

things completely right before Easter. This is also why it is unlikely that 16:8 was Mark's originally intended ending. The post-Easter acclamation and even the empty tomb, if not also accompanied by post-Easter appearances, did not in Mark's view transform the disciples into true Christians, and Mark is writing to a Christian audience that would have needed confirmation that the original disciples, like Mark's audience themselves, had indeed been so transformed, not left out of the kingdom as those who feared and fled, or denied, deserted, or betrayed. This Gospel is not just about how the proclamation of Jesus as Christ and Son of God was the Good News for Mark's disciples, but also how it came to be Good News for the first disciples. Mark's attempt at biography means that by and large he is happy with a narrative Christology that is revealed indirectly through the words and deeds of Jesus, but occasionally also in moments of divine disclosure.

It seems probable that Mark's Gospel, as the earliest Gospel, retains a key historical element from the actual ministry of Jesus, namely, that Jesus' self-disclosure came in an indirect manner involving sometimes hiddenness and revelation to certain persons. Occasionally the light partly dawned during the ministry, though rightly Mark suggests that there were no full-fledged Christians before the death of Christ.

At the end of the day, there is something to be said for a messianic secret (or sonship secret) being both Markan and historical. Jesus was an enigmatic and forceful figure, and Mark, probably more than any other Gospel writer, has given us the flavor of what it might have been like to encounter him in a world with a wide variety of hopes and dreams about redeemer figures. Jesus did not wish to be defined by others but rather to redefine the christological categories. Mark would also have us know that spiritual things are spiritually discerned—only by revelation can the Christ be truly comprehended. But once comprehended he could be confessed with a variety of royal titles—Christ, Son of God, Son of Man, King, Son of David.

JESUS AS IMMANUEL AND SAGE: THE CHRISTOLOGY OF MATTHEW'S GOSPEL

Having discussed the Gospel of Mark, which is supposed to, and does in general, have lower and more primitive christological formulations than we find in the other Gospels, we turn now to a Gospel, called Matthew's Gospel, which scholars almost unanimously agree has a

high and rather overt Christology, including conveying the idea that Jesus is deity or divine. While recognizing the high Christology in this work, scholars do not agree why this is the case. It is my view that perhaps the major reason we find high Christology not only in Matthew but also in John is that both of these evangelists portray Jesus not merely as a sage but as God's Wisdom come to earth, or as Matthew prefers to put it, as God's Presence on earth, Immanuel. In other words, a sapiential portrayal in both of these Gospels leads to the predication of some remarkable things of Jesus. It will be well to flesh out the similarities and differences between Matthew and John at this point since they reveal something of the christological focus of each Gospel.

On first blush, the First and Fourth Gospels seem to be distinctively different from each other. The Gospel of Matthew has no *logos* prologue, I-am discourses, or sign narratives, and John has no birth narrative, human genealogy, Sermon on the Mount, or parable collections. Matthew follows Mark very carefully and takes over 90 percent of Mark's substance into his own Gospel. John could never be accused of doing that.

On closer inspection, however, these two Gospels have much in common. Both begin with a statement about the origins of their central character, Jesus.²⁴ Both of these Gospels have a notable emphasis on Jesus as teacher, which in both cases takes the form of several discourses.²⁵ Both Gospels conclude not only with a full presentation of the passion events and the resurrection appearances but also with a recommissioning and regathering of some of the inner circle of disciples. Furthermore both Gospels were written by Jewish Christians in the last quarter of the first century to communities that had ongoing controversies with the synagogue but were clearly separate from it, at least at the points of origin of the respective Gospels. Thus, in both Gospels the Jewish disciples of Jesus can be separated from "the Jews" (Matt. 28:15; John 10:19-24), which seems to mean primarily those Jews and Jewish authorities opposed to the Jesus movement. Both Gospels seem to have arisen out of a context of conflict and controversy and are shaped not only by whom they are written for but also by whom they are written against.

