direct object of μαθητεύσατε, has to be understood in relation to 'the disciples'. What the disciples are, the nations are not yet. The disciples are those who have already established a new relationship with the διδάσκαλος, or who already belong to the διδάσκαλος. 72 They are the salt of the earth (5.13), the light of the world (5.14),

whose light would shine before men (5.16). They are the enlightened who understand Jesus' teaching (13.10-17,51), those who do the will of the Father in heaven (12.49-50), and those who, with some understanding of who Jesus is, address him as κύριε (8.25; 17.4; 14.28-33).

πάντα τὰ ἔθνη describes the sphere of the disciples' activity. Matthew has sixteen references where ἔθνος or ἔθνικός is used under two different categories : 1) six times in a technical sense as Gentiles (5.47; 6.7,32; 10.5; 18.17; 20.19), corresponding to the **גוֹיִם** in the OT. Of the five occurrences of ἔθνικός in the NT Matthew has three (5.47; 6.7; 18.17), where it occurs in the sense of 'the Gentile' in contrast to the Jew; and 2) ten times in the general sense as 'nations' (4.15; 10.18; 12.18,21; 20.25; 21.43; 24.9,14; 25.32; 28.19). In constructing the 'word of comfort' Matthew draws upon Dan.7.14 (LXX). It is possible that πάντα τὰ ἔθνη in 28.19 is also taken from Dan.7.14, where it means 'Gentiles' besides the λαοί. However, the context of 28.19 does not suggest that τὰ ἔθνη is used in contrast to the Jews. Moreover, the three other instances of the combination of πάντα and τὰ ἔθνη in Matthew (24.9,14; 25.32) render the meaning as 'all the nations' in a general sense.⁷³ The risen Lord's command to mission is based on his claim to universal authority and must be understood in the light of the universalistic motif of the Gospel.

By μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη the Evangelist envisages a

universal community. His universal outlook is one of the characteristics of the Gospel. "The field where the Son of Man sows the seed is the world (Mt.13.38)".⁷⁴ The Gospel is to be preached to the whole world (24.14; 26.13). Many will come from the east and the west and sit at table with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (8.11). The servants (cf. the disciples) go out into the byways and gather both the good and the bad (22.9f). 'All the tribes of the earth' will be present at the coming of the Son of Man (24.30), to whom the elect will be gathered from the four winds (24.31).

πάντα τὰ ἔθνη will be gathered before his glorious throne (25.31-32). The Evangelist's universal outlook comes to a climax at 28.19.

Among the three participles, πορεύθεντες precedes the controlling imperative, μαθητεύσατε . In an effort to identify missionary terms in the Scriptures, Christian tradition has placed much emphasis on πορεύθεντες. πορεύομαι occurs in the NT only in the middle and passive, and is regarded as a deponent verb. Matthew uses its imperative form in association with authoritative commands. In 2.20 Joseph is ordered, πορεύου εἰς γῆν Ἰσραὴλ . The Gentile centurion's authority to command his subordinates is expressed by πορεύθητι (8.9). Jesus sends his disciples on mission to the lost sheep of Israel, commanding πορεύεσθε (10.6). Kingsbury points out that the pleonastic use of the aorist participle of πορεύομαι as a circumstantial participle attending an imperative occurs four other times in Matthew (2.8; 9.13; 11.4; 28.7).⁷⁵ In every case the participle stands for a firm order. In

28.19 the verb being used in the participle, πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη would literally mean 'Therefore, having gone, make disciples of all nations', which as a command derives the emphatic meaning, 'Therefore, go, make disciples of all nations'. Codex D, however, prefers the imperative πορεύεσθε and brings out the sense of command very clearly.

The other two participles, βαπτίζοντες and διδάσκοντες are in the present tense implying continuous action. 'Teaching' is a mission that continues even with those who are already disciples, while 'baptizing' like 'making disciples' occurs only once in a person's experience, which is of a permanent quality. The reading in B and D, βαπτίσαντες, probably tries to bring this out, and places the emphasis on the recipients of baptism. With βαπτίζοντες the emphasis is on the continuing action of the Apostles in baptizing others.

The integrity of the clause introduced by βαπτίζοντες was called in question by F.C.Conybeare⁷⁶ as early as 1902 on the basis of certain citations of Matthew 28.19-20a by Eusebius of Caesarea (bishop, 313-339).⁷⁷ In his Demonstratio Evangelica, which is designed to show that the Christians were right in continuing with the religious beliefs of the Jews to a more perfect way of life, while defending Christianity against the Jews, Eusebius writes: Ἐνθεν εἰκότως ὁ Σωτὴρ καὶ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν

ἀνάστασιν τοῖς αὐτοῖς μαθηταῖς εἰπὼν· "Πορευθέντες
μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη", ἐπιλέγει, "διδάσκοντες
αὐτοὺς τηρεῖν πάντα ὅσα ἐνετειλᾶμην ὑμῖν" (I.3).⁷⁸

In I.4 and 6 Eusebius repeats the same citation.⁷⁹ In III.6 he adds ἐν
τῷ ὀνόματι μου between τὰ ἔθνη and διδάσκοντες,⁸⁰ and
in III.7 he comments on this addition : οὐ γὰρ δὴ ἀπλῶς καὶ
ἀδιορίστως μαθητεύσαι πάντα τὰ ἔθνη προσέτατε, μετὰ⁸¹
προσθήκης δὲ ἀναγκαίας τῆς, "ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ".

In his Historia Ecclesiastica, while dealing with the last siege of the
Jews by Vespasian and his son Titus (68-70), in the context of plots of
the Jews against the Apostles who were then banished from Judea, Eusebius
writes that the Apostles journeyed to all the nations to teach the message
in the power of Christ who said to them "πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε
πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι μου" (III.5.2).⁸²

F.H.Chase's argument against Conybeare that the command to baptize
in the threefold name was irrelevant to the arguments of Eusebius in
these instances⁸³ is not sufficient to disprove Conybeare's proposition
that the evidence of these passages points to the conclusion that
Eusebius found the text in the codices of Caesarea in which the command
to baptize was absent.⁸⁴ Caesarea had been the centre of NT studies, and
was especially the scene of Origen's work. None of the extant NT MSS
containing Matt.28.18-20 can be traced back to the time of Eusebius.

The only two codices which might belong to this period are Ψ and B. Here they differ from Eusebius. As we know little about his texts for the NT, we cannot deny any supposed access of Eusebius to certain Caesarean texts in which the baptismal clause was absent.

Chase again refers to some later writings of Eusebius that include the command to baptize. Socrates, the Church Historian who lived in Constantinople sometime between 379 and 439, refers to a letter of Eusebius to his Church. While explaining the Nicene term $\delta\mu\omicron\omicron\sigma\iota\omicron\varsigma$, he writes : καθὼς καὶ Κύριος ἡμῶν ἀποστέλλων εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα τοὺς ἐκείνου μαθητὰς, εἶπε· Πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος . (Socrates, Historia Ecclesiastica, I.8).⁸⁵ Eusebius quotes the command also in his Contra Marcellum, Chapter I, De Ecclesiastica Theologia, III.5 and Theophania, IV.8.⁸⁶

Conclusions with regard to the authenticity of the baptismal clause in Matthew have often been hypothetical. As the references that contain the command to baptize belong to the later writings of Eusebius, Conybeare is led to believe that this clause was in early times (i.e., before Tertullian) interpolated for dogmatic reasons in some copies of Matthew and that its place was not fully assured till after the Council of Nicea (325).⁸⁷ Bultmann and Hans Kosmala are among those who regard the baptismal clause as a probable case of later interpolation.⁸⁸ David

Flusser supports the Eusebian shorter reading as representing the authentic text of Matthew.⁸⁹ Without substantial proof Lohmeyer concludes that both readings existed in the primitive Church, the longer emerging from Galilean Christianity and the shorter from the Jerusalem tradition, of which Matthew adopted the latter while the longer reading was later interpolated into the Gospel.⁹⁰ A plain fact, however, weighs against such hypothetical conclusions : Eusebius remains alone with his earlier readings (prior to Nicea) over against the overwhelming attestation of the full text of Matt. 28.19-20a by almost all Greek MSS and all extant versions.

The baptismal clause in Matt.28.19 has no direct parallel in the NT. The existence of the triadic formula and its association with baptism find early support outside the NT. Justin Martyr, writing about the middle of the second century, testifies to the practice of purification by water in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit : ἐπ' ὀνόματος τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν ὁλῶν καὶ δεσπότου θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου.⁹¹ Prior to Justin, the Didache, which is widely believed to have originated between 80 and 100,⁹² enunciates an established rule of baptism in the threefold name : Περί δὲ τοῦ βαπτίσματος, οὕτω βαπτίσατε·, ταῦτα πάντα προεπιόντες, βαπτίσατε εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐν ὕδατι ζῶντι (Did.7.1).⁹³ The Didache's constant use of the Gospel according to Matthew⁹⁴ would justify the direct

dependence of Did.7.1 on Matt.28.19.

According to present evidence, the earliest reference to the baptismal formula with the threefold name is in Matthew. The formula as it stands in practically all the MSS can hardly be doubted as the authentic text of the Evangelist. Ascribing the text to Matthean composition, our task is to examine how and why Matthew composed it.

While using the expressions, ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι, ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι, τῷ ὀνόματι, διὰ τὸ ὄνομα, ἔνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματος, εἰς τὸ ὄνομα etc., Matthew presents all except those with the preposition εἰς in passages which he has composed from other writers.⁹⁵ εἰς ὄνομα or εἰς τὸ ὄνομα appears in passages peculiar to Matthew (10.41f; 18.20; 28.19). In 10.41f and 28.19 εἰς ὄνομα is followed by the genitive. In 18.20 it takes the possessive pronoun ἐμὸν. H. Bietenhard points out that in the Greek world and Hellenism ὄνομα with the genitive stands for 'the actual thing' or 'person'.⁹⁶ He expounds Matt.10.41, ὁ δεχόμενος προφήτην εἰς ὄνομα προφήτου as, "He that receives a prophet in the name of, i.e., with respect to the fact that he is a prophet".⁹⁷ In the absence of articles in 10.41f εἰς ὄνομα προφήτου, εἰς ὄνομα δικαίου and εἰς ὄνομα μαθητοῦ might mean 'a (any) prophet as he is, a (any) righteous one as he is and a (any) disciple as he is'. With the addition of the article, εἰς ὄνομα assumes a different sense in 28.19. Here Matthew might be sharing the same tradition of the primitive Church as is

found in Acts 8.16; 19.5 and I Cor.1.13-17. The Evangelist has already introduced the usage in Matt.18.20, *εἰς τὸ ἐπὶ ὄνομα* . The author of the Letter to the Hebrews is familiar with the expression, *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ* (Heb.6.10). Bietenhard translates the phrase in Matt. 18.20 as 'in relation to me' and Heb.6.10 as 'for his sake'.⁹⁸ "As in Matt. 18.20 Christ is the basis on which the two or three meet, so in Heb.6.10 God is the basis of the acts of love".⁹⁹ In the above instances, *εἰς ὄνομα* or *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα* takes a noun in the singular. With the article the noun becomes the basis of the action related to it. The action is done 'in relation to' or 'for the sake of' the noun. In Matt.28. 19 alone *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα* takes three nouns. From the structure of the verse, when the sentence is put on Jesus' lips, *βαπτίζοντες εἰς τὸ ὄνομα πατρὸς* would be more appropriate. Jesus is the basis of baptism. 'Making disciples of all nations' is to be done by baptizing them 'in relation to' Jesus and 'for his sake', so that they belong to him. This is in accordance with the whole text of vv.18-20, where everything directly reflects upon Jesus : 'All authority has been given to me; go, make disciples of all nations unto me, baptizing them for my sake (in relation to me) and teaching them what I commanded you. I am with you'.

Matthew links the commission to the baptismal practice of the Church. Awakening a deep awareness of Christian identity, a Christian's distinction from others is defined by the baptismal clause introduced by *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα* . The use of *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα* in the singular

indicates the Evangelist's knowledge of baptism in the name of one person (i.e., Jesus Christ). He bases the rite on the authority and command of Christ. *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα* taking three nouns is indeed puzzling. In the absence of pre-Matthean evidences for such a usage, we conclude that Matthew is the first to connect baptism with the threefold name. The only reference to the baptismal association of Father, Son and Holy Spirit in the rest of the Gospel is Jesus' baptism. With the threefold name Matthew establishes a connection between Jesus' baptism and Christian baptism. By being baptized in the threefold name one becomes a disciple of Jesus.

Since the command to teach is mentioned after the command to baptize, it has sometimes been suggested that the instruction envisaged here is post-baptismal.¹⁰⁰ From the form of the sentence there are two alternatives here : 1) baptizing being mentioned earlier, perhaps disciple-making is done by baptizing and then the baptized are being taught; and 2) baptizing and teaching being taken on equal levels, disciple-making is done by both with neither of them taking absolute precedence. We are not in a position to opt for either alternative. Hence, we move on to consider the Matthean concern behind the clause introduced by *διδάσκοντες*.

The clause introduced by *διδάσκοντες* is close to Matthean style. It has a natural flow and sequence of its own as it follows the imperative, *μαθητεύσατε* = *πορευθέντες ὅν μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*.

διδάσκοντες αὐτοὺς τηρεῖν πάντα ὅσα ἐνετείλαμην ὑμῖν. It is by teaching to observe Jesus' commands that disciple-making is completed. The διδάσκαλος - μαθηταὶ relationship (cf. 10.24) established between Jesus and the Eleven is here envisaged for a universal community. Matthew uses διδάσκειν with reference to Jesus' instructions (4.23; 9.35; 11.1; 13.54; 22.33). "In the three summaries of Jesus' ministry to Israel (4.23; 9.35; 11.1) the emphasis in each case is on the teaching of Jesus (cf. also 5.2 and 7.28-29; 5.17-19; 23.2-10)."¹⁰¹ The present participle διδάσκοντες implies the teaching as a continuing activity of the disciples. τηρεῖν, that occurs only once in Mark and never in Luke, is used a few times in Matthew, where it means : to keep (in the sense of 'to guard' - see 27.36; 28.4) and to observe (by obeying - see 19.17). At 28.20 it might convey a double meaning : to guard Jesus' commands and observe by obeying them. πάντα ὅσα ἐνετείλαμην refers to the extent and nature of things to teach. It has often been suggested that the five blocks of discourses, each one ending with a formula such as 'when Jesus finished these sayings' (7.28; 11.1; 13.53; 19.1; 26.1) represent the Mosaic Pentateuch. The 'New Moses' motif has been emphasized by Fuller when he states that Matthew conceives the Gospel that he has written as the New Torah, and has deliberately phrased Matt. 28.20a so as to allude to it as such.¹⁰² In this Gospel the subject of ἐντέλλομαι is God (4.6; 15.4), Moses (19.7) or Jesus (17.9; 28.20a).¹⁰³ The Gospel does not assume the form of commands; rather, the Gospel contains commands. πάντα ὅσα might then refer to the whole of Jesus' teaching that has assumed the effect

of commands to the disciples. Hitherto Jesus has been the One who was teaching as one having authority. Now the disciples have been commissioned to teach on the basis and the strength of Jesus' authority.

Written as part of the Lord's commission and as the conclusion of the Gospel, Matt. 28.20a implies a strong Matthean appeal to regard his Gospel as containing the authoritative commands of Jesus, which the Church ought to teach and live by. Thus Matthew establishes a close identification between the teachings of Jesus and those of the Church.

Our discussion of the Apostolic Commission leads to the following conclusions :

- Matthew uses a Danielic pattern to narrate the Appearance story, in which the Apostolic Commission is set within 'the word of comfort'.
- The 'word of comfort' becomes the immediate literary setting of the commission.
- The commission is 'to make disciples' .
- The traditional means of making disciples is 'teaching'. The content of teaching is contained in the Gospel.
- The text includes yet another means : 'baptizing', and with it a baptismal clause consisting of a triadic formula.
- The commission is presented as a mission with the verb, πορευθέντες.

We shall further examine these conclusions and explore them in depth in part 'B'.

The Sequence of the Narrative.

Matthew has his story of the Jewish scandal rather loosely joined to his burial-resurrection narrative. By deducting it from the narrative we get a logical sequence :-

On the death of Jesus, Joseph of Arimathea undertook the burial of his body, while the women sat opposite to the tomb. Early in the first day of the week the women revisited the tomb, found it empty and were informed that Jesus was risen. They were charged to tell the disciples to go to Galilee to see Jesus. The Eleven went there and Jesus appeared to them. He affirmed his endowment with plenary authority, gave the missionary command, $\mu\alpha\theta\eta\tau\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\alpha\tau\epsilon$ and assured them of his continuing presence with them.

Except for Matthew's characteristic abbreviations of, and additions to, the Marcan parallels, he is following the Marcan original at 27.57-61 and 28.1,5-8a. By subtracting these Marcan parallels also from the above sequence we are left with the following : the contents of 28.16-20 : 1) appearance - recognition - worship, 2) the assertion of authority by the One who commissions $\mu\alpha\theta\eta\tau\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\alpha\tau\epsilon$, the process of which involves going, baptizing and teaching, and 3) the assurance of the everlasting presence by the One who holds authority.

As the authority given to Jesus characterizes the apostles' mission and as the assurance of his presence is the strength underlying the

mission, the actual missionary commission (28.19-20a) becomes the focal point of the narrative. Then, the sequence leads up to the key-word , μαθητεύσατε . ¹⁰⁴ Hence, μαθητεύσατε can serve an important role in unfolding the Evangelist's purpose and showing the setting of the resurrection narrative in the life of his Church.

NOTES

1. P.A.Micklem, The Gospel According to St. Matthew, London : 1917, p.275.
2. See Matt. 2.9; 8.2,24,29,34; 9.2 etc.
3. cf. J.Grassi, "Ezekiel XXXVII. 1-14 and the New Testament", NTS, 11, 1964-65, p.163.
4. See Ibid., p.162 and Lloyd Geering, Resurrection - A Symbol of Hope, London : 1971, pp.92-93, 105-108.
5. Further discussion on the Matthean motif is to follow in Chapter V below.
6. See A.H.McNeile, The Gospel According to St. Matthew, London : 1915, p.424.
7. No tradition that regards Jesus' death and resurrection as a single event has so far been identified as the Evangelist's source in this passage.

8. Further discussion on the two usages to follow under 27.62-66 below.
9. J.Muilenberg on Isa.53.9 in the Interpreter's Bible, vol.V,⁴N.B. Harmon, edit., New York : 1956, p.627. cf. D.R.Jones on Isa. 53.9 in Peake's Commentary, p.528. According to Jones, because the Servant's grave is in Babylon, it refers to those nations including Babylon, which are both wicked and rich.
10. K.H.Rengstorf, "Μαθητεύω" , TDNT, IV, p.461.
11. F.Blass and A.Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, transl. and edit., by Robert W. Funk, Chicago : 1961, p.82.
12. Ibid., p.102.
13. وَأَمَّا هُوَ فَمَا كَانَ يَدْرِي is the emphatic form of the perfect passive third person masculine singular, and وَأَمَّا is the inseparable particle introducing the indirect object.
14. ὁράω in the sense of ordinary vision (Matt.2.2), to perceive (9.2), to take heed (8.4; 18.10; 9.3; 16.6), to care for (27.4).
βλέπω as the opposite of to be blind (12.22), to perceive (7.3), justful look (5.28), to discern (13.13), to consider or take heed (22.16; 24.4).
15. M.D.Goulder, Midrash and Lektion in Matthew, London : 1974, p.447. cf. E.L.Bode, The First Easter Morning : The Gospel Accounts of the Women's Visit to the Tomb of Jesus, Rome : 1970, pp.50-51; Robert Gundry, The Use of Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel, Leiden : 1967, p.146.
16. Gen.16.7-14; 22.11-16; Exod.3.2; Judg. 5.23; 6.11-24; 2 Sam. 24.16.
17. Exod. 19.18; Judg.5.4f; Psalms 104.32; Isa.29.6; Jer.10.10; cf. Psalms 68.7-8; 77.18.
18. ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν may be a Semitism, but similar occurrences in Matthew's usage sometimes easily fit into their contexts . For instance, it follows an imperative in 4.4 and a statement that demands an answer in 8.8.
19. As to the use of πορεύεσθαι W.C.Allen points out that it is a favourite term in this Gospel, where it occurs twenty eight times,

whereas in Mark only once at 9.30 (W.C.Allen, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew, New York : 1913, p.303).

20. Justin Martyr, Dial.C.Tryph., 108; Tertullian, De Spectac., XXX.
How the story is reported in the Gospel of Peter will be taken up in chapter II below.
21. See G.M.Lee, "The Guard at the Tomb", Theol., 72, 1969, pp.169-175.
cf. John E. Alsup, The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories of the Gospel-Tradition, London: 1975, pp.116f, where Alsup refers to B.A. Johnson, "The Empty Tomb in the Gospel of Peter Related to Matthew 28.1-7", an unpublished Harvard Dissertation (Harvard : 1966).
Johnson regards the story of the Guard at the Tomb as an independent pre-Matthean tomb-story which Matthew converts into an anti-grave-robbery-legend.
22. ἔχετε κούρωδιαν might mean 'You have guards'. Old Syriac versions translate the phrase to indicate this meaning,
ܐܢܗܘܢ ܡܚܬܝܩܝܢ
23. Lee, "The Guard at the Tomb", p.174.
24. cf. Norman Walker, "After Three Days", Nov.Test., IV, 1960, pp.261-262, where he counts the 'three days' from the day of rejection on Thursday to Sunday and says that Jesus was liberated from prison and death on the fourth day from his rejection.
25. See Goulder, Midrash, p.448.
26. Micklem, Matthew, p.278.
27. Ibid.
28. See McNeile, Matthew, p.429.
29. cf. Matt.14.19,28; 18.25.
30. cf. Matt.13.2; 18.20; 22.41; 26.57.
31. cf. Matt. 6.19,20; 19.18.
32. cf. Matt. 12.14; 22.15; 27.1,7.
33. cf. Matt.26.15; 27.3,5,6,9.
34. cf. Matt.10.18; 27.2,11,14,15,21,27.

35. C.H.Dodd, "The Appearances of the Risen Christ : An Essay in Form-Criticism of the Gospels", in Studies in the Gospels (edit., D.E. Nineham, Oxford : 1955), pp.9-13.
36. προσκυνέω is either to bow reverentially or to worship. 'Holding the feet' is in itself a reverential bowing and therefore, following it προσκυνέω need not repeat the same sense. In Matt.20.20 προσκυνέω is used in the sense of kneeling before Jesus. But in view of other instances such as 2.2,8,11; 8.2f; 9.18; 14.33; 15.25; 18.26 and 4.9f, the verb may be understood in the sense of "to worship". Matthew shows special liking for this term. He was familiar with the term γονυπετέω (17.14; 27.29). But when he edits Mark 1.40 he prefers προσκυνέω (Matt.8.2).
 γονυπετέω is to fall on one's knees before someone, which need not always include the sense of honouring somebody (cf.27.29). For Matthew, προσκυνέω always contains the sense of honouring the superior. The quotation from Deut. 6.13 on the lips of Jesus at Matt. 4.10 need not discredit the worship of Jesus in this Gospel. Rather, from the experience of the Matthean Church of worshipping the risen Lord, the same honour might have been read back into the earthly life of Jesus in the above instances. Perhaps Matthew assumes a worshipful atmosphere in each case. Further, the same term in the appearance story at 28.16-17 implies a legitimate Matthean concept, which he shares with his Church, that the presence of the risen Lord occasions worship.
37. F.Neiryneck, "Les Femmes au Tombeau : Etude de la Rédaction Matthéenne (Matt. XXVIII. 1-10)", NTS, 15, 1968-'69, p.179.
38. cf. Alsup, Appearance Stories, pp.108-114. Alsup weighs scholarly arguments about the story either as a shortened form of a traditional story or as a Matthean construct based on motifs borrowed from the tomb and other appearance stories. (See especially pp.109-110 notes 309 and 310). Alsup himself favours the latter.
39. Perrin, Resurrection, p.44.

40. Ernst Lohmeyer, "Mir ist gegeben alle Gewalt : Eine Exegese von Matt.28,16-20", In Memoriam Ernst Lohmeyer (edit., W.Schmauch), Stuttgart : 1951, p.24.
41. cf. Goulder, Midrash, p.381; Goulder examines three instances of 'mountain' in Matthew : the New Sinai, the mountain of the Torah (5.1); the mountain of marvellous healings and the feeding of the multitudes; the mountain of resurrection, where Jesus gives his last words to the Church (28.16). Goulder wishes to identify the mountain as Tabor, but this has no basis in Matthew.
42. Heinrich Greeven, "Προσκυνέω κτλ.", TDNT, VI, p.763.
43. Matt.2.2,8,11; 4.9,10; 8.2; 9.18; 14.33; 15.25; 18.26; 20.20; 28.9,17. Mark 5.6; 15.19. Luke 4.7,8.
44. Greeven, "Προσκυνέω κτλ.", p.763 : the leper in Matt.8.2/Mark 1.40; Jairus in Matt.9.18/Mark 5.22; Jesus' companions in the boat, Matt.14.33/Mark 6.51; the woman of Canaan, Matt.15.25/Mark 7.25; the mother of James and John, Matt.20.20/Mark 10.35.
45. Ibid.
46. Blass and Debrunner, Greek Grammar, p.131.
47. I.P.Ellis, "But Some Doubted", NTS, 14, 1967-'68, p.577.
48. Allen, Matthew, p.305; McNeile, Matthew, p.484; Goulder, Midrash, p.344. Goulder takes Matt.14.31ff in support and distinguishes between Peter 'the man of little faith' and the disciples who worshipped. Goulder misses the point at 14.32, where Peter and Jesus got into the boat, and at v.33 those in the boat include the doubting Peter.
49. Ellis, "But Some Doubted", p.576.
50. Ibid.
51. J.H.Moulton and G.Milligan, Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament, London : 1952, p.165 :-
 1. τὸ δισταζόμενον (doubtful case) - P par. 11.57, B.C.165.
 2. παραχρημα προσαναφέρειν ὑπὲρ τῶν δοκούντων τινὰ διδασκόν (to refer at once concerning any point which seemed to be open to doubt), B.C.165.

52. Ellis, "But Some Doubted", p.576.
53. See Alsup, Appearance Stories, pp.140-141.
54. Ellis, "But Some Doubted", p.576.
55. Ibid.
56. Augustine George, "Les récits d'apparitions aux Onze" in La Résurrection du Christ et l'Exégèse Moderne (Lectio Divina : 50), Paris : 1969, p.89.
57. Otto Michel, "Der Abschluss der Mattheusevangeliums", Ev.The., 10, 1950-51, pp.16-26, esp. pp.16-17; F.Hahn, Mission in the New Testament, London : 1965, pp.44-66; G.Barth in Tradition and Interpretation, p.131.
58. Lohmeyer, "Mir ist gegeben ...", pp.43-44; Trilling, Das Wahre Israel, pp.21-51.
59. Kingsbury, "Composition ...", p.575; cf. G.D.Kilpatrick, The Origins of the Gospel According to Saint Matthew, Oxford : 1946, pp.48-49.
60. See Neiryck, "Les Femmes au Tombeau ...", p.180; Hubbard, Matthean Redaction, pp.77-78.
61. This will be discussed in detail in later chapters.
62. Karl Barth, "An Exegetical Study of Matthew 28.16-20", in The Theology of the Christian Mission, (edit., G.H.Anderson), London : 1961, p.60.
63. Michel, "Der Abschluss ...", p.22; Trilling, Das Wahre Israel, pp.21-23; Hahn, Mission, p.55 etc.
64. Matt.7.29; 8.9; 9.6,8; 10.1; 21.23 (twice); 21.24,27 and 28.18.
65. J.M.Reese, "How Matthew Portrays the Communication of Christ's Authority", BTB, VII, 1977, pp.139-141.
66. Matt.5.18,34-35; 6.10,19-20; 11.25; 16.19; 18.18,19; 23.9; 24.35; 28.18.
67. H.B.Swete, "Matthew 28.16-20", Expositor, ser.6, vol.6, 1902, pp.257f.
68. Micklem, Matthew, p.287.
69. The One who holds authority is with the disciples always.
70. A.T.Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research, New York : 1919, pp.945-946., e.g., ἐχουτες in I Pet.2.12; ἀποτασσόμενοι in I Pet.2.18; 3.1;

ἀνεχομένοι and υπουδύζοντες in Eph.4.2f etc. In Paul the most outstanding example is Rom. 12.9f,16f.

71. David Daube, "Participle and Imperative in I Peter", in E.G.Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter, London : 1946, pp.467-488. In his careful study of imperative use of participles in I Peter and other epistles, Daube suggests, with many references to non-biblical Hebrew literature (Mishna, Tosefta and Baraita), that such usages are the result of Hebrew influence and are not part of Classical Greek style.
72. "According to Jewish conceptions, the disciples of a great Rabbi were pupils attached to his person, and learning from his lips", (H.B. Swete, "Matthew 28.16-20", p.250). More than such a personal attachment, there is a personal union with Jesus in Christian discipleship : the disciple belongs to the master.
73. See Karl Ludwig Schmidt, " ἑθνος " in the NT", TDNT, II, p.369; Trilling, Das Wahre Israel, pp. 26-28.
74. K.Barth, "An Exegetical Study ..", p.65.
75. Kingsbury, "Composition ...", p.576.
76. F.C.Conybeare, "Three Early Doctrinal Modifications of the Texts of the Gospels", The Hibbert Journal, I, 1902-1903, pp.102-108.
77. For a detailed treatment of Eusebian quotations, see Hubbard, The Matthean Redaction, pp.152-162, where he draws attention to Eusebius' inexact manner of quoting the NT and to the probable authenticity of the baptismal command.
78. J.P.Migne, edit., Patrologia Graeco-Latina, vol.22, 1857, p.40.
79. Ibid., pp.44, 68.
80. Ibid., p.234.
81. Ibid., p.240.
82. Migne, Patrologia Graeco-Latina, vol.20, 1857, p.221.
83. F.H.Chase, "The Lord's Command to Baptize", JTS, 6, 1905, p.487.
84. Ibid., p.485.
85. Migne, Patrologia Graeco-Latina, 67, p.72. Athanasius in his De

- Decretis Nicaenae Synodi, para. 3 (Migne, Patrologia Graeco-Latina, 25, p.428) mentions such a letter of Eusebius to his Church.
86. Migne, Patrologia Graeco-Latina, 24, pp.716, 1013, 629.
 87. See Chase, "The Lord's Command ...", p.484.
 88. Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, vol.I, London : 1951, p.134; Hans Kosmala, "The Conclusion of Matthew", Annual of Swedish Theological Institute, 4, 1965, pp.132-148.
 89. David Flusser, "The Conclusion of Matthew in a New Jewish Christian Source", Annual of Swedish Theological Institute, 5, 1967, pp.110-120.
 90. Lohmeyer, "Mir ist gegeben ...", pp.28-32.
 91. Justin Martyr, Apology, I.61; Migne, Patrologia Graeco-Latina, 6, p.420.
 92. J.Hastings, edit., Dictionary of the Apostolic Church, vol.I, New York : 1919, p.299; Philip Schaff, The Oldest Church Manual called the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, New York : 1885, pp. 119-123.
 There are scholars who ascribe the Didache to the first half of the second century. e.g., J.Quasten, Patrology, Westminster : 1962, p. 37. Among those who assign it to a much earlier date is J.-P.Audet, La Didaché, Instructions des Apôtres, Paris : 1958, pp.187-210. Audet assigns the Didache to Antioch between 40 and 70. A missionary of the Church wrote it and after some time revised it with further additions with reference to a written Gospel similar to Matthew. However, his arguments for an early date are inconclusive. He overemphasizes the differences in some texts from parallel passages in Matthew. If we assign those references to the freedom of the author of the Didache, we may assume that the author used the Gospel, according to Matthew.
 93. Schaff, The Oldest Church Manual., pp.184f. προειπόντες refers to the content of the previous chapters. cf. According to the sequence in Did. 7.1 the teaching may be pre-baptismal as προειπόντες precedes βαπτίσατε in contrast to Matthew.

94. Didache's use of the Gospel may be deduced from the parallels and verbal similarities in the following verses :-

<u>Did.</u> - <u>Matt.</u>	<u>Did.</u> - <u>Matt.</u>	<u>Did.</u> - <u>Matt.</u>
1.1 - 7.13-14	7.1 - 28.19	11.5 - 7.15
1.2 - 22.37, 39; 7.12	8.1 - 6.16	13.2 - 10.10
1.3 - 5.46, 48	8.2 - 6.5, 9-13	14.2 - 5.23, 24
1.4 - 5.39-42, 48; 19.21	9.5 - 7.6	16.1 - 25.13
1.5 - 5.26	10.5 - 24.31	16.4 - 24.24
2.3 - 5.33	11.4 - 10.40	16.8 - 24.30.
3.7 - 5.5		

95. See Chase, "The Lord's Command to Baptize", JTS, 8, 1907, p.168. The following chart is based on Chase's but is more complete.

Matt. 7.22 τῷ ὀνόματι ἐπροφητεύσαμεν

(Jer. 14.14 LXX)

10.22; 24.9 διὰ τὸ ὄνομα μου

(Mark 13.13; Luke 21.17)

12.21 τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἐθνή ἐλπιοῦσιν

(Isa.42.4 LXX, ἐπὶ τὸ ὄνοματι)

18.5 ὅς ἐάν δέξηται ἐν παιδίῳ τοιοῦτο ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου

(Mark 9.37)

19.29 ἐνεκεν τοῦ ἔροῦ ὀνόματος

(Mark 10.29 ἐνεκεν ἔροῦ)

21.9; 23.39 Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι

Κυρίου

(Mark 11.9 from Psalm 118.26)

24.5 πολλοὶ ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου

(Mark 13.6).

96. Hans Bietenhard, "Ὄνομα", TDNT, V, p.244.

97. Ibid., p.274.

98. Ibid., pp.274f cf. RSV's 'for his sake' in Heb.6.10.

99. Ibid., p.275.

100. Reginald H. Fuller, The Formation of the Resurrection Narratives, New York : 1971, p.88.

101. Kingsbury, "Composition ...", p.578.

102. Fuller, Formation, p.89.

103. Kingsbury, "Composition ...", p.578.

104. The Matthean verb μαθητεῦν occurs twice and the noun
μαθηταί five times in such a short section as 27.57-28.20.

Chapter II

A COMPARISON OF THE RESURRECTION NARRATIVE OF MATTHEW WITH THOSE OF OTHERS

A primary step in making an estimate of the Matthean redaction of the resurrection narrative is to compare it with the other resurrection narratives in order to determine the extent of tradition and redaction and the elements that can be attributed to the Evangelist in the narrative and to find concerns which are uniquely his.

Mark 15.42-16.8 : How Matthew edits it.

Matthew's redaction of the Marcan source is governed by abbreviation, alteration and addition.

Abbreviations.

Matthew's abbreviation affects details of the story of the women at the tomb and the time descriptions; and results in the deletion of Pilate's verification whether Jesus was dead before being handed over to Joseph and the specific mention of Peter.

In Mark the crucifixion was observed from afar by Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James and Joses, Salome and many other women who came up with Jesus (Mark 15.40-41). Only Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of

Joses saw where Jesus was buried (Mark 15.47), and Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James along with Salome bought spices and came to the tomb (Mark 16.1). Matthew "reduces the number of women at the grave to two only, omitting Salome so as to remove the Marcan discrepancy between the names of the women at the burial and those of the women at the tomb".¹ Matthew is usually brief in his references to women.² Another concern of Matthew is to be consistent in his mention of the women in the narrative. Based on Mark 15.47, 'the other Mary' in Matt. 27.61 is the mother of Joses, whom he has mentioned earlier in 27.56 (cf. Mark 15.40-41) as the mother of James and Joseph. He repeats his own usage 'the other Mary' again in 28.1, thereby avoiding a repetition of the detail 'the mother of James and Joseph'.³

Matthew omits ἐπεὶ ἦν Παρασκευή, ὃ ἐστὶν προσάββατον of Mark 15.42, a usage intended to explain the familiar Jewish expression, Παρασκευὴ to non-Jewish readers. This usage conflicts with καὶ ἥδη ὀψίας γενομένης . If the day was taken from sunset to sunset,⁴ the burial had to be over before the beginning of Sabbath because of Sabbath restrictions. After Joseph of Arimathea had gone to Pilate to ask for the body of Jesus when it was already (ἥδη) evening,⁵ the burial that followed it must have taken place at night.⁶ Or, at least Matthew thought that Mark meant it to be night when Sabbath began. Avoiding this confusion, Matthew remains safe with the simple statement, ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης (27.57) without repeating the Marcan ἥδη . In the context of his narrative of Jesus' execution and death, Matthew wants to avoid mentioning

the day of the burial except for the time. Matthew introduces the next story (27.62ff) with *τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον, ἥτις ἐστὶν μετὰ τὴν Παρασκευὴν* further implying that the day of the burial was *Παρασκευῇ*.

The two time references in Mark 16.1-2 are reduced to one in Matt.28.1. Mark relates two events in 16.1 and 2 : 1) when the Sabbath passed, the women bought spices and 2) very early in the first day of the week, they came to the tomb to embalm the body. Matthew deletes the purchase of spices.⁷ Therefore, he needs to refer only to the time of the women's visit to see the tomb.

G.R.Driver suggests that the Evangelists, under the influence of the Galilean disciples, followed the solar reckoning of the day from sunrise to sunrise like the Qumran community. Then Matthew's *ὀψὲ σαββάτων* cannot mean 'the Sabbath had passed', but 'at dawn, before the end of the Sabbath' because the end of the Sabbath and the beginning of Sunday coincide.⁸ This suggestion is based on the assumption that Matthew was combining the two time references of Mark 16.1-2. In fact Matthew, who deletes the purchase of spices, would not have wrongly taken over the time reference to it. His abbreviation really affects only Mark 16.2. He abbreviates Mark's *λίαν πρὶ τῇ μὲν σαββάτῳ ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου*,⁹ into *τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτῳ*. Matthew may not be dependent on Mark for *ὀψὲ δὲ σαββάτων*. It means 'late on Sabbath' but can also be understood as 'after the Sabbath'.¹⁰

ὀψέ as 'after' has support of later writers,¹¹ a sense which G. Abbott-Smith thinks is required in Matt. 28.1.¹² By prefixing this phrase Matthew simply states that after the Sabbath, at the dawn of light¹³ into the first day of the week, the women went to see the tomb.

Pilate's verification of Jesus' death is omitted probably as an unnecessary detail. Matthew is interested rather in the gesture shown to the Master by Joseph as a disciple.

