

# Matthew's gospel in recent study

Dick France

*Dr France is the newly appointed principal of Wycliffe Hall in Oxford and the author of the Tyndale commentary on Matthew. We are grateful to him for this foretaste of his forthcoming book on Matthew studies (see below) and to all the contributors to this gospels edition of Themelios.*

An excellent sixty-page survey of the study of Matthew since the Second World War up to 1980 has been compiled by Graham Stanton,<sup>1</sup> and as this should be available in most theological libraries there is no need for me to cover the same ground here. My own *Matthew, Evangelist and Teacher*, forthcoming from Paternoster/Zondervan, will soon offer another, fuller, discussion. So this article can concentrate on some main trends and issues, without listing every relevant book and article of recent decades.

## Synoptic questions

When I was a student we had no doubt that the synoptic problem was solved in all essentials, and that 'Matthew used Mark and Q'. Most of us neither knew nor cared that this was a very recent idea, and that the priority of Matthew had been the almost universal assumption of the church until the mid-nineteenth century. Like all 'pre-critical' theories, it could safely be relegated to the theological museum, and no one took seriously the few Catholic scholars who had attempted to resurrect the 'Augustinian' view of synoptic relationships.<sup>2</sup>

Today the situation has changed. The Augustinian view has won few adherents, but in its place a vigorous resuscitation of the 'Griesbach Hypothesis', spearheaded by W. R. Farmer, has won a significant number of supporters.<sup>3</sup> On this view Matthew came first, and Mark is a deliberate conflation and 'reduction' (if such a term can be used for a gospel which in parallel narratives is typically at least twice as long as Matthew!) of material from the other two synoptic gospels. This is not the place to chronicle the revival of Griesbach's eighteenth-century theory,<sup>4</sup> but it is obvious that if a significant number of scholars cease to believe that 'Matthew used Mark' the effect on Matthean studies will be enormous. This is particularly true of redaction-critical studies, which have typically assumed, and based their results squarely on, the priority of Mark. There have not so far been many significant attempts at redaction criticism on the basis of the priority of Matthew, but C. S. Mann's *Anchor Bible* commentary on Mark (1986) points the way, and the determination of the Griesbach lobby is such that we must expect to see others.

Of course you do not need to be a convinced Griesbachian (or even Augustinian) to have qualms about saying that 'Matthew used Mark'. Many others have come to feel that the simple linear dependence of traditional synoptic theories is too mechanical to be true. The 'awkward' data of the actual literary relationships between the finished gospels which

have always kept synoptic specialists busy, and some of which have proved suitable ammunition for the Griesbachians (though others are as powerfully deployed against them!), perhaps suggest that no such tidy theory is likely to correspond to the way books were actually written in the experimental atmosphere of early Christianity. While to speak simply of 'the independence of Matthew and Mark'<sup>5</sup> may be too radical, there is a lot to be said for the recognition of a more 'living' process of interaction between strands of gospel tradition, written and oral, lying behind the completion of the gospels as we know them, which casts doubt on any simple assumption of the 'priority' of one gospel to another.<sup>6</sup>

So while some redaction-critical studies continue to comb through every minute 'alteration of Mark by Matthew' and discuss what made him do it, others now prefer to study the character of the gospel as it stands (using comparison with the other gospels as one means to this end) without assuming that Matthew had the text of Mark in front of him at all times. This change of synoptic perspective has appropriately coincided with the rise of 'narrative criticism', which approaches each gospel as an independent text with a character and message of its own, rather than primarily as one element in a network of literary relationships.<sup>7</sup> We may expect the next few years to see a developing (and, I hope, creative) tension between these two approaches to the gospels.

## Who and when?

While most scholars continue to assume that the gospel was written some time after AD 80, and that its attribution to Matthew is at best a pious guess, both points continue to be contested by a minority.