It is also arguable that both of these Gospels arose out of, or at least for, a school setting and were meant to be used in Matthew's case as an aid for Jewish Christian teachers to use with their flock, and in John's case as a tool for Johannine evangelists and teachers to use in presenting the Gospel to outsiders. It is no accident that Jesus is most clearly

presented as a teacher with learners (the meaning of *mathētēs*, which we translate as disciple) in these two Gospels. For example, the term *mathētēs*, which occurs only in the first five books of the New Testament, is used some seventy-three times in Matthew, some seventy-eight times in John, but only forty-six times in Mark, and thirty-seven times in Luke (with twenty-eight more instances in Acts). It is also not a chance happening that in both Matthew and John discipleship is defined as keeping Jesus' commands or words (compare Matt. 18:19 with John 14:14 and Matt. 28:18–20 with John 14:15–26, 15:10). It is obvious enough that Matthew's Gospel focuses on instructions for disciples, but there is clearly an interest in portraying Jesus' followers in John also as disciples in general (and not particularly as the Twelve, which group hardly receives notice in the Fourth Gospel). Thus, we find Jesus' followers doing the things that disciples of early Jewish teachers did—spending time with the Master (3:22), calling him rabbi (or some variant thereof, 1:38, 49, 4:31, 9:2, 11:8, 20:16), buying food for him (4:8, 31), and baptizing others for him (4:2). Both Gospels end with stories about how the disciples both doubt and believe even after Jesus is raised from the dead.

The First and Fourth Evangelists, both deeply steeped in Jewish Wisdom literature and lore adopt different sapiential strategies in their presentations of Christ. Matthew focuses on Jesus as a Jewish sage and concentrates on his public forms of wisdom teaching—parables, aphorisms, riddles, and beatitudes. John follows the discourse form we find in Proverbs 8 or Sirach 24, where one subject is treated and developed at some length, thus he portrays Jesus as Wisdom in person.

Matthew and John are also similar in the sapiential way they highlight the use of Father language for God or Father-Son language. In Matthew, Father is used of God some forty-two times, but in John we find a remarkable 115 instances. This is compared to only five times in Mark (none of which occurs before 8:38) and only fifteen times in Luke, some of which come from Q. This usage is closely tied in both these Gospels to an understanding not only of Jesus as *the* Son of God but also of disciples as sons and daughters of God. Furthermore, a close study of the way both the First and Fourth Evangelists qualify the use of Father by the possessive modifiers "my" or "his" when Jesus is speaking reveal that the authors are trying to stress that Jesus had a unique relationship with God.²⁶ Theology, Christology, and discipleship are linked in both of these Gospels through the use of Father language. When one believes that Jesus is God's Son, one can come to

relate to God as Father, as Jesus did. Matthew stresses this in a text like Matt. 11:27b, where it is made clear that one can come to know the Father truly only through the Son. An adequate comparison of the Christologies of Matthew and John would show that Matt. 11:27–28 is no anomalous meteorite fallen from a Johannine sky but rather evidence that both Gospel writers are deeply steeped in Jewish Wisdom and this affects how they present christological matters. We must turn more exclusively to Matthew's presentation at this point.

The First Evangelist carefully constructs his Gospel as a word to the wise (or at least to some Jewish Christians, who probably were already teachers), using three primary sources—Mark, Q, and M. Matthew 13:52 should probably be seen as a clue to how Matthew views both himself and his audience. He is a scribe trained for the kingdom who brings forth both old and new treasures from the Jesus tradition for other Jewish Christian teachers to use. Matthew does not see himself as like later rabbinic scribes, but rather as standing in the tradition of the sapiential scribes described in Sir. 39:1–3: "He seeks out the wisdom of all the ancients, and is concerned with prophecies; he preserves the sayings of the famous and penetrates the subtleties of parables; he seeks out the hidden meanings of proverbs."