Matthew reduces the angel's charge by excluding the specific mention of Peter. In view of the interest in Peter shown in the Gospel (cf. 16.17ff) this is indeed strange. Perhaps Matthew intends the charge to lead on to a single appearance to all the disciples, and so he does not single out Peter for special mention.

Alterations.

In his description of Joseph of Arimathea, Matthew substitutes 'a rich man' for Mark's 'a prominent member of the council', and 'who also was made a disciple to Jesus' for 'who was also looking for the Kingdom of God' (Matt. 27.57; Mark 15.43). An obvious reason for Matthew's dislike for a 'member of the council' is that such a member should be among those who took counsel against Jesus (Matt. 26.3-4; 27.1 cf. Mark 14.1; 15.1). 'Looking for the Kingdom of God' need not suggest any more than 'being a pious Jew'.¹⁴ However, Mark here seems to suggest that more than being a

pious Jew, Joseph, as one who was looking for the Kingdom of God, demonstrates in his deed a recognition of Jesus for his message of the Kingdom. In eliminating the possibility of such a step being taken by a member of the council, Matthew gives an absolutely different picture of Joseph.

Since Matthew in his story of the rich young man states that it will be hard for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of Heaven in a more affirmative language than Mark does (Matt. 19.23 cf. Mark 10.23), his usage *πλούσιος* at 27.57 may not simply refer to material riches. *πλούσιος* is also an 'expression of good standing or social status as defined in the popular mind'.¹⁵ The Evangelist probably refers to Joseph as a man of good standing.

For Matthew, the rich man from Arimathea was already a follower of Jesus. It explains why Matthew presents Joseph as a person interested in a proper burial for Jesus. Though he had no legal claim for Jesus' body, he shows a disciple's honour for the Master. Further, in view of Matthew's interest in the theology of discipleship, *ὃς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐμαθητεύθη τῷ Ἰησοῦ* is a significant alteration.¹⁶ *ἐμαθητεύθη* is to be interpreted in the light of the risen Lord's command, *μαθητεύσατε*. Reflecting the situation of the missionary Church, Matthew redacts the Marcan description of Joseph with the theological presupposition of the mission of disciple-making and the absolute distinction between those who

are for Jesus and those who are against.

Mark is not clear about the ownership of the tomb. Matthew identifies it as belonging to Joseph, a disciple : 'his own new tomb'. $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \nu\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ signifies that it was unused. Matthew omits the purchase of linen and adds $\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}$. His concern to eliminate the shame of a criminal's burial and to describe a solemn dignified burial is evident in the ascription of the adjectives : new and clean.

The aim and manner of the women's visit to the tomb are altered by Matthew. In Mark, the women visit to anoint the body, whereas Matthew has them come to see the tomb. Attempting to explain this difference some scholars have referred to certain external factors. We look at a few of them. D.S. Margoliouth disqualifies the Marcan text regarding the women's project as "illegal, improper and impracticable".¹⁷ He states two reasons for it : There can be no doubt that what they contemplated doing, namely, opening the tomb was illegal; for the tomb was the property of Joseph, whose permission they had not obtained, and the sentiment which abhors disturbing the repose of the dead was widespread.¹⁸ Kennard refers to a relevant legal document that stipulates legal restriction against disturbing the graves of the dead.¹⁹ Marxsen calls attention to a practical problem that in Palestine one would not undertake the anointing of the body on the third day, for, the process of mortification would have already begun.²⁰ A conclusion based on these that Matthew is cautious of such factors while

Mark is not would be rather hypothetical. Neither of the Evangelists shows any identification of any such concern. Instead we must look at the texts from within the narratives to find out the specific concerns of the Evangelists.

Mark interprets the resurrection to his readers by means of the empty tomb story. This is evident in the young man's words in Mark 16.6. The details of the story illustrate his interpretation. Thus, the aim and manner of the women's visit to the tomb and their discussion en route are dramatic details which he provides as a setting for the empty tomb story. The purchase of spices on the Sabbath was permitted. Driver points out that according to SHABBATH 23.5 in the MISHNAH, burial preparations were exempted from Sabbath restrictions.²¹ Nevertheless, having narrated the setting of guards and the sealing of the tomb, Matthew had to ignore the women's intention to embalm the body, and therefore, to delete their conversation en route. By doing so, he also avoids suggesting an inadequate burial by Joseph. Rather, he has the women go to the tomb out of devotion.

Matthew alters the Marcan 'young man' to an angel of the Lord. In Perrin's view, Matthew and the tradition he represents had a whole generation since Mark to meditate on the resurrection event, and naturally the stories had begun to take on details more suitable to a hierophany than the naturalistic young man and the simple discovery of the stone

having been rolled away in Mark.²² Perrin's conclusion here is misleading since in effect he ascribes the alteration to a supposed tradition. We have stated earlier that as the personal representation of Yahweh and as a symbolic figure that stands for God, the angel of the Lord is being used by Matthew to indicate that God himself is active at the resurrection of Jesus. In his description of the angel, Matthew shows literal dependence on Dan. 7.9 and 10.6 and shares with it a general stock of apocalyptic language.²³ The alteration itself is based on the addition of Matthew's own material, 28.2-3. Combining it with the Marcan original, he identifies the young man as the angel that opened the tomb, thereby making the tomb story a single whole.

Matthew's version of what was said at the tomb is substantially the same as Mark's. His minor alterations are nevertheless significant : The young man's message in Mark 16.7 is not about the resurrection. Matthew so changes it as to include the resurrection message (Matt. 28.7).²⁴ The addition 'as he said' (28.6) is a clear reference to Jesus' predictions about the resurrection (16.21; 17.23; 20.19). In Mark, the women are charged with a reminder of Jesus' words about going to Galilee. Matthew changes it into the angel's own words, 'Lo, I have told you' (28.7). Bode finds it analogous to OT practice. "Often in the Old Testament the angel of Yahweh speaks in the first person while giving the words of Yahweh."²⁵

Altering Mark 16.8 to "So they departed quickly from the tomb with fear and great joy, and ran to tell his disciples." (Matt.28.8), Matthew continued his narrative with additional stories. He seems to agree with Mark that the women's initial reaction to the Easter-morning events and message was fear. In Mark, fear causes silence. But in Matthew the 'great joy' and the twice repeated 'quickly' (28.7,8) are deliberate alterations to break the women's silence. He adds "and ran to tell his disciples" in direct response to Mark 16.7.

Additions.

Matthew's major additions are the earthquake, the angelic descent and the opening of the grave, the Jewish scandal story, the appearances and the apostolic commission.

We indicated earlier that 'earthquake' is a biblical concept that Matthew follows.²⁶ Usually it has apocalyptic associations in the OT.²⁷ For Matthew, earthquake is a necessary apocalyptic accompaniment preceding the resurrection. It is evident in the parallels between the raising of the saints and the resurrection of Jesus :

27.51b-52

earthquake

tombs opened

saints raised

28.2,6

earthquake

Jesus' tomb opened

Jesus has risen

In his attempt to explain the manner of the resurrection, the earthquake

is the setting for Matthew's additions of the angelic descent and the opening of the grave. Although the women's discussion as to 'who will roll away the stone for us' is not a required element in Matthew, he answers it. In Mark the women found the stone rolled away, the angel in Matthew rolls it away and is seated outside the tomb; thus answering the Marcan question : **τίς ἀποκυλίσει ἡμῖν τὸν λίθον ;** directly with **ἀγγελος κυρίου ἀπεκύλισεν τὸν λίθον** .²⁸ The angel opens it to let the women see that Jesus was already raised and was not there.

It is from the empty tomb that the Jewish scandal story takes its origin. Goulder says, "Mark leaves the Church open to the now current Jewish slander (28.15b) that the disciples stole the Lord's body".²⁹ Matthew fills this gap with the story of the guard at the tomb. Its apologetic connotation suggests that it has its origin in an apparent dialogue with Jews. In his dialogue with Jewish opponents Matthew aims at telling them that the stealing of the body is an invalid allegation. The details of the story meet this aim.³⁰

Matthew proceeds from the Marcan ending and adds the two appearances (vv.9-10, 16-20). As a sequel to the Marcan story and particularly to fulfil Mark 16.7 (= 14.28) the Galilean appearance would have been enough. With the three common elements of appearance, recognition and worship (which Matthew uses in his story of the appearance to the Eleven), the story merely repeats the angelic commission to the women regarding the

Galilean appearance. Since the Christophany is secondary to the commission, why the Evangelist includes a Christophany to the women is not quite clear.

- 9 We have suggested that the Evangelist apparently wants to give the women a privilege of being witnesses to a Christophany as well and uses this as an occasion to introduce the designation "brethren" for the disciples.³¹

Matthew rounds off his Marcan source with the Galilean appearance to the disciples, which makes a direct sequel to 28.5-8. Added to the appearance story, the apostolic commission (vv.18-20) goes far beyond mere redaction of the Marcan source. The text has been considered on its own merit as the proper conclusion and climax of the Gospel.³² Matthew makes the Galilean meeting anticipated in the Marcan source the immediate setting for this climax.

Luke 23.50-24.53.

The resurrection narrative in Luke consists of the tradition of the tomb, the appearance stories and the ascension.

Luke shows comparatively less concern for the time reference in the burial story. He narrates the story first (23.50-53) and then the time (v.54). Verse 54 goes better with the story of the women. Luke probably intended it to refer to both the burial and the activities of the women. The day of the burial is Πάσχα as in Mark. Unlike Matthew, Luke retains the preparation of spices. The Lucan addition, καὶ

σάββατων ἐπέφωσεν (v.54), in the light of his further additional editorial phrase, "on the Sabbath they rested according to the commandment" (v.56b), clearly means 'and the Sabbath was beginning'. Before the Sabbath officially began the preparation of spices was over. He dissociates this time from the time of the women's visit. Luke corrects an obvious mistake in Mark 16.1, while Matthew deliberately omits it. Since in Matthew the tomb is sealed and guarded, embalming is impossible and the preparation of spices is not required. Hence the omission of the time reference to it.

Luke abbreviates the Marcan time reference to the women's visit as does Matthew. His special terminology is ὁρθρου βαθέως . Both Matthew and Luke sensed some inconsistency between the Marcan λίαν πρωτ and ἀνστειλάντος τοῦ ἡλίου.

In describing Joseph of Arimathea, Luke follows Mark in stating that he was a member of the council (Luke specifies the council as Sanhedrin) and he lived in the hope of seeing the Kingdom of God (23.50-51). But this was not enough to explain Joseph's interest in giving a proper burial to Jesus. So Luke adds that Joseph was a good and righteous man, who did not consent to the condemnation of Jesus (vv.50-51). Luke emphasizes his moral virtues.³³ Joseph's relation to Jesus in Matthew is closer and more adequate to explain why he took an interest in Jesus' burial.

Luke repeats Pilate's verification of Jesus' death (Mark 15.44f).

He follows Mark very closely in narrating the manner of burial, but like Matthew he presents the tomb as unused (v.53).

Luke appends the list of women at the end of the empty tomb pericope (24.10). Instead of Mark's Salome, Luke introduces Joanna, who was already a companion of Jesus (8.3). He also introduces some other women, who would be those who had come with Jesus from Galilee (see 23.55). Marxsen rightly says that he links the Easter stories with Jesus' ministry in Galilee by making the Galilee group witnesses of the events in Jerusalem.³⁴

As in Mark, the women came to anoint the body and to complete the burial by Joseph (24.1). Their intention to return to the tomb for this purpose is indirectly suggested by their taking note of the tomb and of how the body was laid (23.55 cf. v.56). Such details are lacking in Matthew as the women at that point do not intend to perform anything at the tomb. Luke agrees with Matthew in omitting the women's discussion about removing the stone. While such a discussion would not be out of place in Luke, an obvious reason for the omission is that in Luke the resurrection is 'physical' and Jesus has flesh and bones and therefore the stone should have already been removed to let him out.

As in Mark, the women find the stone rolled away and they go inside the tomb (Luke 24.2-3 cf. Mark 16.4-5). Unlike the others Luke says that the women were perplexed at the discovery of the empty tomb (24.4).

The two men³⁵ in dazzling apparel suddenly appear, and their appearance makes the women frightened (24.4-5). Fuller rightly suggests that with such variations, Luke prefers an alternative version to Mark.³⁶

Luke is as vague as Mark about the identity of the messengers. However, ἀστραπτοῦσα (24.4) recalls the lightning-like appearance; cf. ἀστραπή of the angel of the Lord in Matthew.³⁷ In fact, the Emmaus story notes that the women referred to what they experienced as a vision of angels (v.23).³⁸

Luke completely changes his Marcan source about what was said at the tomb. The angels' message is reduced to the announcement of the resurrection without any reference to a future appearance. With his narrative of the appearances in and around Jerusalem, he does not point forward to Galilee. Hence he omits Mark 16.7. Luke's plan to set the appearances in and around Jerusalem and not in Galilee has been recognized as part of his geographical theology.³⁹ Instead of the message in Mark 16.7 Luke places a theological statement on the lips of the two men, "Why do you seek the living among the dead?", as a reproach. They remind the women of what Jesus had proclaimed earlier in Galilee (Luke 24.6) about the events of the redemption that were to happen: arrest, crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus (24.7). With Luke's emphatic δὲ the proclamation points back to 9.12; 13.33; 17.25; 22.37; cf. 24.26. Galilee's importance for Luke is a thing of the past to be remembered. There is no such conflict between the Jerusalem and Galilean

motifs in Matthew. The Easter events embrace both Jerusalem and Galilee. In fact, he builds his Galilean story on Mark 16.7.

In Luke the women are not asked to communicate a message. They go on their own to the Eleven and tell them about their experience. But the Apostles⁴⁰ considered their report an idle tale and did not believe them (24.11). "One can see in the reaction of the apostles to the women's report something of an apologetic intent. For in rejecting the statement of the women Luke keeps the official witnesses of the resurrection independent of the women's story".⁴¹ Luke 24.12 supplies an official witness of the resurrection. However, the authenticity of v.12 is disputed due to its absence in codex Bezae (D) and a few other MSS.⁴² But its place is affirmed by many other important MSS.⁴³ 'Some of those with us' (24.24) may be a reference that includes Peter's visit to the tomb. The story of the tomb is, thus, concluded with the official witness of Peter (24.12). In Matthew, on the other hand, the story of the tomb leads on to the appearance story, and both together to the missionary commission.

Luke narrates the appearance in great detail. A traditional catechesis recalling the primitive Christian kerygma (Jesus lived, died and rose again in accordance with the Scriptures) seems to form the basis of the conversation in the Emmaus story. The encounter between the Emmaus disciples and Jesus ends with the breaking of bread. The formula 'He took the bread and blessed and broke it, and gave it to them' (24.30) bears a Eucharistic connotation.

Precisely the same are the actions at the Last Supper (see Matt. 26.26; Luke 22.19). The 'breaking of bread' is a name for the Eucharistic meal (Acts 2.42,46; 20.7,11; 27.35). Luke is here concerned with the Church's doctrine of the crucified and risen Messiah, the place accorded to him in the Scriptures and the knowledge of his presence through the Word and Sacrament. With the Eucharistic breaking of bread in association with the interpretation of the Scriptures and the experience of the presence of the risen Lord, the whole story resembles a dramatization of early⁴⁴ Christian worship. This is a good example of how Luke, like Matthew, pursues his own goal in explaining the resurrection and its significance to his readers.

Among the Gospels, Luke alone refers to an appearance to Peter (24.34) sharing the Kerygmatic tradition in 1 Cor. 15.5. The empty tomb story was officially confirmed by Peter's visit (v.12). Now the appearance story is sealed by the report of an appearance to Peter in the form of an affirmation of faith : "The Lord has risen indeed and has appeared to Simon". It can be suggested that Matt. 16.17-19 is reminiscent of this tradition, or that at least his knowledge of the tradition is reflected in these verses. In fact, no story of a protophany to Peter is extant in the canonical NT texts, except mere references to it in the kerygmatic tradition. Although Matthew apparently knows of such a tradition (cf. Mark 16.7) he does not include it in his resurrection story, for it does not contribute to his more pressing goals.

Luke connects the Emmaus story with a subsequent appearance to the disciples and others (24.36-49). The link is provided by v.36 : "As they were saying this, Jesus himself stood among them". An apologetic defence of the objectivity of the risen body is obvious in the story with such expressions as , touch, eating food, not a spirit etc. (vv. 31, 39, 41). Perrin suggests that Luke 24.36-43 is an apologetic legend against the Hellenistic Greek world which assumed that religious heroes overcame death by being transformed into spiritual beings, and that the Evangelist resists the tendency to assimilate Jesus into a pantheon of Hellenistic Greek religious heroes.⁴⁵ While such a Hellenistic background is perhaps possible, Luke may not merely be perceiving a possibility, but may actually be facing a real situation in the Church. Luke has Jesus prove that he is not a spirit by demonstrating his humanity. This is probably done to meet some heresy like Docetism. In Matthew too the risen Jesus is being touched (28.9-10), but not to prove the objectivity of Jesus' body.

In presenting the resurrection narratives, Matthew and Luke seem to be representing two situations. Matthew's apology is limited to the empty tomb and is directed against those who object to the reality of resurrection. In Luke the interest in raising doubts about the nature of the risen body demonstrates a theological dispute among those who are interested in the reality of the resurrection and its scriptural basis.

There are a few elements common to the narratives of appearance to the

Eleven in Matthew and Luke :

Matt.28.16-20

- The Eleven assembled
- They saw him
- They worshipped him but some doubted
- Jesus said to them
- Make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit and teaching them
- Behold, I am with you

Luke 24. 33-49

The Eleven assembled with the Emmaus disciples and others (v.33).
 He stood among them and showed himself (vv. 36, 39)
 They supposed that they saw a spirit (v.37) and they still disbelieved (v.41)
 Jesus said to them (v.44)
 Repentance and forgiveness of sins (cf. Johannine baptism) should be preached in his name to all nations (v.47)
 Behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you ... Power from on high (v.49).

The common elements are : 'Jesus appeared to the Eleven, whose response included doubt or uncertainty. Jesus spoke to them of a mission to all nations in his name and assured them of divine strength in their mission'. The details of the story in each Gospel are, however, too varied to claim a common tradition consisting of these common elements.

We noted above in chapter I that Matt. 28.16-20 is a Matthean construct. Matthew is concerned with the ongoing mission for the formation

of a universal community of disciples. In Luke the universal mission of preaching to all nations is to be done beginning from Jerusalem. This is a vital link to the Lucan plan in Acts, where indeed the mission to all nations goes forth from Jerusalem. The preaching of repentance and forgiveness of sins recalls the Johannine baptism (Luke 3.3). 'In Jesus' name' resembles the earliest baptismal formula. Preaching in Jesus' name in 24.47 might also be dependent on Mark 13.10, which Luke has transferred from its apocalyptic to a resurrection setting. Although 'trinitarian' elements may be traced in Luke 24.47-49 ('Jesus', 'my Father' and 'the Power from on high'), the mention of 'my Father' and 'the Power from on high' has no baptismal connotation in Luke. In contrast to Matt.28.18-20 the missionary text in Luke 24 is not part of a command of the risen Lord. Luke brings in a new concept that the mission is based on the Scriptures. We conclude that in developing the story in 24.36-49, Luke obviously is not sharing a common tradition with Matthew.

Luke distinguishes a separate Ascension, marking the end of Jesus' association with his disciples and others (Luke 24.50-53).⁴⁶ Acts 1.1-11 carries this theme over and links it with the forthcoming reception of the Holy Spirit and the subsequent universal mission of bearing witness to Jesus on the basis of Jesus' own words (Acts 1:5,8). Luke 24.50-53 signifies the exaltation of Christ and Acts 1.1-11 marks the beginning of the Church.⁴⁷ Matthew mentions no separate Ascension. Rather it is the exalted Lord (see 28.18) who appears and commands the universal mission.

Matthew accentuates the continuing presence of Jesus with the disciples to the end of the ages.

John 19.31-20.31 (and 5.25-29).

We accept the majority position that the Fourth Gospel is independent of the Synoptics, although there are overlappings of material between them.

The nearest parallel to Matt.27.52f in the NT is John 5.25-29.⁴⁸ There the Son of God is given the authority of judgement, and the dead ones in the tombs who hear his voice will come forth either to the resurrection of life or to the resurrection of judgement in accordance with their deeds. W.G.Essame comments : "The LXX of Is. 26.19 may have influenced the language of John 5.28 (ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις) while Dan. 12.2 may have suggested the thought of judgement".⁴⁹ The OT background and the eschatological sense behind the text are obvious. The basic agreement between John and Matthew here are the OT background and the association of the resurrection of the dead with the person of the Son of God. In contrast to Matthew, John does not specify a time when the dead will hear the voice of the Son of God and come to life. The tradition that Jesus preached to the dead comes up in I Peter 3.18f and 4.6. Outside of the NT, in Ignatius' writings, the prophets were disciples of Jesus (Magn. 8.2; 9.2) and Jesus raised them from the dead (Magn. 9.2). Matthew does not associate the raising of the dead with an act of voice of Jesus.

Rather, Matthew constructs his story by relating the resurrection of the saints as a consequence of Jesus' death.⁵⁰ He is concerned with the soteriological significance of Jesus' death.

In the burial part of the tradition of the tomb, John says that the bodies should not remain on the cross on the Sabbath and that the burial took place on 'the day of preparation' (19.31,42). The Jews ask Pilate that the bodies be taken away before Sabbath (19.31). But it is Joseph of Arimathea who asks for Jesus' body and on Pilate's permission undertakes the burial (vv.38ff). Joseph is assisted by Nicodemus, whose name has already been introduced at John 3.1f. Joseph is *ὁ μαθητὴς τοῦ Ἰησοῦ*, but secretly. Matthew and John therefore agree in ascribing discipleship to Joseph. K. Peter G. Curtis notes that whereas John frequently uses the noun (78 times) nowhere else does he make a comparable ascription of discipleship to an individual outside the Twelve. Curtis believes that John was familiar with a written version of Matthew on the burial story in which Joseph was described as a disciple.⁵¹ But Matthew does not simply use the noun form. He deliberately uses the transitive verb to emphasize the 'act of disciple-making'.⁵² His emphasis is theological, reflecting the mission of Jesus and the Church, and thus distinct from the Johannine ascription of discipleship to Joseph. Joseph's identity is less specific in John. As in Matthew, the grave is new and as in Luke, it is unused. The garden and the tomb are not reported as belonging to Joseph (v.41). Verse 41 implies that he did not know to whom it belonged. The women did

not witness the burial. Jesus' body was anointed before burial. The spices were bought by Nicodemus (v.39). These major differences stand in the way of any direct dependence of John on the Synoptics.

In the Easter day story of the tomb also there are overlappings between John and the Synoptics. Mary Magdalene visits the tomb early on the first day of the week, finds the stone removed, meets the two angels in white, converses with them and is finally met by Jesus. These basic agreements with one or more of the Synoptics are overshadowed by the differences.

In 20.1-18 John has two stories : Mary Magdalene at the tomb (vv.1-2, 11-18) and Peter and the Beloved Disciple at the tomb (vv.3-10). Many assume that "the Evangelist inserted the story of the disciples' race into a story about Mary Magdalene's visit to the tomb. And in fact 20.11 can be read as a direct sequel to 20.1",⁵³ regarding v.2 as editorial.

Like Luke, John mentions the removal of the stone without prior mention of it at the burial. The open grave, for Mary Magdalene⁵⁴, means only the disappearance of the body (v.2 cf. v.13), which she reports to Peter and the other disciple, without being charged by the angels to do so. The disciples believe in the disappearance of Jesus' body on the evidence of the empty tomb and the presence and position of the grave clothes (vv. 5-7). We notice that it is in the disciples' story which is peculiar to

John that the empty tomb assumes this importance evidently to provide apostolic affirmation and authority to it.

As to the identity of the individuals at the tomb, John agrees with Matthew in naming them as angels. In the Synoptics the angels' words include a reference to Jesus' resurrection in one form or another. In John, on the other hand, the angels' role is comparatively insignificant; they just ask the woman why she is crying. This must be redactional because with the witness of the two disciples to the empty tomb, an angelic intervention for the same purpose would be rather redundant. John could have even removed the angels without hindering his scheme. Compared with the other Gospels, it is all the more clear now that the place and role accorded to the angel in Matthew are distinctively significant, for : 1) Matthew alone uses the designation 'the angel of the Lord', signifying the personal presence of Yahweh; 2) The angel of the Lord announces the resurrection by demonstrating a proof : the opening of the tomb; and 3) In Matthew alone the angel's words to the women include a resurrection-message for the disciples, besides the message about the Galilean appearance.

The appearance stories in Matthew and John include a Christophany to the women (Matt. 28.9-10; John 20.14-18). In John the Christophany to Mary is narrated as a full-fledged appearance story with dramatic details. The appearance of Jesus does not make Mary recognize him, but his voice

addressing her 'Mary' results in her immediate recognition with the response, 'Rabbouni'. In Matthew there is no such suspense. The appearance itself leads to immediate recognition resulting in holding his feet and worshipping him. In John, Mary is forbidden to cling to Jesus, since he has not yet ascended to the Father.

The imperative, *μὴ μου ἄπτοῦ* has been variously interpreted. J.H. Bernard argues for an original *μὴ πτόου*, 'do not fear', to make it agree with the other Gospels.⁵⁵ This, however, has no MS support. According to Fuller the present imperative, *μὴ μου ἄπτοῦ* means 'stop clinging to me' in the sense of 'do not continue what you are already doing'. If the pre-Johannine tradition had contained the point found in the Matthean version that the women 'took hold of his feet', then 'stop clinging to me' makes good sense.⁵⁶ Since Matt. 28.9-10 is Matthew's own construct and is independent of any supposed pre-Johannine tradition, what exactly was contained in such a tradition cannot be determined by the Matthean story. Dodd on the other hand suggests that since *μὴ* with the present imperative of *ἄπτεσθαι*⁵⁷ may simply negate the specific meaning of the tense, Jesus' warning *μὴ μου ἄπτοῦ* might mean 'do not cling to me' without any necessary implication that Mary was doing so.⁵⁸ This suggestion is more appealing when the story in John is taken by itself since it avoids a possible supposition that Mary did touch Jesus. Jesus' forbidding of Mary from clinging to him must be due to two factors :

- 1) the urgency of the mission entrusted to her to tell his 'brethren' that

he is ascending to the Father; and 2) Mary wants to keep Jesus close to her, which John sees to be untenable since Jesus is ascending to the Father.

Jesus charges the women in both stories although the message to be conveyed is different. The charge in both contains the words, 'Go to my brethren and say to them' (Matt. 28.10; John 20.17). Matthew's Galilean motif and aim "to achieve the redactional seam between tomb and appearance traditions"⁵⁹ are absent in John. Instead the message is about the Ascension. John believes that it is the ascended Lord whom the disciples met (whereas Mary meets the risen Jesus) just as in Matthew it is the exalted One (cf. all authority is given me) that appears to the disciples. Matthew of course does not distinguish between resurrection and exaltation. The title 'brethren'⁶⁰ in John 20.17 may suggest some indirect connection with Matt. 28.10, a connection that cannot otherwise be established. Mary's words, 'I have seen the Lord' (John 20.18), give added stress to the appearance, making her a witness, whereas in Matthew the appearance is subordinated to the charge to go and tell the brethren.

The appearance to the disciples (vv. 19-23) has a similar pattern⁶¹ to that in Matt. 28.16-20, although in details it is absolutely different. The appearances in Luke and John show closer affinities, especially at John 20. 19-20 and Luke 24. 36, 40.⁶² The purpose is to convince the disciples of the resurrection by physical demonstration. Matthew does not

show a similar concern. Each Gospel narrates its missionary charge in different form.⁶³ In John the apostolate proceeds from the Father through the Son : "As the Father has sent me, even so I send you" (20,21). In Matthew too, the authority is the Father's (28,18). The assurance of divine assistance is the endowment of the Spirit in John 20.22 :

"Receive the Holy Spirit". In Matt.28.20 it is the Lord's presence that is assured : I shall be with you. The disciples are given authority to remit and retain sins (John 20.23). We noted earlier that in Luke 24.47, the term 'remit' has a baptismal connotation. But John 20.23 specifies the administrative aspect of the Church discipline, comparable to Matt.16,19 and 18,18. If the Johannine setting is closer to the traditional context, we would suppose that Matthew has transposed this part of the resurrection tradition to an earlier stage of Jesus' ministry, as it does not subscribe to his goals in the resurrection narrative.

John and Matthew share the theme of doubt in the context of the resurrection. The simple statement of the doubt of some in Matt. 28.17 is paralleled by the doubt of Thomas in elaborate form in John 20.24-29. The theme of doubt in some form is found in the other Gospel narratives as well (see Luke 24.11, 41; Pseudo-Mark 16.11-16). As Alsop conceives it, the Thomas story is a thematic extension of the previous group appearance in order to focus attention on the question of the proper, believing response to the resurrection message. The role of Thomas here is then to stand as a prototype of an inappropriate response to the

apostolic witness.⁶⁴ Although in the Gospel Thomas represents misunderstanding and doubt (cf. 11.16; 14.5),⁶⁵ Alsup's interpretation is open to question. In fact Thomas represents final belief. In the Fourth Gospel Thomas is of a type corresponding to Peter in the Synoptics and doubt is merely a context leading to the believing confession. We discuss it below.

The Johannine tradition shows a tendency at certain levels to replace Peter by Thomas. In the Synoptics Peter represents misunderstanding and doubt, yet he confesses the earthly Jesus as the "Christ" (Mark.8.29). In the Fourth Gospel Thomas assumes this position and confesses the exalted Jesus as "my Lord and my God" (v.28). Thomas is given the privilege of being invited to touch the risen Lord and to utter this confession.⁶⁶ Although Thomas does not actually touch Jesus, the invitation to touch has been acknowledged by the immediate confession. It is the climax of the witness by Mary Magdalene ('I have seen the Lord'; v.18) and the disciples ('We have seen the Lord'; v.25). The words, "Because you have seen me you have believed" with the second person singular, *ἑώρακας* and *πεπίστευκας* (v.29a) apply to Thomas. Nevertheless, Thomas being of a type, what is said to him applies also to those previous witnesses. But the macarism, "Blessed are those who have not seen and yet believe" (v.28b) applies to all believers. Thomas is thus of a type that John develops through his Gospel to present the Christian belief in Jesus as Lord and God. The elaboration of the 'doubt' theme is purely instrumental in this context. Matthew's simple

statement of 'doubt' does not have comparable significance.

The concluding verses of John (20.30-31) are to be understood in the above context. It suggests that the Evangelist did not make use of all the material available to him, and what he has written is to help his readers to believe in Christ and have life.

John 21.

The Epilogue (chapter 21) added to the Fourth Gospel takes the scene away from Jerusalem to Galilee. The author narrates an appearance to Peter and six other disciples by the sea of Tiberias (21.1-14) and a commissioning of Peter (vv.15-19).

By describing the appearance by the sea of Tiberias as the third to the disciples,⁶⁷ the author attempts to connect it with John 20 and implies that there were appearances in Jerusalem and Galilee. There is considerable scholarly support for the Johannine authorship of chapter 21 based on its style and content.⁶⁸ But John 21 has no chronological sequence with the stories of chapter 20, primarily because the disciples in chapter 21 have not yet received the apostolic commission mentioned in 20.21. The author narrates the story in chapter 21 as a setting for the commissioning of Peter, which recalls a miraculous catch of fish as the occasion of the call and connects it with a meal.

About the composition of the narrative, various suggestions have been offered.⁶⁹ The story shows acquaintance with different elements in the Gospels. An appearance and table fellowship are shared by John 21.1-14 and the Lucan Emmaus story (Luke 24.13-35). R.T. Fortna denies any direct relation of the Johannine to the Emmaus story, basically because the latter is not a miracle story.⁷⁰ The common element in both is the recognition in the context of a meal. The details of the miraculous catch are very similar to those in Luke 5.4-11. Again, details are different to establish a direct dependence on Luke 5. Following Fortna's conclusion that the present passage is an intricate combination of a number of elements,⁷¹ we infer that the author is conflating floating traditions of an appearance in Galilee, a miraculous catch of fish in connection with Peter's call and apostolic functions, and a table fellowship with the additional special motif of the inclusion of the Beloved Disciple (vv.20ff). John 21. 1 and 14 are redactional. In their absence vv.2-13 do not suggest a post-resurrection appearance.

The stories of appearances in Galilee in Matt.28 and John 21 are different in form and are treated independently of each other. In both the appearance is motivated by the wish to introduce a commission, one to make disciples (earlier stage) and the other to feed the existing community (later stage). It is evident that John is pre-eminently concerned with the pastoral care of the Church. John has Jesus say: "Feed and tend my sheep" (vv.15-17). Matthew has a similar concern for the

administration of the Church in another context (Matt.18.15ff). Hence in John 21 we observe a later concern to ascribe the basis of pastoral care and administration to a commission of the risen Lord. The title 'brethren' restricted to the Eleven in Matt.28 and John 20 is in John 21 the title applied to the whole community (21.23).

I Corinthians 15.1-8.

The earliest account of the resurrection in the NT is by Paul in I Corinthians 15. Two questions are treated here : 1) the resurrection of Christ and 2) the hope and nature of the resurrection of the dead. The Gospels are generally silent on the latter. For the former, Paul produces a traditional catechism of a kerygmatic nature in the form of a statement of faith (vv.3-4) and adds authority to it by appending an official list of persons to whom the risen Lord appeared (vv.5-6a,7).⁷² Verses 6b and 8 are generally regarded as Pauline.⁷³ We notice that Paul is the only one in the NT who gives a first hand written report that the risen Lord had appeared to him. Paul reports his experience of being confronted with the heavenly voice considering it on the same level as all other appearances.

The basic Kerygma is here handed down by Paul who has himself received it.⁷⁴ This παράδοσις (cf.v.3) appears to be a four-articled creed⁷⁵ : died ... was buried ... raised ... and appeared (cf. Acts 2. 24,32; 3.15,26; 4.33; 5.30; 1 Thess.4.14 etc). No direct influence of this kerygmatic formula on the Gospel stories (except at Luke 24.34) can be

established. However, the basic elements are found in detailed story form in the Gospels (the fourth article is of course missing in Mark).

The Gospels do not seem to share any such formal list of appearances with I Cor. 15. A good deal of conjecture is required to explain the original form and the sequence of the appearances.⁷⁶ For our present purpose we need not enter into an extensive discussion. The appearances to more than five hundred brethren, James and to Paul have no parallels in the Gospels. The appearance to the Twelve (Eleven) or 'his disciples' is the only one commonly shared by Paul, Matthew, Luke and John.

Another major difference between Paul and the Gospels is the absence from I Cor. 15 of the empty tomb and the women's story. The earliest Kerygma did not contain it, and Paul is himself not concerned with it. So it is fruitless to argue about what Paul does not say. It cannot be proved whether or not Paul knew about the empty tomb. Of the four articles of faith introduced by repeated *ὅτι* in I Cor. 15.3-5 (*ἀπέθανεν, ἐτάφη, ἐγήγερται, ὡφθῇ*), *ἐγήγερται* following *ἐτάφη* perhaps indicates knowledge of the empty tomb. However, it may not have been a problem for Paul. The weakness of concluding thus is that it is based on supposition.

In the Gospels the appearances often serve to introduce commands or instructions, and they connect the missionary task of the community with

the appearances. Matthew also does this and uses the common tradition of the appearance to the Eleven to introduce his version of the missionary command. He shares with Paul the title 'brethren' as applied to Christians. While Paul employs it for Christians at large (15.6), Matthew restricts it to the Eleven (28.10 cf. v.16).

The earliest tradition in I Cor.15.3-5 makes Peter the first witness to the resurrection. Mark makes special mention of Peter in the young man's message (16.7). Luke mentions a primary appearance to Peter (24.34). John 20 and 21 specify the Petrine prominence. In John 20.7 Peter witnesses the empty tomb, and in chapter 21 Peter receives the superior pastoral task. In view of Matt.16.13-20 and his dependence on Mark 16.7 we would expect Matthew to follow a similar popular line. But Matthew alone shows no such interest in Peter the individual in the resurrection narrative. Even if Matthew knew the tradition of a primary appearance to Peter, his intention to introduce the corporate mission of the community of disciples does not need special mention of Peter. For him the strength of the corporate mission is the assurance of the Lord's presence and universal authority, rather than the authority of individual witnesses.

The Alternative Endings to Mark.

Many manuscripts exclude the Longer Ending (Mark 16.9-20).⁷⁷ But many of the important MSS, although mostly later ones, include the Longer Ending.⁷⁸ The authorship of the Longer Ending has not been well established.⁷⁹

These verses were presumably incorporated as an ending around the middle of the second century.⁸⁰ Its vocabulary and style are inconsistent with the text of Mark.⁸¹ The Longer Ending is regarded as a Resurrection-synopsis based on elements from elsewhere⁸²:

v.9 based on John 20.11-18; Luke 8.2

vv. 10-14, 17-20 based on Luke 24.13-53; Acts 1.6-11; 2.4; 28.1-10

vv. 14a, 15-16 based on Matt.28.16,19-20; Luke 24.47.

Although there are differences in details, the Longer Ending particularly attests to the Matthean story of the appearance to the Eleven including the universal mission of teaching⁸³ and baptizing. With these the author shows an insight into the main purpose of the narrative in Matthew.

The Shorter Ending, another second century formulation⁸⁴, reads as follows:

"And all that had been commanded them, they proclaimed briefly to those around Peter. And after these things Jesus himself also appeared to them, and from the East as far as the West, he sent out through them the sacred and incorruptible Kerygma of everlasting salvation".⁸⁵

The author follows up the intention of Mark 16.7 and presumably makes use of other NT materials to complete the ending. The features

he seems to draw along the line of Matt. 28.16-20 are : the appearance to them (i.e., the Eleven), the sending out on universal mission from East to West (i.e., to all nations) and the Kerygma of eternal salvation (a term used elsewhere in the NT only at Heb.5.9). The latter may be considered parallel to the Matthean 'make disciples of all nations by baptizing and teaching'.

The Gospel of Peter.

The second century apocryphal Gospel of Peter⁸⁶ has several elements in common with the canonical Gospels.

In the burial episode it places the body of Jesus under the custody of the Jews who give it to Joseph for burial. Joseph is identified as the 'friend of Pilate and the Lord' (I.3) and as a spectator of Jesus' good deeds (VI.23). The tomb and the garden belong to him (VI.21-24). The women have no part at this stage of the story.

The time of the women's visit on Easter day is almost the same as in Matt.28.1. The First Day of the Week is now known as the Lord's Day. Mary Magdalene is a woman-disciple of the Lord in the Gospel of Peter. The women's discussion on the way (which Matthew omits) and the intention of their visit (which Matthew edits from his Marcan source) are far more elaborate in the Gospel of Peter than in Mark, (GP. XII.50-54). The women's act of embalming is depicted as part of a custom.