The most stimulating recent protest against the consensus view is in the 'Higher-Critical Conclusions' to Gundry's commentary,<sup>8</sup> which offer a date before AD 63 and the apostle Matthew as the author. Gundry's arguments include a controversial reassessment of Eusebius' famous quotation from Papias — controversial both in that he proposes to date Papias a generation earlier than has been normal (and thus make him a direct disciple of the original apostles), and also in that he adopts Kürzinger's translation of Papias' *Hebraidi dialecto* as 'in a Hebrew style' and thus understands him to be speaking of the *Greek* Gospel of Matthew. But even if his reinterpretation of the Papias tradition is debatable, Gundry offers other arguments derived from the text itself which deserve to be taken seriously as pointing to a period before the Jewish War.

The *Anchor Bible* commentary on Matthew by Albright and Mann (1971) also contains an unusually confident, if idiosyncratic, argument on internal grounds for the apostle Matthew-Levi as the author. And of course no one disputes the unanimity of the patristic tradition after Papias for apostolic authorship. But second-century and later traditions

and irreversible, so that there was no further point in evangelism among Jews – God had rejected Israel.<sup>32</sup> This negative attitude to Israel comes into sharpest focus in the statement that ‘the kingdom of God will be taken away from you and given to a nation which produces its fruits’ (21:43), and in the embarrassing contrast of 27:24-25 between the declared innocence of Pilate and the eager acceptance by ‘all the people’ of the responsibility for the death of Jesus. It is further underlined by the strong stress on judgment which runs through the book, particularly judgment on Jerusalem, on the temple, and on ‘this generation’, in whom all Israel’s past rebellion has come to its climax (23:29-39).<sup>33</sup> It is this sort of language which underlies the proposals mentioned earlier to regard Matthew as in its final form an anti-Jewish manifesto by a Gentile Christian writer.

Two factors, however, must not be overlooked in evaluating these negative elements in Matthew’s attitude to Israel. One is the sustained contrast which the gospel draws between the leaders of Israel and the people as a whole. The leaders (who up to chapter 23 are most frequently characterized as scribes and/or Pharisees,<sup>34</sup> while the ‘chief priests and elders’ come to the centre of the stage for the passion narrative) are presented as almost uniformly hostile to Jesus and intent on destroying him. It is to them specifically that most of the threats of judgment (particularly in the three polemical parables of 21:28–22:14) are addressed. The ‘crowds’, by contrast, are represented as still open to persuasion, impressed by Jesus’ authority and enjoying his verbal victories over his opponents, so that when Jesus launches into his diatribe against the scribes and Pharisees in chapter 23 it is addressed over their heads to the crowds who are warned against following their lead.<sup>35</sup> At the same time, it must be noted that the judgment pronounced against the Jewish leadership seems at times to involve a larger community (‘another nation’, 21:43; ‘their city’, 22:7); it is Jerusalem and its temple that is to be destroyed, not just its leadership replaced (23:37–24:2). And by the time the leaders’ rejection of Jesus reaches its climax they have the crowds on their side as well (26:55; 27:15–23) so that ultimately ‘all the people’ accept their responsibility for his death (27:25).<sup>36</sup>

The other factor is, once again, the idea of ‘fulfilment’. If it is right in one sense to speak of the failure and rejection of ‘Israel’ in Matthew’s perspective, this does not entail that God has changed his mind about having ‘a people’, but only that that people are no longer to be identified in racial, still less political, terms. An important strand in Matthew’s ‘typological’ allusions to the OT is the conception of Jesus as himself the ‘fulfilment’ of Israel, the one in whom the national ideal reaches its full embodiment, and of the disciples of Jesus as thus taking over the role of Israel as the people of God. As ‘many from east and west’ (8:11–12) thus find their way into the people of God through faith in Jesus, this church drawn from all nations comes to be seen as itself the true Israel, the *ekklesia* of Jesus (16:18). It is, to use Dodd’s phrase, ‘not a matter of replacement but of resurrection’.<sup>37</sup>