The evangelist alludes to himself not as a sage but as a scribe, as is probably the case with his audience. This distinction is important to the First Evangelist because he wants to portray Jesus as the great sage and master teacher, but himself and his audience as only recorders and passers down of the tradition. Scribes are not the originators of the tradition but rather the transmitters, interpreters, and applicers of it. It is not an accident that Peter, the first key disciple of Jesus, is portrayed in Matt. 16:17ff. as the one given the authority to bind and loose in the sense of making decisions and giving certain commandments about what one is bound to do and what one is free to do. In other words, Peter is portrayed as the disciple given the task of interpreting the Jesus tradition for the church. There is a deliberate contrast between his teaching and that of the Pharisees, who, instead of using (hermeneutical) keys to open the gate to the kingdom as Peter does, do not allow people to go into the kingdom (Matt. 23:13, 15). The commissioning of Peter in this role provides the climax of the first main part of Matthew's narrative. Of course the climax of the whole work may be compared to Matthew 16, for Matt. 28:18–20 indicates that it is the duty of disciples to make other disciples and this involves teaching them. In Matthew, but not in Mark, Jesus instructs his disciples on

the *dos* and *don'ts* of being teachers (5:19). The whole point of mentioning the scribes' and Pharisees' righteousness in 5:20 is that they are rival teachers. Again in 10:24–25a, a passage not paralleled elsewhere, a disciple is said not to be above his master teacher (Jesus), but rather is called to be like his teacher.

Thus, Matthew edits and arranges his material in careful fashion to present a certain kind of portrait of the central character in the narrative—Jesus. In general, as was common in ancient biographies, the method of portraiture is indirect, allowing words and deeds and relationships to reveal the identity and character of the main character. A close examination of the editorial work shows the type of pedagogy the author has in mind. Strikingly, in Matthew's Gospel, while the disciples repeatedly address Jesus as Lord (see, e.g., 8:21, 25; 14:28; 16:22), when a stranger or a Jewish leader addresses Jesus it is as *rabbi* or teacher (see, 8:19; 12:38; 19:16; 22:16, 24, 36). Notice that it is only the betrayer Judas among the disciples who calls Jesus *rabbi* (26:25, 49). What this tells us immediately is that the First Evangelist does not see titles or terms of respect like *rabbi* or teacher as adequate to describe Jesus. This is not to say that such titles are inaccurate, for indeed texts like Matt. 23:8–10 make plain that Matthew does want to say Jesus is a sage or teacher, indeed *the* teacher of the disciples. Thus, the disciples, who will in turn disciple others, should not seek to label themselves as *rabbi* or use the customary term of endearment *'abba'* or Father sometimes used of Jewish teachers or wise men.²⁷ Further, in Matt. 26:17–19 near the end of Jesus' earthly ministry Jesus calls himself "the teacher" with the assumption the audience will know immediately who this is. The setting apart of Jesus as sage, and more than sage, from other potential teachers is also seen in the contrast found at the end of the Sermon on the Mount in chapter 7, where Jesus, who teaches with independent authority, is contrasted with *their* scribes. The point here is twofold: Jesus is no mere scribe and the problem is not with scribes in general but with *their* scribes.

The image of Jesus as sage or teacher is so crucial for Matthew that in redactional summary passages he cites teaching ahead of preaching and healing as Jesus' chief task (see 4:23; 9:35; 11:1). This is all the more striking when one compares the parallel Markan summary in Mark 1:39, where there is no mention of teaching, and when one compares Matt. 11:1 to Luke 7:1, where in the Lukan passage there is no use of the term "teaching." The content of this teaching is seen repeatedly to be parables, aphorisms, and Wisdom discourses. This image of

Jesus as sage or teacher and his disciples as scribes or teachers is crucial and gets at the heart of some of things that make Matthew's contribution to the christological discussion distinctive.