The Gospel of Peter shares many of the apocalyptic elements special to Matthew. Matt. 28.2-3 is paralleled in GP IX.35-XI.44, where the significant differences are the dramatic details about how Jesus walks out of the grave accompanied by two 'young men' (i.e., angels).⁸⁷ The Gospel of Peter has the descent of two men in place of Matthew's single angel who moves the stone. In the Gospel of Peter the stone moves by itself. In Matthew an earthquake occurs at the death of Jesus (27.51) and at the resurrection (28.2), whereas in the Gospel of Peter it happens when Jesus' body is brought down from the cross (GP VI.21).⁸⁸

GP XIII.55-57 is parallel to Matt. 28.5-8, but shows more affinity to Mark 16.5-8 :

GP

- The women stoop down
- saw a young man sitting in the midst of the tomb, clothed in bright shining robe.
- He said to them: Why have you come ? Whom do you seek, not him who was crucified ? He was risen and gone... See the place where he lay, that he is not here.

Mark

- They enter the tomb
- saw a young man sitting on the right side dressed in white robe.
- He said to them: Do not be amazed; You seek Jesus of Nazareth who was crucified. He has risen, he is not here; see the place where they laid him.

- (For he has risen and gone
to the place from which he
was sent).

(John 20.17, Jesus says : "I am ascending
to my Father").

- Then the women were afraid
and fled.

They fled from the tomb for trembling
and astonishment had come upon them.

There is striking similarity between both. The major difference is the
absence of the charge to the women about a Galilean appearance. They receive
a message reminiscent of John 20.17.

The story of the guard at the tomb lacks the Matthean features of a
Jewish scandal. The story in the Gospel of Peter has a more elaborate form.
Between Matt.27.62-66 and GP VIII.28-33 the basic elements seem to be the
same. There are verbal similarities particularly at "lest his disciples go
and steal him away" (and tell the people that) "he is risen from the dead"
(Matt.27.64; GP VIII.30). The setting of the guards and sealing the
sepulchre are more detailed and precise in the Gospel of Peter. The group
on guard includes guards with Petronius the Centurion and elders and
scribes. They close the tomb and put seven seals, pitch a tent and watch.
They are all made witnesses to the resurrection-event (GP IX.35-XI.44).

The Gospel of Peter XI.45-49 (cf. Matt.28.11-15) : On seeing what
had happened the guards abandoned the tomb out of fear (cf. Matt.28.4)
and hastened to tell Pilate. The others at the tomb came to Pilate and
out of fear of fellow-Jews requested him to command the guards to tell

no one what they had seen. In Matthew the story appears in a different form as a bribery-legend aimed at answering a Jewish accusation of body-stealing, and thus an apologetic legend. By contrast the Gospel of Peter aims at making the details historical. The extant fragment of the ending of the Gospel of Peter (XIV. 58-60) breaks off abruptly at XIV.60 without reporting an intended appearance story. Thus no appearance story survives. But the mention of Simon Peter and others going fishing is perhaps reminiscent of the beginning of a story parallel to John 21.2-13.

The story of the Guard at the tomb is found only in Matthew and the Gospel of Peter. Many features of this story and other apocalyptic elements are common to these Gospels. In our analysis of the Matthean text in chapter I above we came to the conclusion that the grave-guard story is a Matthean construct to answer the Jewish scandal of grave-robbery. The Matthean features of the Jewish scandal are lacking in the Gospel of Peter. By reducing the features of the Jewish scandal the story is enhanced in the Gospel of Peter with considerable elaboration of objective details. The angelic descent, the act of rolling back the stone and such apocalyptic elements as earthquake in Matthew have already been ascribed to Matthew's initial attempt to describe the how of the resurrection. The Matthean tendency is followed up and expanded in the Gospel of Peter. Whereas Matthew keeps his reserve about describing the resurrection event, the apocryphal Gospel describes it with dramatic details to make the story complete. In the absence of a pre-Matthean

source for the common elements peculiar to Matthew and the Gospel of Peter, the dependence of the Gospel of Peter on Matthew is a compelling conclusion. The minor differences and the additional details in the Gospel of Peter are ~~then~~ the result of redaction and considerable elaboration.

If the Gospel of Peter is dependent on Matthew, why a dependence on Mark? We have seen that Mark 16.1-8 is preserved more or less intact in the Gospel of Peter. Particularly striking are the similarities in the women's discussion on the way, their intention and the individuals at the tomb described as 'young men' (only one young man in Mark, whereas the GP has two). The changes in the Gospel of Peter are not considerable compared to the Matthean and Lucan redactions of the Marcan pericope. Hence, the dependence of the Gospel of Peter on Mark beyond the Matthean redaction of Mark cannot be dismissed. No conclusive evidence has so far been mustered for an indirect contact of the Gospel of Peter on Mark and Matthew. The contact must then be direct.

Conclusions.

Our survey has shown that Matt. 27.57-28.20 has striking parallels in other resurrection narratives.⁸⁹ That Jesus suffered, died, was buried and rose again are key elements of the Kerygma. The narratives we have considered presuppose these elements, which form the basis of common agreement. In editing sources and adding new materials the writers are influenced by their time, community, personal convictions, special motifs

etc. On the evidence of the differences, each narrative represents a certain stage in the development of the resurrection tradition.

In the burial tradition represented in Paul's preaching at Pisidian Antioch (Acts 13.27-29) it is the Jerusalemites and their rulers who bury Jesus. This is stated in simple terms implying no major concern of the Apostle, and hence probably representing the earliest tradition that we have. The narratives in the Gospels demonstrate a tendency to change the burial by enemies into one by friends.⁹⁰ The apocryphal Gospel of Peter combines these two phases. It places the body of Jesus in the custody of Jews who give it to Joseph for burial. Joseph's influence and concern are explained by his being a friend of Pilate and the Lord (I.3) and a spectator of Jesus' good deeds (VI.23). In Mark, Joseph is a respected member of the Council,⁹¹ who was himself looking for the Kingdom of God (15.43). He provides a link between Joseph's religious aspiration and Jesus' message of the Kingdom of God (1.15). Both Matthew and Luke find the Marcan description of the burial by Joseph insufficient to explain Joseph's interest in Jesus. Luke in his Gospel adds moral virtues to Joseph : a good and righteous man who had not consented to the purpose and deed of the Sanhedrin (23.50-51). Matthew and John ascribe discipleship to Joseph (Matt.27.57; John 19.38). Matthew states his social status as a rich man, rather than as a member of the Council. A man of some importance, who was sympathetic to Jesus, Joseph's involvement in the burial has been gradually fixed into the Christian tradition. What distinguishes Matthew

in particular as we have already pointed out is his usage of the verb *ἐπαθῆτεύθη* which with reference to the Commission, *παθῆτεύσατε*, presupposes the mission already as operating in Jesus' contact with others.

The kerygmatic tradition has already identified the risen One with the crucified Jesus; the empty tomb is not a necessary element in the Kerygma. The empty tomb belongs to the Gospel tradition, where it is employed to interpret the resurrection. In Luke and John it acquires apostolic authority by having the disciples also witness the empty tomb. Matthew has a different emphasis. To explain divine involvement in the resurrection and to emphasize the emptiness of the tomb, Matthew adds apocalyptic and apologetic details.

Resurrection and Ascension are terms employed to interpret the faith of the early Church in Jesus. The earliest Christian conviction was that by resurrection (ascension) God exalted Jesus (see Rom. 1.1-4; cf. Eph. 1.20f). Matthew also takes a position in which no distinction is drawn between resurrection and exaltation.

The kerygmatic formula in I Cor. 15 adds an official list of persons to whom the risen Lord appeared. We have not been able to assess the extent of influence it exerts on the Gospel narratives of appearances. With descriptive details the appearance stories generally introduce complex

theological statements. Matthew is the first to narrate such stories, but he does it with the minimum of details about the manner of appearances. Rather, he concentrates in bringing out his specific goals.

Whether there ever existed a common tradition⁹² as the source for the parallel elements in the group-appearance-commission narratives of Matthew, Luke and John is highly doubtful for the following reasons :

1) Such a traditional form has not yet been identified; 2) If such a tradition was accessible to each Evangelist it should have had a concrete form with some trace of it in the Kerygma or in some other common source; and 3) The details in each Gospel are too varied to claim a common source.

On the other hand, each Evangelist has tried to explain the Church's mission and its link with the risen Lord and the apostles.

In our analysis in chapter I we concluded that the Galilean appearance-commission story in Matthew is a Matthean creation which forms the climax of the Gospel. We have also seen how the form and content of the narrative are derived from the Evangelist's own addition to the Transfiguration story (Matt. 17.6-7), and are dependent on a Danielic vision pattern (Dan. 10.9-12). The Evangelist fixes the Commission into this framework.⁹³

In our analysis of the Matthean resurrection narrative and comparison of it with parallel narratives we have discussed how Matthew

as a redactor has worked on his traditions and added specific materials on his own. We now proceed to examine the wider setting of the narrative in order to ascertain the emphases, motifs and theological goals that are unique to the Evangelist.

NOTES.

1. Fuller, Formation., pp.75f.
2. H.Philip West Jr., "A Primitive Version of Luke in the Composition of Matthew", NTS, 14, 1967-'68, p.80. Taking a number of instances of Matthean redaction of Mark's references to women (Matt.8.14-15/ Mark 1.29-31; Matt.26.6-13/Mark 14.3-9; Matt.27.55f/Mark 15.40-41; Matt.9.18-26/Mark 5.21-43; Matt.15.21-28/Mark 7.24-30), Philip West thinks that Matthew reduces details about women to the minimum, in conformity with the practice of the Church.
3. cf. Chapter I, p.21 above.
4. See G.R.Driver, "Two Problems in the New Testament", JTS, 16, 1965, p.329.
5. With ἔσθῃ , ὥσπερ γενομένης means 'and when evening had already come', implying that it was late evening. cf. Mark 1.32; 6.47. At 1.32 ὥσπερ δὲ γενομένης is further qualified by

'after the sun had set', a sense Mark probably implies always when he uses it.

6. J.Spencer Kennard Jr., "The Burial of Jesus", JBL, 74, 1955, p.229; Bode, First Easter Morning., p.224
7. Why he does it will be discussed subsequently in this chapter.
8. Driver, "Two Problems in the New Testament", pp.327-328.
9. Codex 'D' has ἀνατέλλοντος τοῦ ἡλίου instead of the aorist. This may be an attempt to make it agree with λείαν πρωτ̃. The genitive absolute in the present tense means 'when the sun was rising'. Matthew seems to follow such an insight in his abbreviating process.
10. Bode, First Easter Morning., p.11.
11. See J.H.Moulton, A Grammar of New Testament Greek, vol. I, (T & T Clark), 1908, "Prolegomena", pp.72-73.
12. G.Abbott-Smith, A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament, New York : 1936, "ὄψέ".
13. ἐπιφώσκειν means 'to begin to lighten' (Bode, First Easter Morning, p.11), 'to let shine' (Abbott-Smith, Greek Lexicon.).
14. cf. Ernst Lohmeyer, Das Evangelium des Markus, Göttingen : 1963, p.351. Lohmeyer supposes that the earliest tradition may have spoken of a pious Jew.
15. See McNelle, Matthew, p.426; Kirsopp Lake, The Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, New York : 1907, p.50. Lake supposes that Matthew was taking up a colloquial meaning of the original εὐχήμεων "which, as Phrynicius the Grammarian explains, had obtained in vulgar speech, the meaning of rich, though it properly means 'of good standing'".
16. See the discussion on ἐμαθητεύθη in Chapter I, pp.19-21 above. A detailed discussion on the theology of discipleship follows in chapter III. For a development of the subject 'who buried Jesus' see the final stage of the present chapter.
17. D.S.Margoliouth, "The Visit to the Tomb", ET, 38, 1926-'27, p.280.

Margoliouth, however, believes in the priority of Matthew.

18. Ibid., p.279.
19. Kennard, "The Burial of Jesus", p.232 : An Epigraph from a Nazareth Inscription, dated at sometime between 50 B.C and A.D.50, now preserved at the Archives d'Histoire du Droit Oriental II, states the ordinance of Caesar : "It is my pleasure that graves and tombs remain undisturbed in perpetuity for those who have made them for the cult of their ancestors or children or members of their house. If, however, any man lay information that another has either demolished them, or has in any other way extracted the buried, or has maliciously transferred them to other places in order to wrong them, or has displaced the sealing or other stones, against such a one I order a trial to be instituted."
20. Willi Marxsen, The Resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth, Philadelphia : 1970, p.45.
21. Driver, "Two Problems in the New Testament", p.329.
22. Perrin, Resurrection, p. 43.
23. See Chapter I, pp.22-23 above.
24. Verner H.Kelber, edit., The Passion in Mark, Philadelphia : 1976 (J.D. Crossan in op.cit., pp.148f).
25. Bode, First Easter Morning, p.54. Bode refers to such passages as Gen.16.10; 21.17,18; 22.15-18.
26. See Chapter I, p.23 and notes 16-17 on p.59 above.
27. See Isa.13.13; 29.6; Jer.4.24; 51.29; Joel 2.10; 3.16.
28. cf. Neiryneck, "Les Femmes au Tombeau ...", p.171; Goulder, Midrash., p.447.
29. Goulder, loc.cit.
30. See the detailed analysis and discussion of the Jewish Scandal story in Chapter I, pp.26-30 above.
31. Chapter I, pp.30-33 above.
32. See Chapter I, pp. 40-56 above.
33. cf. Pierre Benoit, The Passion and Resurrection of Jesus Christ,

London : 1969, p.216 : "Luke is interested in his 'soul', and he 'likes to emphasize moral and spiritual qualities'".

34. Marxsen, Resurrection., p.49.
35. Various opinions have been offered for the Lucan predilection for pairs. John Reumarm(Jesus in the Church's Gospels, Philadelphia : 1968, p.356) believes that this probably comes from a tradition that maintained the principle that a thing should be established at the mouth of two witnesses (Deut.19.15). Bultmann. (History of the Synoptic Tradition, pp.314-317) believes that the theme of pairs common in folklore has operated here.
36. Fuller, Formation, p.96.
37. Bode, First Easter Morning., p.59. Matthew also assimilates the Marcan 'young man' to the angel who opens the grave.
38. Ibid., p.60.
39. Ibid., p.62.
40. Luke introduces the title 'apostles' already prior to the resurrection (see 17.5; 22.14).
41. Bode, First Easter Morning, p.67.
42. it^a, b, d, e, l, r¹, Syr^{pal}, Marcion, Diatessaron.
43. Ψ A B K L W X Δ Π Υ p⁷⁵ and many others.
44. cf. Justin Martyr, Apology, I. 66-67 in The Fathers of the Church : Saint Justin Martyr (edit., Thomas B.Falls, New York : 1948), pp. 105-106.
45. Perrin, Resurrection, pp.66-67.
46. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to assess the authenticity of the Ascension stories in 'Luke - Acts' . καὶ ἀνεβήκετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν in Luke 24.51 is omitted by some MSS including D and most of the Old Latin texts. Many scholars argue that Luke 24.50-53 and Acts 1.1-5 are later interpolations : See Philip Menoud, "Remarques sur les textes de l'ascension dans Luc-Actes", Neutestamentliche studien für Rudolf Bultmann (edit., Walter Eltester), Berlin : 1954, pp.148-156; E.Trocme, Le "Livre des Actes" et l'histoire, Paris : 1957, pp.30-34; A.N.Wilder,

"Variant Traditions of the Resurrection in Acts" JBL, 62, 1943, pp. 306-311.

47. cf. P.A. Van Stempvoort, "The Interpretation of the Ascension in Luke and Acts", NTS, 5, 1958-'59, pp.30-42.
48. A tension between John 5:25 and 29 has been a concern for many. Verse 25 in a general sense tells that the dead will hear the voice of the Son of God and will live. But v.29 tells that the resurrection is either to life or to judgement. Some consider vv.28-29 as a redactional addition. (See R.E. Brown, The Gospel According to John (1-xii), Garden City : 1966, pp.219-221; D.M. Smith Jr., The Composition and Order of the Fourth Gospel, New Haven : 1965, pp. 134ff, where he refers to Bultmann's position). Dodd, on the other hand, favours the unity of 5:25-29. For him the distinction is between the present resurrection and the final resurrection. Verses 25-26 speak of a passing from death to life 'here and now' (before bodily death) as a result of the power of the word of Christ. The word will have the same power hereafter that according to vv.28-29 the hour is coming when all who are in the tomb will hear his voice and come out (C.H. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, Cambridge : 1963, pp.148, 364, 365). Dodd rightly sees the distinction between the expressions : 'the hour is coming and now is' and 'the hour is coming' (see vv.25 and 28). The Matthean parallel is, however, to the resurrection from the tomb.
49. W.G. Essame, "Matthew XXVII. 51-54 and John V. 25-29", ET, 76, 1964, p.103.
50. More discussion to follow in Chapter V below.
51. K. Peter G. Curtis, "Three Points of Contact between Matthew and John in the Burial and Resurrection Narratives", JTS, 23, 1972, p.443.
52. See Chapter I, pp.19-20 above.
53. Marxsen, Resurrection, p.57.
54. That Mary Magdalene was not alone is evidenced by her words to the

disciples : "We do not know where they have laid him" (20.2). In fact John mentions the presence of other women at the crucifixion (19.25). For a summary of different interpretations on the use of the plural 'we' here, see Bode, First Easter Morning., pp.73-74, where Bode favours the expression as a manner of speech and supports it with five other instances of the use of οἱ μαθηταί with the subject in the singular (See 3.2,11; 14.5; 9.31 and 21.24). But it is also possible that John is singling out Mary Magdalene from the rest of the women at the tomb for his version of Christophany.

55. J.H.Bernard, Gospel According to John , II, Edinborough : 1928,p.670.
56. Fuller, Formation., pp.137-138.
57. the only instance in John.
58. Dodd, The Fourth Gospel.,p.443 note.2.
59. Alsup, Appearance Stories., p.208. See pp.108-114 as well.
60. John uses the noun 'brother' twelve times for physical relationship (1.40,41; 2.12; 7.3,5,10; 11.2,18,20,23,32). The only different usage is here (besides Chapter 21). Curtis takes this as a possible case of Johannine dependence on Matthew (Curtis, "Three Points of Contact ...", p.442).
61. This story shares the pattern of the 'Concise' type of the Resurrection Appearances (See Dodd, "Appearances ...", pp.9ff).
62. For conflicting opinions about the connections, see John Amedee Bailey, The Traditions Common to the Gospels of Luke and John, Leiden : 1963, p.92. Bailey holds that Luke is John's source here. See Ibid.n.3. Alfred Loisy (L'Evangile Selon Luc, Paris : 1924) regards John as the earlier Gospel and Luke as drawing on John. F.C.Grant ("Was the Author of John Dependent Upon the Gospel of Luke ?", JBL, 1937, p.301) regards Luke 24.37,39-43 as a gloss from John 20f. His view lacks MS. support. We would assume that a common tradition underlies both.
63. See our comparison between Matthew and Luke, pp. 84-86 above.
64. Alsup, Appearance Stories., p.148.

65. Fuller calls attention to the development of the story connected with Thomas. In the Synoptics he is only one among the Twelve. In John he becomes the vehicle of misunderstanding and doubt (11.16; 14.5). In the Apocryphal Writings (e.g., The Gospel of Thomas) there is a whole cycle of Thomas tradition. The precise role of Thomas in the Fourth Gospel marks the beginning of a Thomas legend (Fuller, Formation., p.142).
66. Throughout the Gospel John brings Jesus into closest relationship with God (See 1.1; 5.18; 8.58; 10.30,33; 12.45; 14.9; 17.1; 20.31).
67. This excludes the appearance to Mary Magdalene, for John does not regard her as a disciple.
68. B.H.Streeter, The Four Gospels, London : 1924, pp.471-481; J.H. Bernard, John; Bishop Cassian, "John XXI", NTS, 3, 1957, pp.132-136; E.Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel, London : 1947, p.552; P.Trudinger, "Subtle Word-plays in the Gospel of John, and the Problem of Chapter 21", Journal of Religious Thought, 28, 1971, pp.30f; S.S. Smalley, "The Sign in John XXI", NTS, 20, 1974, pp.275-288 etc. are some of them.
69. To mention a few, M.Goguel (The Birth of Christianity, New York : 1954, p.51) suggests that a resurrection appearance was added later to the story of a miraculous catch of fish that was originally followed by a meal; R.T.Fortna (The Gospel of Signs, Cambridge : 1970, p.98) thinks that the story is basically a miracle story, which John has made into an Easter story.
70. Fortna, Gospel of Signs, p.98.
71. Ibid., p.89: miraculous catch of fish, epiphany of Jesus, resurrection appearance, breakfast of fish, eucharist and Petrine legend.
72. J.Jeremias (The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, New York : 1966, pp.101-103) argues for its Aramaic and Palestinian origin. H.Conzelmann ("On the Analysis of the Confessional Formula in I Cor.15.3-5", Int., 20, 1966, pp.15-25) favours a Greek origin. Fuller (Formation., pp.11, 14) takes a reconciling position : The formula in its content is

Palestinian, but Paul received it Hellenised from Damascus where he was converted; and the list of appearances was from Jerusalem or Palestine.

73. See C.F.Evans, Resurrection and the New Testament, London : 1970, p. 42-44; Fuller, Formation, p.11.
74. παραδίδωμι and παραλαμβάνω are technical terms used to express 'tradition' : Büchsel in TDNT, II, pp. 169-173 and G. Delling in TDNT, IV, pp.12-15.
75. M.Dibelius, (Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums, Tübingen : 1961, p. 17 note 1.), regards it as a reproduction of a credal formula. J. Schmitt (Jésus ressuscité dans la prédication apostolique, Paris : 1949, p.52) sees in it a doctrinal statement in a didactic form.
76. J.H.Schütz, "Apostolic Authority and the Control of Tradition : I Cor. XV", NTS, 15, 1968-'69, pp.448-453; Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, p. 102; Fuller, Formation, pp.27-30.
77. See the listing by F.C.Kenyon, Our Bible and Ancient Manuscripts, New York : 1941, pp.134, 141, 162, 169f and J.K.Elliott, "The Text and Language of the Ending of Mark's Gospel", Theologische Zeitschrift, 27, 1971, p.256 (B Syr^s Arm^{mss} Georgian Versions: Adysh and Opiza, a few MSS of Ethiopic Version, Minuscules 304, 2386, 1420; Fathers: Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, Jerome).
78. A C D W E K L Δ Q Π Ψ H M S U Ω .
79. The Arm^{ms} that contains the verses adds a note that the text is of the 'Elder Ariston'. But there is nothing to confirm its validity (Kenyon, The Text of the Greek Bible, London: 1958, p.127).
80. The strongest support for this dating is Irenaeus (died 202) who quotes 16.19 in his third book against Heresies (See Streeter, Four Gospels, p.124).
81. For a detailed analysis see Elliott, "The Text and Language ...", pp.256-259, where he shows a number of terms and phrases of non-Markan nature.
82. cf. G.W.Trompf, "The First Resurrection Appearance and the Ending

of Mark's Gospel", NTS, 18, 1972, p.327. The table given in our text does not follow Trompf's.

83. The Longer Ending has here 'preaching' as in Luke 24.47.
84. In MSS the Shorter Ending is placed either after 16.8 or 16.20 (V L k, 099, 0112, 579 and some MSS of Shahidic, Boharic and Ethiopic versions and lectionary 1602) or in the margin (274, Syr^{hl}). "According to E.A.Lowe, k shows palaeographical marks of having been copied from a second century papyrus" (B.M.Metzger, The Text of the New Testament, New York : 1964, p.73). Having been contained in the Codex Bezae Cantabrigiae (k) the text should have been present in that second century papyrus from which 'k' is copied.
85. Free translation from A.Huck and H.Leitzmann, Synopse der drei Ersten Evangelien, Tübingen : 1950, p.213.
86. The Gospel of Peter was discovered in 1886-1887. From internal evidences M.Léon Vaganay assigns its composition to 120-130 (L'Évangile de Pierre, Paris : 1930, pp.162f).
87. The Gospel of Peter agrees with Mark in describing angels as young men.
88. If the Gospel of Peter has no direct dependence on Matthew, it has to be regarded either as indirect dependence or as two independent uses of a similar apocalyptic element.
89. Since our purpose is to treat the setting of the Matthean narrative we have considered only those narratives which are of considerable importance to it.
90. See Fuller, Formation, pp.54-55.
91. Sanhedrin cf. 'rulers' in Acts 13.27.
92. On the basis of the agreement among Matthew, Luke and John on the group-appearance and the correspondence of the apostolic commission to the main elements in the OT commissionings, Hubbard has formulated a hypothetical proto-commission as the possible basis of each narrative (Matthean Redaction, Chapter IV cf. Chapter II).

What he has achieved is in fact an appearance - commission synopsis. Considering the question of tradition and redaction in Matt.28.16-20, J.P.Meier has argued that Matthew has worked upon some existing unidentified tradition ("Two Disputed Questions in Matt.28.16-20", JBL, 96, 1977, pp.407-424, where he considers the leading arguments of Hubbard as well). This is also hypothetical.

93. See esp. Chapter I, pp. 38-40 above.

PART B

THE SETTING OF THE NARRATIVE

Chapter III

ECCLESIASTICAL SETTING

Matthew's Gospel is very much Church-centred; much more expressly so than others, it has been written for and from within the Church. We now turn to consider how the Matthean concept of the Church determines the structure of the Resurrection Narrative.

The concluding verses of the Gospel (28.18-20) end without specific mention of the accomplishment of what has been commanded there. In Part 'A' we indicated that the resurrection narrative in the Matthean setting contains the climax of the writing : the Great Command, *παθητε*. This key phrase in the aorist imperative active implies a definite action. With this phrase the final verses (18-20) imply that the Gospel is written to a Christian community that looks back to the work of the first disciples for its origin and it lives on the conviction that the risen Lord commanded *παθητε* and that he is ever present with the community in the accomplishment of that task.

Μαθητεύσατε envisages a community of disciples in the post-resurrection period. In the Evangelist's perception this period is the time of the Church and the Gospel. His Church is part of the universal community of disciples, which is engaged in the process of making further disciples. This process includes baptizing and teaching. The Church is thus a baptizing and teaching community. The correlative participle preceding μαθητεύσατε is πορεύθεντες which implies going in response to the risen Lord's command and therefore the Church is a missionary community. The response of the disciples and the women (28.17, 9) to the Christophany is worship, a reflection of the practices of the Church as a worshipping community. We now consider each of these perceptions of the Church in some detail.

A Community of Disciples.

The Christian community is envisaged as 'Disciples' in 28.18-20. This special designation within the commission to the Eleven Disciples implies that the new community is intended to be what they themselves have been to Jesus.

Disciples, Apostles and the Twelve are identical in this Gospel. Matthew's special interest in the title 'Twelve' or 'Eleven' is minimal. So he often qualifies it with 'disciples' and once with 'apostles' (10.1). 'Disciples' is the usual designation that Matthew uses either by itself¹

or with a personal pronoun, ² αὐτοῦ, ³ σου, or ⁴ μου. A few times the numerical designation 'Twelve'⁵ is used and once 'Eleven'⁶. The frequency of the use of 'disciples' without a personal pronoun shows that Matthew is referring to a definite group known to his readers.

The disciples are distinguished from the crowd that followed Jesus. ὄχλος or ὄχλοι in the Gospel constitutes the setting of Jesus' ministry. In contrast to the role of the disciples their role is, therefore, of interest here. R.Mayer says : "As the chorus which confirms Jesus' words and acts by joy, admiration, astonishment and fear, the crowd has an essential role in the synoptists."⁷ Especially in Matthew, they are not what the disciples are. Great crowds follow Jesus everywhere (4.25; 20.29), but their following is merely superficial, for they are never the intimate followers of Jesus.

There is a real progression to the role of the crowds in Matthew. "In Matthew after VII.28 the ὄχλοι come to the fore as the audience".⁸ They are astonished at his teaching (7.28). They marvel at his miracles (9.33). Jesus teaches them in parables (13.34), instructs them (15.10) and feeds them out of compassion (15.32,35). At his triumphal entry a large crowd accompanies him and in front of the Jerusalemites publicly witnesses that he is the prophet Jesus who is from Nazareth of Galilee (21.1-11). The authorities are afraid to deal with anyone whom the crowds regard as a prophet (cf. 14.5; 21.26, where it is seen to be true of John

the Baptist). In Matthew's Gospel the $\delta\chi\lambda\omicron\iota$ progress towards recognition of Jesus as the Messiah. He is the only Evangelist who ascribes such an important role to them.

δ $\lambda\alpha\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ in the earlier chapters means 'Israel' (1.21; 2.4,6; 4.23; 13.15; 15.8). Towards the end it turns hostile to Jesus. When $\omicron\iota$ $\delta\chi\lambda\omicron\iota$ stand with the enemies (the chief priests and the elders of the people) to condemn Jesus (27.20-22) they are equated with δ $\lambda\alpha\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ (27.24-25). A great crowd comes with Judas at the betrayal. Pilate washes his hands before them and they cry out that Jesus should be crucified (27.23-26). Admiration thus turns into hostility under the influence of the enemies. This anticlimax testifies that the crowd never understood who Jesus was.

The presence of the crowd becomes only a backdrop to introduce the call and privilege of the disciples, who are distinguished from the multitude by the fact that they are given understanding⁹ while the multitude is obdurate.¹⁰ This is shown in the way in which Matthew edits several Marcan texts and materials special to him.¹¹ The crowd is not often present when Jesus gives important teachings to his disciples (5.1; 13.36).¹² The $\mu\alpha\theta\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ - $\delta\iota\delta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ relationship so prominent in Matthew does not operate in the relationship between Jesus and the crowd. Though the relationship operates between Jesus and the disciples they do not address him as $\rho\alpha\beta\beta\iota$ or $\delta\iota\delta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\alpha\lambda\epsilon$, except Judas at 26.25, 49.¹³

They address him κύριε , an address familiar to the early Church. In Matthew κύριε is not a simple address of respect; besides being used by the disciples, those who come to Jesus for healing also call him κύριε in the sense of "a miracle-working saviour" (8.2,6,8; 9.28; 15.22,25; 17.15; 20.33).¹⁴ The public and the scribes understand Jesus only as a rabbi or a prophet. In one instance, immediately after a scribe addresses Jesus διδάσκαλε , a disciple addresses him as κύριε (8.19,21). He is more than a rabbi to the disciples; they could pray "Save Lord, we are perishing" (8.25).

Matt.10.25 as applied to Jesus and the disciples would mean that Jesus the οἰκοδεσπότης and κύριος of his δοῦλοι is not a rabbi in the Jewish sense. Unlike the rabbinic system, discipleship is a permanent relationship that leaves no room for the disciple to become διδάσκαλος in his turn on the basis of his knowledge of the Torah (23.8ff). It is a lasting relationship because the Lord is ever present with them (28.20 cf. 18.20).

Many characteristics distinguish the community of disciples from the crowd. "The disciples are the free sons of God (17.20); they are entrusted with the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven (13.11), eye - and ear - witnesses of the fulfilment of that which prophets and righteous men desired in vain to see and hear (13.16ff); they are the salt of the earth and the light of the world, the city set upon the hill (5.13)."¹⁵ In

contrast to the wise and understanding (Scribes and Pharisees) they are the babes to whom Jesus' teachings and works have been revealed (11.25). It is to them that the Son has chosen to reveal the Father (11.27). By taking Jesus' yoke (Jesus' teaching in contrast to the Mosaic Torah) on themselves and learning from him they find rest for their souls (11.29). Their righteousness based on Jesus' teaching is to exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees based on Mosaic Law for the cause of the Kingdom of Heaven (5.20). Although the Law of Moses is still valid (5.18; 23.2f) the disciples' allegiance to it is not to the letter but to the meaning as revealed by Jesus who teaches with authority (5.21-48; 7.29). In Matthew, Jesus has thus called the disciples and with them the community to both his person and teaching.

Followers of the one teacher, Jesus, the disciples are brethren among themselves (23.8). There are a number of instances in the NT, especially in Paul and Acts where the title ἀδελφοί denotes fellow-Christians.¹⁶ The Christians being ἀδελφοί, the Church's basic social structure is of Christian brotherhood. Matthew supplies authority to it by introducing the title through Jesus' words in the story of the Christophany to the women (28.9-10). In 28.10 "my brethren" refers to the Eleven.¹⁷ Since Matt.28.9-10 is intended to provide a redactional link between the tomb and Galilean appearance stories, the three titles 'his disciples' (28.7), 'my brethren' (28.10) and 'the Eleven' (28.16) refer to the same group. 'His disciples' in the Gospel generally refers to the

Twelve (here, the Eleven). 'My brethren' in 12.49-50 and 25.40 has a broader application beyond the Twelve. But in 12.49-50 it is by pointing to his disciples as his brothers that Jesus makes the general statement (v.50). The application of the title 'brethren' to the Christians in general is substantiated by the Great Commission, where Jesus' disciples (brethren) are commissioned to make others what they themselves are.

The exercise of authority and discipline within the community is evident in 16.17-19 and 18.15-18. Matthew seems to develop these two texts on the same saying identically reported in 16.19 and 18.18 : "Whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" ('you' in 16.19 is in the singular and in 18.18 in the plural). This saying seems to be based on the risen Lord's authority in heaven and on earth and readapted to an earlier stage of Jesus' ministry. The same prepositional phrases are used in :

28.18	ἐν οὐρανῷ	-	ἐπὶ γῆς
18.18	ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς	-	ἐν οὐρανῷ
and 16.19	ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς	-	ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς .

The plural in 16.19 is probably in agreement with the preceding βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν for a literary accommodation. The forgiving and retaining of sins as part of the risen Lord's commission is reported in John 20.23.¹⁸ In Matthew and John the saying is concerned with the discipline of the Church, and thus has a community setting. John's version may be closer to an original traditional context whereas in Matthew it is

hard to apply it to the unsettled situation of the original disciples. However, both try to place an existing practice of the Church in an appropriate context where it will have authority from Jesus.

Matt.16.17-19 is clearly an addition¹⁹ to the original Marcan story of the confession at Caesarea Philippi. A strong pre-Matthean semitic cast is usually suggested for this logion on the basis of such expressions as 'flesh and blood' for mankind, 'Father in heaven', 'the gates of Hades', the name 'Simon Bar-Jona' and the word-play of Πέτρος - πέτρα from the double meaning of ܣܕܝܗ.²⁰ Since no semitic source of the logion can be identified we shall examine the possibility that Matthew himself created the text.²¹

A common tradition of authority to forgive and retain sins in a community setting may be presupposed for Matt.16.19; 18.18 and John 20.23. Matthew bases this authority on his concept of the risen Lord's authority in heaven and on earth. He then combines them into the saying: "Whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (16.19; 18.18). Matthew presents 16.17-19a as a setting to introduce this saying.

22

Ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν , μακάριος εἶ (5.3ff), ὁ πατὴρ
 ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (6.9,14f; 10.32f etc.) and βασιλεῖα
 τῶν οὐρανῶν²³ in 16.17-19a are usual expressions of the Evangelist.

οἰκοδομεῖν ἐπὶ τῇ πέτρῳ is used earlier at 7.24, where the Evangelist has borrowed it from Q (cf. Luke 6.48). Since he uses the verb form of 'keys' in connection with the Kingdom of Heaven at 23.13(κλείετε) we regard αἱ κλεῖδες τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν (16.19) also as Matthew's own construct. 'Gates/of Hades' and 'keys of the Kingdom of Heaven' are used antithetically in vv.18-19a. ἡ δὲ as the opposite of 'heaven' is from Q as in 11.23 (cf. Luke 10.15). πύλας ᾧδου found in the Apocrypha (Wisdom 16.13; III Macc.5.51) was perhaps in popular use during Matthew's time. 'Flesh and blood' as a negative setting of divine revelation was already a Christian concept which Matthew shares with Paul (Gal.1.16).

A Semitic surname such as Βαρωνᾶ in Matt.16.17 is the only use of its kind in the NT. While using such an Aramaic name once, if an original pun on the Aramaic ܒܪܬܐ was also known to Matthew, he would have certainly preserved it in the original form, especially since Simon was already known in the Christian tradition by that name (I Cor.15.5).⁴² The Evangelist never employs the name Cephas in his Gospel. Since he received the statement, "Simon, to whom he (Jesus) gave the name Peter" from Mark 3.16, he has rephrased it to the direct address, "You are Peter" and transposed it to the present context. The striking correspondence of Simon's confession to Jesus' conferring the name 'Peter' on Simon :

Peter says, Σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος (16.16)

Jesus says, Σίμων Βαρωνᾶ, σὺ εἶ Πέτρος (16.17,18)

must be due to Matthew himself. The Evangelist seems to have combined ὁ

εἰ Πέτρος and οἰκοδομεῖν ἐπὶ τῇ πέτρᾳ because of their literal resemblance. The word-play of Πέτρος - πέτρα is apparently developed from this combination. The differences in meaning and gender between Πέτρος and πέτρα suggest that the Evangelist attaches only secondary importance to the word-play here.

The Evangelist's primary concern in the logion is with the Church and its discipline (with special emphasis on Petrine prominence) : "I will build my Church" and "I will give you the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven". The keys are described as the authority to bind and loose (whatever) on earth which will be bound and loosed in heaven. Matthew traces such authority exercised in and for the Church to the words of Jesus to Peter.

We are on firm ground to conclude that in language the logion, 16. 17-19 is very much Matthean, although he makes use of a few expressions and concepts which are also found elsewhere.

Not only in language but in the flow of thought the logion is Matthean. The Marcan contrast between 'men' and 'you' (Mark 8.27,29) in the Caesarea Philippi story is easily adapted to the general distinction between 'the crowd' and 'the disciples' in Matthew, where revelation is attributed only to the disciples. Thus, Jesus as 'the Messiah - Son of God' is revealed to Peter the disciple. The institutional character of the community, with its authority exercised by individuals in and for the

community is brought out in Matt.16.17-19. The Marcan Caesarea Philippi story is selected as the setting for this material, where Matthew gives an institutional significance to Peter's profession of faith.

Based on Mark 8.29,31, Jesus' immediate response to Peter's confession includes the disclosure of the necessity of his passion, death and resurrection (Matt.16.21). Here, Jesus' messiahship is defined in terms of his suffering, death and resurrection. Set between the confession and response, the promise of building the Church and of giving the keys of the Kingdom (with *οἰκοδομήσω* and *δώσω* in the future tense) looks beyond the passion, death and resurrection of Jesus for its fulfilment. Jesus who promises to build his Church will, after his resurrection, give the command to make disciples of all nations and declare his perpetual presence with the community. The one who promises to give the keys of the Kingdom will, as the risen Lord, make his claim to absolute authority (28.18-20). Referred to as a saying of the earthly Jesus, the great future acts of 16.18-19 are, for Matthew, the accomplishment of what is envisaged in 28.18-20, because all authority belongs to the risen Lord, who is himself the Lord of the Church (cf. 'my Church').