The suggestion that only a Gentile author could have espoused such a theology of the people of God was interestingly called in question in a short article by Graham Stanton in which he showed how the same theology is further developed in the second-century 5 Ezra, a clearly Jewish-

Christian work which nonetheless pictures the church as a ‘people soon to come’ which will inherit the privileges which Israel lost by disobedience. Yet this new community, like its predecessor, looks to Jerusalem as its ‘mother’. Here we see Matthew’s careful balance of continuity and discontinuity maintained by his Jewish-Christian successors.<sup>38</sup>

### Matthew’s church

Matthew’s has traditionally been seen as an especially ‘ecclesiastical’ gospel, not only on the (remarkably flimsy) grounds that it, unlike the other gospels, twice includes the word *ekklesia*, but also because chapter 18 in particular has been seen as a sort of ‘manual of discipline’ designed for the use of church leaders.<sup>39</sup> A thorough study of chapter 18 by W. G. Thompson<sup>40</sup> has, however, questioned this view of its function, pointing out its lack of reference to any leadership structure, and its focus on pastoral concern rather than on formal ‘church discipline’.

The lack of reference to church offices has been emphasized by E. Schweizer, whose portrait of ‘Matthew’s Church’<sup>41</sup> offers a stimulating alternative to the traditional ‘ecclesiastical’ image; he pictures a church in which prophets, wise men and scribes have an important role, but do not occupy exclusive office, where all disciples recognize one another as ‘little ones’, and where any move towards a formally constituted leadership is resisted. If Schweizer’s picture is overdrawn, it nevertheless seems closer to the atmosphere of Matthew 18 than do those who read into Matthew’s ‘ecclesial’ language an anachronistic scenario of formal ecclesiastical organization.

It has been generally recognized, however, that Matthew writes as a pastor/teacher in his church, with an eye to the relevance of his material to the life and thinking of a typical first-century congregation.<sup>42</sup> The organization of his teaching material into extended ‘discourses’ with coherent themes points to such a purpose, and the repeated emphasis on the nature of the church as a *corpus mixtum* seems to reflect the unsettling experience of division within the professing Christian group.<sup>43</sup> It has been argued by some that Matthew is better characterized as a pastor than as a theologian.<sup>44</sup>

### Christology

Among the various christological titles used in Matthew, two have been the subject of interesting recent discussion.

‘Son of David’ is clearly of special importance for Matthew’s presentation of Jesus as Messiah, but attention to the contexts in which it occurs indicates a particular connection with his healing ministry. While this could be purely coincidental (in that it tends to be used by ‘outsiders’ approaching Jesus, and such approaches are often in connection with a request for healing), the suggestion has been made that a healing Son of David formed part of Jewish messianic hope, perhaps modelled on the reputation of Solomon in later Jewish tradition as a healer and exorcist.<sup>45</sup> But it is more probable that Matthew associates the title ‘Son of David’ with Jesus’ ministry of healing and compassion in order to distance Jesus from the more triumphalistic aspects of popular messianic expectation, since it has been pointed out that the title is used of him predominantly by those of no standing in Jewish society – the blind, the lame, the dumb, and even the Gentile mother of a possessed girl.<sup>46</sup>

J. D. Kingsbury has become well known for his reiterated emphasis on the central importance of 'Son of God' for Matthew's (and Mark's) christology,<sup>47</sup> a point with which few would disagree, though not so many have been convinced by his desire to find the title present by implication where Matthew actually uses other titles for Jesus (as 'surrogates', so Kingsbury).<sup>48</sup> A stimulating recent article by D. J. Versput<sup>49</sup> offers a more restricted understanding of Matthew's use of the term than Kingsbury envisages, designed to focus attention on Jesus' filial relationship with God (rather than his ontological status) and the obedient, gentle, suffering ministry in which this resulted, in deliberate contrast to 'the imperial triumphal traits of Jewish Davidic expectation'; the term therefore represents a calculated challenge to popular 'Son of David' messianism. This is an important article, but it is not the last word on the subject, and it is to be hoped that subsequent discussion will do fuller justice to the 'ontological' implications of Matthew's 'Son of God' language, especially in the light of his deliberate presentation of the virgin conception of Jesus in chapter 1, and of his extension of the role of 'the Son' beyond Jesus' earthly ministry, culminating in the trinitarian formula of 28:19.