Much has been made of the idea that Matthew's central idea is that Christ is the New Moses, offering five great discourses, the first even from a mount. Without discounting this idea, probably too much has been made of it. For one thing it is not clear whether there are five or six discourses (depending on what one does with Matthew 23 in relationship to chapters 24–25). Moreover, the evangelist seems as interested in contrasting Jesus with Moses as in comparing the two. After all, Moses did not ban oath taking, all killing, or adultery of the heart! Even in the birth narratives where a Moses motif has sometimes been detected it is surely a secondary motif because Matthew 1 is by and large about how Jesus can be called Son of David and Matthew 2 about how he can be called Son of God (see below). Moses is not a Son of David or of God, and he is certainly not a Son of Man figure, and these are the three primary titles Matthew applies to Jesus. We must conclude that the "New Moses" idea, if it exists at all in Matthew, is at most a minor theme, and so one must look elsewhere to discern Matthew's distinctive contribution to the christological discussion. I would argue that he makes his most distinctive contribution by showing that (1) Jesus is a messianic Son of David, like but greater than Solomon, offering even greater Wisdom; (2) he is Wisdom come in person and so embodying and conveying the very presence of God to God's people (Immanuel); (3) he is Son of God, whose characteristic intimacy with the Father is modeled in part on the relationship of Wisdom to God in Jewish sapiential literature; and (4) he is the great eschatological sage, offering God's final teaching for salvation.

What then happens when an early Jewish Christian wishes to portray Jesus as like Solomon but even greater, being the very embodiment of Wisdom on earth? For a largely Jewish audience such as Matthew's, one would stress that Jesus is *the* Son of David in a way the source did not (the phrase is found eleven times in Matthew but only four in Mark and Luke and none in John).²⁸ The Jewish tone of this Gospel is set from the very beginning, where Matthew expands on his Markan source by adding the birth narratives, which stress that Jesus is the Son of David, the seventh son of the seventh son.²⁹

It was also the case, however, that in Jewish tradition ultimately Wisdom was *the* teacher of God's people (see Prov. 1:20–30; 8:10–16; Sir. 4:24; Wis. Sol. 6:14; 8:4). This role of Wisdom as *the* teacher is

assigned by Matthew to Jesus himself, which explains how Matthew can portray Jesus as both sage and Wisdom. In calling Jesus *the Teacher*, a sapiential Christology would be implied to those steeped in Jewish Wisdom material (cf., e.g., Wisdom of Solomon, where the teacher is ultimately Wisdom, who inspires Solomon, but also Solomon as great sage).

Various scholars have attempted to make one or another of the more familiar christological titles the key to Matthean Christology (e.g., J. D. Kingsbury choosing Son of God).³⁰ This appears to me to be a fundamental mistake for two reasons. First, it neglects the sapiential character of the Gospel as a whole, which helps to explain how all the titles are used. Second, a comprehensive approach must be taken because there is overlap in meaning between some of the titles. Consider, for example, Matthew's use of Son of Man when compared to his sources. We find the title Son of Man thirty-two times in Matthew, twenty-one of which come over from Mark or Q, but nine of which are found in special Matthean material. Six of these nine are in apocalyptic contexts that stress the future roles of the Son of Man, and in some of these—for example, Matt. 13:41—the Son of Man traditions in Daniel 7 stand in the background here.³¹ In Matthew, as in Mark, Son of Man is Jesus' chief phrase of self-identification (see Matt. 16:13–20). During his ministry Jesus is Son of Man, representative of his people and one endowed with kingdom power, but he is also the one coming as Son of Man to be the apocalyptic judge.³² But Jesus' ministry roles and roles at the eschaton can also be described in other terms and with other titles (e.g., the use of Son of David of Jesus' ministry).

Another title that has led to misunderstandings of Matthew's Christology is the title *kyrios*. Too often it has been assumed that *kyrios* necessarily implies the divinity of Christ in this Gospel. This overlooks the fact that when it is used in the vocative, such as in 7:22 or 25:11 it seems to mean no more than "respected sir," or "master." It is certainly arguable that this is the meaning in 8:2, 6, 8, 21, 25:14, and 28:30, where an appeal to Jesus and not a confession is being made. In short, this title cannot be used as the quintessential proof that Matthew has imposed a high Christology on more primitive material.