In Matt.18.15-18 we have a series of regulations for a local congregation to deal with a brother who has sinned. Like 16.17-19 this text also shows signs of Matthean formulation. Except for the slight resemblance of 18.15a to Luke 17.3²⁴, the entire section of Matt.18.15-20

is unique to him. Placed immediately after the parable of the lost sheep (Q : Matt.18.12-14; Luke 15.3-7), Matthew uses the parable as the context to introduce the local disciplinary provision of the Church for a brother who is at fault. We have seen that within the community of disciples,

διδάσκαλος is a fellow-disciple (5.47; 18.15,21; 23.8 cf. 28.10).

Comparing with 5.22b,34-38; 19.12; 23.20-22, Trilling regards 18.15-18 as a characteristic form of Matthean halakah.²⁵ In developing the text, Matthew repeats 16.19 with its idea of binding and loosing at 18.18.

Although the final formulation of the text belongs to Matthew the resemblance of 18.15-17 to other NT passages²⁶ shows that the practice is not confined to Matthew's own community.

In 18.15 the term κερδαίνω meaning to 'gain' or 'win' a brother resembles a technical Pauline usage (see I Cor.9.18-22). Matt.18.16 quotes Deut. 19.15b agreeing almost word for word with the Pauline version of it in II Cor.13.1 :-

Deut. 19.15 : ἐπὶ στόματος δύο μαρτύρων καὶ ἐπὶ στόματος
τρίων μαρτύρων σταθῆται πᾶν ῥῆμα.

2 Cor.13.1 : ἐπὶ στόματος δύο μαρτύρων καὶ τριῶν
σταθῆσεται πᾶν ῥῆμα .

Matt.18.16 : ἵνα ἐπὶ στόματος δύο μαρτύρων ἢ τριῶν
σταθῇ πᾶν ῥῆμα .

In Gal.6.1 Paul bids the spiritual to restore any man taken in a trespass. Paul directs disciplinary issues to the decision of the Church assembly,

and at the extreme he suggests excommunication (I Cor.5.3-5). The Matthean community follows a similar line in pronouncing one who refuses to be reconciled to be 'a Gentile and a tax-collector' (18.17). In both, the disciplinary action is exclusion from fellowship.²⁷ The expression,

ὥσπερ ὁ ἔθνικός καὶ ὁ τελώνης reflects a Jewish attitude towards Gentiles and tax-collectors. With the exception of III John 7, the adjective ἔθνικός describing "character rather than mere position"²⁸ is peculiar to Matthew in the NT (Matt.5.47; 6.7 and 18.17). Matthew employs these terms to describe those who are not true disciples.

The Matthean Church has a well set-up system of exclusion from fellowship resulting from a three level trial : private (18.15), before witnesses (18.16) and by the Church (18.17), leaving, of course, sufficient room for repentance. We must conclude that the Matthean Church is a fairly well organized society where an individual member could be subjected to legal discipline by which he is reconciled or removed from society.

Set in the context of the parable of the lost sheep (18.12-14) and concluded with the assurance of divine answer to a prayer of two who are in agreement (18.19), the Evangelist's intention in 18.15-18 is not merely to describe the judicial structure of the local Church but also to state a general rule that every member has to make every effort to bring to reconciliation a brother (a fellow-disciple or 'one of the little ones', v.14) who is at fault. This emphasis is further brought out in 18.21-22.

The Church as a local assembly of disciples and its gathering and deliberations as sanctioned by the presence of the Lord (18.20) are affirmations of the risen Lord's perpetual presence.

Thus, the universal community of disciples envisioned in 28.18-20 appears in this Gospel as an institution with rules, discipline and teachings, which are not applicable to the unsettled situation of the original disciples, who were moving around with Jesus. However, by putting this situation back into the time of Jesus Matthew links his community with the original disciples.

A Baptizing Community.

The universal community of disciples consists of those who have been made disciples of the risen Lord by Christian baptism. The Evangelist introduces Christian baptism at 28.19 as a post-resurrection rite commanded by the risen Lord.

The only pre-Christian baptism in the Gospel is that by John the Baptist. Matthew has drastically changed Mark 1.1ff not only to develop the identity of Jesus through the infancy narratives but to include John's discourse on the baptism of repentance (Q : Matt.3.7-10) and the conversation between John and Jesus about why Jesus had to be baptized (3.14-15). The discourse deals with the significance of John's baptism : The baptism of

repentance is to effect a change in human conduct. It is the right conduct and not Abrahamic descent that is the basis of deliverance from the coming judgement and of becoming children of God. The conversation between John and Jesus (3.14-15) is unique to Matthew. It establishes two things : 1) Jesus, 'the mightier One who baptizes with the Holy Spirit and fire', does not really need to be baptized by John; 2) Nevertheless, the baptism of repentance is endorsed by Jesus' reception of it "in fulfilment of all righteousness".

δικαιοσύνη is a particularly Matthean expression. J.C.Fenton argues that since the righteousness stands for obedience to divine commandments which are contained in the OT, to fulfil all righteousness is to fulfil the scriptures. Hence, the baptism by John reenacts the baptism in the Red Sea.²⁹ Since righteousness is the goal of all divine commands, and since the term usually refers to human conduct in Matthew's Gospel, we accept G.Barth's position that it denotes the conduct of a man which is in agreement with God's will, that is well pleasing to him and right before him.³⁰ Barth further explains that Jesus fulfils all righteousness by his humility. By baptism he, the messianic judge of the world enters on the way of the passion and resurrection, in that he humbles himself, enters into the rank of the sinners and acts for them.³¹ John's baptism is thus for 'rightness' of life before God. Jesus' reception of it is on behalf of others which, through his passion and resurrection, effects a change in those who need to be baptized with

the baptism of repentance.

The Synoptic Gospels regard John the Baptist as the fore-runner of Jesus. The significance of John and his baptism is to make others understand who Jesus is and whence is his authority (Matt. 21.24-25 and par.). Consequently, Johannine baptism becomes the proto-type of Christian baptism. In the Church the baptism 'in Jesus' name' replaces the baptism of John. According to Lars Hartmann, this qualifying phrase has a positive content: in Christian baptism as distinct from the baptism of John one belongs to Jesus.³² We have seen that Jesus is the basis of Christian baptism that is represented in the Great Commission. It is administered in relation to Jesus or for his sake; every element in 28. 19-20 directly reflects upon Jesus : Make disciples, baptizing them in the name of the Son ... and teaching them to observe all that I have commanded ..., I am with you.³³ Commanded by the risen Lord, Christian baptism is the means of admission to the community of disciples, whereby one is united with Christ in his death and resurrection.

The earliest explicit reference to the triadic formula in association with baptism is in Matthew.³⁴ Since the baptismal association of the formula is absent in the commission passages in the other Gospels, its place in a traditional commission Gattung is highly doubtful. Echoes of triadic forms used in the early Church are found in the formulae : Father - Son - Spirit, God - Lord - Spirit, Lord - God - Spirit etc. (I Cor. 12.4-6;

II Cor.13.14; Eph. 4.4-6). *Εἰς θεὸς καὶ Πατὴρ πάντων, εἰς κύριος ἐν πνεῦμα* and *ἐν βάπτισμα* (Eph.4.4-6) as the basis of later Creeds³⁵ possibly implies that it was originally used in a liturgical context. The inclusion of 'one baptism' and 'one body' (the Church) there would then imply that this original context may have been the baptismal service of the Church. However, baptismal use of the triadic formula does not appear anywhere in the NT apart from Matt.28.19.

The position of the triadic formula within the baptismal clause in Matthew is attested by the *Didache*.³⁶ As we have said, the Eusebian citations have not disproved its place in Matthew.³⁷ In the absence of a source prior to Matthew for the triadic baptismal formula we cannot be sure that Matthew has adopted it from his Church. We reiterate our opinion that it is a Matthean construct. Matthew maintains the God - Son - Spirit association in Jesus' birth, baptism, ministry and final commission. At the birth of Jesus the Holy Spirit is the creative power of God (1.18,20). At Jesus' baptism God as Father (with the heavenly voice), Jesus as the Son and the Holy Spirit are involved (3.16-17). It is by the Spirit of God that Jesus casts out demons (12.28). This association is climactically concluded in Matthew with the risen Lord's command to baptize in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit.

We must now consider whether the Christian baptism with the triadic formula is intended to fulfil the baptism John predicts of Jesus : 'He will

baptize you with the Holy Spirit and fire' (3.11). Jewish tradition speaks of fire as a symbol of judgement.³⁸ In the context of the Day of Judgement Paul speaks of fire as a purifying and destroying power (I Cor. 3.13-15). In John's preaching as reported by Matthew, the eschatological judgement is regarded as a baptism with fire (3.11f). The theme of eschatological judgement reappears in parables in Matt. 25. Both include the concept of final separation of the righteous from the wicked. Baptism with fire generally conveys and signifies the idea of eschatological judgement. This concept does not seem to directly influence the baptism according to Matt. 28.19, where neither the idea of judgement nor a mention of fire is included.

The Holy Spirit in Matt.3.11-12 has eschatological implications. The eschatological messianic association of the Holy Spirit has its roots in Jewish traditions.³⁹ The New Testament is generally concerned with the endowment and fullness of the Spirit in Christian life.⁴⁰ The gift of the Spirit at Pentecost (Acts 2.4) is often regarded as the manifest sign of the outpouring of the Spirit in the messianic age (cf. Joel 2.28). Christian baptism is understood as a baptism with the One Spirit (I Cor. 12.13 and Eph. 4.4-6). In Matthew's Gospel the Holy Spirit is the active power of God (1.18,20; 10.20; 12.28). At Jesus' baptism the descent of the Spirit signifies that the Messiah is being anointed with the Spirit (3.16-17). At 28.19 the term 'in the name of the Holy Spirit' distinguishes the baptismal association of the Spirit here from all other NT instances of

baptism with or by the Holy Spirit. Matthew's concern here is not with the meaning of Christian baptism, but with the demand for and act of baptism as a means of disciple-making. By baptizing 'in the name of the Holy Spirit', baptism is done 'in relation to' or 'for the sake of' the Holy Spirit. As every element in 28.18-20 reflects upon Jesus and his universal authority, by being baptized in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, one is made a disciple to Jesus the Son. Since 'baptism with the Holy Spirit and fire' (3.11) refers to the theological content of baptism, and 28.19 does not probe into such contents, Matthew does not seem to think in terms of fulfilment of the Johannine prediction.

Although Palestinian and Hellenistic Churches practised baptism from the beginning (Acts 2.38,41; 8.12; Rom.6.3; I Cor.12.13), this practice is traced to the command of the risen Lord for the first time by Matthew. He thus provides information on the institution of Christian baptism and attributes the command of the risen Lord as its authority. In the baptism of John, Jesus identifies himself with the sinners who need to be baptized by acting as their proxy. In Christian baptism according to Matthew, one identifies oneself with the risen Lord by being made a disciple to him and making disciples of others on his behalf.

A Teaching Community.

Matt.28.18-20 envisages a teaching community that propagates the

observance of Jesus' commands.⁴¹ Teaching is an important activity during the apostolic period. For instance, those who are baptized at Pentecost devote themselves to the Apostles' teaching (Acts 2.42). After baptizing Crispus, his household and many Corinthians, Paul remains with them for a year and a half, teaching them the word of God (Acts 18.8-11). According to Matthew, teaching is a continuing activity of the Church (signified by the present participle, διδασκοντες). Since its content is Jesus' teaching the Church is bound to Jesus by keeping and observing it in a 'disciples - master' relationship. The community to which the Gospel is addressed evidently consists of such disciples who had been taught by earlier disciples.

Those who regard the Gospel as a catechetical work take the phrase 'all that I commanded you' as a reference to the entire Gospel.⁴² Others who have full regard for the didactic character of the Gospel confine the phrase specifically to Jesus' teachings.⁴³ The Gospel and Jesus' commands are not identical just as preaching and teaching are not the same in Matthew. The Gospel of the Kingdom (4.23; 9.35; cf. 26.13) is to be preached for a testimony to all nations before the end (24.14 cf. Matthew's source, Mark 13.10), whereas disciples are made out of all nations by baptism and by teaching to observe Jesus' commands. With the term τηρετω Jesus' commands refer to nothing more than the didactic materials ascribed to Jesus in the Gospel.

Matthew arranges the didactic material in five major sections of discourses⁴⁴ with the central theme, 'the Kingdom of Heaven' :

- Matt. 5-7 : The old Law reinterpreted to the disciples as a way of life to follow in order to enter the Kingdom of Heaven.
- 10 : Directions for a restricted mission addressed to the apostles.
- 13 : Teachings on the Kingdom addressed, in parables, to the crowd (in the presence of the disciples).
- 16 : Teaching on the conduct of the community, addressed to the disciples and applied to a local setting.
- 23-25 : 23:- Addressing the crowd and the disciples warning them of the practices of the scribes and Pharisees who shut the Kingdom against others.
24-25:- Private teachings to the disciples about the coming of the Kingdom and the signs of the end.

Matthew intends much of the discourses to have been addressed to the first disciples who as Jews were familiar with the Law and Jewish customs. The formula, 'You have heard that it was said to the men of old ... But I say unto you', implies that Jesus is expounding the Law to his disciples who knew its content, but that they should understand it as Jesus teaches it. Matthew tries to establish that Jesus' teaching is absolutely in agreement with the Mosaic Law (12.1-7; 15.1-20; 19.1-9). He insists that

the Law is still valid (5.18f). Commandments are to be kept (19.17-19). As required by the Law, such practices as almsgiving, prayer, sacrifice, fasting, Sabbath observance etc. (5.23-24; 6.5-6, 16-18; 24.20) are to continue. With the didactic clause in the Great Commission Matthew implies that the Church continues to teach the same.

In Christian discipleship, according to the Great Commission, the emphasis is more on the observance than on mere knowledge of Jesus' commands (28.20a). Here, Matthew seems to draw a distinction between Rabbinic legalism and Christian practices. If Jesus is just an interpreter of the Law he is no different from the rabbis. For the rabbis the Law of Moses is the authoritative medium expressing God's will. For the Church the medium is primarily the person of Jesus who taught as one who has authority. J.P. Martin comments that Jesus, for Matthew, is the only true interpreter of Moses for the Church; therefore, Matthew calls the Church back to the "one teacher, one master, the Christ" (23.8-12).⁴⁵ The disciple-community observes Jesus' commands which are based on his own authority. It is noteworthy that Matthew's phrasing 'all that I commanded you' is similar to OT references to Yahweh's commands (see Exod.7.2; I Chron. 22.13; Jer.1.17). Matthew ascribes universal applicability to Jesus' commands and addresses his Gospel to a community consisting of members of Jewish and Gentile origin.

As to the nature of the Law of the new community, the law of love

has, in Jesus, fulfilled the Law of Moses. The whole body of Moses' Law is summed up in the command to love God and to love one's neighbour (22.37-39). According to Matthew's own additional statement, all the Law and the Prophets depend on this law of love (22.40). G.Barth sees in it a concentration of the whole Law; one in which everything is contained.⁴⁶ The new community has to demonstrate it (25.31-46). Lloyd Gaston says : "For Matthew it is very important that Jesus fulfilled the Law of Moses ; the Church, however, should fulfil the law of love."⁴⁷ For Barth, the law of love is the principle of interpretation of the Torah and the prophets.⁴⁸ Since the Gospel reemphasizes the validity of the Law of Moses and presents Jesus as fulfilling it, it should be said that the Law of Moses is essentially the law of love. The unique feature of the law of love is that it prescribes even love of enemies (5.44) and it forbids anger and lust leading to wrong action (5.22,28). The Evangelist sets a goal for the community that, by obedience to the law of love, the disciples' righteousness must exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees who are the acclaimed custodians of the Law (see 22.40; 9.13; 12.7; 18.12ff; 5.20). The pretended righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees is systematically exposed in Matt.23 by the list of woes against their pretentious observance of the Law . In contrast to the practices of the scribes and Pharisees, rightness of action with right motives is the criterion for the judgement of observances required by the Law in offering, almsgiving, prayer, fasting etc. .

The Matthean Church as a didactic community that teaches its members to live according to Jesus' teachings is the real setting of the didactic clause. The Evangelist also ascribes authority of the Lord's commands to the Church's teaching task.⁴⁹

A Missionary Community.

πάντα τὰ ἔθνη describes the sphere of the disciples' activity according to Matt. 28.18-20. In our analysis of the text we have concluded that τὰ ἔθνη here must be understood in the light of the universalistic motif of the Gospel and that when it is combined with πάντα it always takes the general rather than the technical sense.⁵⁰ The history of the early Church represented in Acts and Pauline epistles testifies that the Church received and baptized converts from Jews and Gentiles. Assuming that Matthew's community consists of such converts, we believe that its subsequent mission emerges from the scope of the community as 'universalist' rather than 'Gentile'.

Matthew reports two apostolic missions (Matt. 10 and 28), which share a number of basic elements. In Matt. 10 the Twelve are involved and in 28, the Eleven. Both missions are commissioned by Jesus from Galilee. In 10.1 missionary authority is imparted to them by Jesus and in 28.18ff the basis of missionary authority is the universal authority of Jesus and it is affirmed by the promise of his continued presence. In both, the Evangelist is silent about the actual course of the missions.

The missions in Matt.10 and 28 have sometimes been classified as Jewish mission and Gentile mission. The terms 'particularist mission' and 'universalist mission' characterize them better in the light of particularistic (see 10.5f; 15.24; 18.17; 19.28 etc.) and universalistic (see 2.1-12; 8.11f; 12.18-21; 13.38; 21.28-22.14; 24.14; 26.13 etc.) emphases in the Gospel. The terms might suggest contradictory emphases. Scholarly opinions about the contradiction differ widely. Goulder examines four possible explanations : 1) Since both emphases were known to have been held in the Church, the contradiction is to be accepted (maintained by Nepper-Christensen); 2) Particularist view might be included, but has been transcended by the universalist view (Trilling); 3) Matthew was just the editor who included both views without noticing the opposition; and 4) The contradiction is only apparent.⁵¹ Goulder himself suggests a reconciling view that Matthew "inserts a generally positive view of the Gentile mission, for that had been the Lord's will, as history showed : he inserts also a more limited view of the apostolic mission, since the apostles' work had been the evangelizing of Palestine only".⁵² Another extreme view is suggested by Ernest L. Abel who ascribes particularist and universalist material to different authors.⁵³ Abel succeeds in further explaining the differences by setting them apart. Every view stated above lacks an adequate interpretation of the Matthean motif in maintaining both emphases in tension. A close examination of the texts within the setting of the Evangelist's own background would show that it is within his purpose to hold both emphases without absolute contradiction.

The influence of OT scriptures on Matthean perspectives may be suggested as part of the setting of both particularist and universalist emphases in the Gospel. The call and election of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and of Israel as the chosen people, the Sinai Covenant etc. reflect early particularist tendencies. Elijah fought against religious syncretism for the cause of religious particularism. Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi demonstrate concern for national as well as religious particularism (Hagg.2; Zech.8; Mal.1,3). According to Joel 3.1ff salvation is for Israel, whereas the nations will face judgement on account of Israel. Ezra and Nehemiah develop particularist emphasis and speak of the rejection of the nations. The universalist emphasis in the OT is traced basically to the promise to Abraham: "In your seed the families of the earth shall be blessed" (Gen.12.3 cf. 18.18; 28.14; 22.18; 26.4), and Jeremiah later alludes to it (Jer.4.2). The book of Ruth affirms that divine providence is for all who rely on God. In Jonah we come across a serious concern for universal mission that divine grace must be preached to all the nations. According to Amos and Isaiah, the nations belong to YHWH who guides them. They hope for his salvation (Isa. 2.2ff; 11.10). Deutero-Isaiah is especially concerned with the salvation of the nations and he reminds Israel of its universal missionary vocation that as the elect of YHWH and a light to the Gentiles, God's salvation must reach the ends of the earth through them (42.1ff; 49.1ff; esp.vv.5-6). We cannot determine the extent of direct influence of these OT points of view on Matthew. From his general dependence on the OT beyond a series of

quotations we would hope Matthew to have at least been indirectly influenced by the two emphases of the OT. However, he develops his view of universalism at one point (12.18-21) with his free quotation of Isa. 42.1-4.

The particularist emphasis is a Matthean motif. In Jesus' conversation with the Canaanite woman (Matt.15.22-28) Matthew affirms that Jesus' own apostolate is primarily to the lost sheep of the house of Israel - a theme Matthew introduces in his redaction of the Marcan story (Mark 7.25-30). Jesus' ministry still extends beyond the 'house of Israel' (Matt.15.28 cf. 8.5-13), where faith transcends privilege. His disciples' apostolate is also primarily to the 'lost sheep of the house of Israel' (10.5f).⁵⁴

The image of 'sheep' as applied to Israel is from the OT. The estranged or scattered Israel is like lost sheep without a shepherd (Numb.27.17; I Kings 22.17; II Chron.18.16; Isa.13.14; Ezek.34.5; Zech. 10.2). The name 'sheep' or 'flock' is applied directly to Israel in II Sam. 24.17; Isa.63.11; Jer.13.20; 50.17; Ezek.34.11,31 etc. . The designation 'lost sheep' is used with reference to the community of Israel, whose shepherds have forgotten their fold (Jer.50.6). That Matthew is familiar with these usages is clear from the similar references in his Gospel. The harassed and helpless Jewish crowds are like sheep without a shepherd (Matt.9.36). In 10.16 and 26.31 the designation "sheep" is limited to the

'Twelve' disciples who have Jesus as their shepherd. The qualifying terms 'lost' and 'the house of Israel' at 10.5f and 15.24 would then refer to all Israel, except those who belong to the community of disciples.

Matthew shows special interest in the number 'Twelve' (10.1,2,5) in the setting of the mission to Israel. He sees in Jesus a historical continuity with Israel (cf. the genealogy in Matt.1). Without an absolute discontinuity the New Israel continues with Jesus and his disciples, who according to Matthew have a primary concern for the rest of Israel. As F.W.Beare stresses, Matthew's concern at 10.1-16 is to bring out as strongly as possible the thought that Jesus was primarily concerned with Israel.⁵⁵

The universalistic emphasis is also a Matthean motif which he has been building up through the Gospel. At the birth of Jesus, the Magi, representing the Gentile world and directed by their own knowledge, approach Jesus and worship him with their offerings (2.1-12). The Evangelist accords this privilege to the Gentile Magi in an attempt to include the Gentiles in the story of Jesus from the beginning. Matthew makes the healing of the Centurion's servant (from Q) an occasion to introduce the coming of many from the east and west to the Kingdom of Heaven (8.11-12). Jesus heals the daughter of the Canaanite woman (15.21-28 cf. Mark 7.24-30). Trilling concludes from Matthew's redaction of

these healing stories that Jesus was indeed sent only to Israel, and that the Gentiles occupy Israel's place because of the latter's rejection of Jesus.⁵⁶ He reads into these stories the themes of 'rejection and substitution' instead of the primacy of concern and an implicit universalism. The themes of 'rejection and substitution' are rather evident in such pericope as the parable of the marriage feast (Q : Matt. 22.1-14; Luke 14.16-24), where the gathering of the uninvited expresses concern for universalism as the leading motif. With his free citation of Isa.42.1-4 Matthew states that (12.15-21) the Servant prophecy is being fulfilled in Jesus in whom the Gentiles find the message of justice and hope. At 24.14 he very strongly expresses through Jesus' words the Church's missionary concern that the Gospel must be preached throughout the world before the end as a testimony to the nations. Matthew's universalistic emphasis is concluded with the risen Lord's command in 28.18-20.⁵⁷ Jeremias rightly points out that among the synoptists "Matthew evinces the strongest inclination to ascribe to Jesus a missionary activity among the Gentiles".⁵⁷ Just as Jesus went to Jews and Gentiles, so did the disciples after the resurrection.

Though Matthew maintains both particularist and universalist emphases in the Gospel, we cannot be sure whether or not there was an actual mission of the disciples during Jesus' time. Matthew bases his information about the sending of the apostles on Mark 6.7f, and probably regards the mission as having been carried out. However, the description of the restricted

mission is coloured by features reflecting a later time, a time Matthew knows of : Those on mission to Israel are hungry, thirsty and in need of lodging. They are being persecuted, imprisoned and delivered up to death by their own kinsmen (10.16-22 cf. 25.31-46). They are dragged before the secular authorities who are Gentiles (10.18). The apostles are not yet able to cover all the cities of Israel (10.23).

Christianity as an offshoot of Judaism naturally felt obliged to give priority to reaching the Jews first (cf. Rom.1.16). The graphic description of the manner of the mission, the fate of the disciples and their failure (10.5-25) could hardly be perceived as a pattern designed for future missions, because of its precise details. The sketch here reflects actual experiences missionaries are facing. Further, the restriction against Samaritans and Gentiles (10.5) negatively suggests the simultaneous existence of a universal mission.⁵⁸ This further agrees with the Gospel theme of the failure of Israel to accept and the Gentile acceptance of, the Messiah and the Kingdom. The mission text within the general approach of the Gospel suggests that particularism and universalism represent two different missionary stances in Matthew's Church.

The discourse in Matt.10 further demonstrates that the Twelve have a mission very similar to that of Jesus and that they share Jesus' power (10.1,5-8). The missionary task of the apostles is to announce the imminence of the Kingdom and to carry out its signs (10.7f).⁵⁹ The Marcan

'preaching of repentance' (Mark 6.12) is changed to announcing the coming of the Kingdom of Heaven (Matt.10.7). They thus proclaim the same message as Jesus. Of the four commands : "heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse lepers and cast out demons" (10.8) two are Matthew's own additions to his source (Mark 6.13); i.e., raising the dead and cleansing the lepers (cf. Matt. 8.1ff). H.J.Held says that it is quite obviously Matthew's opinion that the disciples should do the work of Jesus. The content of their proclamation is the same as that of the preaching of Jesus (10.7; 4.17). Their healing activity comprises all the miracles reported in Matt.8-9 (10.8, with the exception of the healing of the blind).⁶⁰ Thus in Matthew's view the disciples' mission is an extension of Jesus' mission, and Jesus' ministry is the model for their ministry.

Matthew presents the apostles as having the same message and ministry as Jesus. This is rather difficult to conceive as a temporary task. They resemble the ministry and message of the Church in its continuing mission. According to Eduard Schweizer, the continuance of the authority with the disciples (Matt.10) presupposes that healings and similar miracles are still going on in the Church.⁶¹ He thinks that in the Matthean Church some particularly gifted members of the Church are probably following Jesus in a more literal way, continuing his itinerant life, wandering from place to place to serve and to teach the Church.⁶² Gerd Theissen describes the situation of wandering charismatics as a sociological phenomenon in earliest Christianity.⁶³ The ministry and message of the disciples have

a wider application than to the limited Jewish-Christian missionary setting. That the Church is equipped with a wider missionary vision is evident in Matt.28.18-20 (cf. Luke 24.47f) reflecting the universalistic missionary enterprise already in progress during the first century.

Matt.10.5-6; 15.24 and 28.18-20 belong to Matthew's own material. Rather than being contradictory, they belong to a definite Matthean scheme of salvation-history. While being sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel Jesus' ministry reaches beyond Israel (15.24) to those who find their hope in him. On the pattern of this primacy of concern his disciples have their primary obligation to reach Israel (10.5-6). The rejection of the Messiah is a conspicuous feature in the Gospel, which the disciples also face with adverse consequences in their mission to Israel (10.16-22). Since Matthew nowhere specifies an absolute abandonment of the apostles' mission to Israel, and the Gospel is concluded with a climactic summary of its universalistic concern, we would assume that according to Matthew the mission to Israel is now included in one universal mission.

Taking the two apostolic missions together and as mutually inclusive in a single continuing mission of the Messiah, we come across a missionary community of disciples which is commissioned to preach the message of the Kingdom, to carry on Jesus' ministry (10.7-8) and to make further disciples to Jesus by baptizing them and teaching them to observe Jesus'

commands (28.18-20). In the missionary task, the community is always committed to allegiance to the past ministry and the message of Jesus.

A Worshipping Community.

Matthew's interest in describing as worship the gesture of those who approach in reverence to Jesus is evident from his redaction of various Marcan passages.⁶⁴ Matthew's conviction that Jesus is recognized in worship as one who reveals himself to his disciples and as one who is always present with them (28.16-20) is carried through the entire Gospel. We now take a look at how the liturgical interest and background of Matthew prompted his presentation of the Christophanies in chapter 28.

The First Gospel is regarded by Kilpatrick and Carrington as a revised edition of a lectionary prepared for liturgical use in the Church. Kilpatrick ascribes the shaping of the Gospel to the liturgical milieu of a city Church, probably in Syria.⁶⁵ From the reading of Mark, Q and M in the liturgical gatherings of the Church, Matthew has taken over passages from these sources and developed them in accordance with liturgical need in the Church.⁶⁶ Matthew is only credited with the style and language of an editor.⁶⁷ Carrington who is primarily concerned with the Gospel of Mark which, he believes, has been shaped into a lectionary in 48 sections of twelve four-week readings, considers that Matthew also designed his sources into a similar calendrical mould in response to the needs of his

Church.⁶⁸ W.D.Davies questions this lectionary theory on the ground that it is mechanical. For him, however, the liturgical influence on Matthew's Gospel is an important concern.⁶⁹

Goulder follows up Kilpatrick's lectionary suggestions with a different scheme. He rejects the multiple sources of Matthew and argues that Matthew has a single source, Mark. The Gospel is a free reworking of midrashic expansion on Mark with very little addition from outside Mark. Goulder thus approaches the lectionary hypothesis by regarding the new materials and style as typically Matthean. He claims that Matthew wrote his Gospel to be read in Church round the year and that it follows the lections of the Jewish year.⁷⁰ However, Goulder fails to muster any evidence for the use of an established Matthean lectionary in the early Church. That the First Gospel was most often quoted by the second century Fathers who read it in the Church⁷¹ does not substantiate an original lectionary arrangement of the Gospel. The motifs underlying Matthew's redaction of his sources are much more than liturgical. With his artificial divisions of the Gospel material,⁷² Goulder, in effect, proposes a new lectionary based on the First Gospel.

Though the opinions of Kilpatrick, Carrington and Goulder have not received wide support, we recognize a liturgical motif or background behind certain passages in the Gospel : e.g., 6.6-13; 11.25-30; 18.9-10, 16-20. We now take a look at these texts.

The Lord's Prayer is set within the context of giving instructions to the community of disciples on piety which includes prayer (6.1-18). The prayer itself is more elaborate than Luke's version (Luke 11.2-4) and, therefore, probably longer than the Q form. The form in Didache is almost identical and apparently dependent on the Matthean form (cf. Did. 8.2).

Davies identifies much of the content and form of the Lord's Prayer and the appended doxology in the Eighteen Benedictions of the Synagogue worship. He suggests that in substance the prayer goes back to Jesus himself and that the present form is reconstructed as a Christian counterpart to the SHEMONE ESREH.⁷³ That in substance the prayer goes back to Jesus is hypothetical, whereas its Jewish-Christian background is evident. An entirely different position is taken by Goulder. In his view, what we have in Matthew is a prayer composed by the Evangelist from the traditions of the prayers of Jesus in Mark's Gospel, amplified from the Exodus context of the Sermon on the Mount and couched in Matthean language.⁷⁴ In his analysis, Jesus' teaching on prayer in Mark 11.25 and the prayer at Gethsemane in Mark 14.36 supply its basic content. The first three petitions for God's honouring and the latter three for our needs correspond to the two halves of the Decalogue. 'Give this day our bread for the morrow' is amplified in correspondence to the giving of manna for the coming day.⁷⁵ Saying that what we have in Luke is a version pruned of the rounded Matthean periods and couched in Lucan language,⁷⁶

Goulder ascribes the original form of the Lord's Prayer to Matthew. For him there is no Q form of the prayer since he does not accept the Q hypothesis. Goulder has not succeeded in establishing his denial of the Q hypothesis. Therefore, the relation between the Matthean and Lucan forms of the prayer needs further consideration.

If Matthew were the original composer of the Lord's Prayer, as Goulder thinks, we would expect considerable agreement between its content and setting in Matthew. Where Jesus criticises the Jewish leaders and draws a contrast between how they are and how his disciples should be in regard to the practice of piety, almsgiving, prayer and fasting, the content of the Lord's Prayer has no proper connection with the teaching that precedes and follows it (except the teaching on forgiveness in vv.14f). Since the preface at 6.8 refers to Jesus' saying : "Your Father knows what you need before you ask him", the content of 'asking for needs' within the Lord's Prayer is inconsistent with the Matthean preface. Luke, on the other hand, prefers the occasion of a prayer of Jesus as the context, where one of the disciples asks Jesus to teach them to pray. Luke at least adapts the prayer to a seemingly more appropriate setting.

Since Matthew and Luke share a fairly similar basic form of the Lord's Prayer, we ascribe it to their common source, Q. The differences between the two recensions suggest the redactional reworking of the basic form by either or both. Since we cannot determine the extent of the Lucan redaction,

it is mainly on the basis of Mattheanisms that we can assess the additions and alterations in Matthew. The clauses which are absent in Luke but found in Matthew provide the primary source of enquiry. These are: "Our (Father) who art in heaven Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven But deliver us from evil (i.e., the Evil One)".

While Luke does not quote Mark 11.25, Matthew takes it away from the Marcan context and sets it in after the Lord's Prayer (Matt.6.14-15) primarily because it shares with the prayer the theme of forgiveness. Making use of Mark 11.25 here as well as at 18.35, (where he refers to God as the 'Father who is in heaven'), Matthew seems to amplify the address 'Father' in the Lord's Prayer into 'Our Father who art in heaven'. The phrase has its roots in Rabbinic literature⁷⁷, and it was also used as a "standard Jewish prayer formula".⁷⁸ The sense of the phrase, 'thy will be done', owes its origin to Jesus' prayer at Gethsemane (Mark 14.36), but the form is Matthean since he repeats it at 26.42b. 'On earth as it is in heaven' is a natural corollary to the address, 'Father in heaven', whose will is asked to be accomplished on earth (cf.7.21b). Raymond Brown notes that "heaven and earth" is a Hebrew expression for "world" or "universe" and that the petition, "on the coming about of God's will on earth as in heaven emphasizes the universality of the divine glory".⁷⁹ 'Heaven and earth' is a favourite Matthean combination.⁸⁰ It expresses the recognition of God as the Lord of heaven and earth based on the tradition of Gen.1.1: God created the heavens and the earth. This recognition is evident in the

Gospel in which the combination is generally used in connection with the Lord's universal authority. For Matthew, the noun, ὁ πόνηρος, is a synonym for Satan; it is evident in his redaction of the Marcan parable of the Sower (Mark 4.15/Matt.13.19). The petition, 'but deliver us from evil (the evil one)' following 'lead us not into temptation' is to avoid confusing God for the Tempter and to allude to the evil one as the one who has tempted Jesus.

Besides the additions, the minor changes in the Matthean rendition may be understood as redactional. 'This day' in Matthew in comparison with 'each day' in Luke is clearly more specific. Since Matthew describes sin as debt in Matt.18.23-35, 'our debts' (Luke : 'sins') is used for consistency with the clause that follows : 'as we have forgiven our debtors'. Matthew's rendition of the clause itself is more specific than that of Luke which says : 'for we ourselves forgive every one who is indebted to us'. Matthew regards reconciliation with fellowmen as a prerequisite for prayer to God for forgiveness.

Matthew intends the Lord's Prayer as a model prayer. This is evident from the introductory instruction : 'Pray then like this (v.9a). With additions and changes he has turned the prayer into a liturgical form intending it to be used by the community at worship. The repeated use of the plural ὑμεῖς in its various cases reemphasizes its community setting. With 'this day' the Evangelist intends the prayer to be recited daily by

the community. The realization of the heavenly Father's will on earth as it is in heaven is fundamental to the community's mission commanded by the Son who is endowed with all authority in heaven and on earth. The mission as the accomplishment of divine authority is, at the same time, the exercise of the divine will.

Matt.11.25-26 (Q : Luke 10.21) contains a liturgical formula of thanksgiving : 'I thank you Father, Lord of heaven and earth'. The address 'Father' with the addition 'Lord of heaven and earth', which is reminiscent of ben Sirach's prayer (Ecclus. 51.1), is a traditional liturgical form, obviously of Jewish origin. The prayer in Matt.11.25-26 speaks of the revelation for which thanksgiving is offered. The object of the revelation, 'these things', is not clear in either Matthew or Luke. The content of the prayer, 'the hiding of these things (cf. mysteries) from the wise and revelation of these to the babes' has echoes in the OT (Isa.29.14; Psalms 19.7) and in Paul (I Cor.1.18-20, where v.19 is dependent on Isa.29.14). Jesus' thanksgiving here represents the community's thanksgiving for the revelation and understanding. In the context of the prayer of thanksgiving Jesus declares (Q : Matt.11.27; Luke 10.22) the divine authority over all things given to the Son, who alone knows the Father and reveals him to those to whom the Son chooses to reveal (i.e., the babes, the 'little ones' who are the disciples. cf. 10.42; 18.1ff; 19.13ff).

Corresponding to ben Sirach's subsequent invitation to his

instructions (Ecclus.51.23-27) Jesus invites those who labour and are heavy laden to come to him, take his 'yoke' upon them and learn from him (Matt.11.28-30). The 'yoke' in ben Sirach's invitation signifies instruction or learning : "Put your neck under the yoke" (Ecclus.51.26) means 'commit yourselves to learning'. The Rabbinic tradition has identified the 'yoke' with the Law (Aboth 3.6 : 'the yoke of the Law'). Matthew undoubtedly takes over such expressions from Jewish tradition. In his text, through Jesus he addresses himself to his fellow-Jews who are heavy laden with the burden of the Law as expounded to them by the scribes and Pharisees (cf. Matt.23.4). Matthew also presupposes an existing community of disciples who learn the Law from Jesus who has himself fulfilled the Law (5.17).

In Matthew's redaction of the Q material (11.25-27) with the additional call to learning from Jesus (11.28-30) we find a sequence : prayer (worship) - claim to authority - call to instruction. Matthew employs a similar sequence in his Galilean appearance story, where after being worshipped the risen Lord claims possession of absolute authority and commissions the disciples to instruct the community to observe his commands. 'Discipleship' is a basic concept in both. In 11.28-30 there is a direct call to discipleship ("come ... learn from me") and in 28.19-20 the main motif is 'to make disciples' by teaching them. Both texts have in their background a community that learns and observes Jesus' commands.