Two other christological themes have been usefully opened up. B. Gerhardsson has shown the importance for Matthew of the Isaianic figure of the Servant (the subject of two of his formula-quotations) as the basis of a motif of service running through the whole gospel, and culminating in Jesus' obedient self-giving as a ransom for many.<sup>50</sup> And while M. J. Suggs has not convinced many in his attempt to elevate the theme of Wisdom to a central place in Matthew's christology,<sup>51</sup> he has successfully drawn attention to Matthew's careful adaptation of the tradition of a few of Jesus' sayings in order to present Jesus as not merely Wisdom's messenger but himself the presence of the divine Wisdom among men.<sup>52</sup>

But Matthew's Jesus is not to be confined within ready-made models and titles, however exalted. Running through the gospel is a perception of Jesus as breaking through existing categories. It is seen in his authority,<sup>53</sup> particularly as displayed in his miracles.<sup>54</sup> In this authority men are confronted with the presence of God in a new way, and are forced to ask, 'Who is this?' And Matthew has made his answer clear from the start, in the phrase 'God with us' (1:23), an idea which is progressively filled out until it culminates in the final declaration of the risen Jesus, 'I am with you always' (28:20).<sup>55</sup>

Most recent interpreters agree in finding in the final scene in the hills of Galilee (28:16-20) the culmination of and the key to the gospel's christology.<sup>56</sup> There the vision of 'the enthronement of the Son of Man' drawn from Daniel 7:13-14 reaches its triumphant fulfilment in the universal authority of the risen Lord, who can now be included (as 'the Son') together with the Father and the Holy Spirit as the object of allegiance for disciples from all nations.<sup>57</sup>

London: SPCK, 1983), for a collection of some significant essays on Matthew from 1928 to 1974.

<sup>2</sup> J. Chapman, *Matthew, Mark and Luke* (London: Longmans, 1937); B. C. Butler, *The Originality of St. Matthew* (Cambridge: UP, 1951).

<sup>3</sup> W. R. Farmer, *The Synoptic Problem* (Dillsboro: Western North Carolina Press, 1976), and other articles; J. B. Orchard, *Matthew, Luke and Mark* (Manchester: Koinonia, 1976); and many others. An important weapon used against the 'post-Streeter consensus' has been H.-H. Stoldt, *History and Criticism of the Marcan Hypothesis* (ET Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1980).

<sup>4</sup> See C. M. Tuckett, *The Revival of the Griesbach Hypothesis* (Cambridge: UP, 1983).

<sup>5</sup> J. M. Rist, *On the Independence of Matthew and Mark* (Cambridge: UP, 1978). Rist does, of course, recognize common tradition, both oral and written, but denies that either gospel is based on the other.

<sup>6</sup> E. P. Sanders, *The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition* (Cambridge: UP, 1969), pointed this way. The approach is more fully developed in J. A. T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1976), pp. 92-117.

<sup>7</sup> For 'narrative-critical' studies of Matthew see e.g. R. A. Edwards, *Matthew's Story of Jesus* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985); J. D. Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), and his articles in *JSNT* 21 (1984), pp. 3-36, and *JSNT* 25 (1985), pp. 61-81.

<sup>8</sup> R. H. Gundry, *Matthew: a Commentary on his Literary and Theological Art* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), pp. 599-622.

<sup>9</sup> M. Hengel, *Studies in the Gospel of Mark* (ET London: SCM, 1985), pp. 64-84.

<sup>10</sup> N. B. Stonehouse, *Origins of the Synoptic Gospels* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963), pp. 46-47.