Of course the title Christ is very important to the First Evangelist. He does wish to argue that Jesus is the Jewish Messiah (see 11:2), the one who sought out the lost sheep of Israel. Christ's messiahship is furthermore closely connected with his role as acting for and perhaps even in some sense as Israel, fulfilling the roles Israel had failed in (see

2:13–15, where what was said of Israel is now said of Christ). There is a definite Jewish flavor to how Matthew uses the term, though there is also the additional Christian twist of speaking about Christ as one who must suffer and die on the cross. It is interesting that it is often in healing contexts where Jesus is revealed to be the Christ in this Gospel (see 10:1, 8; 11:2). Jesus in these contexts speaks of his fulfilling of Isaianic prophecies. Yet with all this Christ is not an omnibus term that explains or provides the essence of the christological reflections of Matthew.

For one thing, messiahship is primarily a theme in chapters 1–4, and not surprisingly it is intertwined with the material about the Son of David and Jesus as Israel (2:15, 4:3, 6). Furthermore, it is also precisely in these early chapters, perhaps particularly chapter 2, that we are introduced to Jesus as Son of God, though the title occurs also at crucial junctures of the Gospel (4:3, 6, 14:33, 16:15–16). Jesus is said to be Son of God from birth and so by nature because of the virgin conception (on which see below),³³ whereas he is Son of David through Joseph by legal adoption. It is also true that Matthew more than the other evangelists emphasizes that Jesus is king, in particular king of the Jews (1:1, 6, 17, 18–25, 2:6, 15, 9:27, 12:22–24, 21:1–14).³⁴ All of these titles, then, are ways of showing Jesus to be not only the fulfiller of Old Testament prophecy but also the fulfiller of Israel's mission on earth. In Jesus, Israel's history is recapitulated and climaxed. These titles are woven into the fabric of the discussion, and no one of them really explains the author's christological orientation and perspective in the way focusing on Jesus as sage and Wisdom does.

In a moment we will attempt to show how following the flow of Matthew's narrative and doing a sapiential interpretation of the material best gets at Matthew's Christology. It is in order to point out, however, that it is not just in the overt statements about Jesus as Wisdom that we find a high Christology but that there are other hints as well. The use of the term Immanuel or the idea behind it to frame the Gospel (1:23 and 28:20–21) is likely to indicate not just that Jesus brought the presence of God to God's people while he was on earth, but, as the Matthew 28 reference suggests, he continued to be, even after his death and resurrection, the divine presence with them forever. This concept likely has ontological overtones suggesting the omnipresence of Jesus after his exaltation. Notice also Matthew's modification of the Markan saying "Why do you call me good? No one is good but God alone" (compare Mark 10:17–18 with Matt. 19:16–17).

Matthew avoids the possible interpretation that Jesus might be neither good nor God by having Jesus say "Why do you ask me about the good? There is only One who is good." This says something significant about Matthew's christological outlook.

One may also consider Matt. 22:14ff./Mark 12:35ff. as further evidence that Matthew is comfortable even calling Jesus David's Lord in a way that suggests that that Lord existed before David. Matthew is the only one who states explicitly that this Son of David is Lord. Here Jesus is revealed as Lord, Son of David, even Christ, but most importantly in this text Lord is not used in an honorific way or as a vocative. Rather, something ontological, something about Christ's essential nature, seems to be implied. This is in no way surprising in a Gospel that begins by calling Jesus Immanuel and predicating of him a divinely caused conception, and throughout uses Scriptures that the author thinks Jesus fulfilled or is described by, including Scriptures that previously were taken to be about Yahweh and his activities (see, e.g., Matt. 21:15–16, drawing on Ps. 8:2). It is interesting to see how Matthew has modified his source at the crucial point of Jesus' trial. Matthew 26:63 has Jesus' answer to the high priest as "You have said so," which may be an affirmation ("you have said it"), but if so it is certainly a less clear one than what we find in Mark (see above). Schnackenburg suggests that this modification may be related to the fact that Jesus is mocked at the cross as Son of God in this Gospel (Matt. 27:40, 43). "The mockers hang on to the high priest's question and want to carry it *ad absurdum*."³⁵ There is, then, a good deal to be learned by looking at the traditional titles in Matthew, but this does not do full justice to Matthew's christological approach, as we shall now see.