Ecclesiastical discipline exercised in the context of prayer and

worship (Matt.18.19-20) recalls a practice of the Matthean Church corresponding to that in the Corinthian Church (I Cor. 5.4). Matt.18.19 signifies that the Church is a community of disciples who pray to God through Jesus. Delling suggests that in conjunction with 18.19, Jesus' saying in 18.20 "can be taken substantially as the clue to the meaning, foundation, content and aim of the primitive Christian service; for the foundation of Christian service is contained in the $\delta\nu\omega\mu\alpha$ 'In $\rho\sigma\theta$ '⁸¹ The presence of Christ, promised in 18.19-20 is realized by the risen Lord's presence with the disciples in their ministry. This is in agreement with the Jewish tradition in Aboth 3.2⁸², where divine presence is promised "if two sit together and words of the Law are spoken between them". Corresponding to it the risen Lord promises to be present at the teaching of his commandments. In 18.20 the concept of the Lord's presence is applied to worship and discipline in the Church. "In that people gather in Jesus' name, he takes the place of the Torah; but also in that he is in their midst he takes the place of divine presence".⁸³ Matthew brackets his Gospel with words of the divine presence of Jesus as Emmanuel: 'God with us' (1.23) and as the risen Lord 'I am with you' (28.20), and thus provides a worship setting for the entire Gospel.

The First Gospel demonstrates awareness of the place and importance of prayer in individual and community life. It enunciates principles and directives for prayer. The Evangelist and the community believe that prayer and fasting are means of healing (17.21).⁸⁴ Prayer is needed to resist

temptation (6.13; 26.41). Answer to prayer is assured and 'the Father in heaven' is believed to be the giver of all good things to those who ask him (7.7-11; 18.19). The community both encourages private prayer (6.5-6) and recognizes the importance of congregational prayer (18.19-20). In the community's attitude towards others, prayer has a significant place. The community, therefore, has to pray even for those who persecute them (5.44).

That the Matthean community is a worshipping community is further evident from the liturgical features found in the Matthean account of the institution of the Eucharist. With the accounts of the Last Supper, the synoptists inform their readers of the origin of the central rite their communities have been observing in their worship life. Compared with Mark, the preparation of the Passover meal is described by Matthew in less detail (Matt.26.17-19). Whereas Luke alone clearly identifies the Last Supper with the Passover meal, (Luke 22.15-20), Matthew, like Mark, is not clear as to whether or not Jesus and his disciples did indeed eat the Passover meal. It is specified that the Last Supper was an evening meal (26.20ff)⁸⁵ that Jesus and his disciples shared.

In Matthew's account of the Last Supper (26.26-29) he follows Mark 14.22-25 closely, but makes minor alterations and additions which are liturgically significant. With the introductory phrase borrowed from Mark, "as they were eating", Matthew informs his readers that the institution of the Church's Eucharist took place in the context of the Last Supper.

With the addition of "eat" to the Marcan words over the bread and the alteration of the words over the cup, "and they all drank of it" in Mark to "Drink of it all of you" the words of the institution have been given more liturgical content and literal consistency. Matthew might be using the words the same way as his community used them in its liturgical gatherings. In the Matthean form, the words are addressed to the congregation. The addition, "for the forgiveness of sins" in Matt. 26.28 is also Matthean. He moves this phrase from the context of the Johannine baptism (Mark 1.4) to his Eucharistic formula. This clause also suggests a possibility that in Matthew's Church the Eucharist was meant for the forgiveness of sins. Didache follows this Matthean tenor; according to it, confession of sins precedes the Eucharist (Did. 14.1). Reconciliation between brethren is for Matthew a prerequisite to an offering at the altar (Matt. 5.23-24).

There are a few liturgical terms which Matthew incorporates in his Gospel. For instance, the address *κύριε* echoes a confessional element (8.25). *κύριε, σῶσον* (8.25; 14.30) is in itself a prayer. So is *κύριε, ἐλέησον* in 17.15. "In the name of" (28.19) generally refers to God "and the formula appears to have belonged to the language of worship and implied the idea of invocation."⁸⁶ Matthew incorporates this liturgical formula in his composition of the baptismal formula.

The 'mountain' in Matt. 28.16 signifies a worship setting.⁸⁷

Traditionally religious significance is ascribed to mountains as places of revelation and worship. The natural phenomenon of the mountain, as Foerster discusses, has awakened religious concepts in all ages and among all peoples.⁸⁸ In OT prophecy and poetry, *ὄρος* signifies the superior power of God (Isa.40.12; Psalms 65.6; 90.2; 95.4) and is associated with a sense of proximity to God (Exod.17.9f; Deut. 11.29; 27.12f; Joshua 8.33).⁸⁹ Horeb is called the 'mountain of God' (Exod.3.1). Sinai occupies a supreme place as the 'mountain of revelation', on which the Torah was given (Exod.19ff). Elijah ascends Mount Carmel to pray (I Kings 18.42). Matthew follows the traditional concept of mountains as places of revelation and worship. The 'mountain' in Matthew (5.1; 15.29; 17.1; 24.3) is especially significant as the place of the revelations of Jesus. Jesus retires to the mountain for prayer (14.23). The Lord's Prayer in Matthew is said on a mountain (5.1; 6.9-13). The Matthean concept of 'mountain' comes to a climax at 28.16, where the unnamed theological mountain of the Christophany is both the place of revelation of the exalted One and the place where the disciples worship him.

Many of the commissionings in the OT have a setting of worship and words of divine presence as in 28.20b (cf. Gen. 28.15; Judg. 6. 12-13) are the assurance of support for them.⁹⁰ The Great Commission set in the context of worship is thus rooted in the OT tradition.

A worshipping community, of which Matthew is a member, is an obvious setting of the Gospel and its resurrection narrative. The Evangelist has not only made use of traditional liturgical elements and language of worship but created additional materials to help the community's sense of worship. We have already discussed Matthew's preference for the term προσκυνεῖν in the sense of worship and his intent to present the earthly Jesus and the risen Lord as being worshipped.⁹¹ The Christophanies in Matt. 28 are hence occasions of corporate worship of the risen Lord.

The aim of this chapter has been to explore the extent of ecclesiastical influence on Matthean redaction and composition of the resurrection narrative. We have seen that in the narrative as well as in the Gospel Matthew thinks in terms of a community - a community founded on a master-disciple relationship with Jesus. The community demonstrates institutional features and a wide missionary outlook; and it traces the source of its authority to Jesus' words.

NOTES.

1. Matt. 8.21; 13.10; 14.15,19,22,26; 15.12,33,36; 16.5,20; 17.6,10,13,19; 18.1; 19.10,13,25; 21.6,20; 24.3; 26.8,17,19,26,35,36,40,45,56; 27.64.
2. Matt. 5.1; 8.23; 9.10,11,19,37; 12.1,49; 15.23.
3. Matt. 9.14; 15.2.
4. Matt. 26.18.
5. Matt. 10.1,2,5; 11.1; 20.17; 26.14,20,47.
6. Matt. 28.16.
7. R.Meyer, "ὁχλος" , TDNT, V, p.586.
8. Bultmann, History of the Synoptic Tradition, p.333.
9. A post-resurrection attitude is applied to them and hence, the time of the Church is equated with the earthly situation of Jesus. cf. G.Barth, in Tradition and Interpretation., p.111.
10. Ibid., p.108.
11. This has been fully discussed by Barth, pp.108-112.
12. Matt.5.1 implies that the section introduced by it consists of private teachings to the disciples, and not a sermon to the crowd. The intimate teachings to the disciples given in chapters 5-7 testify to it. But the sermon ends with the crowd in 7.28. Although these chapters are intended to be a unit, the contradiction between 5.1 and 7.28 with regard to the audience implies that Matthew is combining Jesus' teachings on different occasions, some of which may have been given to a large audience. They are collated for teaching in the Church.
13. For a detailed study on Jesus as Rabbi see D.Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, London : 1956, pp.205-223.
 Since Jesus is addressed as Rabbi, K.Stendahl supposes that there may be an unbroken line of tradition from the School of Jesus and the School of John to the School of Matthew with its ingenious interpretation of the OT as the crown of its scholarship (K.Stendahl, School of St. Matthew, p.34). An influence of Rabbinic social pattern

on the Matthean Church is possible, but Matthew prefers Jesus not to be called Rabbi by the Church.

Hans Kosmala points out that 'Rabbi' was not an official title until after the destruction of Jerusalem ("In My Name", Swedish Theological Institute Annual, V, 1966-67, p.90). The address belongs to the time of Matthew. However, the title is used to indicate the lack of understanding by the crowd in contrast to the intimate knowledge of the disciples, for whom Jesus is KYRIOS.

14. Bornkamm, Tradition and Interpretation, p.42.
15. Ibid., pp. 38-39.
16. H.F.von Soden, "ἀδελφός καὶ ἄλλοι", TDNT, I, p.145, where he refers to some 30 instances in Acts and 130 in Paul. ἀδελφός, as he points out, is a religious title taken over from Jewish religious custom.
17. Stonehouse argues in favour of a broad application of the title here to all those who are attached to Jesus, since the only other two instances in Matthew (12.49-50 and 25.40) are such and since the company of Jesus in and around Jerusalem at that time would comprise more than the Twelve and the few women (N.B.Stonehouse, The Witness of Matthew and Mark to Christ, Michigan: 1958, pp. 175-176). We argue that the broad application is possible only in view of the Great Commission.

See Trilling, Das Wahre Israel, pp.29-31 for a discussion on 'the disciples as Christ's brethren'. He quotes O.Michel that the word 'Jüngerschaft' "klingt im Matthäus-Evangelium nicht mehr missionarisch, sondern gemeindenässig" (p.31).

18. See J.A.Emerton, "Binding and Loosing - Forgiving and Retaining", JTS, 13, 1962, pp.325-331. Emerton suggests that the saying in Matthew and John probably originated from Isa.22.22: "He shall open, and none shall shut; and he shall shut and none shall open". But Emerton's

conjecture lacks adequate evidence, and as W.G.Thompson comments, it fails to take sufficient account of the Matthean context (W.G. Thompson, Matthew's Advice to a Divided Community, Rome : 1970, p. 191). Rather, it seems to originate in an ecclesiastical context, where disciplinary measures are required.

19. Cullmann, for example, regards Matt.16.17-19 as a misplaced narrative which interrupts the flow of the Marcan story. According to him, this was a dominical saying of Jesus which belonged originally to the context of the Last Supper and now represented by Luke 22.31-34. (Cullmann, Peter : Disciple, Apostle, Martyr, Philadelphia : 1962, pp.176-217; Cullmann, "πέτρα , Πέτρος" , TDNT, VI, pp.95-108; cf. Robert H.Grundy, "The Narrative Framework of Matthew XVI. 17-19", Nov. Test., 7, 1964-65, pp.1-8, where Grundy rejects Cullmann's shifting of the narrative framework of the logion to the scene described in Luke 22.31-34). Since the only thing that both Evangelists have in common here is the idea of the prominence of Peter, this attempt to determine the original setting on the basis of Luke 22.31ff must be considered hypothetical.

According to R.H.Fuller the 'You are Peter' saying is best taken as a verbalization of the meaning of a primary appearance of the Lord to Peter. As a detached saying it was easily transferable to a setting in Jesus' earthly ministry (Fuller, Formation., pp.166-167; Fuller, "The Resurrection of Jesus", Bib. Res., IV, 1960, p.22). Comparing with the Johannine parallel logion of the forgiving and retaining of sins (John 20.23), Fuller concludes that Matt.16.19 and 18.18 belong to the post-Easter appearance tradition with its baptismal content of the remission of sins. He concludes that Matthew changed both the context and content of the logion : from resurrection to Jesus' earthly ministry, and from baptismal to the Church's discipline. (Fuller, "The 'Thou art Peter' Pericope and the Easter Appearances", McCormick Quarterly, 20, 1966-67, pp.312-313). A

resurrection appearance to Peter and a Petrine commission are also supported by other NT evidence (See I Cor.15.5; Luke 24.34; John 21.4ff). However, if we regard the logion in John 20.23 as closer to the original context, the authority to forgive and retain sins is given to the community of disciples. Hence, in Matthew's adaptation of the logion, Matt.18.18 has a more accurate setting than 16.19.

20. See Max Wilcox, "Peter and the Rock : A Fresh Look at Matthew XVI.17-19", NTS, 22, 1975-76, p.74; Cullmann, "πέτρα", TDNT, VI, pp.98f; Cullmann, "Πέτρος, Κηφῆς", TDNT, VI, pp.100-108.
21. Goulder, for example, argues that Matthew himself has developed the logion from Peter's confession, Mark 3.16, where the surname 'Peter' is introduced, and Eph.2.22, which states the concept of building the Church on apostolic foundation. (Midrash., pp.386-391).

According to Wilcox, the section, Matt.16.17-19 was not originally a single unit. Based on different sources and on the interpretative tradition of the Church, the final form of the logion is due to Matthew himself. ("Peter and the Rock..", pp.74-88).

22. e.g., Matt.4.4; 22.1; 28.5.
23. Matt.3.2; 4.17; 5.20; 13.44,45,47 and many more.
24. Matt.18.15a : If your brother sins against you, go and tell him his fault. cf. Luke 17.3 : If your brother sins, rebuke him.
25. Trilling, Das Wahre Israel, p.117.
26. I Cor.5.9-6.6; II Cor. 13.1; Gal.6.1; II Thess.3.6,14-15; I Tim.5.19-20; II Tim. 4.2; Tit. 3.10-11; Heb. 10.28; James 5.19-20.
27. cf. Goulder, Midrash., pp.163,169, 400-401.
28. Abbott-Smith, Lexicon., "ἐθνικός". The adverb ἐθνικῶς referring to Gentile fashion is used only once in the NT (Gal.2.14). See Ibid., "ἐθνικῶς". For a detailed discussion on the technical and general sense of ἔθνος and ἐθνικός see Chapter I, pp.55-56 above.
29. Fenton, Saint Matthew, pp.59,61.

30. G.Barth, Tradition and Interpretation., pp.138-139. He notes the uniform usage of $\delta\iota\alpha\kappa\alpha\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\upsilon\nu\eta$ (7 times) in Matthew, while it occurs only once in Luke (1.75).
31. Ibid., pp.140-141.
32. Lars Hartmann, "Into the Name of Jesus", NTS, 20, 1973-'74, pp.432-440.
33. See Chapter I, p.53 above.
34. See Chapter I, p.54 above.
35. Nicene and Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creeds. cf. John C. Kirby, Ephesians, Baptism and Pentecost, London : 1968, p.151; T.H.Bindley, The Oecumenical Documents of the Faith, (rev. ed. by F.W.Green), London : 1950, pp.29, 31, 45, 73-75.
36. See Chapter I, pp.51-52 above. cf. Did. 9.5, where it shows that a monadic formula was also in use.
37. See Chapter I, pp.48-51 above. Eusebius quotes the triadic formula only in his later writings. It does not however mean that he was not aware of the triadic formula in Matthew.
38. See Isa.66.15f; Amos 1.4; 7.4; Mal.3.2; Psalms of Solomon 15.4; IQH 3.28-31; 6.18; IQS 2.8,15 (W.H.Brownlee, "John the Baptist in the New Light of Ancient Scrolls", Int., 9, 1955, pp.90f.
39. James D.G.Dunn, ("Spirit-and-Fire Baptism", Nov.Test., 14, 1972) states that in Jewish tradition prior to John there was no expectation of the Spirit as the gift of the Messiah. The eschatological outpouring of the Spirit was not directly connected with the Messiah (p.88). The Qumran sect seems to regard the Holy Spirit as a cleansing power (p.90 : IQS 3.7-9; IQH 16.12; cf. 7.6; 17.26; Frag.2,9,13). This sect had already linked the hopes of a Spirit-anointed Messiah and a divine outpouring of the Spirit in the Messianic age. The Isaiah Scroll of Cave I at Qumran reads at Isa.LII. 14f that the Spirit-anointed Messiah shall sprinkle many nations because of himself (pp.89-90).

40. See Acts 2.3f; 6.3; 9.17-18; 10.44-48; 11.24; 13.9; 18.25; 19.1-7; Rom. 7.6; 15.16; I Cor. 3.16; II Cor. 1.22; 5.5; Gal. 4.6; 5.16 etc.
41. See Chapter I, pp.54-56 above.
42. cf. G.Schille, "Bemerkungen zur Formgeschichte des Evangeliums : Das Evangelium des Matthäus als Katechismus", NTS, 4, 1957-'58, pp.1-24, 101-114; E. von Dobschütz, "Matthäus als Rabbi und Katechet", ZNW, 27, 1928, pp.338-348.
43. cf. P.Benoit, L'evangile selon St. Matthieu, Paris :1961; D.Hill, The Gospel of Matthew, London : 1972, pp.43-48.
44. Stendahl, who sees 'Matthew' as a catechetical handbook for the early Church, credits Matthew with the collection of Jesus' words into these discourses and classifies them under five headings (The School of St. Matthew, pp.205f, 26) :-
 - 5-7 : Ethics
 - 10.5-42 : Apostleship -- mission - martyrdom
 - 13.1-52 : Teaching on the Kingdom of God, both in public and in private
 - 17.24-18.35 : Church discipline, particularly so far as it concerns re-establishment within the Church.
 - 24.1-25.46 : Eschatology and farewell address.
45. J.P.Martin, "The Church in Matthew", Int., 29, 1975, p.45.
46. G.Barth, Tradition and Interpretation., p.77.
47. Lloyd Gaston, "The Messiah of Israel as Teacher of the Gentiles", Int., 29, 1975, p.37.
48. Barth, Tradition and Interpretation., p.85.
49. We have indicated in Chapter I the apparent dependence of Didache on Matthew. The title of Didache as "The Teachings of the Twelve Apostles" may be based on the risen Lord commanding them to teach. However, Didache is concerned with imparting to the Church the commands of our Lord in the Gospel (see Did. 15.4; 11.3; 6.2). The author has probably reconstructed the teachings of his Church with a knowledge of the

Gospel according to Matthew and prompted by its commission (28.20a). Thus, Didache as a manual of community-conduct may be regarded as the ecclesiastical consequence of the Great Commission in Matthew. Gaston ("The Messiah of Israel...", p.36) regards Didache as a sequel to Matthew's Gospel due to its major concern to impart to the Gentile Christians what the Lord commanded the disciples to observe.

50. See Chapter I, pp.46-48 above. cf. Trilling, Das Wahre Israel, pp.26-28. Trilling argues that in all four occurrences of πάντα τὰ ἔθνη in Matthew (24.9,14; 25.32; 28.19) it is broadly universalistic and it includes Jews as well. Jeremias is among those who restrict ἔθνη only to the Gentiles (Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, New York : 1963, p.209). Daniel Harrington rejects Trilling's conclusions (D.J.Harrington, "Make Disciples of all the Gentiles", CBQ, 37, 1975, pp.363-366). Trilling's view finds support in K.L. Schmidt, "ἔθνος", TDNT, II, p.369; W.G.Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament, New York : 1966, pp.81f and Hubbard, Matthean Redaction., pp.84-87 and many more.
51. Goulder, Midrash., p.340, where he refers to Nepper-Christensen, Das Matthäusevangelium - Ein judenchristliches Evangelium?, Aarhus: 1958, pp.204f and Trilling, Das Wahre Israel, p.102. See Goulder's discussion of the four possible explanations in Midrash., pp.340ff.
52. Ibid., p.344.
53. Ernest L. Abel, "Who Wrote Matthew?", NTS, 17, 1970-'71, pp.138-151.
54. J.Jeremias, Jesus' Promise to the Nations, London: 1958, p.20 note 2 : "οἶκος in the sense of 'tribe', 'lineage', 'community' is a Semitism". Jeremias (Ibid., p.21) regards the 'lost sheep' as referring to the 9½ lost tribes of the Northern Kingdom, whose restoration to the 2½ tribes of the Jewish nation formed part of the ultimate expectation. Jeremias draws in support the twelvefold aspect of the disciples and their eschatological function in Matt.19.28, but overlooks the fact that the number 'Twelve' at 19.28 is concerned with 'judgement' and not 'restoration'.

55. F.W.Beare, "Mission and Mission Charge", JBL, 89, 1970, p.9. cf. Acts 13.46f; Rom.11.11-14, where Paul the champion of the Gentile mission follows the same concern when he goes first to the synagogue whenever possible.
56. Trilling, Das Wahre Israel, pp.82-84.
57. Jeremias, Jesus' Promise, p.34. Jeremias presents evidences : Matthew's introduction of Jesus' ministry by quoting Isa.8.23-9.1 that includes a mention of 'Gentiles' (Matt.4.15-16), his addition to Mark 3.7-10 with a mention of Syria (Matt.4.24) and such cases as healing the Gentiles (8.5-13), the significance of κόσμος in 13.38 and of fish ἐκ παντός γένους in 13.48 and the summary of Jesus' activity among the Gentiles at 15.29-31 (pp.34-35). See also pp.46-54.
58. Cf. Beare, "Mission and Mission Charge", p.9. Such a saying as Matt. 10.5, according to Beare seems to reflect a time of the early Church after the issue of the Gentile mission had been joined or when it was at least contemplated.
59. cf. Bornkamm, Tradition and Interpretation, p.18.
60. Held, Tradition and Interpretation, p.250. He notes in note 3 : "The omission of the healing of the blind may be a matter of chance; that it was not committed to the disciples is according to Matt.10.1 not probable since the power to heal covers all sickness and infirmities."
61. Eduard Schweizer, "Observance of the Law and Charismatic Activity in Matthew", NTS, 16, 1969-70, p.226.
62. Ibid., p.229.
63. Gerd Theissen, The First Followers of Jesus, London :1978, pp.10-14, where he also describes the experience of the wandering charismatics as homelessness (10.23,44; 23.34), lack of family (cf. 19.10f; 10.20), lack of possessions (cf. 6.19ff, 25-32, 33, 34; 10.10,42) and lack of protection (cf. 5.38f,41; 10.17ff).
64. Greeven, "προσκυνῶ καὶ", TDNT, VI, p.763. See Matt.8.2; 9.18; 14.33; 15.25; 20.20; 2.2,8,11; 4.9f; 18.2f,26 etc..

65. Kilpatrick, The Origins., p.124.
66. Ibid., pp.59-100.
67. Ibid., p.54.
68. P.Carrington, The Primitive Christian Calendar, Cambridge:1952
69. W.D.Davies, "Reflections on Archbishop Carrington's 'The Primitive Christian Calendar'" in The Background of the NT and its Eschatology (W.D.Davies and D.Daube, edit.), Cambridge: 1956, pp.124ff.
70. Goulder, Midrash., pp.171-198.
71. Ibid., p.193.
72. Ibid., pp.195-198.
73. W.D.Davies, The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount, Cambridge : 1964, pp.309-313. For the full and shorter forms of the Shemone Ezreh see C.W.Dugmore, Influence of the Synagogue on the Divine Office, London: 1964, pp.114ff and R.M.Grant, Historical Introduction to the New Testament, London : 1963, p.284.
74. Goulder, Midrash., p.298. How Goulder illustrates the statement is seen in pp.298-301.
75. Ibid., pp.298-301.
76. Ibid., p.298.
77. See G.F.Moore, Judaism, I, Cambridge: 1927, p.359.
78. Raymond E.Brown, New Testament Essays, New York: 1968, p.285 and note 29, where he refers to Shemone Ezreh 6 : "Forgive us, our Father, for we have sinned", and Seder Elij. 7 (33) : "Our Father who art in heaven".
79. Ibid., p.300 and note 77 as well as p.301.
80. See Chapter I, 42 above, where the following references have already been listed under note 66 (p.63 above) : Matt.5.18,34-35; 6.10,19-20; 11.25; 16.19; 18.18,19; 23.9; 24.35; 28.18.
81. D.G.Delling, Worship in the New Testament, London :1962, p.15 and n.1.
82. Aboth 3.2 belongs to Rabbi Hananiah ben Teradion (A.D. c.135) and it represents a Jewish tradition prior to him, which is found in different forms (See Hebert Danby, Mishnah, London:1933, p.450).

83. Gaston, "Messiah of Israel,...", p.38.
84. 17.21 being found only in one group of MSS, it is generally regarded as an interpolation. Considering the place of prayer and fasting in this Gospel (Matt.6.2-18), it is close to the mind of Matthew.
85. Since our intention is to identify the eucharistic liturgical features in the Matthean account, we need not enter into the discussion on whether the Last Supper was the Passover meal or a Chaburah or Kiddush. See A.R.C. Leaney, "What was the Lord's Supper?", Theol., 70, 1967, pp.51-62 and J. Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, London: 1966, pp.26-31, 111ff. Blessings at regular meals was a regular practice among the Jews. (See H.W. Beyer, "εὐλογέω", TDNT, II, pp.760-761).
86. M. Goguel, The Primitive Church, London: 1964, p.287.
87. See Chapter I, p.34 above.
88. W. Foerster, "ἄρτος", TDNT, V, pp.475-479.
89. Ibid., pp.480-482.
90. See Hubbard, Matthean Redaction, pp.25-67, where he tries to show that Matthew shares these OT features. cf. Deut.31.23; Gen. 26.3,24; 28.15; Exod. 4.4-16; Josh.1.9; Judg.6.16; Jer. 1.8-9.
91. Chapter I, pp. 31,35 above.

Chapter IV

CHRISTOLOGICAL SETTING

Matthew recapitulates the Gospel's leading Christological themes in the resurrection narrative in order to set out the basis and authority of the Apostolic Commission. The concluding verses, 28.18-20, designate the Messiah who has risen from the dead (28.6-7) as the Son. The claim of universal authority by the risen One points to the designation of Jesus as the Lord. The theme of exaltation is sometimes interpreted under the category of Son of Man. The commission to teach Jesus' commands, and Jesus' teachings regarded as commands call for the New Moses typology. The promise of his perpetual presence in the community brings out the Emmanuel idea of 1.23. We consider each of these in turn.

The Messiah

That 'Jesus is the Christ' is a general conviction of the Evangelist and it originates in the Jewish concept of messiahship. Longenecker notes that the biblical and post-biblical Jewish literature shows a greater interest in the messianic age than in the person of the Messiah.¹ However, the title 'Messiah' has a long history from its earlier general application to the anointed kings, priests, prophets, patriarchs and even Cyrus the Persian in carrying out the divine plan² to the later particularistic application to a future politico-national deliverer or a

spiritual redeemer.³ Since the genuine messianic sayings in Jewish literature belong to a relatively later period (post-Exilic), the Messiah as the ideal king is a later concept.⁴ The politico-national Messiah was believed to come from the line of David.

The title 'Son of David' in Jewish literature originates from 2 Sam. 7.11-14 where it refers to a divine promise to David, which is perhaps the basis of the later Davidic Messianic concept. The advent of the Son of David has become a traditional expectation (Psalm 89). But the hoped-for ideal king of David's line (Amos 9.11; Hos. 3.5; Isa. 9.7; Jer. 23.5f; Ezek. 34.23 etc) is not called Messiah in the sense of the Inter-Testamental technical title for an eschatological figure (Psalms of Solomon 17. cf. Eccles. 47.11; I Macc. 2.57). The Qumran community believed in two messiahs, of whom the lay king was to be of the house of David.⁵ The community looked forward to the coming of a Messiah of universal significance, who would be anointed with the Spirit. The Isaiah Scroll found in Cave I reads at Isa. 52.14f: "As many were astonished at him - so did I anoint his face more than man's, and his form beyond that of sons of men - so shall he sprinkle many nations because of himself".⁶ Christianity inherits the traditional messianic concept from Judaism. Matthew especially maintains the Messiah's significance for many nations, which we shall consider below.

Matthew introduces Jesus as the Messiah fulfilling Jewish

aspirations. Jesus in his Gospel is 'the Son of Abraham' and 'the Son of David' (Matt.1.1). "He is 'the Son of Abraham' because it is in him that the entire history of Israel, which began in Abraham, reaches its culmination (1.17)".⁷ Hence, Matthew takes Jesus' lineage as far back as Abraham, the progenitor of Israel in order to account for the universal significance of Jesus. The divine promise to Abraham includes the birth of a son as well as blessing to all the nations in him (Gen. 17.1ff; 18.9ff; esp. v.18). The possibility of non-Jews becoming children of Abraham is alluded to in Matt.3.9. Finally, to Jesus who is introduced as the Son of Abraham by the opening verse of the Gospel, all the nations are being made disciples (28.18-20) in fulfilment of the old promise to Abraham. The descendants promised to Abraham include kings (17.6), and David himself is the descendant of Abraham. However, the Evangelist's repeated usage of the title 'the Son of David'⁸ implies his regard for the fulfilment of popular Jewish messianic expectations.

The Davidic descent is a significant element in Matthew's Gospel. The Matthean genealogy establishes the title's authenticity (see 1.1,17). With the specific mention of the Abrahamic descent in 1.1 the Evangelist points to the Davidic Messiah's significance for the nations. For Matthew, Bethlehem the city of David is significant as the place of birth of the Davidic Messiah in fulfilment of prophecies (Matt.2.5-6 cf. Mic.5.2). The Evangelist often uses the title in healing stories (9.27-31; 12.22-23; 15.21-28; 20.29-34), where it is not a mere political designation since

David himself has never been recognized as a healer or exorcist. However, as J.R. Donahue notes, in intertestamental Judaism and in Judaism of the early Christian era exorcism distinguishes a person as possessor of royal power in David's line.⁹ The Evangelist shares with them such a concept in applying the title to Jesus mainly in the healing stories. The address 'Son of David' in 20.30f is derived directly from Mark 10.47-48. With the repeated usage of this address the title has become a characteristic Matthean form of address in petitions for healing. This is why the same messianic address is uttered even by a Gentile in faith (15.22). Jesus was accorded a royal welcome to Jerusalem and was acclaimed as the Son of David, the Messiah of Israel (21.9). But Matthew qualifies Jesus' Davidic messiahship by the expression 'a humble king' (21.5) drawing upon Isa. 62.11 and Zech. 9.9. Matthew also shares Mark's objective of presenting Jesus the Son of David as the Lord of David challenging the Jewish leaders' understanding of Davidic messiahship (Mark. 12.35-37; Matt. 22.41-46). Here, Matthew, like Mark, has Jesus claim that the content of his messiahship is not limited to his Davidic origin. The Messiah is indeed the Lord, whose lordship according to Matt. 28.18 is absolute and universal.

The large number of references to Jesus as Christ (only five out of seventeen are from Mark and Q) in Matthew shows his intent to apply this title to Jesus.¹⁰ In most of these references 'Christ' is a title or designation rather than a name.¹¹ In his treatment of this title the Evangelist gradually leads his readers to overcome the popular Jewish

colouring of the Messiah. Rather, the emphasis is increasingly laid on the ministry of Christ culminating in his suffering, death and resurrection. "For Matthew the work of Jesus comes under the rubric of the new messianic understanding",¹² Thus, Jesus' healings are said to be τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Χριστοῦ (11.2). The works of Christ here refer to the miracles related in chapters 8-9. The Baptist's enquiry as to whether Jesus himself is "he who is to come" (i.e., the traditionally expected Messiah) and Jesus' answer in 11.3-6 explain Jesus as the Messiah of healing. He, the Son of David is the Servant-Messiah of healing, in whom Isa.42.1-4 and 53.4 ("He took our infirmities and bore our diseases") are being fulfilled (Matt.12.15-23). His deeds answer the question, "Can this be the Son of David?" (12.23). The question reflects a debate over this messianic ascription to Jesus. Hummel is perhaps right when he credits Matthew with the creation of a debate on the association of Jesus' messiahship and sonship to David (12.22-45) out of the story of the healing of the demoniac.¹³ The messianic healings are manifest signs of forgiveness of sins (9.2), his sufferings and death are in fulfilment of the Scriptures and for the forgiveness of sins (26.54, 28).¹⁴ This sense is already expressed in the meaning of the name 'Jesus': 'for he will save his people from their sins' (1.21). Jesus Christ the deliverer of his people from their sins is the one who has triumphed over death (28.6-7) and is exalted and given absolute authority (28.18). The Messiah is here portrayed as the victorious one, in whom the new community of disciples is being constituted.

The total messianic picture in the Gospel ultimately reflects the Evangelist's convictions. Whether or not Jesus himself made messianic claims is still open to question. Since Jesus never claims affirmatively that he is the Messiah, his reticence or silence about it and the absence of his open denial of it are probably authentic. We conclude that the Church's ascription of messiahship to Jesus is a step beyond Jesus' own expressed claim, and that the Synoptists are attempting to strengthen his claim to it by further Christological designations.

The Son of God.

Christ, for Matthew, is the Son of God (14.33; 16.16; 26.63). Matthew specifically links the titles 'Messiah' and 'Son of God' in 16.16 and 26.63. Since Son of God is here used as a messianic title, we must review its antecedents in Jewish literature.

Corporate sonship to God is a familiar concept in the OT. God is regarded as Father and Israel as his son.¹⁵ Angels are sometimes described as sons of God (Gen. 6.2; Job 1.6; 38.7). The righteous of Israel are also designated as sons of God (Sir.4.10; Pss. Sol. 8.8; 17.30; 18.4). According to Manson, Yahweh is Father of Israel in the sense that he is the founder and creator of the nation.¹⁶ By election and covenant Israel has received this filial relationship. An increasing awareness of unworthiness of all Israel for this filial relationship is expressed in the designation of the righteous only as the sons of God.

The designation of individuals as sons of God indicates the special position such individuals occupy in relation to Yahweh and Israel. Hence, in the divine promise to David in Nathan's prophecy, the future Davidic king is designated a 'son of God' (2 Sam. 7.14). According to Martin Hengel, this designation is the divine legitimisation of the ruler, and the concept of father-son relationship between God and king (2 Sam. 7.12-14) is taken up and developed in 1 Chron. 17.13; 22.10; 28.6 and Psalm 89.4ff.¹⁷ The Babylonian and Egyptian concept of divine descent of kings is alien to Jewish thought.¹⁸ In Yahwism divine honour is never ascribed to kings. Therefore, sonship is attributed to the Davidic king not by physical descent from God but by adoption. A formula of adoption is given in Psalm 2.7: "You are my son, today I have begotten you", a Psalm which probably comes from a Jewish coronation ritual. Passages such as this which infer the title 'Son of God' came to be interpreted messianically. The Qumran community, for instance, interprets 'the son' in 2 Sam. 7.14 as referring to the Davidic Messiah (4Q Flor. 1.11f). Hengel notes that the document, 4Q Florilegium breaks off at the reference to Psalm 2, and that in another document the Messiah's birth is regarded as God's work (IQSa 2, 11f). He further refers to another text from Cave 4 (in Aramaic) where the term 'son of God' appears.¹⁹ Although 'son of God' was just coming into use as a messianic title in pre-Christian Judaism,²⁰ the Christian tradition does not merely use the title 'Son of God' to Christ in the Judaic sense, but believes that Jesus Christ is the Son of God in a unique sense. We proceed to consider how Matthew gives expression to this belief.

Among the Synoptists, Matthew gives increasing importance to 'Son of God' as a confessional title. Eleven of the occurrences of the title in Matthew are redactional²¹ and are generally confessional in nature.²² Matthew has the 'men of little faith' (8.26; 14.31) ask the question: "What sort of man is this?" (8.27) and answer it with the community's confession: "Truly you are the Son of God" (14.33) in direct response to a traditional OT formula of divine revelation: "It is I, have no fear" (14.27 cf. although differently worded, Gen.26.24; Isa.35.4; 41.10; 43.5). The confession in another form appears in 16.16 where Peter representing the community, confesses: "You are the Christ, the Son of the Living God" (cf. 26.63). Here, Matthew links the titles, 'Christ' and 'Son of God' by adding 'the Son of the Living God' to Mark's 'You are the Christ' (Mark 8.29), and the messiahship of the Son is affirmed by the Father's revelation of it. Hence, Jesus' response confirms this confession as a revelation by "my Father who is in heaven" (Matt.16.17).

Matthew allows those outside the believing community to utter the title 'Son of God' when there is an element of submission or recognition. Demons submit to him with the words: 'O Son of God' (8.29 cf. Mark 3.11; 5.7). The Roman centurion and those who were with him utter: 'Αληθεως θεου υιος ην ο υιος' (27.54 cf. Mark 15.39). We concluded earlier that Matthew changes the tone of the Marcan sentence completely in the pericope, Matt. 27.51-54, in order to emphasize the awesomeness of the corporate confession: 'Truly God's Son was this'.²³ This confession

might be viewed in the light of the mission to the nations with its intended appeal to the Gentiles.

The title 'Son of God' as applied to Jesus sometimes occurs in the context of negative attitudes towards him. At the Temptations Jesus is tempted with the address : 'If you are the Son of God' (4.3,6). The same words are repeated by the high priest (26.63) and by those who pass by the cross (27.40). This address is thus often used by the enemies. In his redaction of the high priest's question Matthew changes the Marcan 'Son of the Blessed' to 'Son of God' (26.63 cf. Mark 14.61). In Jesus' answer to the high priest 'I am' is changed to $\Sigma\upsilon \epsilon\iota\pi\alpha\varsigma$ ²⁴ as if Matthew were hesitant to put the confessional title 'Son of God' on the lips of an enemy as a positive confession (26.64 cf. Jesus' positive approval of Peter's confession, 16.15ff). Matthew's additions to the mockery scene are based on the designation 'Son of God' (27.38-44 cf. Mark 15.27-32). He adds the phrase 'If you are the Son of God' in 27.40. Verse 43 is another addition based on an alleged claim by Jesus : 'I am the Son of God'. In the Gospel, when the enemies address Jesus as 'Son of God', the address is always rendered with a conditional clause of the temptation type (4.3,6), thereby distinguishing it from the confessional use of the title.

We have already indicated that in the OT the Father-Son concept operates between Yahweh and Israel and between Yahweh and righteous

individuals in Israel. Throughout the OT, however, Yahweh is never addressed directly as 'my Father' by any individual. In the Gospel, however, Jesus refers to God as 'my Father' or 'Father' in a sense unknown in the OT. Compared to Mark and Luke where 'Father' is used only a few times with reference to God, Matthew's frequent usage of the address indicates that it predominantly reflects his own concern.²⁵ His redaction of Mark at some places strongly suggests his concern for Jesus' self-understanding as 'Son of God'.²⁶ Fuller comments that the Q passage, Matt.11.25-27 is an indirect witness to Jesus' self-understanding of unique sonship based on the tradition of Jesus' calling God "Abba".²⁷ The Evangelist's description of the disciples as sons of God (5.9,45 cf. 13.38,43) presupposes his reference to Jesus the Son who calls them 'my brethren' (28.10), and addresses God as 'Our Father' (6.9). In the address, 'Our Father' Matthew also shares the OT concept that God is the Father of the community.