<sup>11</sup> The opposing sides are conveniently surveyed in J. P. Meier, *Law and History in Matthew's Gospel* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976), pp. 9-13, and by Stanton in 'Origin' (see n. 1), pp. 1911-1916.

<sup>12</sup> See R. Kimelman in E. P. Sanders *et al.* (ed.), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition* vol. 2 (London: SCM, 1981), pp. 226-244.

<sup>13</sup> *JBL* 66 (1947), pp. 165-172.

<sup>14</sup> Notably P. Nepper-Christensen, *Das Matthäusevangelium: ein judenchristliches Evangelium?* (Aarhus, 1958); G. Strecker, *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), pp. 15-35. Also R. Walker, E. L. Abel, S. Van Tilborg, W. Pesch, L. Gaston, J. P. Meier and perhaps, with caution, W. Trilling.

<sup>15</sup> M. D. Goulder, *Midrash and Lecture in Matthew* (London: SPCK, 1974), pp. 21-24, deals trenchantly with Strecker's arguments. On the specific question of Matthew's alleged ignorance about Sadducees, see D. A. Carson, *JETS* 25 (1982), pp. 161-174.

<sup>16</sup> Major studies include K. Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew* (Uppsala, 1954); R. H. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel* (Leiden: Brill, 1967); W. Rothfuchs, *Die Erfüllungszitate des Matthäus-Evangeliums* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1969); G. M. Soares Prabhu, *The Formula-Quotations in the Infancy Narrative of Matthew* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976).

<sup>17</sup> Stendahl's proposal of a 'school' rather than an individual as the source of the material has been quietly set aside with the rise of redaction-criticism and its focus on individual authorship.

<sup>18</sup> I have attempted to trace some of these hermeneutical patterns in the four formula-quotations of Matthew 2 in *NTS* 27 (1980/81), pp. 233-251.

<sup>19</sup> Gundry, *Use*, pp. 172-174; cf. Soares Prabhu, *Formula-Quotations*, pp. 73-77.

<sup>20</sup> An interestingly moderate and sympathetic presentation of this charge is by C. F. D. Moule, *The Origin of Christology* (Cambridge: UP, 1977), pp. 127-134. Moule distinguishes more sharply than I would wish to do between the (unacceptable) exegetical technique and the (acceptable) theology which gives rise to it.

<sup>21</sup> See L. Morris in *Gospel Perspectives* 3 (see n. 23), pp. 129-156.

<sup>22</sup> Gundry, *Matthew, a Commentary*, pp. 623-640 ('A Theological Postscript').

<sup>23</sup> R. T. France and D. Wenham (eds.), *Gospel Perspectives* 3 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1983).

<sup>24</sup> An important corrective to Goulder's approach from the point of view of Jewish studies is P. Alexander's paper 'Midrash and the

<sup>1</sup> G. N. Stanton, 'The Origin and Purpose of Matthew's Gospel: Matthean Scholarship from 1945 to 1980', in H. Temporini and W. Haase (eds.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt, II Principat* vol. 25, part 3 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1985), pp. 1889-1951. See also G. N. Stanton (ed.), *The Interpretation of Matthew* (Philadelphia: Fortress/

Gospels', in C. M. Tuckett (ed.), *Synoptic Studies* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1984), pp. 1-18.

<sup>25</sup> H. Frankemölle, *Jahwe-Bund und Kirche Christi* (Münster: Aschendorf, 1984), pp. 382-394; T. L. Donaldson, *Jesus on the Mountain: a Study in Matthean Theology* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1985), pp. 204-205.

<sup>26</sup> E.g. E. P. Blair, *Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1960), pp. 124-137. Donaldson's focus on a different OT mountain leads him to play down this theme (as had W. D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge, 1963), pp. 25-93); see D. C. Allison, *ExpT* 98 (1986/7), pp. 203-205, for a recent response to Donaldson.

<sup>27</sup> R. H. Gundry, *Use*, pp. 2-5, drew attention to the importance of the allusive references over against Stendahl's concentration on direct quotations.