The Gospel begins with the announcement that it will present Jesus the Messiah, the Son of David, in other words. Jesus the King, and so it begins where one ought to start with a story about a king, with his royal pedigree. Jesus' genealogy has some surprises in it, but then so did Solomon's, and it is the desire of the evangelist to show that Jesus is indeed a Solomonic figure, only greater than Solomon—the archetypal Son of David.

Kings were often said in antiquity to have miraculous births, and Jesus is no different. Not only is Jesus born of a virgin but he is to be called Immanuel, one of the throne names for the king mentioned in Isa. 9:6.³⁶ It must be kept steadily in view that the precise title Son of David is not really attested before the time *Psalms of Solomon* was written. In other words, our author's frequent use of this title through-

out his Gospel reflects a late sapiential perspective, not an Old Testament one. The term Immanuel at the least implies that God is present with his people through Jesus, but the discussion of the form this presence takes is held back until Matt. 11:19, where Jesus is specifically called Wisdom—in other words, God's presence come in the flesh.³⁷ Again in Matt. 13:42 the old categories, the old titles don't fully capture Jesus—one greater than Solomon is present, one who is more aptly described as Wisdom, who is divine and yet who can be distinguished from the Father.

But if Jesus is the great king, the Son of David long awaited, one would expect signs in the heavens to announce his coming, and would expect king's counselors and seers to announce his coming and visit him, and would expect that he would be in power struggles with other great kings. This is of course precisely how things are portrayed in Matthew 2. The birth of Jesus is signaled by a great star, he is visited by Magi, he is presented with gifts fit for a king, and he is the subject of a plot by King Herod and forced to flee the country.

Great kings are foretold by prophets, and when kings traveled anywhere they had heralds going before them announcing their approach and arrival. This is clearly the role John the Baptist plays in the first Gospel. He is said to fulfill Isa. 40:3 and speaks of the greater one coming after him in a way that plays down his own status (Matt. 3:11). Later in the story John sends his own disciples to find out about the royal or messianic deeds of Jesus (11:2). Jesus at that point recites his deeds and in a statement paralleling 11:2 says that Wisdom is vindicated by her deeds.

Of course Jewish kings, like most ancient kings, had to be anointed before they could act or speak as royal ones, and so Matt. 3:13–17 records the anointing ceremony and the public pronouncement, "This is my Beloved Son with whom I am well pleased." Here our evangelist not only is drawing carefully on his Q source but is re-presenting it with a sapiential twist drawing on material from Wisdom of Solomon. It was expected of a king that he would "fulfill all righteousness" (see Wis. Sol. 1:14f.) and that the endowment of God's Spirit poured out on the king also included the endowment of divine wisdom to make decisions and help the people. Matthew has added the phrase "with whom I am well pleased" in 17:5 to make clear the parallels between the baptismal and transfiguration scenes. At the Marthean transfiguration we hear that Jesus' face shone like the sun and his clothes became dazzling white, a description extremely reminiscent of the description of

Wisdom in Wis. Sol. 7:26-29. The point is that Jesus is being portrayed early and late in this Gospel as the royal one, the Son of David, as the one who manifests the very properties of Wisdom precisely because he is Wisdom come to earth.