The 'mountain' in Matthew is the place of revelation of Jesus' sonship. Kingsbury notes that Matthew associates the setting of the 'mountain' exclusively with Jesus as the Son of God. Jesus is tempted on a mountain as the Son of God (4.3,6). The report of Jesus retiring to the 'mountain' for prayer falls in a pericope in which the disciples are said to have worshipped him as such (14.23,33). Since Jesus in this Gospel embarks upon his public ministry as the Son of God (4.17-22), Matthew has Jesus ascend the mountain of the Sermon to teach (5.1-2; 7.28-29) and the

mountain in 15.29 to heal (15.30-31).²⁸ The 'mountain' being the place of revelation of the 'Son of God', Jesus' ministry of teaching and healing has a 'mountain' as its setting. On the mountain of Transfiguration Jesus is declared to be God's Son (17.1,5). Finally the revelation is endorsed by Jesus on the mountain of Christophany (28.16) referring to himself by that title (28.19).

The title 'Son of God' in Matthew is one of authority. The Father-Son concept is implicit in the heavenly voice designating Jesus as 'my Son' at his baptism and transfiguration. In 11.27 and 28.18ff Matthew includes the thought of investiture of authority on the Son. Psalm 2.7-8 : "You are my son; today I have begotten you. Ask of me and I will make the nations your heritage and the ends of the earth your possession" is the probable source of this thought even if Matthew does not quote this passage. The address, 'You are my son' has generally been regarded as a source of the heavenly voice at Jesus' baptism. Since Matthew repeats it from Mark there is nothing Matthean about it in the baptismal context. Lindars stresses that the primary application of Psalm 2.7 in the NT is not in relation to baptism, but resurrection. He refers to Acts 13.33 (Paul's speech) and Heb.1.5; 5.5 where Psalm 2.7 is quoted in relation to the resurrection.²⁹ Matthew seems to follow this application by drawing upon Psalm 2.7-8 in his composition of 28.18ff. According to Rengstorff Psalm 2.7-8 is reminiscent of an ancient oriental coronation rite in which the king is given authority by God. In the rite the king is adopted and

given authority to share in the power of the God who adopts him.³⁰ In pre-Christian Judaism the divine decree announcing the endowment of authority is addressed to the promised heir of the Davidic line.³¹ For Matthew Jesus is the Davidic Messiah and the Son of God. But, transcending the royal authority, the risen One as the Son of God claims absolute authority, on the basis of which the mission of the Church is to extend to all the nations. The association of the 'Son' with 'the nations as his heritage' very probably lies behind the formation of Matt. 28.18ff.

The 'Son of God' Christology is the basic setting of the triadic baptismal formula in Matt. 28.19. Following Lohmeyer, R.H. Fuller argues that the formula is of apocalyptic origin. He suggests that the apocalyptic triad originally consisted of 'the angels - the elect one - the Lord of spirits', which in early Christian usage (Mark 8.38 cf. Luke 12.8f; I Thess. 3.13; 5.21) was modified as 'the Son of Man - the Father - the angels'. With the development of the Father-Son Christology it evolved into 'the Father - the Son - the angels'. Finally the angels were replaced by the Holy Spirit (cf. Rev. 1.4).³² This evolutionary hypothesis is too sketchy to be satisfactory to determine the origin of the formula. We reiterate the Matthean authorship of the formula. Since Matthew is the first to connect baptism with the threefold name, and the only reference to the baptismal association of the Father - Son - Holy Spirit in the rest of the Gospel is Jesus' baptism, Matthew here intends to establish a

connection between Jesus' baptism and Christian baptism.³³ With the descent of the Holy Spirit at baptism Jesus is declared to be God's beloved Son, who with the Father and the Holy Spirit is the basis of Christian baptism.

The Son of Man.

The resurrection narrative in Matthew has been interpreted in terms of the motif of exaltation under the category of Son of Man,³⁴ although the title does not appear in the narrative.

ܕ ܡܢ ܐܢܫܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ is the literal translation of the Aramaic idiom, bar nasha which simply means 'the man'.³⁵ 'Son of Man' appears in this sense at Numb. 23.19; Psalms 8.4; 80.17 (where 'the man' and 'the son of man' are parallel) and 144.3. In Ezekiel God addresses the prophet by this name (Ezek.2.1; 3.17; 4.1; 5.1 etc.). Since the prophet refers it to himself, it is a self-designation there. It is in the apocalyptic writings that the phrase 'son of man' receives increasing importance. In Dan.7.13-14 the 'one like a son of man' is an eschatological figure who stands for 'the people of the saints of the Most High' (Dan.7.27). In the Similitudes of Enoch (1 Enoch 37-71 : the Ethiopic Book of Enoch), the son of man is a pre-existent, righteous messianic judge and in the Apocalypse of Ezra (IV Ezra or 2 Esdras) 13, the name refers to the Davidic Messiah, whose kingdom precedes the new AEON.³⁶ In Jewish tradition

the term 'son of man' has evolved from its simple idiomatic usage into the individualized apocalyptic, messianic figure of the future hope.

In the NT the term 'Son of Man' has become a significant Christological title, which is practically confined to the Gospels.³⁷ In the Synoptic Gospels where it occurs only in sayings attributed to Jesus, Jesus speaks of the Son of Man in the third person with reference to i) his present ministry,³⁸ ii) his suffering and resurrection³⁹ and iii) the future Son of Man and events to come.⁴⁰ Mark, Q and the special materials of Matthew and Luke all employ the title. In addition, Matthew and Luke sometimes read the title into the Marcan source.⁴¹

The Synoptics identify Jesus with the Son of Man in his present earthly ministry. In addition, Matthew interchanges personal pronoun and 'Son of Man' with reference to Jesus (16.13,15), implying that in his thought Jesus and the Son of Man are identical with reference to his earthly ministry.

The sayings which include the title 'Son of Man' with reference to suffering and resurrection belong to Mark, though they are not confined to it. Matthew Black classifies the Q passage, Matt.8.20⁴² and 11.19 (Luke 9.58; 7.34) under the 'Suffering Son of Man' sayings.⁴³ Based on Mark, Matthew also refers to Jesus as the Son of Man in terms of his passion and resurrection.⁴⁴ The mission of the Son of Man is to proclaim the

coming of the Kingdom and to die for many (16.24-28; 20.28). In the three passion predictions (16.21; 17.22; 20.17ff) resurrection is the climax of the Son of Man's life and vicarious suffering. The Servant passage (Isa. 42.1-4) is applied to Jesus in Matt. 12.18-21, where Jesus' triumph is stated in terms of justice and its victory, endowment of the Spirit and as hope of the Gentiles. Isa. 53.4 is fulfilled in Jesus' healings by his 'taking our infirmities and bearing our diseases' (Matt. 8.17). "By calling himself the Son of Man, while at the same time also interpreting his mission in terms of the Suffering Servant, Jesus emphasizes his conviction that his redemptive suffering would issue in triumph".⁴⁵ Rather, it is the Church's conviction based on the interpretation of resurrection as the triumph of Jesus, to which Matthew obviously bears witness.

The 'public title'⁴⁶ Son of Man with reference to Jesus' earthly ministry, suffering and resurrection is employed predominantly where Jesus faces the public, enemies and unbelievers. It is interesting to observe that in the passion predictions addressed to the disciples Jesus employs the designation when referring to the enemies' action. With reference to the 'coming Son of Man' and future events the title is used often in Jesus' address to the disciples.

The concept that the Son of Man is to come in the future belongs mainly to Q, although not confined to it (cf. Mark 13.26; 14.62). Bultmann believes it to be an authentic usage by Jesus but referring to

someone other than Jesus himself.⁴⁷ In analyzing four 'future Son of Man' sayings in Q, Edwards states that they are part of a similar form (Gattung) and regards the present state of these sayings as the product of the early Church and its table fellowship.⁴⁸ Prior to Edwards' essay H.B. Thell tried to reconcile the authenticity and community-setting of the title. He believed that the references to the apocalyptic Son of Man, as distinct from Jesus, are genuine and that the community undoubtedly identified Jesus with the coming Son of Man on the basis of his resurrection, and designated Jesus in his earthly ministry by the name of the One who will come.⁴⁹ Matthew himself implicitly identifies the coming Son of Man with the earthly Jesus in his redaction of Mark 13:4 (cf. v.26) by including the phrase 'of your coming' into the disciples' question at 24:3.

In Matthew when the Son of Man is not being used for the earthly Jesus it is closely connected with the Parousia and Judgement (see 24:27-44).⁵⁰ From the large number of Matthean additions of 'Son of Man' with reference to the Parousia, Kingsbury concludes that Matthew's primary interest in this title has to do with its association with the Parousia.⁵¹ In his redaction of 'the Kingdom of God come with power' of Mark 9:1 as 'the Son of Man coming in his Kingdom' (Matt.16:28) Matthew identifies the coming Kingdom with the Parousia of the Son of Man. He does this since the Syrian expectation of an immediate realization of the Kingdom is still a future hope for him. He also characterizes the Son of Man as the eschatological judge (25:31-46; 13:36-43). The Matthean addition, 'and

then he will repay everyman for what he has done' (16.27) to the Marcan saying about the Son of Man's coming in the glory of his Father (Mark 8. 38), signifies that in Mark the coming Son of Man is the Son of God (cf. his Father) and that Matthew identifies this 'Son of God - Son of Man' with the eschatological judge. To be the eschatological judge is then the future role of the Son of Man. According to Matt. 24.44 the Son of Man's future role of judgement is to take place at the Parousia.

In Matt. 26.63-64 where the Christ, the Son of God and the Son of Man are all used for Jesus, the exaltation and Parousia of the Son of Man are also combined. In the Marcan original (Mark 14.61-62) Jesus' answer to the high priest is composed of elements from the OT: ἐκ δεξιῶν καθήμενον (τῆς δυνάμεως) from Psalm 110.1 and (ὁψοῦσε) τὸν γῆιν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ (ὀφθαλμοῦ) from Dan. 7.13 (cf. 7.18-27). Taking the parallel sentences in Matt. 16.27; 24.30 and 26.64 together we recognise that the exaltation and the Parousia are not identical but associated and that the exalted One and the Son of Man are identical.

Leaving the title 'Son of Man' at 26.64 the Evangelist carries the exaltation theme forward to the resurrection narrative. Arguing that the apocalyptic Son of Man sayings are products of a Church that had learned to think of and consider Jesus to be Son of Man on the basis of Christian exegetical traditions, Norman Perrin states that Christology begins with

the exaltation tradition in which Jesus' resurrection is interpreted as his exaltation to God's right hand as Son of Man, a tradition using Psalm 110.1 and Dan. 7.13.⁵² The connection of Matt. 20.10 with Dan. 7.13f has been variously interpreted. Michael believes that Matt. 20.10 is the fulfilment of Dan. 7.13f.⁵³ R.C. Tuck says: "If one assumes that the context of Dan. 7.13 lay at the background of Jesus' concept of the Son of Man, then it may reasonably be supposed that verse 14 has been fulfilled in the Gospel account."⁵⁴ Among those who do not regard the connection in terms of fulfilment is Aleup, for whom an indirect dependence of Matt. 20.10 on Dan. 7.14 is probable, considering Matthew's use of the OT.⁵⁵ Todd, Hahn and Trilling deny a dependence of Matt. 20.10 on the Danielic Son of Man concept, but do not deny the Evangelist's use of Dan. 7.14 to describe Jesus' exaltation and endowment of authority.⁵⁶ Based on Mark 14.62, the use of Dan. 7.13 at Matt. 26.64 speaks of the Parousia. Independent of Mark, Matthew makes use of Dan. 7.14 to speak of the exaltation of the risen One at 20.10.

In chapter I we argued that Matthew modelled his concluding verses on the form of Daniel's description of the effect of his apocalyptic vision on himself (Dan. 10.9-12).⁵⁷ In his composition of the Great Commission within the Word of Comfort, Matthew also freely draws on phrases and ideas from Dan. 7.14 (LXX): καὶ ἰδοὺ οὗτος ἰσχυρία καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς κατὰ γόνυ καὶ πᾶσα ὁδοὺ αὐτοῦ λατρεύουσιν· καὶ ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ αἰώνιος, ἥτις οὐ μὴ ἀρῇ

καὶ ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ ἔτις οὐ μὴ φθαρῇ . The significant differences in Matthew from Daniel are Christologically motivated. Matt. 28.18-20 is dominated by the theme of exaltation - enthronement of the risen One instead of the Parousia - judgement of the Son of Man in Dan. 7.13f. In the absence of a specific account of exaltation or enthronement in Matt. 28, the allusion in verse 18 to Dan. 7.14 is mainly to the exaltation motif. Matthew uses it to introduce the authority behind the Great Commission.

The Lord.

In setting forth the absolute authority of the Exalted One the Matthean **Κύριος** Christology plays an important role. According to Trilling the key to the entire Gospel is its conclusion which is governed by its preeminent Christological concept of **Κύριος**.⁵⁸ Although the title does not occur in Matt. 28, the concept, as we shall see shortly, is clearly implicit.

Κύριος has acquired preeminence among the Christological titles of the NT in general. According to Kingsbury, "one of the principal reasons the title **Κύριος** is said to have increasingly gained the ascendancy over other primitive titles was the need of the early Church for **epiclesis**, for interaction (especially in the cult) with the risen One."⁵⁹ Disagreeing with the attempts by various scholars to ascribe to **Κύριος** the preeminence among the Christological titles in Matthew, Kingsbury advances the argument that since **Κύριος** basically refers beyond itself to some other

definitive title (Son of David, Son of God or Son of Man) it is to be regarded in this Gospel as an auxiliary Christological title.⁶⁰ In our opinion, Kingsbury underestimates the significance of the title κύριος for Matthew. We recall Matthew's intention to develop the relationship between Jesus and the community of disciples as a κύριος - μαθηταί relationship.⁶¹ Introduced on the lips of the disciples, κύριε in Matthew is not a simple form of address, although there are other places where it has the conventional meaning 'sir' (27.63). It is the community of disciples and those who believe in him that address him 'lord', out of a commitment far deeper than ordinary respect. Hence, where Mark has the disciples address Jesus διδασκαλε or ραββί, Matthew changes it to κύριε (Mark 9.5; 4.38/ Matt. 17.4; 8.25). He also has those outside the community of disciples who come to Jesus for healing address him as κύριος. Where the father of the epileptic boy addresses Jesus διδασκαλε, according to Mark 9.17, Matthew not only alters the address to κύριε but adds a solemn prayer: 'Have mercy upon my son' (Matt. 17.15). In his redaction of the healing of the blind, Matthew replaces the Marcan address, ραββουνι (Mark 10.51) by κύριε (Matt. 20.31). The Matthean concept of authority underlies the address in such instances.

The universal authority of the Exalted One in Matt. 28.18-20 is now stressed as transcending the authority he had during the earthly ministry (cf. 11.27). His authority at all levels is unparalleled and indisputable. Hence, without making any claim for himself or for his teaching the earthly

Jesus calls men to follow him (4.18-22). He teaches with authority (7.29 cf. the repeated usage of 'But I say to you' in Matt.5-7). He speaks (forgiving sins) and acts (healing the sick) with authority (Matt.11.2-6; 9.2-8). The authority implied in all these foreshadows the absolute authority of the Exalted Lord.

Many NT passages that speak of the exaltation of Jesus draw no distinction between Jesus' resurrection and enthronement (see Acts 2.32-33; Rom.1.4; Phil.2.9-11; Heb.1.3-13; 8.1). Matthew agrees with them and shares the belief that Jesus' authority is derived from the Father (so Matt.21.23-27; 28.18 cf. 11.27). The authority that characterises the earthly Jesus' teaching and ministry and exercised in a limited sphere has now been affirmed as limitless : ἐν ὅρατι καὶ ἐν τῇ γῇ (28.18).

Underlying Matt.28.18-20 is a Christology in which Jesus has become the Lord of the universe. His exaltation to lordship over heaven and earth is characteristic of Hellenistic Christology.⁶² The title 'Lord' itself has a Hellenistic background. In Pagan cults and mystery religions 'Lord' was a title of divine honour and power⁶³, the influence of which on Hellenistic Christology is only apparent.⁶⁴ The title was especially familiar to the Hellenistic congregations because it was the usual translation of YHWH into Greek (LXX), a title emphasising the universal reign and lordship of God, and now being given to Jesus. The Matthean narrative shares with the Hellenistic Christology the theme of exaltation and its central feature,

the cosmic dimension of the authority of the exalted Lord. The association of 'heaven and earth' or sometimes 'heaven' by itself with the exaltation of Christ has wider attestation in the NT.⁶⁵ Matthew takes this up, but he neither defines the lordship of Christ nor specifies a definite moment of Jesus' installation to lordship. His interest is rather in the universal community that accepts the *κύριος ἰησοῦς* of the exalted Lord and worships him. This universal authority is set as the basis of the commission, mission and the community. The title 'Lord' best expresses Jesus' relation to the Church and through the Church to the world.

The New Moses Typology.

Within the setting of earlier indications in the Gospel, the mention of the 'mountain' and Jesus' 'commands' in Matt. 28.16-20 may suggest the New Moses typology as a Matthean motif.⁶⁶ By themselves, the 'mountain' and Jesus' 'commands' in the pericope need not be parallel to Sinai and the Decalogue. The Apostolic Commission to teach does not include any new set of commands given from a mountain. The content of the Apostles' teaching is the earthly Jesus' commands (28.20a). As Jesus accepts the validity of Written and Oral Torah⁶⁷ and as there is no set of specific commands in the Gospel, by Jesus' commands we mean Jesus' teachings. Matthew has systematically arranged Jesus' teachings into units of discourses. It has often been suggested that these discourses are arranged in five units following the five-fold division of the Mosaic Torah.

Based on a study of J.C.Hawkins,⁶⁸ B.W.Bacon argues for the Torah pattern of five books in Matthew (each with a narrative, discourse and a closing formula) between a prologue and an epilogue. He argues that this design was to present the Gospel as the New Torah of the New Moses.⁶⁹ Austin Farrer, following a similar line, argues for a hexateuchal system beginning with the prologue as the 'Book of the Genesis of Jesus Christ' and ending with the narrative of Joshua-Jesus establishing the Kingdom.⁷⁰

Bacon's theory is questioned by many⁷¹ and endorsed by others.⁷² His theory is questioned mainly for its devaluation of the infancy narrative and the passion-resurrection narrative as mere prologue and epilogue. Recent scholarship stresses the important place of the Matthean beginning and ending, which are integral parts of the Gospel, determining its general character and content. The ending is the climax of the Gospel.⁷³ Hence, the ending is set in the context of the nature and content of the whole Gospel, and the Gospel discourses acquire importance as the commands of Jesus to be taught and observed in the Church as required by the final commission.

Outside of the NT, as early as the time of Ignatius, Jesus' teachings have been referred to as 'the ordinances of Christ', 'the commands of Jesus', 'the word of Jesus' and 'the law of Jesus Christ'.⁷⁴ Matthew's arrangement of the teachings of Jesus which constitutes the law of the new community, the nature and applicability of the law and the authority of Jesus who

commands the law are already discussed in chapter III above.⁷⁵ We must now consider whether and how the Evangelist thinks of Jesus in terms of Moses-typology. The continuity of the Church with the Old Israel and Jesus-Moses parallelism are basic NT concepts. Although Matthew has fewer references to Moses, when compared with other Gospels, especially John, his Gospel reflects the strong influence of Moses-traditions.

Like Moses, Jesus escaped the slaughter of male children. In describing Jesus' return from Egypt, Matt.2.20 borrows language from Exod.4.19 :

Exod.4.19

The Lord says to Moses: "Go back to Egypt; for all the men who were seeking your life are dead".

Matt.2.20

The angel of the Lord (= the Lord) says to Joseph: "Go to the land of Israel, for those who sought the child's life are dead".

With the addition of 'forty nights', Matthew's reference to Jesus' fasting 'forty days and forty nights' (Matt.4.2) recalls the tradition of the fasting of Moses and Elijah (Exod.34.28; Deut.9.9,11,18; 24.18; I Kings 19.8). The mountain of the third temptation (Matt.4.8), as J.C. Kirby suggests, may be interpreted as Pisgah from which Moses viewed the promised land.⁷⁶ Both Jesus and Moses declare the will of God from a 'mountain' (5.1ff; Exod.19.3ff; 24.12ff). Matthew arranges ten miracles in chapters 8-9 apparently in agreement with Moses' ten mighty deeds (Exod. 7-12). Kingsbury refers to Jesus' baptism in the Jordan as parallel

to Moses and Israel crossing the Red Sea, the radiant appearance of Jesus at Transfiguration to that of Moses while descending from Sinai (Exod. 34. 29-35), the heavenly voice to the disciples commanding them to listen to Jesus, the Son as parallel to Moses' command to Israel to give heed to a prophet like himself whom God would raise up for them (Deut. 18.15) and the risen Jesus enjoining the disciples to keep all that he had commanded them as parallel to Moses' receiving the Law that was binding on Israel.⁷⁷ New Moses typology is being read into these instances. After all, Jesus' baptism and transfiguration are based on Matthew's source, Mark. Here, there is no compelling parallel between Jesus and Moses in the Matthean redaction. In the risen Lord's commission the new community of disciples is being bound to the person of Jesus by observing the demands of Jesus' teachings, whereas in the case of Moses, he is only the recipient and mediator of the divine Law that binds Israel to YHWH.

There are numerous references in Matthew that might suggest Jesus-Moses parallelism. Considerable work has already been done marshalling such references, which we need not repeat.⁷⁸ Although there are references that call for the Moses-typology, the Mosaic authority is not parallel or equal to Jesus' authority. Neither is Jesus' authority derived from nor dependent on the Mosaic Torah, but stated as derived from the Father, Jesus being the Son. This authority sets him over and above Moses. In the Transfiguration story the Messiah-Son of God is distinguished from Moses (17.1-8). Based on this superior authority Jesus is able to introduce his

teaching with the phrase 'I say' to emphasize its content. A formula containing the phrase, 'You have heard ... but I say' is repeatedly employed with reference to Jesus' interpretation of the Mosaic Law (Matt. 5-7). Morton Smith attempts to draw parallels in Rabbinic literature to the phrase but fails as he has not been able to produce a single Rabbinic usage of the formula with reference to the Mosaic Law, except such references as 'Rabbi so and so used to say ... but I say'.⁷⁹ The Matthean formula on Jesus' lips, however, implies unparalleled authority (cf. 7.29).

With absolute authority, unlike Mosaic authority, the risen One commissions his disciples to teach "all that I commanded you" (28.20a). The phrase "all what I commanded you" is an expression reminiscent of OT references to Yahweh's commands (Exod. 7.2; I Chron. 22.13; Jer. 1.17). Matthew ascribes to Jesus' teachings the dignity and authority of commands, and validates them with a word of the risen Lord (28.20a).

Inseparably connected with the New Moses typology is the New Exodus-New Israel theme found in such instances as Jesus' coming out of Egypt (2.15), his baptism and temptation (3-4), the New Sinai setting and the giving of the law (5.1-7.29), the call of the Twelve to represent the tribes of Israel and to be leaders of the New Israel (10.1-4; 19.28; 28.19) etc. . Having discussed almost every instance in the Synoptic Gospels that suggests an identification of Jesus with Israel, Moses and Exodus and evaluating the Matthean treatment, Kirby comes to the conclusion that

the Exodus stands for Israel's past deliverance as well as typifies the greater redemption that is to come and Matthew intends to show that the latter has been fulfilled in Christ.⁸⁰ The greater redemption for Matthew is the deliverance from sins. Jesus will deliver his people from their sins (1.21) by giving his life as a ransom for many (20.28), by pouring out his "blood of the covenant" (26.28). The greater redemption of the New Israel is accomplished in Jesus' person. By this he transcends Moses.

While there are, then, implicit but significant references to a New Moses typology as well as the strong influence of Moses traditions in Matthew's Gospel, Matthew does not designate Jesus as the New Moses. For him Jesus the Messiah is not a human agent of the law, but law-giver himself, who as the risen Lord declares his teachings as 'his commands'.

Emmanuel.

Matthew's Gospel is bound together by its Emmanuel Christology. Bryce J. Malina comments that Matt. 28.20b clearly links up with Matt. 1.23, and "since Matthew is fond of literary inclusions it would seem that the version in 1.22 was intended to form an inclusion with 28.20b and proleptically prepares for it."⁸¹ The concept 'God with us' in Jesus-Emmanuel runs through the Gospel leading it to the final promise at 28.20.

Although Emmanuel is not a Messianic title in the OT the thought of God's presence with his people is frequently found. As examples we may

relate two references comparable to Matthew's usage : 1) The proof-formula of Moses' missionary task is the revealed meaning and significance of God's name, 'I am who I am' or 'I will be what I will be', the basic meaning of the imperfect of the verb form of YHWH (Exod.3.14) and the divine promise 'I will be with your mouth (and of Aaron's) and teach you what you shall speak and do' (Exod.4.12 and 15); and 2) On the evidence of Baba Bathra 14a that lists Chronicles as the last book of the Jewish scriptures, Malina conjectures that Matthew intends some relationship between the proof-formula of II Chron.36.23 as the ending of Chronicles and that of Matt.28.20 as the ending of the Gospel.⁸² The proof-formula 'I am with you' in Matthew is then parallel to 'May the Lord his God be with him' (II Chron.36.23). The Chronicles further includes a declaration of authority given by God. Even if Matthew is not directly dependent on the Chronicles' scheme, he obviously shares an OT Gattung with similar features.⁸³

Matthew identifies 'Emmanuel' as a Jewish messianic category and applies it to Jesus at 1.23 quoting Isa.7.14. In Isa.7.14 (cf.8.8) Emmanuel is the sign that God would deliver Ahas and his people from their enemies and that the Davidic line would continue. However, as Mowinkel points out, "we are not told that he will reign as king over Israel, or indeed that he will be of royal rank, or that he will deliver the people from distress."⁸⁴ Matthew selects this prophecy primarily to substantiate the virgin birth⁸⁵ and finds the Emmanuel sign in the prophecy. Having

found the name 'Emmanuel' in this source, he adds its meaning from Isa. 8.10 and makes full use of it in the Gospel. For Isaiah, Emmanuel is a sign of political deliverance. Matthew not only supplies the meaning of 'Emmanuel' as 'God with us' from Isa. 8.10 but substitutes for its political connotation a religious one. This he does by joining to the Emmanuel concept the meaning of the name 'Jesus' that 'he will save his people from their sins' (1.21-23). The Emmanuel in Jesus is the deliverer from sin. By selecting Isa. 7.14, the Evangelist "obviously regards 'Jesus' as equivalent in meaning (vv. 21, 23) to Emmanuel and expounds it to mean the one who will save (σωτήριον - σωτήρ) his people from their sins".¹¹

In Matt. 1.21-23 we may observe the Matthean equations as follows :

Jesus = He will save his people from their sins.

Emmanuel = God with us.

Therefore, Jesus-Emmanuel is God with us who will save his people from their sins.

God's presence in Jesus is one which provides deliverance from sins. Matthew intends this presence to operate in Jesus' healing deeds. In healing the paralytic, Jesus imparts his saving presence to the paralytic with the words : 'your sins are forgiven' (9.2). Since it is the concept of 'God with us' that is found in 28.20b the presence of Jesus-Emmanuel with the community of disciples includes deliverance from sins. In Jewish faith God alone can forgive sins⁸⁷ (cf. Mark 2.7). Matthew apparently applies this divine authority to the name of Jesus.

Matthew attaches special significance to the name and presence of Jesus. In Church gatherings when at least two or three are gathered **εἰς τὸ ὄνομα ἑοῦ** (18.20) they experience 'God with us'. Leaving everything and following Jesus 'for my sake and for the Gospel' (Mark 10.29) or 'for the sake of the Kingdom of God' (Luke 18.29) becomes 'for my name's sake' in Matt. 19.29. The disciples face hatred and persecution on account of Jesus' name (**ἐὰν τὸ ὄνομα μου** 10.22). The same fate forms part of the signs of the end-time (24.9 cf. Mark 13.13; Luke 21.12,17). Hence, persecution is to be faced with the assurance that 'God is with us'. Finally, the Gospel declares Jesus' continuing presence with the community that is engaged in the universal mission of making disciples by baptising them 'in the name of the Son ...'.

The Emmanuel concept has parallels in Rabbinic literature. The **הוֹיָהוּ** concept of Aboth 3.2,6 resembles the Matthean thought. In Aboth, divine presence is promised to any congregation which is constituted of a minimum of at least ten people engaged in the study of the Law. Divine blessings reach even to a number less than ten who are engaged in the study of the Law (Aboth 3.6). "If two sit together and words of the law are spoken between them the divine presence rests between them" (Aboth 3.2).⁶⁸ These passages are reminiscent of Jesus' presence promised to a congregation of even two or three who gather in his name (Matt. 18.20) and to the missionary community that teaches his commands (Matt. 28.20).

The Matthean contribution to the Emmanuel concept is that in his hands it acquires Christological character. Jesus, throughout the Gospel, is God with us.⁸⁹ The Christological association of the 'name' of Jesus with the idea of divine presence is particularly evident in the three key verses (1.23; 18.20; 28.20) which belong to the Evangelist's own material. The thrust of ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι⁹⁰ is that the presence of God through the person of Jesus, his teachings and his ministry continues to happen in the risen Lord's presence with the community of disciples of all generations, who baptize, teach and assemble in his name. The promise implies a future between the present and the end-time according to the concluding words of the Gospel with ἔσοι αἱ ἡμέραι preceding ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος. Since there is no termination of Jesus' association with the disciple-community, Matthew sees no need of a separate ascension or farewell of the risen Lord.

Since there is no separation of the risen One from the disciples, and the Gospel identifies the coming Son of Man with Jesus, a futuristic Parousia of the Son of Man may seem inconsistent. The Parousia entails the idea of judgement. The Parousia-judgement of the coming Son of Man in Matthew's special material is a universal aspect that involves all the nations based on their conduct towards Jesus' brethren (Matt. 25.31-46 cf. 13.36-43). According to Matt. 25.31ff the nations must have already been confronted by Jesus' brethren. Hence, the Parousia is consequent upon the universal mission of Jesus' brethren to all the nations (28.10, 19-20).

The Christophany in Matt.28 is the particular manifestation of the presence of the exalted Lord to command the universal mission. Similarly, the Parousia is the particular manifestation of the presence of the exalted Son of Man for universal judgement. The permanent quality of the divine presence in 18.20 and 28.20 explains the risen Lord's function with reference to his community of disciples. The presence of the exalted Son of Man at the Parousia explains his eschatological function with reference to the world at large. The Emmanuel concept links them to one another.

Conclusion.

The Christological task of explaining Jesus' messiahship and 'Jesus - God - Church' relationship is brought forward to the Matthean resurrection narrative. The narrative is such that it provides a clear identity between the crucified Jesus and the exalted Lord and thus it renders a proper climax and conclusion to the Gospel's total witness to the Christ.

Any attempt to distinguish any one of the various Christological concepts in the Gospel as representing the pre-eminent Matthean portrait of Jesus is shown to be rather inconclusive. Matthew treats the various titles as complementary to the total picture. Introduced as the Son of Abraham and the Son of David, Jesus is connected to the political history and hope of Israel. The resurrection narrative is presented as fulfilment of Israel's eschatological and messianic expectations. But the earthly messianic expectation did not need a resurrection. Jesus who designates

himself as the Son of Man and is confessed as the Son of God, by suffering, death and resurrection transcends all political hopes by being exalted to universal lordship.

In his redaction of the concluding verses of the Gospel Matthew seems to have followed two lines : 1) Matt. 28.18-20 as a Christological transformation of the Apocalyptic Son of Man (Dan. 7.13-14) and 2) Matt. 28.18-20 as a part of the Hellenistic KYRIOS Christology in the context of the oriental enthronement pattern, comparable to Phil. 2.6-11. In describing Jesus' exaltation, the Evangelist makes use of specific aspects of the Son of Man concept and KYRIOS Christology without mentioning the titles in the text.

The sovereignty of the exalted Lord is acknowledged by the Church in its worship and obedient missionary-apostolic action. The resurrection narrative describes the relationship between the risen One and his Church. How the community conceives this relationship is further expressed in the Moses typology and the Emmanuel concept. Parallel to Moses, Jesus' teachings are binding on the community as commands. But transcending Moses, the giver of the commands here imparts to the community his own perpetual presence. The Emmanuel concept maintains a balance between the pre-crucifixion and post-resurrection modes of the divine presence through Jesus. The universal authority coupled with this balance is the basis of the community's mission which is a continuation of Jesus' own mission.

The community continues to live on in the conviction that the Lord sends the mission, guides it and brings it to fulfilment at the end of the age. Jesus' own mission consists of teaching and healing (Matt. 5-7 and 8-9). The community's mission also consists of teaching and the ministry of healing and baptism (28.19-20a; 10a). The presence of Christ is the source of authority for the Church's teachings and ministry (28.20b).

Except in the baptismal clause where 'the Son' is mentioned as part of the triadic formula, the Evangelist omits specific mention of all Christological titles in chapter 28. In the appearance stories Jesus himself is the speaker who, as in the rest of the Gospel, does not refer to himself in different titles. Appearing to his followers Jesus employs the personal pronoun 'I' instead of the public title, 'Son of Man'.

Our enquiry in the present chapter leads into the conclusion that the Evangelist recapitulates the Gospel's leading Christological concepts in the conclusion of the Gospel to provide the basis and authority of the apostolic commission, and that the resurrection narrative with its Christological overtones is set in the context of the Gospel's total witness to Christ.

NOTES.

1. Richard N. Longenecker, The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity, London: 1970, p.63. See Isa.26-29,40ff; Ezek.40-48; Dan.12; Joel 2.28-3.21 etc.. cf. Isa.9.6f; Mic.5.2; Zach. 9.9 etc..
2. Ibid., p.64. See I Sam. 2.10,35; 24.6; 26.9,11,16,23; Lev.4.3,5,16; 8.12; Psalm 84.10; I Kings 19.16; Psalm 105.15; I Chron.16.22; Isa.45.1.
3. e.g., Dan. 9.25-26; Pss. of Sol. 17.23-51.
4. cf. S.Mowinckel, He That Cometh, Oxford : 1956, pp.15-20, where he examines the authentic biblical passages, and pp.155-186, where he discusses the origin and development of the messianic hope centred on the Davidic sonship.
5. G.Vermees, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, Penguin Books, 1975, pp.266-270; Community Rule 9; Damascus Document 13, 19, 20.
6. quoted from James D.G.Dunn, "Spirit-and-Fire Baptism", pp.89f.
7. Kingsbury, "Form and Message...", p.19.
8. Matt.1.1; 12.23; 20.30-31; 21.9,15; 22.42-45. cf. Gaston, "The Messiah of Israel", pp.34-35, where he believes that there are some connections between the writings of Ignatius of Antioch and Matthew, both reflecting the situation of the Church in Antioch. To emphasize the full humanity of Jesus the appropriate title Ignatius employs is 'the Son of David' (Ignatius, Eph. 18.2; 20.2; Rom. 7.3; Smyrn. 1.1; Trall., 9.1).
9. John R. Donahue, in Kelber, edit., Passion in Mark, pp.73,75.
10. See F.P. Blair, Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew, Nashville : 1960, pp.54f. Matt.16.16; 22.42; 24.23; 26.63 from Mark and 11.2 from Q.
11. Longenecker, Christology, p.75. See Matt.1.17; 2.4; 11.2; 16.16,20,21; 22.42; 24.5; 23; 26.63,68; 27.17,22.
12. Walter Grundmann, " $\chi\rho\iota\varsigma$ $\kappa\tau\lambda$ ", TDNT, IX, p.538.
13. Hummel, Die Auseinandersetzung, p.119.
14. More than any other Gospel Matthew stresses that the Scriptures find

- their fulfilment in Jesus : See 1.22-23; 2.5f, 15, 17f, 23; 4.14-16; 8.17; 12.17-21; 13.14f, 35; 21.4f; 26.24, 31, 54; 27.9f.
15. Exod.4.22f; Deut.14.1; 32.6, 18; Isa.1.2; 30.1; 63.6, 16; Jer.3.4, 19-22; 31.9, 20; Hos.11.1; Pss.of Sol. 13.9; 17.27-30; 18.4; Jub.1.24f.
 16. T.W.Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, Cambridge: 1935, p.91.
 17. Martin Hengel, The Son of God, Philadelphia : 1976, pp.22-23.
 18. Vincent Taylor, The Names of Jesus, London: 1962, p.54. His references include the following : The kings of Egypt were believed to be the descendants of the god, Ra. The Ptolemies were described by $\nu\lambda\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ 'H\lambda\iota\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\kappa\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$. Deissmann (Bible Studies and Light from the Ancient East) quotes instances of the designation $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\ \nu\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ for Augustus and his successors. (See also the references in Hengel, Son of God, p.23 note 47).
 19. Hengel, Son of God, p.44.
 20. R.H.Fuller, The Foundations of New Testament Christology, London: 1965, p.32. Fuller bases his conclusion mainly on 4Q Florilegium I. 10-14, which he quotes: "And the Lord tells you that he will build a house for you, and I will set up your seed after you, and I will establish your royal throne for ever. I will be his Father and he will be my son. This is the sprout of David". Fuller also says that according to E.Lövestam (Son and Saviour, Lund; 1961, p.12) this is a succinct summary of Nathan's prophecy in II Sam.7.10b-14.
 21. J.D.Kingsbury, "The Title 'Son of God' in Matthew's Gospel", BTB, 1975, p.6 : Matt.1.21, 23, 25; 2.15; 14.33; 16.16; 21.38; 26.63; 27.40, 43; 28.19. cf. Hummel, Die Auseinandersetzung, pp.116-122, where he regards 'Son of God' as the main title for the earthly Jesus in Matthew.
 22. Kingsbury, "The Title 'Son of Man' ...", pp.193-195.
 23. See the discussion in Chapter I, p.18 above.
 24. The Matthean phrase $\sigma\omicron\ \epsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\gamma\epsilon$ as an affirmation of what has previously been stated is evident from Jesus' answer to Judas at 26.25.