<sup>28</sup> This interpretation of Matthew as 'conservative' with regard to the observance of the law is most recently defended by R. Mohrlang, *Matthew and Paul* (Cambridge: UP, 1984), pp. 7-26, 42-47.

<sup>29</sup> Matthew's concern with antinomianism was stressed especially by G. Barth in G. Bornkamm, G. Barth & H. J. Held, *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew* (ET London: SCM, 1963), esp. pp. 159-164; cf. J. Zumstein, *La Condition du Croyant dans l'Evangile selon Matthieu* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977), pp. 199-200.

<sup>30</sup> R. J. Banks, *JBL* 93 (1974), pp. 226-242; *Jesus and the Law in the Synoptic Tradition* (Cambridge: UP, 1975), pp. 182-235. Substantially the same interpretation is supported e.g. by Meier, *Law*, pp. 41-124, 160-161; R. A. Guelich, *The Sermon on the Mount* (Waco: Word, 1982), pp. 134-174; D. J. Moo, *JSNT* 20 (1984), pp. 3-49 (in the course of a more wide-ranging and significant survey of Jesus and the law), and by the commentaries of Carson and myself.

<sup>31</sup> For this interpretation cf. Banks, *Jesus*, pp. 175-180. On chapter 23 as a whole see the excellent study of D. E. Garland, *The Intention of Matthew 23* (Leiden: Brill, 1979).

<sup>32</sup> So especially D. R. A. Hare, *The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel according to St. Matthew* (Cambridge: UP, 1967). A specific application of this understanding of Matthew was in the proposal of Hare and D. J. Harrington (*CBQ* 37 [1975], pp. 359-369) that *panta ta ethne* in 28:19 should be translated 'all the Gentiles', thus excluding the Jews from the Great Commission; in response see J. P. Meier, *CBQ* 39 (1977), pp. 94-102.

<sup>33</sup> Matthew's emphasis on judgment is exhaustively studied by D. Marguerat, *Le Jugement dans l'Evangile de Matthieu* (Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1981).

<sup>34</sup> For Matthew's particularly hostile presentation of the Pharisees see G. Strecker, *Weg*, pp. 137-143; D. R. A. Hare, *Persecution*, pp. 80-96.

<sup>35</sup> For this more favourable attitude to the crowds see S. Van Tilborg, *The Jewish Leaders in Matthew* (Leiden: Brill, 1972), pp. 142-165; P. S. Minear, *ATR Supp.* 3 (1974), pp. 28-44.

<sup>36</sup> There is a sensitive discussion of this issue by S. Légasse, 'L' "antijudaïsme" dans l'Evangile selon Matthieu', in M. Didier (ed.), *L'Evangile selon Matthieu* (Gembloux: Duculot, 1972), pp. 417-428. Cf. also Garland, *Intention*, pp. 39-41, 213f.

<sup>37</sup> C. H. Dodd, *The Founder of Christianity* (London: Collins, 1970), p. 90.

<sup>38</sup> G. N. Stanton, '5 Ezra and Matthean Christianity in the Second Century', in *JTS* 28 (1977), pp. 67-83.

<sup>39</sup> The attempt of Stendahl, *School*, to read Matthew in the light of the Qumran texts played a part in promoting this view. The term *Gemeindeordnung* was applied to Mt. 18 especially by G. Bornkamm

in his 1956 essay on 'End-expectation and Church in Matthew' (Bornkamm, Barth & Held, *Tradition*, pp. 15-51), and the theme of disciplinary authority in his 'The Authority to "Bind" and "Loose" in the Church in Matthew's Gospel' (in Stanton, *Interpretation*, pp. 85-97).

<sup>40</sup> W. G. Thompson, *Matthew's Advice to a Divided Community: Mt. 17:22-18:35* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1970).