25. See Blair, Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew, p.58 : 4 times in Mark; 15 times in Luke and 45 times in Matthew.
26. See Mark 3.35/Matt.12.50; Mark 10.40/Matt.20.23; Mark 14.25/Matt.26.29.
27. Fuller, Foundations, pp.115,242 note 80.
28. Kingsbury, "Form and Message ...", p.21; Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom, p.57.
29. Barnabas Lindars, New Testament Apologetic, London: 1973, pp.139-144.
30. Karl Heinrich Rengstorf, "Old and New Testament Traces of a Formula of the Judean Royal Ritual", Nov. Test., 5, 1962, pp.237-239.
31. Psalm 2.7 cf. II Sam.7.11-14; Eccles. 47.11; 4Q Flor.; M.Black, "The Christological Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament", NTS., 18, 1971-'72, pp.2-3.
32. Fuller, Formation., p.87.
33. See Chapter I, pp.53-54 above.
34. Kingsbury, "Composition and Christology...", p.580.
35. See Mowinckel, He That Cometh, p.346.
36. See Ibid., pp.353-357; Longenecker, Christology., pp.82-85. The date and composition of the Similitudes of Enoch are highly disputed, but it is beyond our scope to discuss this here.
37. Elsewhere in the NT Jesus is rarely called 'the Son of Man' : See Acts 7.56; Heb.2.6; Rev.1.13; 14.14.
38. Matt. 8.20/Luke 9.58; Matt.11.19/Luke 7.34; Matt.12.32/Luke 12.10; Matt.9.6; 12.8; 13.37; Luke 6.22; 19.10; Mark 2.10,28; 10.45.
39. Mark 8.31; 9.9-13,31; 10.33f; 14.21,41 and par.
40. Matt.10.32f/Luke 12.8f; Matt.12.40/Luke 11.30; Matt.24.27/Luke 17.24; Matt.24.37/Luke 17.26; Matt.24.38f/Luke 17.28-30; Matt.24.44/Luke 12.40; Matt.10.23; 16.27-28; 19.28; 24.30; 25.31; Mark 13.26.
- 38-40. Richard A. Edwards, "The Eschatological Correlative as a Gattung in the New Testament", ZNW, 60, 1969, p.9; Blair, Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew, pp.72f,77. For Blair, the dominant Christological category in Matthew is the Son of Man (p.83). For Davies both Son of Man and Lord are dominant in Matthew (Setting of the Sermon., pp.96-99).

41. See Mark 3.28,29 cf. Matt.12.32; Luke 12.10; Mark 14.1 cf. Matt.26.2.
42. The Evangelist introduces the title for the first time here.
43. Matthew Black, "The 'Son of Man' Passion Sayings in the Gospel Tradition", ZNW, 60, 1969, p.2.
44. Matt.17.9,12,22; 20.18-19; 26.24,45.
45. Joseph B.Clower, Jr., The Church in the Thought of Jesus, Richmond: 1959, p.99.
46. cf. Kingsbury, "The Title 'Son of Man' ...", pp.193,197-202.
47. Bultmann, Theology of the NT, I, p.30.
48. Edwards, "The Eschatological Correlative ...", pp.11-20 : Matt.12.40/ Luke 11.30; Matt.24.27/Luke 17.24; Matt.24.37/Luke 17.26; Matt.24.38f/ Luke 17.28-30.
49. H.E. Tödt, The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition, London: 1965, pp.228-231. Tödt's work is a study inspired by G. Bornkamm.
50. Evans, Resurrection., p.89.
51. Kingsbury, "The Title 'Son of Man'", p.196. See Matt.10.23; 13.41; 16.28; 19.28; 24.30; 25.31.
52. Norman Perrin, "The Son of Man in Ancient Judaism and Primitive Christianity: A Suggestion", Bib. Res., 11, 1966, pp.26-28.
 Apocalyptic and soteriological ideas are associated with the Son of Man concept in Judaism. The Son of Man as a transcendent bringer of salvation is a concept shared independently by the Similitudes of Enoch and 4th Ezra 13. (See Perrin, op.cit., pp.18,28; Fuller, Foundations., pp.34-43 and the present chapter, pp.186-187 above).
53. Michel, "Der Abschluss...", p.22 cf. Lohmeyer, Matthäus., pp.416f.
54. R.C. Tuck, "The Lord Who Said Go : Some Reflections on Matt.28.16-20", ANQ, 7, 1966-67, p.88.
55. Alsop, Appearance Stories., p.178.
56. Tödt, Son of Man., p.288; Hahn, Mission., p.66; Trilling, Das Wahre Israel., pp.21-23.
57. Chapter I, pp.39-40 above.

58. Trilling, Das Wahre Israel, pp.21-51.
59. Kingsbury, "The Title 'KYRIOS'", p.254 and Kingsbury, Matthew : Structure, Christology, Kingdom, p.112.
60. Kingsbury, Matthew : Structure ., pp.103-113.
61. Chapter III, pp.122-124 above.
62. An obvious example of Hellenistic Christology is the Christological hymn, Phil. 2.6-11 that emerged in the Hellenistic Christian communities. The thought pattern of the Gospel agrees with the theme of the hymn :

Phil.2.6-11

- Jesus emptied himself of all divine prerogatives.
- By taking the humblest form of a servant he became obedient even unto the death on the cross.
- Exaltation : God has highly exalted him. Every knee in heaven and on earth should bow to the name of Jesus and confess that he is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.

Matt.

- Incarnation and earthly life.
- Servant-Messiah crucified to death.
- Exalted to authority in heaven and on earth, worshipped by the community, and disciples are made in the name of the Son and the Father (28.16-20).

Instead of the death-resurrection (ascension) pattern of the Gospel tradition, Phil.2.6-11 follows a pattern consisting of an antithesis between KENOSIS (vv.6-8) and exaltation (vv.9-11).

63. Emperor-cults emerged in the pagan world during the first century B.C. and continued into the Christian era. Emperors were worshipped as Lords : e.g., Ptolemy III in Egypt, Caligula, Claudius, Nero and Domitian in Rome. Mystery religions applied the designation to their deities : e.g., Isis, Osiris, Serapis, Artemis, Hermes etc., (See Taylor, Names of Jesus, p.39; W.Foerster, "κύριος", TDNT, III, pp. 1049-1052; Hengel, Son of God, pp.77-79, especially the detailed foot-notes 135 and 136.).

64. The fact that the name κύριος has a Hellenistic background and it became the predominant Christological title in Hellenistic Christianity does not necessarily imply that it originated in Hellenistic Christianity. The Aramaic address ܕܢܝܢ (ܕܢܝܢ) survives in the invocation Μαράνα θά in I Cor. 16.22 (cf. a corresponding prayer, Ἀπὸν, ἔρχου Κύριε Ἰησοῦ in Rev. 12.20). Μαράνα θά also occurs in Did. 10.6. As a fixed formula in the context of worship in the Pauline congregation it must be pre-Pauline and of Jewish-Christian origin. Jesus was thus addressed 'Lord' in both Jewish-Christian and Gentile-Christian circles.
65. See Eph. 4.7-10; Rom. 10.5-8; I Tim. 3.16; I Pet. 3.18-22 cf. Xavier Leon Dufour, Resurrection and the Message of Easter, London: 1974, pp. 25-45.
66. cf. Davies, Setting of the Sermon., pp. 85-93. W.D. Davies has stated that the New Moses motif in Matt. 28.16-20 is no more than suggestive, resting on earlier indications in the Gospel (p. 86).
67. See Goulder, Midrash., p. 158.
68. J.C. Hawkins, Horae Synopticae : Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem, Oxford : 1909, pp. 163-165.
69. B.W. Bacon, Studies in Matthew, London: 1931, pp. 80ff.
70. Austin Farrer, St. Matthew and St. Mark, London: 1966, pp. 177ff.
71. Trilling, Das wahre Israel, p. 217; Davies, Setting of the Sermon., pp. 14-25, 61, 92f; Blair, Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew, p. 133; H.B. Green, "The Structure of St. Matthew's Gospel", Stud. Eva., 4, 1968, pp. 48-50.
72. Kilpatrick, Origins., pp. 135f; Standahl, School of St. Matthew, pp. 24-27.
73. cf. Trilling, Das Wahre Israel, pp. 217f; Strecker, Der Weg., p. 147 n. 2; Blair, Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew, p. 133.
74. Ignatius, Magn., 13.1; Eph. 9.2; Phil. 1.2; Eph. 15.2; Magn. 2.1; See Gaston, "The Messiah of Israel ...", p. 35.
75. Chapter III, pp. 138-141 above.
76. J.C. Kirby, The Exodus in the New Testament, (S.T.M. thesis), Montreal: McGill University, 1957, p. 48.

77. Kingsbury, Matthew : Structure, Christology, Kingdom, pp.89-90.
78. See H.M.Teeple, The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet, Philadelphia: 1957, pp.74-85; Kirby, The Exodus., pp.36-71; Jeremias, "Μωϋσῆς ", TDNT, IV, pp.870-871; Blair, Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew, pp. 57,133-135; and the extensive discussion of Davies, Setting of the Sermon., pp.25-93.
79. Morton Smith, Tannaitic Parallels to the Gospels, Philadelphia: 1951, pp.27-30.
80. Kirby, The Exodus., pp.36-71, esp. 66-67,71.
81. Bruce J.Malina, "The Literary Structure and Form of Matt.xxviii. 16-20", NTS, 17, 1970-'71, p.91. cf. W.Rothfuchs, Die Erfüllungszeit des Matthäusevangeliums, Eine Biblische-theologische Untersuchung, Stuttgart : 1969, p.126, where he regards Matt.28.20b as an inclusion with 1.23.
82. Malina, "The Literary Structure...", pp.95,96 note 1.
83. cf. Gen.28.15; Judg.6.12; Hagg.1.13.
84. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, p.111.
85. Matthew does not seem to read the Isaiah text in its full setting. cf. van Daelen, The Real Resurrection, p.92: "That Isaiah did not speak of a virgin but of a young woman of marriageable age is irrelevant as we are not concerned with what Isaiah meant but with what Matthew wanted to convey".
86. Fuller, The Foundations, p.196.
87. Matthew's omission of the Marcan phrase, 'who can forgive sins but God alone ?' in his redaction of the healing of the paralytic (Mark 2.3-12; Matt.9.1-8) is an acceptance of the statement by implication, and at the same time an assertion that Jesus the Son of Man possesses this divine authority.
88. Words of Rabbi Hananiah ben Teradion (died A.D. c. 135). See the verses in W.O.E.Oesterley, transl., The Sayings of the Jewish Fathers, London: 1919.

89. cf. Kingsbury, out of his preference for the Son of God Christology in Matthew, says : Matthew suggests with 1.23 and 28.20 that Jesus is the Son of God in the sense that in his person God dwells with his people. The so-called Emmanuel passage furnishes us with a thumb-nail definition of what it means for Matthew to confess that Jesus is Son of God; conceived by the Holy Spirit and born of a virgin, Jesus is the one in whom God chooses to dwell among his people. ("Composition and Christology....", p.582; "Form and Message ...", p.20).
90. Malina finds a problem with the present tense, $\epsilon\iota\mu\iota$, with which the clause can be a promise only if taken as a future or periphrastic. (Malina, "The Literary Structure ...", p.91).

Chapter V

CONTEMPORARY JEWISH SETTING

In his redaction of the Resurrection Narrative Matthew enhances the Marcan outline with concepts and patterns drawn from Jewish traditions and also in the context of the Church's conflict with the Jews. We go on to consider these under two divisions : 1) The Jewish concept of resurrection as a setting of the Matthean narrative : the eschatological and apocalyptic setting, and 2) Christians and Jews in conflict : the polemical setting.

The Jewish concept of resurrection as a setting of the Matthean narrative : the eschatological and apocalyptic setting.

The Jewish hope of resurrection has its roots in the OT; it sustains a belief in a life beyond earthly existence. However, the OT speaks very little directly about resurrection.

Since, in biblical perception man is a unitive personality consisting of soul, flesh, mind and body to which life has been given, death is the end of life when human personality, though it still exists, ceases to live.¹ X.L.Dufour states the biblical (OT) concept thus : At death the whole man goes to Sheol and leads a corporeal existence that

no longer deserves the name 'life'.² Resurrection, therefore, is the whole person coming back to life.

In the OT, belief in the resurrection is developed from 1) faith in God as the Lord of life who rules everywhere even in Sheol, 2) communion with God as a key factor in the hope of the messianic time of salvation, and 3) the acceptance of a fundamental connection between judgement and redemption, the latter including the ideas of purifying and renewing.³ Ideas of resurrection in the OT, however, are not consistent. The book of Psalms does not speak of resurrection, but of continued fellowship with God, based on the strength of God's power and presence (Psalms 16; 73.24). YHWH being the God of the living and the dead, his presence is being felt even in Sheol (Psalm 139.8). The belief in the unbroken fellowship sometimes takes the form of an affirmation of faith: "God will ransom my soul from the power of Sheol, for he will receive me" (Psalm 49.15 cf. 73.24). It is actually in the writings of prophets that hints of resurrection begin to appear. A clear reference to the belief in the resurrection appears in Isa.26.19, where it indicates that the righteous dead shall live and their bodies shall rise to share the coming deliverance, in a sense more real than existence in Sheol. Resurrection as revival or revitalization of the people or the nation is found in Hos.6.1-2 and Ezek. 37.1-14. Ezekiel's apocalyptic vision of the resurrection of Israel (37.1-14) indicates the opening of the eschatological era, whose principal sign is the resurrection of the dead.⁴ The hope of an eschatological

general resurrection emerged with the prophets.

The concept of resurrection is more comprehensively developed in Apocalyptic⁵, where it is generally a sign of the messianic age. The apocalypse added in Isaiah states a belief in the overcoming of death and a communion with God for all the peoples and nations at a messianic time of salvation (25.6-9). The divine triumph over death and the resurrection of the righteous to everlasting life are associated in Dan. 12.2. II Maccabees views human destiny in terms of future resurrection (7.9, 11, 14, 22f, 29, 36; 12.43-45)⁶, one which probably implies a physical form.⁷ Written a generation or two after and independent of I Maccabees, II Maccabees still provides a picturesque supplement to it and covers the same period of history as I Macc. 1-7⁸: the time of martyrdom under the persecutions by Antiochus Epiphanes. II Maccabees links resurrection with the concept of martyrdom. Since eternal life is a reunion with the brethren in the kingdom of earth, resurrection takes the crudest form of restitution of the actual tormented body (II Macc. 7.14-38; 14.46).⁹ Resurrection being a sign of the messianic age, it is the Messiah who calls forth the dead.¹⁰ The Apocalypse of Baruch, written probably between A.D. 70 and 100 speaks of the advent of the Messiah and his return in glory, when those who had fallen asleep shall rise again and the souls of the righteous shall rejoice and those of the wicked shall waste away the more (II Bar. 30).¹¹ Baruch also states that the dead rise with the same body and recognize each other and are transformed to angels to dwell in

heaven (50.2-51.10). IV Ezra speaks of Paradise and the blessedness for the righteous in the day of resurrection (7.32-37). The Similitudes of Enoch mentions the resurrection of the righteous (Enoch 46.6; 62.13-16). Although resurrection has acquired importance as an eschatological doctrine of Judaism the belief in it has never been uniform.

In the course of the struggle between Judaism and Hellenism, Hellenism under the Seleucid rule (after the battle of Panium, 198 B.C.) appealed to many Jews.¹² The Jewish assimilation of and reaction to the Hellenistic idea of the immortality of the soul are evident in the literature of the first and second centuries B.C.¹³ The Book of Wisdom, dated between 150 B.C. and the turn of the first century B.C., states that God rewards the righteous with immortality (3.4).¹⁴ II Maccabees, on the other hand, affirms the idea of resurrection (7.14). The Book of Wisdom indicates that Hellenistic Judaism at its extreme has replaced the idea of resurrection by the concept of immortality of the soul (8.19f; 9.15) and the idea of Sheol by that of retribution at death (3.1ff).¹⁵ This change entailed a conflict between Hebrew and Hellenistic Jewish concepts of human destiny. Christianity emerged in such a setting.

Since the first disciples and many of the first Christians were Jews, the rigorously Hebraic concept of resurrection rather than the Hellenistic immortality must have strongly influenced the Christian belief. The Jewish thought combines two converging themes: the concept of the Kingdom on

earth for the righteous and the resurrection to enjoy its bliss. The concept of physical resurrection is an accompanying theme believed to have originally derived from Persian influence. Judaism derives from Iranian thought its association of physical resurrection with the eschatological renewal of all things, of which the resurrection of the body is only one particular aspect.¹⁶

The resurrection hope was not accepted by all Jews as a matter of faith. The Pharisees accepted and the Sadducees rejected it (Mark 12.18; Acts 23.8). The Sadducees' strict adherence to Torah alone is the basis of their rejection of resurrection. The conflict between the two groups over the issue is reflected in Matt.22.23-33 (= Mark 12.18-27), where it is presented as a conflict between Jesus and the Sadducees.¹⁷

The messianic association with resurrection is maintained in later interpretations of the resurrection theme. The Ezekiel passage that originally spoke of post-exilic regeneration of a new Israel is interpreted by Rabbinic commentators as a prophecy of the final resurrection in the messianic age.¹⁸ It is read in this sense during the Passover,¹⁹ and was understood so by many of the early Christian Fathers.²⁰ Since Matt.27.51-53 draws on Ezek. 37.1-14; Isa.26.19 and Dan.12.2,²¹ the Matthean story of the resurrection of the saints may be intended to fulfil the hope of the final resurrection in the messianic age.

In 27.51-53 Matthew employs language implying physical resurrection with the mention of the bodies of the saints coming out and appearing to many. But the concept of a blissful earthly kingdom for the raised up saints to enjoy is not found there. A physical resurrection is hardly the Matthean motif here. Here, Matthew breaks away from the Jewish thought that combines the concept of a Kingdom on earth and physical resurrection. As a midrash on the general resurrection of the new messianic age, the basic motif behind Matt. 27.51-53 is determined by its context rather than by its content.

Incorporated into the death scene, the soteriological significance of Jesus' death is manifested in the accompanying resurrection of the saints. Donald Senior points out that in Matthew the death scene represents a challenge to Jesus' divine sonship (27.38-54; esp. v.43) and that the scene dramatically leads on to the confession: "Truly this was the Son of God" (v.54).²² However, as the raised up saints come out of the tombs and appear to many only after Jesus' own resurrection,²³ the executioners who utter the confession do not witness the total resurrection of the saints. Therefore, the resurrection of the saints is not so closely connected with their confession of Jesus as Son of God. Rather, it emphasizes the soteriological significance of Jesus' death, which Senior recognizes as only one of the Matthean motifs.²⁴ The basic motif is indeed to emphasize the life-giving power of Jesus' death.

It is part of the Matthean scheme to introduce eschatological new life as a consequence of the death of Jesus. H.C.Waetjen shares this view when he states that Jesus is the figure who links two different epochs. He is the end of history in that he brings on the final cataclysm with a cry (27.50) and initiates the new creation by the emission of divine life with his final dying breath which subsequently effects the resurrection of the holy ones.²⁵ In distinction from the general resurrection of contemporary Jewish hope, where the righteous and the wicked are raised to face judgement, Matthew has only the righteous (the saints) being raised. This is his attempt to relate the saints of old to the community of disciples, as seen below.

Obviously Matthew does not confine Jesus' resurrection to traditional Jewish conceptions, and he therefore distinguishes it from that of the saints. His resurrection is the exaltation to glory, wherein the risen One declares his absolute authority. It is the exalted One who claims a universal community to be his disciples. His claim effects the dawn of the Christian movement. His death and resurrection together join the saints of old to the community of disciples of the new AEON.

We now turn to consider the Jewish setting of the link between the 'third day', 'after three days' and the resurrection. Matthew and Luke prefer 'on the third day' to the Marcan 'after three days' in the resurrection predictions.²⁶ But Matthew uses 'after three days' in his

Jewish scandal story. The OT recounts numerous events that took place on the third day.²⁷ Bode finds the 'third day' in the OT as the day of salvation and deliverance.²⁸ The 'third day' motif of the resurrection is usually traced to Jonah 2.1 and Hosea 6.2. Matthew refers to Jonah's experience (Jonah 2.1) as a proto-type of the Son of Man being in the heart of the earth three days and three nights (Matt.12.40), whereas he makes no direct reference to Hos.6.2. In Jonah it is literally 'three days' while in Hosea it means 'the near future' of a national revival, restoration or revitalization. The influence of Hos.6.2 on Matthew, as we shall see, is indirect.

Surveying the Rabbinic literature, Harvey K. McArthur points out that the passages from Jonah and Hosea are associated in Midrash Rabbah (Esther IX.2) with reference to Isaiah's hope of relief from distress.²⁹ The usual interpretation of Hosea 6.2 in Rabbinic literature gives it an eschatological character - the end-time resurrection of the dead rather than a mere revival of the nation. The identification of Hosea 6.2 with the resurrection of the dead is supported by the Targum and many other Rabbinic passages. The Targum reads 'on the third day' of Hosea 6.2 as 'on the day of the resurrection of the dead'.³⁰ Rabbinic thought had already associated 'the third day' of Hosea 6.2 with the 'three days and three nights' of Jonah 2.1-2, 11 with reference to the eschatological resurrection.³¹

In quoting Jonah 2.1 Matthew may not be concerned with what Jonah stands for, but with how it could be interpreted in connection with Jesus' resurrection. The Evangelist's major concern at 12.38ff where he quotes Jonah 2.1 is with the impiety of the Pharisees in looking for a sign from Jesus. As we stated in chapter I, with his unusual expression, 'after three days' in the Jewish scandal story, Matthew provides a link between this story and Jesus' dialogue with the Pharisees in Matt.12.38-41. 'After three days' is employed to be suggestive of 'the three days and three nights' of the story of Jonah,³² which could be interpreted as a resurrection typology. On the other hand, Hosea 6.2 is never quoted in the NT. Selby McCasland notes that Tertullian was the first Christian to apply this verse to the resurrection of Jesus.³³ Evans states a way of getting around the question. "That Hosea 6.2 is nowhere cited in the New Testament may indicate that its use had been early, and had left its mark on the tradition at a level deeper than explicit quotation".³⁴ It is more likely that out of his familiarity with Rabbinic Judaism Matthew may be dependent on rabbinic traditions about Hosea 6.2 and at the same time he might be avoiding a direct reference to it since he distinguishes Jesus' resurrection from the eschatological general resurrection of the Jewish hope. Although the unobserved resurrection need not have occurred precisely, on the third day, Matthew preserves a traditional element in using both expressions, 'on the third day' and 'after three days' in his Gospel.

Matthew employs apocalyptic language in his attempt to describe the death and resurrection of Jesus, a language familiar to contemporary Jewish ears. His tendency to multiply apocalyptic portents is particularly evident in Matt. 27.51-54 and 28.2-4.

We have seen how Matthew associates the resurrection of the saints and the death of Jesus as parts of his theological reflection, as a way of bringing out the soteriological significance of Jesus' death. He further colours the story with apocalyptic features. Although the accompanying statement that the raised up saints came to the holy city and appeared to many (27.53) is to be regarded as Matthew's own attempt to supply evidence for what has been stated in v.52 (that saints who had fallen asleep were raised), the whole story is reminiscent of the apocalyptic appearance of the saints of the Most High receiving the Kingdom (Dan. 7.18, 21f, 25, 27) and of the prophecy of Ezekiel that the Lord will open the graves, raise his people and bring them to the land of Israel (Ezek. 37.12).

The opening of the tombs of the saints at Jesus' death and of Jesus' tomb after his resurrection is preceded in each instance by an earthquake. "The earthquake symbolizes God's wrathful judgement on the old aeon and his powerful intervention to bring in his rule and kingdom".³⁵ The earthquake is usually associated with the appearance of the Lord³⁶ and the eschatological Day of the Lord. The prophets associate earthquake with the eschatological Day of the Lord, which brings deliverance to Israel.³⁷

With the earthquake in Matt. 27.51-53 the tombs are opened to let the saints rise as a sign of the new AEON (the Day of the Lord or the messianic age) and of the life-giving presence of the Lord.

Matt. 28.2-4 is the Evangelist's addition of apocalyptic phenomena to the Marcan original in an attempt to describe the circumstantial details of Jesus' resurrection. The phenomena here include the angel of the Lord and the earthquake. We already discussed above in chapter I that Matthew shows literal dependence on Daniel and shares a general stock of apocalyptic language here.³⁸ Matthew assimilates the Marcan 'young man' to the angel who opens the grave. Representing the Lord, the angel of the Lord is a manifestation of Yahweh himself.³⁹ The descent of the angel brings about the earthquake. The earthquake itself symbolizes the presence of Yahweh. Hence, Matthew is saying in symbolic apocalyptic language that God himself is manifestly acting at the resurrection of Jesus. Since the apocalyptic phenomena are employed only in evidence of Jesus' resurrection, the resurrection according to Matthew is not dependent on those phenomena.

Giving the circumstantial details in apocalyptic language, the Evangelist nevertheless keeps his reserve about telling what really happened at the resurrection. The circumstantial details lead to the central message: the announcement of Jesus' resurrection, the apocalyptic symbol of which is the open tomb. In Jewish thought the tomb symbolizes Sheol.⁴⁰ While the open tomb signifies the defeat of Sheol, the resurrection

is the victory of redeeming life.

We discussed earlier how Matthew makes use of an apocalyptic vision-pattern to introduce the risen Lord's appearance and commission.⁴¹ Matthew also employs language from Daniel's description of the apocalyptic Son of Man (7.14)⁴² to describe the risen Jesus as the exalted Lord revealing himself to mankind and claiming absolute authority.

Matthew makes use of the Jewish concept of the eschatological resurrection of the dead and biblical-apocalyptic imageries and language in his narrative. Yet he distinguishes Jesus' resurrection from the eschatological resurrection of the dead. The significance Matthew finds in Jesus' resurrection is that it is the basis of the existence and mission of the Church.

Christians and Jews in Conflict : Polemical Setting.

The polemical setting of the resurrection narrative is best understood in the context of the historical situation of Matthew and his Church. The destruction of the Temple and the Fall of Jerusalem (A.D.70) are already historical events when Matthew writes his Gospel (Matt.22.7; 23.38; 24.1-2). Consequently, the Judaism of Matthew's time is no more temple-centred but Torah-centred. The synagogues assume considerable importance. 'The scribes and Pharisees' and among them the professional teachers of the Law, 'the rabbis' have become the leaders of Judaism.

That the Church is separating itself from Judaism is indicated by the repeated reference to 'their synagogue' in Matthew's Gospel. The initial reference to 'their synagogue' is from Mark 1.39 (Matt.4.23), which Matthew repeats in his redaction of other Marcan passages⁴³ (Matt.10.17). Though with the destruction of the Temple, the prominence of the 'Sadducees' had diminished, they still existed as the aristocratic priestly class in Judaism. The Gospel according to Matthew provides evidence of the Church's continued debate with the Jewish leaders and their resistance to the Christian movement and its basic claims.

Jesus, for Matthew, is the Jesus of the Church. Many of Jesus' conflicts with the Jewish leaders presented in the Gospel, in addition to those from Matthew's sources, reflect the Evangelist's own historical situation. Matthew repeats instances from Mark that might correspond to actual moments in Jesus' ministry, in which the scribes and Pharisees criticise Jesus and his disciples for their association with unclean persons, failure to fast, violation of Sabbath restrictions and non-observance of ritual hand washing before meals etc..⁴⁴ Among the Synoptists Matthew comes out most strongly in depicting Jesus' condemnation of the scribes and Pharisees on the issue of observance of the Law and piety. The very fact that the scribes and Pharisees are constantly criticised indicates an active enmity between them and the Matthean Church. Hence, Matthew has Jesus speak for the Church in order to ascribe authority to the Church's defence.

Jesus, in Matthew's portrait, represents the best of Jewish traits and shares several convictions with the Pharisees such as adherence to oral tradition (23.2-3), to the Mosaic Law and the belief in the resurrection etc. (22.29,32). What eventually separated Jesus from Jewish leaders, according to Matthew, was Jesus' conception of religion as against Pharisaic Judaism. The religion Jesus teaches is of a life of superior righteousness and of absolute preparedness for the Kingdom of Heaven. Therefore, Jesus exhorts the Church that its righteousness must exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees (5.20). 'Righteousness' in Matthew is 'doing the will of God', in other words, obedience to God; which essentially is the same thing that the Torah demands.⁴⁵ In 5.20 Matthew is indirectly claiming superior righteousness for the Church with a rather negative outlook on the Jewish leaders.

The observance of the Law as a source of conflict between the Pharisees and the Church is treated at length in Matthew (see Matt.5-7 and 23). The Pharisees are condemned for their external ritual purity, lack of inner cleanliness, hypocrisy and self-righteousness - things which the Church confronted in Pharisaic Judaism. Hence, Matthew has Jesus address them as 'hypocrites' (13 times in Matthew and rarely elsewhere), 'evildoers' (7.23; 13.41), 'deceitful men' (16.6,11f), 'blind guides' (23.16,24), 'blind Pharisees' (23.26) and 'fools' (23.17). The scribes and Pharisees are accused of ignoring weightier matters of the Law in favour of their own laws (23.23-24). The Pharisees are told that there are others

in God's care who have not kept the Jewish laws (21.31 cf. 8.10-12) and that the Kingdom will be taken away from them and given to the new community that produces fruits (21.43).⁴⁶ Here, it is primarily a warning against the self-righteousness of the so-called meticulous observers of the Law and a justification of the Church's acceptance of others into its fold on the basis of belief and repentance. Matthew does not however entertain an outright denial of Pharisaic teaching. The new community is told to observe what the scribes and Pharisees teach but not to do what they do (23.3). According to Matthew, Jesus came not to abolish the Mosaic Law, but to fulfil it (5.17). For the Church it is the claim of the authority of Jesus that counts above the Law (cf. 12.8). On the basis of the absolute authority of the One who fulfils the Law, the disciples are finally commissioned to teach the community to observe Jesus' commands (his teachings). 'The nation that produces fruits' (21.43) is an allusion to this new community that observes Jesus' commands (28.19-20). Jesus' commands are thus the basis of Christian conduct, which finds itself in conflict with the Pharisaic conduct. A question remains: How do we account for these tensions in Matthew from a theological perspective?

In her analysis of Jewish-Christian relations Rosemary Ruether argues that the anti-Jewish hostility belongs to the exegetical tradition of the Church. The Church developed the oral NT upon a messianic midrash of the Psalms and Prophets whereas the scribes and Pharisees developed a halakic midrash of the oral Torah based on the Pentateuch.⁴⁷ According to

Ruether, Christians and Jews came into conflict mainly on the issue of fulfilled and unfulfilled messianism. The Jews rejected the Christian claim that the messianic age has come with Jesus.⁴⁸ The number of fulfilment quotations in Matthew⁴⁹ indicates Matthew's belief that Jesus is the fulfilment of scriptures (see 5.17). Matthew presents Jesus also as the true interpreter of the Law (Matt.5-7). The Jewish failure to believe in the Messiah of the Church is of serious concern for Matthew (see Matt.13.14-15 based on Isa.6.9-10). In the Gospel there is in fact the tension between two situations : the unbelief of many Jews and the new situation of the belief of non-Jews (11.20-24). According to Ruether, Matt.12.38-42 portrays the types of believing Gentiles and unbelieving Jews. The gathering of the Gentiles is the new element of hope for Matthew when he considers the failure of the traditional heirs of divine promises.⁵⁰ Matthew's anti-Jewish stance is to a great extent the result of his dissatisfaction with the unbelief of many Jews in the messianism fulfilled in Jesus. Hence, the way in which Matthew characterizes the Jewish leaders, their practices, attitudes etc. is coloured by his own anti-Jewish stance.

In its conflict with the Jews the Church in Matthew is depicted as a persecuted community. We make a brief survey of passages relating to the Jewish treatment of Christians. Though not a direct reference to Jewish persecution, the eighth beatitude (Matt.5.10), sharing the same rhythmic style and form as the preceding ones, is a rather general statement about persecution for the cause of righteousness, and its reward. Since 5.11-12

shares the same theme of persecution, these verses are appended to 5.10 as part of Matthew's characteristic style of grouping similar materials together. Verse 11 with its specific list of sufferings reflects real situations which have arisen because of belief in Jesus. The concept of special reward for those who suffer is a Rabbinic concept which Matthew shares (v.12a).⁵¹ Verse 12b with its reference to the prophets' fate is added in to support vv.11-12a. Matt.10.17-23 is a graphic list of warnings against Jewish persecution of the missionaries and it concludes that the mission to the Jews will not always succeed; and prescribes withdrawal wherever the mission meets with rejection. Matt.23.34 states the kinds of persecutions under the scribes and Pharisees, who, the Evangelist fears, will even hand over the missionaries to the Roman authorities to be murdered.⁵² Actual killings or at least murder threats by the Jewish persecutors is to be postulated behind the statements of both 10.28 and 23.34. Matt. 13.21 implies that some missionaries have abdicated in the face of persecution. The synagogues took the lead in persecuting the Christians (10.17; 23.34). In his study of the Jewish persecution of Christians in Matthew, Douglas R.A.Hare concludes that the references in Matthew are to the persecution of Christian missionaries by the Jews.⁵³ Matthew sees in the persecution of Christian missionaries a continuation of the fate of the prophets of old. Hence, he describes in bitter terms the persecutors as the children of those who persecuted the prophets,⁵⁴ who still persecute the (Christian) prophets and wise men (23.29ff).

Although the Evangelist prescribes withdrawal whenever the mission meets with rejection by the Jews, this has not been the general principle in practice. In the Gospel, persecutions bring about two effects on the Church : a passive endurance of sufferings and an active Christian mission.

Jesus' advice about non-violent passive endurance of persecutions (5.39,44ff) set up an ethical standard among Christians of facing actual situations with love. This is a strict reversal of the Zealot principle of violent resistance to political oppression.⁵⁵ Matt.5.44 prescribes prayer for those who persecute the Christians and includes an implicit renunciation of violence. Matt.5.44 is from Q (= Luke 6.27-28). The inclusion of "persecute" is redactional and hence the whole instruction is intended for possible occasions of persecution. Commenting on the verse, E.Schweizer says that the prayer for one's enemies "shows on the one hand that love must not remain a mere feeling, but must issue in action; when one's hands are tied in persecution, the greatest and most important action may well be prayer."⁵⁶

The mission is basically a Jewish idea. An active proselytizing prompted by contact with Gentiles has been attested by many as a Jewish practice of the time (cf. Matt.23.15).⁵⁷ Here comments that the missionary zeal displayed by the Christian Church toward the Gentiles ought to be viewed as a continuation of a strong tendency within the parent religion.⁵⁸

An active missionary endeavour in Judaism is, however, not generally agreed upon. Gager, for instance, agrees with A.D. Nock that "we should be cautious in inferring widespread efforts by Jews to convert Gentiles. Individual Jews did undoubtedly try to 'draw men to the Law', but in the main the proselyte was the man who came to the Law, and the duty of the Jew was to commend the Law by his example (cf. Deut. 4.6) rather than by missionary endeavour."⁵⁹ Matthew might be overemphasizing the Jewish missionary zeal. Christianity, however, revitalized an inherent missionary tendency in Judaism that has its roots in the promise to Abraham (Gen. 12.3 cf. Jer. 4.2) and which found strong expression in the books of Jonah, Ruth, Amos, Isaiah and Deutero-Isaiah, who insisted on the task of bringing the message of salvation by YHWH to the Gentiles (see esp. Isa. 11.10; 42.1ff; 49.5-6).

While the Jewish mission is to the Gentiles, the Church's mission is to both Jews and Gentiles. The mission rests on the authority of the Lord, whose own earthly mission was primarily to the lost sheep of the house of Israel (15.24). Yet it reached beyond. Since in Matthew the disciples' mission is modelled on and is the extension of Jesus' mission, Jesus' primacy of concern for the Jews is the pattern for the disciples' mission, (10.5-6). Matthew finds himself within the milieu of Jews and Gentiles on the one hand and the Christian Church to which he belongs, on the other. Those texts in his Gospel that show particularist, anti-Gentile, 'universalist' and anti-Jewish tendencies belong to his special additions and redaction.⁶⁰

Within his milieu the possibility of a tension among such tendencies is obvious. Moreover, they reflect the situation of the Matthean Church. In this context, Matthew envisages a new situation in which this tension is annulled. An obvious significance of the resurrection, for Matthew, is that it annuls the tension. By speaking of the risen Lord's reaching out to the world through the community of disciples, the Evangelist accommodates the fact that Gentiles had already entered the Christian fold without being channelled through Judaism. The Evangelist now indirectly demands of the Jews to adopt a new attitude to Jesus and the Church that consists of members of Jewish and Gentile origin. Hence, in the parable of the Last Judgement (25.31-46),⁶¹ the judgement is not based on racial priority, but on the attitude towards Jesus expressing itself in acts of love to the least of his brethren, who are elsewhere described as 'the little ones' (10.42 cf. 18.6 = Mark 9.42; Matt. 18.10, 14). Bornkamm describes the standard applied here as 'love for the least', which according to him and G. Barth signifies 'the doing of God's will'.⁶²

If the Christian mission were only to the Gentiles, the Jews of Matthew's time would not have been so angered about the Christian movement and mission, except to regard it as a counter movement aimed at proselytizing Gentiles. A Church still concerned with the Jews is presupposed in the Gospel. In spite of this concern, the missionary community not only faces persecution but counter-propaganda against the Church's claims.

The Jewish counter-propaganda is nowhere as evident in the Gospel as in the Jewish scandal story. In its present context the Jewish scandal is the final stage of Israel's rejection of its Messiah.⁶³ As Kingsbury remarks, the animosity of the Jewish leaders is such that they plot the death of Jesus (12.14; 16.21; 21.45-46; chapters 26-27), secure the aid of Judas (26.2-25; 26.47-50; 27.3-4), of the crowds (26.47; 27.2-23) and of the Gentile authorities (27.1-2, 11-38) to see to it that Jesus' death takes place. They condemn him (27.15-26) and finally perpetuate the slanderous story of body-stealing.⁶⁴

In its context, the Jewish scandal story is an apologetic legend of the empty tomb. Kelber suggests that the story is neither prior to nor independent of Mark. In his opinion the story indicates that there was already Jewish polemic against the Marcan story of the empty tomb within the Matthean environment and that the story represents a triangular relationship between Matthew, his Marcan source and his Jewish surroundings.⁶⁵ Attractive as it is, this suggestion lacks direct evidence. Since Mark does not mention the setting of the guard we regard the story as independent of Mark. We have already pointed out certain improbabilities about the credibility of the story.⁶⁶ Without giving serious consideration to those improbabilities, Matthew frames the story to meet a single motive : to tell his contemporary Jewish opponents that body-stealing is a wrong allegation,⁶⁷ probably as part of a dialogue between the Church and the Jews. By stating that this story is being told to this day (28.15)

the Evangelist also wants to tell his readers that the attitude of Jewish opponents to Jesus has been unchanged over the years since the time of the resurrection. Since in the Gospel Matthew characterizes the Jewish leaders in a language reflecting his anti-Jewish stance, his counter-allegations in the story with charges of conspiracy, deceit and bribery also belong to his anti-Jewish stance. However, the story reflects the fact that allegations and counter-allegations were characteristic of the conflict between Jews and Christians (cf. Matt.15. 1-20/Mark 7.1-23).

Among the Gospels Matthew alone reports two stories about the empty tomb : the one that developed around the women (shared by the other Gospels) and the other developed in contention with the Jewish leaders. Both stories are related to the resurrection message : 'He has risen' (Matt.28.6, announced by the angel) and 'He has risen from the dead' (27.64, part of the Kerygma). In one, the resurrection is affirmed by its consequence : 'He is not here' (28.6) and in the other, rejected by its alleged consequence : 'His disciples stole him away' (27.64; 28.13). In the women's story the empty tomb is of purely symbolical significance. It symbolizes the absence of Jesus' body. Since women's witness has no legal standing, Matthew does not create an apologetic legend out of it. The women's story is rather to inform the believers. Therefore, Matthew does not bring in any disciple to check the empty tomb to establish an official witness. Neither does he emphasize the physical character of the

risen One nor has he any apologetic to meet this end. Nevertheless, by his distinctive story of the Jewish scandal Matthew makes the empty tomb tradition a significant part of the resurrection narrative. We trace in the story an increasing importance of the empty tomb as the Church sought to defend itself and its mission against Jewish polemics.

Conclusions.

We have given attention to the Evangelist's Jewish heritage as a setting of his resurrection belief. The Jews believed in the eschatological resurrection of the dead to take place in bodily form as a sign of the messianic age. The Gospel proclaims the resurrection of Jesus as a present reality. The Jewish leaders oppose it because for them resurrection is eschatological and is still a future hope. Matthew, however, distinguishes Jesus' resurrection from the hoped-for general resurrection. The Evangelist attributes redemptive significance to Jesus' death and resurrection. His death results in the resurrection of the saints of old and his own resurrection is the exaltation to absolute authority as the basis of the messianic community's life and mission.

While apocalyptic language is used to explain the opening of the tomb Matthew keeps his reserve about what really "happened" to Jesus at the resurrection. Hence for Matthew it is not the event itself but its meaning and significance which are of importance. The apocalyptic

setting leads to the announcement of the Easter message. The angel of the Lord as the apocalyptic agent of the opening of the tomb is endowed with the significant role of announcing Jesus' resurrection by demonstrating a proof that the open tomb is the apocalyptic symbol of the event.

The main thrust of the resurrection narrative is the Church's mission that emerges from the risen Lord. The mission faces continuous opposition from the synagogue and the Jewish leaders, an opposition that already began during Jesus' earthly ministry. The tension between the Church and the Jewish leaders runs through the entire Gospel and expresses itself mainly in four levels: 1) the conflict over the observance of the Law, 2) the Jewish persecution of Christians, 3) Jewish polemics against basic Christian claims and 4) the anti-Jewish stance of the Evangelist and the Church. In such a context Matthew develops the concept that the Church is universalistic in scope.

In short, Matthew presents his resurrection narrative in the wide setting of Jewish beliefs, in familiar apocalyptic language and with apologetics against Jewish polemics.

NOTES.

1. See Xavier Léon Dufour, Resurrection and the Message of Easter, London: 1974, p.18; Th.C.Vriezen, An Outline of Old Testament Theology, Oxford: 1962, pp.61,201f,204.
2. Dufour, Resurrection., p.18. Dufour here refers to Psalm 63.9; Isa. 5.14; 7.11; 38.18; Hab.2.5; Prov.7.27; Job 17.13; I Sam.2.6; II Sam.12.23.
3. Vriezen, OT Theology, pp.204,234,274.
4. cf. J.Grassi, "Ezekiel xxxvii.1-14 and the New Testament", NTS, 11, 1964-'65, p.162.
5. Albrecht Oepke, " Ἀνίστημι κτλ.", TDNT, I, p.370.
6. Lloyd Geering, Resurrection - A Symbol of Hope, London: 1971, pp. 113-114.
7. *Ibid.*, p.114. See II Macc. 7.11; 14.46.
8. C.H.Brockington, A Critical Introduction to the Apocrypha, London: 1961, pp.120-122.
9. cf. Evans, Resurrection, p.15.
10. II Baruch 30,72; II Esdras 12.33; I Enoch 51.1ff; 61.4ff.
11. Geering, Resurrection., p.121 cf. II Bar.49.2; 50.1-51.3; II Esd.7.28-37.
12. See Brockington, Intro. to the Apocrypha, pp.1,4-5.
13. J.McLeman, Resurrection - Then and Now, London: 1965, pp.60-61.
14. Brockington, Intro. to the Apocrypha, pp.54,59,64.
15. cf. Bultmann, " Ἰῶν κτλ." TDNT, II, p.859. See also McLeman, Resurrection., pp.58-68.
16. Pierre Grelot, "La résurrection de Jésus et son arrière-plan biblique et Juif", La Résurrection du Christ et l'Évangélisme moderne, p.32. Grelot also refers to W.Bousset, H.Gressmann, Die Religion des Judentums im Spät-hellenistischen Zeitalter, Tübingen: 1925, pp. 510-524 and H. Birkeland, "The Belief in the Resurrection of the Dead in the Old Testament", Studia Evangelica, 3, 1950, pp.60-78.

17. In Mark 12.18-27 and par. Jesus counters the Sadducees on the basis of the Torah by emphasizing that God as the God of the Patriarchs of old is the God of the living and not of the dead and that the resurrection life is parallel to angelic existence.
18. Grassi, "Ezekiel ...", p.162 : Midrash Rabbah: Gen.R. 13.6; 14.5; Deut. R. 7.7; Lev.R. 14.19.
19. Ibid., See Talmud Babyl. Meg. 31a.
20. Ibid.; Justin, Apol., 1.52; Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. V.xv; Tertullian, De Resurr. Carnis, 29.30.
21. See Chapter I, pp.16-18 above.
22. Donald Senior, "The Death of Jesus and the Resurrection of the Holy Ones", CBQ, 38, 1976, pp.321-325.
23. Answers to the question of the gap between the resurrection of the saints at Jesus' death and their coming out of the tombs later and appearing to many after Jesus' resurrection can only be hypothetical since Matthew leaves no clue to a definite answer. Even the usually suggested answer that the inclusion of the phrase, "after his resurrection" is to emphasize Christ as the first-fruits from the dead is drawn from outside the Gospel, that is, I Cor.15.20. According to the story, the saints are in fact raised before Jesus' resurrection. For reasons stated in chapter I, p.18 above, we cannot conclude from the present story alone that for Matthew Jesus' death and resurrection are a single event which precedes the resurrection of the saints. "After his resurrection" is, however, an inconsistent inclusion into Matthew's own apocalyptic story.
24. The other being confessional; See Donald Senior, "The Death of Jesus...", pp.325-329.
25. Herman C. Waetjen, "The Genealogy as the Key to the Gospel According to Matthew", JBL, 95, 1976, p.213.
26. Mark 8.31; 9.31; 10.34 cf. Matt.16.21; 17.23; 20.18; Luke 18.33; 9.22.
27. Bode, First Easter Morning, pp.119-124. He includes a list of OT references on p.119 note 2. 'On the third day' is highly significant

- in Jewish thought. See Gen.42.18; Exod.19.11,16; I Kings 12.12; II Chron.10.12; Esther 5.1-8 cf. Luke 13.31-33.
28. Bode, First Easter Morning., p.119.
 29. H.K.McArthur, "On the Third Day", NTS, 18, 1971-'72, p.83.
 30. Ibid., pp.83-86 : B.Sanhedrin 97a; B.Rosh Hashana 31a; P.Barakoth Va; P.Sanhedrin IX.6; Midrash Rabbah : Esther IX.2; Deut.VII.6; Gen.LVI.1; XCI.7; Midrash of Psalms: Ps.22.5; Yalkuth Shimeoni Joshua II.16 and Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer 51. See also Shalom Coleman, Hosea Concepts in Midrash and Talmud, Bloemfontein : 1960, p.156.
 31. McArthur, "On the Third Day", pp.83-86.
 32. Chapter I, p.28 above.
 33. Selby McCasland, The Resurrection of Jesus, New York: 1932, p.106.
See also his article, "The Scriptural Basis of 'On the Third Day'", JBL, 48, 1929, p.132.
 34. Evans, Resurrection., p.49.
 35. J.P.Meier, "Salvation - History in Matthew : In Search of a Starting Point", CBQ, 37, 1975, pp.208f.
 36. Exod. 19.18; I Kings 19.11f; Psalm 114.7; Her.12.26.
 37. Isa.13.1-22; Jer.4.24; 51.29; Ezek.7.1-27; 37.7; Amos 2.13-16; Joel 2.10; 3.16.
 38. See Chapter I, pp.22-23 above.
 39. See Gen.16.7,13; Exod.3.2; Gen.22.11ff; Judg.6.17ff.
 40. Dufour, Resurrection., p.110, see note 14, where he quotes J.Pederson, Israel, vol.I, 1929, p.462 : "The 'Ur' - grave we might call Sheol ... where there is grave there is Sheol and where there is Sheol, there is grave".
 41. See Chapter I, pp.39-40 above.
 42. See Chapter IV, pp.190-192 above.
 43. Mark 6.6b/Matt.9.35; Mark 3.1/Matt.12.9; Mark 6.2/Matt.13.54.
 44. Mark 2.13-17/Matt.9.9-13; Mark 2.18-22/Matt.9.14-17; Mark 2.23-28/Matt.12.1-8; Mark 2.1-8/Matt.12.9-14; Mark.7.1-23/Matt.15.1-20. cf. John G.Gager, (Kingdom and Community, New Jersey : 1975), who admits

that the Gospels' image of Jesus very often corresponds to real moments in the life of Jesus, gives the above references from Mark and parallels as evidences for how the Pharisees numbered Jesus and his disciples among the impure outsiders (am ha-'ares) (pp.22-26). The Pharisaic attitude to Jesus was not of neglect but concern, for Jesus already appeared to them as a competitor in his appeal to the masses and for his authoritative interpretation of the Law.

45. See Douglas R.A.Hare, The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel According to St. Matthew, Cambridge : 1967, p.131 note 1 : "For Matthew δίκαιοσύνη is the abstract noun which corresponds to the phrase ποιεῖν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Πατρὸς , thus 5.20 is to be understood by reference to 7.21".
46. J.G.Gager ascribes this reversal of outsider-insider distinction to the antithetical relationship between the Church and the Jewish leaders and to the Church's protest against the former. (Kingdom and Community, p.27). As we shall see, there is more to this reversal than mere antagonism and protest of the Church against Pharisaic Judaism.
47. Rosemary Radford Ruether, Faith and Fratricide, New York: 1974, pp. 64-65.
48. Ibid., Introduction by Gregory Baum, pp.19-20.
49. Matt.1.23; 2.15,18,23; 4.15; 8.17; 12.18-21; 13.35; 21.5; 27.9f.
50. Ruether, Faith and Fratricide, pp.84-85.
51. C.G.Montefiore, Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teachings, New York: 1970, pp.31-35. See the various Rabbinic texts which he refers to. We shall just cite one among them : "Beloved are sufferings before God, for the glory of God rests on those upon whom sufferings come" Sifre 73a cf. Mechilta 72b).
52. Since crucifixion is a Roman punishment for political rebels this is possible.
53. Hare, Theme of Jewish Persecution., pp.80-114, 146ff. cf. Kingsbury, Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom, p.134, where he lists the

various kinds of persecutions as : verbal abuse, arraignment for disturbing peace, perjured testimony in court, flogging in synagogues, stoning, pursuit from city to city and even death.

54. probably a reference to II Chron.24.20f; Jer.2.30; 26.20-23; I Kings 19.10,14 etc.
55. The Christians in Palestine, for instance, belong to the "peace party" who did not take part in the Jewish rebellion against the Romans (Theissen, First Followers., p.113).
56. E.Schweizer, The Good News According to Matthew, London: 1975, p.133.
57. See Hare, Jewish Persecution., pp.9-10. Among the references he lists are Matt.23.15; Acts 2.10; 6.5; Justin, Dial., 80.122f.
58. Ibid., p.10. See Hare's discussion on Jewish proselytism on pp.9ff.
59. quoted by Gager, Kingdom and Community., p.62 note 78.
60. Matt.10.5-6; 15.24; 4.15; 5.47; 6.7; 18.17; 8.11-12; 28.18-20.
61. J.A.T.Robinson groups this parable with the parables of the separation of the wheat from the tares (13.24-30) and the sorting of the good and bad fish (13.47-50), where the idea of judgement excludes special privilege absolutely. (Robinson, Twelve New Testament Studies, London: 1962, pp.76ff).
62. Bornkamm and Barth, Tradition and Interpretation., pp.23-24,59.
63. In the Jewish eye, Israel's rejection of Jesus may be justifiable at least for the following reasons : The Pharisees were challenged by Jesus' influence with the masses and offended by his keeping company with tax-collectors and sinners and the breaking of Sabbath restrictions. He challenged the Sadducees at the basis of their stronghold, the Temple by cleansing it ; angered the Herodians on the question of tribute money and enraged the extremists, the Zealots by his demand for love of the enemies and renouncing of violence.
64. Kingsbury, Matthew : Structure, Christology, Kingdom, p.153.
65. Kelber, Passion in Mark, p.139.
66. See Chapter I, p.27.
67. See Chapter I, p.30.

CONCLUSION

In our enquiry we have examined the construction of the Matthean Resurrection Narrative, and identified the Evangelist's additions to his sources and his special contributions to our understanding of Jesus' resurrection. With tradition and redaction he composes his version of the 'resurrection-related' events in a sequence leading up to the basic motif expressed by the commission, *paenitentia*.

The commission is presented within the setting of a Christophany to the Eleven (28.16-20). The resemblance of the Matthean 'appearance-commission' story to an OT *Gattung* of commissionings is evident, but to ascribe the basis of the Matthean form to a proto-commissioning being shared by Luke and John is merely hypothetical. The differences outweigh the similarities in these Gospels.

In our discussion of the composition of the appearance story we have observed obvious parallels between Matt.28.17-18,20b and 17.6-7. In his composition of 17.6-7 and 28.17-18,20b the Evangelist makes use of a Danielic vision pattern (Dan.10.9-12). The major difference in Matt.28.17-18,20b is in the Word of Comfort, which proclaims the authority and presence of the risen Lord (28.18b,20b). It is made up of elements from

Dan. 7.14; Matt. 11.27 (Q); 1.23 (Isa. 7.14) and 18.20. The commission itself is placed within the Word of Comfort.

Matthew develops the Christophany on the basis of Mark 16.7 by locating it in Galilee. In Matthew's redaction, Galilee of the nations is the symbolic spot where the risen One reveals himself as the Lord of the κόσμος who sends the Church out on its mission. Matthew does not discuss the manner of the resurrection appearance but subordinates the Christophany to the mission it introduces. This particular manifestation of the exalted Lord is in order to command the mission.

The commission 'to make disciples of all nations' provides a key to the understanding of the Gospel and the Gospel leads up to this phrase. Matthew's is a Gospel of the 'master-disciple relationship' between the historical Jesus and the Twelve; and between the risen (exalted) Lord and the Church. Matthew has personal knowledge of his community for which the resurrection of Jesus is already a part of the Kerygma. In addition to the written sources, the Church's faith, mission, practices (including baptism and teaching) and worship are contemporary sources which Matthew draws upon. Conscious of the needs of the Church he responds by informing it of the events which lay at its foundation and of the response it should make to those events.

Matthew redacts the 'appearance - commission' story by recapitulating

several basic themes of the Gospel that are of ecclesiastical and Christological importance. The commission connects the existence and expansion of the Church with its origin in Jesus and the disciples. The Church exists as a domain in which the authority of the risen Lord is fully recognized. Matthew faces the reality of the expansion of this domain as an extension of Jesus' own mission. The Evangelist realizes in the mission a tension between 'particularism' and 'universalism'. A major significance of the resurrection is that it annuls this tension. Jesus being exalted to universal authority, the way is now open to all to become his disciples.

Matt.28.18-20 with its Christological overtones is set in the context of the disciples' total witness to Christ. Except for the mention of 'the Son' in the baptismal clause, Matthew avoids specific mention of the Gospel's Christological titles in this section. However, the concepts underlying the main titles are explicit in these verses, where their significance is alluded to in the context of the community. The Evangelist provides a clear identity between the crucified Jesus and the exalted Lord, and concludes the Christological tasks of explaining Jesus' messiahship and Jesus - God - Church relationship.

Matthew reports two stories of the tomb; the one based on the Marcan outline as a preface to the Galilean Christophany, and the other developed in contention with the Jewish leaders, reflecting a missionary

context.

Besides leading on to the Galilean appearance, the details of the Marcan story in Matthew prepare the ground for the angelic announcement of the resurrection of Jesus. The apocalyptic symbol of the announcement is the open tomb. The apocalyptic phenomena in the pericope are only instrumental in describing the circumstantial details of the resurrection. But the resurrection is not in any way dependent on them. As the resurrection is supposed to have happened prior to the opening of the tomb, the open tomb merely accounts for the absence of the body. True to the Marcan source, Matthew does not connect the disciples with the story of the tomb and thereby with the Jerusalem tradition. In his redaction of the Marcan ending with the addition of a Christophany to the women, giving them the privilege to witness an appearance and using the story to introduce the designation 'brethren' for the disciples, the significant contribution is the identification of the messenger as the giver of the message. The angel of the Lord is now identified as the Lord himself who appears to the women giving them a commission.

In the story of the tomb developed in contention with the Jewish leaders the emptiness of the tomb is emphasized for apologetic reasons. Since the reference to "this day" in 28.15 is only to the scandal of body-stealing, the full story Matthew constructs is to answer this particular scandal among the Jews with whom Matthew and his community are in

dialogue. This apologetic legend presupposes a missionary context in which the Church's Kerygma is met with resistance. According to Matthew, the emptiness of the tomb on account of the resurrection was a matter of controversy between Jews and Christians, and the part concerning the Jewish scandal in the story of the tomb arose as an answer to Jewish polemics. However, Matthew with his apocalyptic and apologetic additions to the tomb stories, makes the empty tomb tradition a very important part of the resurrection narrative.

As part of the missionary situation, Matthew gives expression to the Jewish hope of the resurrection of the dead (27.51-53), but distinguishes Jesus' resurrection from the hoped-for general resurrection. Besides seeing a fulfilment motif here, by specifying the resurrection of the saints as a consequence of the death of Jesus Matthew emphasizes the soteriological significance of Jesus' death.¹ The Jewish concepts of resurrection were not, however, consistent. Matthew here concentrates on the resurrection of the righteous, a concept developed mostly in Jewish apocalyptic literature. With his story Matthew establishes an organic link between the saints of old and Jesus and his Church. The resurrection of the saints in chapter 27 is based on Jewish hope whereas the resurrection of Jesus in chapter 28 is based on the Christian tradition Matthew has received.

An absolute abandonment of missions to the Jews is not in

accordance with the Matthean narrative. Such abandonment is often read into the parables that speak of the Jewish rejection of the Messiah and the parables of judgement, which could otherwise be interpreted as warnings against the Jewish rejection. Both the resurrection of the saints and the Jewish scandal story are best understood in the light of Christian mission to the Jews. We have concluded that the Matthean details of the restricted mission in Matt.10 resemble a current missionary situation. The apostles have not covered all the cities of Israel, because the universal mission with a renewed attention towards the Gentiles has been in full swing during Matthew's time. An active mission to the Jews may be presupposed in all passages where an anti-Jewish attitude is explicit. The Church's unrelieved opposition to Pharisaic legalism may be viewed as a reaction resulting from the Church's mission to them. It is to the Jewish converts that Matthew apparently recommends allegiance to the Law, whereas he does not seem to expect the Gentile converts to follow the Jewish Law. The allegiance demanded of the universal Church is to the teachings of Jesus. The cumulative message of the Gospel demands of the Jews to adopt a new attitude to Jesus and the Church which already consists of members of Jewish and Gentile origin.

The resurrection narrative in the First Gospel is the author's own interpretation of the event. Comparisons with other resurrection narratives have shown that much of the non-Markan material in the

Matthean narrative is his own and the rest is his interpretation of Mark. Beyond Mark, Matthew has built up the Galilean tradition not merely to emend a seemingly apparent abrupt Marcan ending but to bring his own theological perspectives to a conclusion. Matthew has thus redacted his version of the resurrection story to serve his specific motifs which are mainly ecclesiastical, Christological and polemical. The significance of the resurrection as Matthew presents it is that in the final analysis it is the source of discipleship for Christians in all ages, and the impetus for them to bring others into the same relationship with the risen Lord.

NOTE

1. Elsewhere, in the Eucharistic words over the cup, Matthew interprets the saving effect of Jesus' sacrificial death also as the "forgiveness of sins" (26.28c).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbott-Smith, G., A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament, New York: 1936.
- Abel, E.L., "Who Wrote Matthew?", NTS, 17, 1970-'71, pp. 138-151.
- Allen, W.C., A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew, New York: 1925.
- Alsup, J.E., The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories of the Gospel Tradition, London: 1975.
- Audet, J.-P., La Didaché, Instructions des Apôtres, Paris: 1958.
- Bacon, B.W., Studies in Matthew, London: 1931.
- Bailey, J.A., The Traditions Common to the Gospels of Luke and John, Leiden: 1963.
- Barth, K., "An Exegetical Study of Matthew 28.16-20", The Theology of the Christian Mission, (edit., G.H. Anderson), London: 1961.
- Beare, F.W., "The Mission of the Disciples and the Mission Charge: Matthew 10 and Parallels", JBL, 89, 1970, pp. 1-13.
- Benoit, P., L' évangile selon St. Matthieu, Paris: 1961.
- The Passion and Resurrection of Jesus Christ, London: 1969.
- Bernard, J.H., Gospel According to John, II, Edinburgh: 1928.
- Beyer, H.W., "Εὐλογέω", TDNT, II.
- Bietenhard, H., "ὄνομα", TDNT, V.
- Bindley, T.H., The Oecumenical Documents of the Faith (rev. ed. by F.W. Green), London: 1950.
- Birkeland, H., "The Belief in the Resurrection of the Dead in the Old Testament", Stud. Ev., 3, 1950, pp. 60-78.
- Black, M., "The 'Son of Man' Passion Sayings in the Gospel Tradition", ZNW, 60, 1969, pp. 1-8.
- Blair, E.P., Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew, New York: 1960.
- Blass, F., and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature (transl. and edit., R.W.

- Funk), Chicago: 1961.
- Bode, E.L., The First Easter Morning : The Gospel Accounts of the Women's Visit to the Tomb of Jesus, Rome: 1970.
- Bornkamm, G., G.Barth and H.J.Held, Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew, Philadelphia: 1963.
- Bousset, W. and H.Gressmann, Die Religion des Judentums im spät-hellenistischen Zeitalter, Tübingen: 1925.
- Brockington, L.H., A Critical Introduction to the Apocrypha, London: 1961.
- Brown, R.E., New Testament Essays, New York: 1968.
- The Virginal Conception and Bodily Resurrection of Jesus, New York: 1973.
- The Gospel According to John (I-XII), Garden City: 1966.
- Bultmann, R., Theology of the New Testament, I, London: 1951.
- The History of the Synoptic Tradition, (transl., J.Marsh), Oxford: 1963.
- " Ἰωάν ", TDNT, II.
- Carlston, C.E., "Interpreting the Gospel of Matthew", Int., 29, 1975, pp.3-12.
- Carrington, P., The Primitive Christian Calendar, Cambridge: 1952.
- Cassian, B., "John XXI", NTS, 3, 1957, pp.132-136.
- Chase, F.J., "The Lord's Command to Baptize", JTS, 6, 1905, pp.481-521.
- Clower, J.B. Jr., The Church in the Thought of Jesus, Richmond: 1959.
- Coleman, S., Hosea Concepts in Midrash and Talmud, Bloemfontain: 1960.
- Conybeare, F.C., "Three Early Doctrinal Modifications of the Text of the Gospels", Hibbert Journal, I, 1902-1903, pp.96-113.
- Conzelmann, H., "On the Analysis of the Confessional Formula in I Cor.15. 3-5", Int., 20, 1966, pp.15-25.
- Cullmann, O., Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr, London: 1962.
- " πῆτρα ", TDNT, VI.
- " Πῆτρος ,Κηφῆς " , TDNT, VI.
- Danby, H., Mishnah, London: 1933.

Daube, D., "Participle and Imperative in I Peter" in E.G.Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter, London: 1946, pp.467-488.

The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, London: 1956.

Davies, W.D., "Reflections on Archbishop Carrington's 'The Primitive Christian Calendar'" in The Background of the NT and its Eschatology, (edit., Davies, W.D. and D.Daube), Cambridge :1956.

The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount, Cambridge: 1964.

Delling, D.G., Worship in the New Testament, London: 1962.

Dibelius, M., Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums, Tübingen: 1961.

Dodd, C.H., "The Appearances of the Risen Christ : An Essay in Form-Criticism of the Gospels", in Studies in the Gospels, (edit., D.E.Nineham), Oxford: 1955.

The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, Cambridge: 1963.

Driver, G.R., "Two Problems in the New Testament", JTS, 16, 1965, pp. 327-337.

Dufour, L., Resurrection and the Message of Easter, London: 1974.

Dugmore, C.W., Influence of the Synagogue on Divine Office, London: 1964.

Dunn, J.D.G., "Spirit and Fire Baptism", Nov.Test., 14, 1972, pp.81-92.

Edwards, R.A., "The Eschatological Correlative as a Gattung in the New Testament", ZNW, 60, 1969, pp.9ff.

Elliott, J.K., "The Text and Language of the Ending of Mark's Gospel", Th.Z., 27, 1971, pp.255-262.

Ellis, I.P., "But Some Doubted", NTS, 14, 1967-'68, pp.574-580.

Emerton, J.A., "Binding and Loosing - Forgiving and Retaining", JTS, 13, 1962, pp.325-331.

Essame, W.G., "Matthew XXVII.51-54 and John V. 25-29", Exp.T., 76, 1964, p.103.

Evans, C.F., "I will go before you into Galilee", JTS, n.s.5, 1954, pp.3-18.
Resurrection and the New Testament, London: 1970.

- Falls, T.B., edit., The Fathers of the Church, New York: 1948.
- Farrer, A., St. Matthew and St. Mark, London: 1966.
- Fenton, J.C., Saint Matthew, London: 1973.
- Flusser, D., "The Conclusion of Matthew in a New Jewish Christian Source", ASTI, 5, 1967, pp.110-120.
- Foerster, W., "ὁπoc", TDNT, V.
- Fortna, R.T., The Gospel of Signs, Cambridge: 1970.
- Fuller, R.H., The Formation of the Resurrection Narratives, New York: 1971.
- The Foundations of New Testament Christology, (London: 1965.
- "The Resurrection of Jesus", Bib. Res., 14, 1960, pp.8-24
- The 'Thou art Peter' Pericope and the Easter Appearances", McCQ., 20, 1966-'67, pp.309-315.
- Gager, J.G., Kingdom and Community, New Jersey: 1975.
- Gaston, L., "The Messiah of Israel as Teacher of the Gentiles", Int., 29, 1975, pp.24-40.
- Geering, L., Resurrection - A Symbol of Hope, London: 1971.
- George, A., "Les récits d'apparitions aux Onze, a partir de Luc 24.36-53", in La résurrection du Christ et l'exégèse moderne (Lectio Divina), Paris: 1969.
- Goguel, The Birth of Christianity, New York: 1954.
- Goulder, M.D., Midrash and Lektion in Matthew, London: 1974.
- Grant, R.M., Historical Introduction to the New Testament, London: 1963.
- Grassi, J., "Ezekiel XXXVII.1-14 and the New Testament", NTS, 11, 1964-'65, pp.162-164.
- Green, H.B., The Gospel According to Matthew, Oxford: 1975.
- "The Structure of St. Matthew's Gospel", StudEva, 4, 1968, pp.48ff.
- Greeven, H., "σπορννέω", TDNT, VI.
- Grelot, P., "La Résurrection de Jésus et son arrière-plan biblique et juif", La Résurrection du Christ et l'exégèse moderne, Paris: 1969.

Grundmann, W., " $\chi\rho\iota\omega$ ", TDNT, V.

Gundry, R.H., "The Narrative Framework of Matthew XVI. 17-19", Nov. Test. 7, 1964, pp.1-9.
The Use of Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel, Leiden: 1967.

Hahn, F., Mission in the New Testament, Naperville: 1965.

Titles of Jesus in Christology, New York: 1969.

Hare, D.R.A., The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel According to St. Matthew, Cambridge: 1967.

Harmon, N.B., edit., Interpreter's Bible, New York: 1956.

Harrington, D.J., "Make Disciples of all the Gentiles", CBQ, 37, 1975, pp.359-369.

Hartmann, L., "Into the Name of Jesus", NTS, 20, 1973-'74, pp.432-440.

Hastings, J., edit., Dictionary of the Apostolic Church, I, New York: 1919.

Hawkins, J.C., Horae Synopticae : Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem, Oxford: 1909.

Hengel, M., The Son of God, Philadelphia: 1976.

Hill, D., The Gospel of Matthew, London: 1972.

Hoskyns, E., The Fourth Gospel, London: 1947.

Hubbard, B.J., The Matthean Redaction of a Primitive Apostolic Commissioning : An Exegesis of Matthew 28.16-20, Montana: 1974.

Huck, A., H.Lietzmann, Synopse der drei Ersten Evangelien, Tübingen: 1950.

Hummel, R., Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kirche und Judentum im Matthäusevangelium, München: 1963.

Jeremias, J., Jesus' Promise to the Nations, London: 1958.

The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, New York: 1966.

The Parables of Jesus, New York: 1963.

Johnson, M.D., The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies, Cambridge: 1969.

Kelber, V.H., edit., The Passion in Mark, Philadelphia: 1976.

Kennard, J.S.Jr., "The Burial of Jesus", JBL, 74, 1955, pp.227-238.

Kenyon, F.C., Our Bible and Ancient Manuscripts, New York: 1941.

- Kenyon, F.C., The Text of the Greek Bible, London: 1958.
- Kilpatrick, G.D., The Origins of the Gospel According to Saint Matthew, Oxford: 1946.
- Kingsbury, J.D., The Parables of Jesus in Matthew 13 : A Study in Redaction Criticism, Richmond: 1969.
- Matthew : Structure, Christology, Kingdom, Philadelphia: 1975.
- Matthew (Proclamation Commentaries), Philadelphia: 1977,
- "Form and Message of Matthew", Int., 29, 1975, pp.13-23.
- "The Structure of Matthew's Gospel and the Concept of Salvation-History", CBQ, 35., 1973, pp.451-474.
- "The Title KYRIOS in Matthew's Gospel", JBL, 94, 1975, pp.246-255.
- "The Title 'Son of Man' in Matthew's Gospel", CBQ, 37, 1975, pp.193-202.
- "The Composition and Christology of Matthew 28.16-20", JBL, 93, 1974, pp.573-584.
- Kirby, J.C., Ephesians, Baptism and Pentecost, London: 1968.
- The Exodus in the New Testament, (S.T.M.thesis), Montreal: McGill University, 1957.
- Kosmala, H., "The Conclusion of Matthew", ASTI, 4, 1965, pp.132-148.
- "In My Name", ASTI, 5, 1966-67, pp.87-109.
- Kummel, W.G., Introduction to the New Testament, New York: 1966.
- Lake, K., The Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, New York: 1907.
- transl., The Apostolic Fathers, Volumes I & II, London: 1959.
- Leaney, A.R.C., "What Was the Lord's Supper?", Theol., 70, 1967, pp.51-62.
- Lee, G.N., "The Guard at the Tomb", Theol. 72, 1969, pp. 169-175.
- Lindars, B., New Testament Apologetic, London: 1973.
- Lohmeyer, E., "Mir ist gegeben alle Gewalt !" Eine Exegese von Matt.28. 16-20", in In Memoriam Ernst Lohmeyer (edit., W.Schmuck), Stuttgart: 1951, pp.22-49.

- Loisy, A., L'Evangile selon Luc, Paris: 1924.
- Longenecker, R.N., The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity, London: 1970.
- Löwestam, E., Son and Saviour, Lund : 1961.
- Malina, B.J., "The Literary Structure and Form of Matt.28.16-20", NTS, 1970-'71, pp.87-103.
- Nanson, T.W., The Teaching of Jesus, Cambridge: 1935.
- Margoliouth, D.S., "The Visit to the Tomb", Exp.T., 38, 1926-'27, pp. 278-280.
- Martin, J.P., "The Church in Matthew", Int., 29, 1975, pp.41-56.
- Marxsen, W., The Resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth, Philadelphia: 1970.
- McArthur, H.K., "On the Third Day", NTS, 18, 1971-'72, pp.81-86.
- McCasland, S., The Resurrection of Jesus, New York: 1932.
- "The Scriptural Basis of 'On the Third Day'", JBL, 48, 1929, pp.124-137.
- McLeman, J., Resurrection - Then and Now, London: 1965.
- McNeile, A.H., The Gospel According to St. Matthew, London: 1915.
- Meier, J.P., "Salvation-History in Matthew : In Search of a Starting Point", CBQ, 37, 1975, pp. 203-215.
- Nanoud, P., "Remarques sur les textes de L'ascension dans Luc-Actes", in Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann, (edit., W. Eltester) Berlin: 1954.
- Nettler, B.H., The Text of the New Testament, New York: 1964.
- Neyer, R., "ὁχλος", TDNT, V.
- Michel, O., "Der Abschluss der Matthäusevangeliums", Ev.Theol., 10, 1950-'51, pp.16-26.
- Nicklen, P.A., The Gospel According to St. Matthew, London: 1917.
- Nispe, J.P., edit., Patrologia Graeco-Latina, Paris: 1857-1887.
- Noore, G.F., Judaism, I, Cambridge: 1927.
- Noulton, J.H., A Grammar of New Testament Greek, vol.I, (T. & T. Clark), 1908.

- Moulton, J.H. and G. Milligan, Vocabulary of the New Testament, London: 1952.
- Montefiore, C.G., Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teaching, New York: 1970.
- Nowinckel, S., He That Cometh, Oxford: 1956.
- Neiryock, F., "Les Femmes au tombeau : étude de la rédaction matthéenne (Mt. 28.1-10)", NTS, 15, 1968-'69, pp. 168-190.
- Oepke, A., "ἀνίσταται", TDNT, I.
- Oesterley, W.O.E., transl., The Sayings of the Jewish Fathers, London: 1919.
- Perrin, N., The Resurrection According to Matthew, Mark and Luke, Philadelphia: 1977.
- "The Son of Man in Ancient Judaism and Primitive Christianity : A Suggestion", Bib. Res., 11, 1966, pp. 17-28.
- Quasten, J., Patrology, Westminster : 1962.
- Reese, J.N., "How Matthew Portrays the Communication of Christ's Authority", BTB, 7, 1977, pp. 139-144.
- Rengstorff, K.H., "μαρτυρεῖ", TDNT, IV.
- "Old and New Testament Traces of a Formula of the Judean Royal Ritual", Noy. Test., 5, 1962, pp. 229-244.
- Reumann, J., Jesus in the Church's Gospels, Philadelphia: 1968.
- Robertson, A.T., A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research, New York : 1919.
- Robinson, J.A.T., Twelve New Testament Studies, London: 1962.
- Rohde, J., Rediscovering the Teaching of the Evangelists, London: 1968.
- Rothfuchs, W., Die Erfüllungssätze des Matthäusevangeliums, Stuttgart: 1969.
- Ruether, R.R., Faith and Fratricide, New York: 1974.
- Schaff, P., The Oldest Church Manual Called the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, New York: 1885.
- Schille, G., "Bemerkungen zur Formgeschichte des Evangeliums : Das Evangelium des Matthäus als Katechismus", NTS, 4, 1957-'58, pp. 1-24; 101-114.

- Schmidt, K.L., "Εὐαγγ", TDNT, II.
- Schmitt, J., Jésus ressuscité dans la prédication apostolique, Paris:1949.
- Schütz, J.H., "Apostolic Authority and the Control of Tradition: I Cor.XV", NTS, 15, 1968-'69, pp.448-453.
- Schweizer, E., "Observance of the Law and Charismatic Activity in Matthew", NTS, 16, 1969-'70, pp.213-230.
- The Good News According to Matthew, London: 1975.
- Senior, D., "The Death of Jesus and the Resurrection of the Holy Ones", CBQ, 38, 1976, pp.321-325.
- Smalley, S.S., "The Sign in John XII", NTS, 20, 1974, pp.275-288.
- Smith, D.N.Jr., The Composition and Order of the Fourth Gospel, New Haven: 1965.
- Smith, M., Tannaitic Parallels to the Gospels, Philadelphia: 1951.
- Soden, H.F., von., "δέσλφορ", TDNT, I.
- Stampvoort, P.A. van., "The Interpretation of Ascension in Luke and Acts", NTS, 5, 1958-'59, pp.30-42.
- Standahl, K., "Matthew". Beke's Commentary of the Bible, London: 1962.
- The School of St. Matthew, Philadelphia: 1968.
- Stonehouse, N.B., The Witness of Matthew and Mark to Christ, Michigan: 1958.
- Strecker, G., Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit - Untersuchung zur Theologie des Matthäus, Göttingen: 1962.
- Streeter, B.H., The Four Gospels, London: 1924.
- Swete, H.B., "Matthew XXVIII. 16-20", Expositor, ser.6, vol.6, 1902, pp. 241-259.
- Tagawa, K., "People and Community in the Gospel of Matthew", NTS, 16, 1969-'70, pp.149-162.
- Taylor, V., The Names of Jesus, London: 1962.
- Teepie, H.M., The Messianic Eschatological Prophet, Philadelphia: 1957.
- Theissen, G., The First Followers of Jesus, London: 1978.

- Thompson, W.G., Matthew's Advice to a Divided Community : Mt.17.22-18.35, Rome: 1970.
- Tödt, H.E., The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition, Philadelphia: 1965.
- Trilling, W., Das Wahre Israel: Studien zur theologie des Mattheusevangeliums, München: 1964.
- Trocme, E., Le "Livre des Actes" et l'histoire, Paris: 1957.
- Trompf, G.W., "The First Resurrection Appearance and the Ending of Mark's Gospel", NTS, 18, 1972, pp.308-330.
- Tuck, R.C., "The Lord who said Go : Some Reflections on Matt.28.16-20", ANQ, 7, 1966-'67, pp.85-92.
- Vaganay, M.L., L'Evangile de Pierre, Paris: 1930.
- Vermes, G., The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, Penguin Books, 1975.
- Vriesen, Th.C., An Outline of Old Testament Theology, Oxford: 1962.
- Waetjen, H.C., "The Genealogy as the Key to the Gospel According to Matthew", JBL, 95, 1976, pp.205-230.
- Walker, N., "After Three Days", Nov.Test., 4, 1960, pp.261-262.
- Walker, R., Die Heilgeschichte im ersten Evangelium, Göttingen: 1967.
- West, H.P.Jr., "A Primitive Version of Luke in the Composition of Matthew", NTS, 14, 1967-'68, pp. 75-95.
- Whiston, W., transl., Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews, Philadelphia:1957.
- Wilcox, N., "Peter the Rock : A Fresh Look at Matthew XVI.17-19", NTS, 22, 1975-'76, pp.73-88.
- Wilder, A.N., "Variant Traditions of the Resurrection in Acts", JBL, 62, 1943, pp.306-311.