<sup>41</sup> E. Schweizer, 'Matthew's Church', in Stanton, *Interpretation*, pp. 129-155, an extract from a collection of essays entitled *Matthäus und seine Gemeinde* (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1974); cf. *NTS* 16 (1969/70), pp. 213-230.

<sup>42</sup> P. S. Minear, *Matthew: the Teacher's Gospel* (London: Darton Longman & Todd, 1982), sees Matthew as a teacher writing for teachers in the congregation.

<sup>43</sup> This emphasis of the gospel is noted by Bornkamm in the 1956 essay referred to in n. 39 above, and is discussed e.g. by Zumstein, *Condition*, pp. 381-385; Marguerat, *Jugement*, pp. 424-447.

<sup>44</sup> W. Pesch, *Matthäus, der Seelsorger* (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1966); R. Thysman, *Communauté et directives éthiques: la catéchèse de Matthieu* (Gembloux: Duculot, 1974).

<sup>45</sup> C. Burger, *Jesus als Davidsohn* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970); B. Nolan, *The Royal Son of God* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), pp. 158-215. The Solomonic connection has been explored further by D. C. Duling, *HTR* 68 (1975), pp. 235-252; *NTS* 24 (1977/8), pp. 392-410.

<sup>46</sup> J. M. Gibbs, *NTS* 10 (1964/5), pp. 446-464; J. D. Kingsbury, *JBL* 95 (1976), pp. 591-602; W. R. G. Loader, *CBQ* 44 (1982), pp. 570-585.

<sup>47</sup> J. D. Kingsbury, *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), pp. 40-127; *JSNT* 21 (1984), pp. 3-36.

<sup>48</sup> See e.g. D. Hill, *JSNT* 6 (1980), pp. 2-16.

<sup>49</sup> D. J. Versepunt, 'The Role and Meaning of the "Son of God" Title in Matthew's Gospel', *NTS* 33 (1987), pp. 532-556.

<sup>50</sup> B. Gerhardsson, *ST* 27 (1973), pp. 73-106; and in R. J. Banks (ed.), *Reconciliation and Hope* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1974), pp. 25-35.

<sup>51</sup> M. J. Suggs, *Wisdom, Christology and Law in Matthew's Gospel* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard UP, 1970); critical review by M. D. Johnson, *CBQ* 36 (1974), pp. 44-64.

<sup>52</sup> E.g. J. D. G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making* (London: SCM, 1980), pp. 197-206. For a full study of the Wisdom motif in Mt. 11:25-30 (the most significant instance) see C. Deutsch, *Hidden Wisdom and the Easy Yoke* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1987).

<sup>53</sup> See esp. Blair, *Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew*.

<sup>54</sup> See the fine study by B. Gerhardsson, *The Mighty Acts of Jesus according to Matthew* (Lund: Gleerup, 1979).

<sup>55</sup> See Frankemölle, *Jahwe-Bund*, pp. 7-83, for the 'being with' theme.

<sup>56</sup> O. Michel's famous essay (in Stanton, *Interpretation*, pp. 30-41) was followed e.g. by W. Trilling, *Das wahre Israel* (München: Kösel, 1964), pp. 21-51; G. Bornkamm in J. M. Robinson (ed.), *The Future of our Religious Past* (London: SCM, 1971), pp. 203-229; J. P. Meier, *JBL* 96 (1977), pp. 407-424; O. S. Brooks, *JSNT* 10 (1981), pp. 2-18; Donaldson, *Jesus*, pp. 170-190. A valuable dissertation on 28:16-20 is B. J. Hubbard, *The Matthean Redaction of a Primitive Apostolic Commissioning* (Missoula: Scholars' Press, 1974).

<sup>57</sup> Davies, *Setting*, pp. 196-198. The view of the 'Son of Man' as king is one of the most distinctive features of Matthew's christology; cf. 13:41; 16:28; 19:28; 25:31ff. For a substantial demonstration of the essential connection between the kingdom of God and the Son of Man (so long denied in German scholarship) see C. C. Caragounis, *The Son of Man* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1986).