In the Wisdom of Solomon, what follows the discussion of the investiture of the king with spirit and wisdom is the discussion of the testing of the king (Wis. Sol. 2:12ff.). This passage in fact illuminates the two major testing scenes in Matthew 4 and 26-27 and deserves to be quoted in part: "Let us lie in wait for the righteous man, because he is inconvenient to us and opposes our actions. . . . He professes to have a knowledge of God and calls himself a child of God. . . . he calls the last end of the righteous happy, and boasts that God is his father." This portion informs our reading of Matthew 4, but what follows it informs Matthew 26-27: "Let us see if his words are true, and let us test what will happen at the end of his life, for if the righteous man is God's child, he will help him, and will deliver him from his adversaries. Let us test him with insult and torture him, so that we may find out how gentle he is [see also Matt. 11:29], and make trial of his forbearance. Let us condemn him to a shameful death. . . ." Jesus thus is being tested first and last as the righteous king, the true Son of David like Solomon. He resists by relying on God's Word or wisdom to resist temptations.

At the beginning of the account of Jesus' ministry in Matt. 4:12ff. another quotation from Isaiah (9:1-2) is offered. This text is part of a longer passage lauding the coming great Davidic king with numerous throne names, and then is added in Isa. 9:6-7: "his authority will grow continually, and there will be endless peace for the throne of David and his kingdom." When Jesus goes forth preaching and healing and teaching, he is meant to be seen as a king going forth bringing righteousness and healing and proper rule to the land.

It is not necessary to go over in detail the sapiential material in Matthew 5-7, which would be better called the Teaching on the Mount. What is striking is that when one examines the topics broached in this so-called sermon it reads like the stranding topics discussed in Proverbs 2-6, after the introduction of Wisdom herself at the outset of Proverbs, topics dealing with dealing with the narrow path, with beatitudes, with warning against sexual impurity, with acknowledgment of God's wisdom revealed in nature, and exhortations to guard one's speech. Nor is it an accident that the discourse in Matthew 5-7 ends in 7:24ff. with the parable about the wise man. The one who hears and heeds this discourse will become such a person.³⁸ Matthew

is portraying Jesus as the king greater than Solomon and beyond that even as Wisdom offering her teaching. Thus, the reader will not be jolted when shortly after this Jesus is simply identified as Wisdom.

The miracles stories in Matthew 8-9 also fit into this sapiential presentation of Jesus as one greater than Solomon/Wisdom because Jesus heals as the Son of David, as a Solomonic figure, and Josephus reminds us in *Antiquities* 8:45-47 that God granted Solomon knowledge of the arts to use against demons and the wisdom to cure illnesses. In every instance after the birth narratives, the phrase Son of David arises in Matthew in a healing context. Jesus is a healer like Solomon; therefore, he should be appealed to using the Solomonic title. Elsewhere we have offered a more detailed analysis along these lines of all Matthew's material, but what we have said above should suffice to show that all the different kinds of ministry teachings and narratives are read through a sapiential filter by this evangelist in the service of his presentation of Jesus as both royal Son of David like Solomon, as the ultimate Jewish sage, and also as the one greater than Solomon—namely, Wisdom come in the flesh.³⁹

Matthew's presentation is not partial and piecemeal; it is systematically approached and cannot be limited to the passages more obviously indebted to Wisdom material such as 23:37ff., where Jesus is seen as Wisdom trying to gather her Jewish children in Jerusalem, or 11:28-29, where Wisdom offers her yoke, drawing on Sir. 6:19-31 and 51:26. The matrix of the whole presentation of Christ in this Gospel is sapiential, and the other titles and terms are fitted into this wider context. This is why focusing on the traditional titles is inadequate, even when it includes the title King.

For Matthew there is one great sage, one great teacher, one final Son of David, one Wisdom of God, one person who can be called Immanuel. This person is Jesus. He was a nonpareil who could be both David's Son and yet also David's Lord, both Son of Man and yet also Son of God. It is indeed hard to imagine a much higher Christology than is conveyed in this Gospel, which begins with a person who is Immanuel and ends with his being given all authority in heaven and earth to empower and send out disciples for the task of replication. The yoke to which Matthew beckons his listeners is at once the yoke of Jesus' wisdom and the yoke of Jesus as Wisdom, who says "take up your cross and follow me" as well as "take my yoke upon you."

We have reached the apex of canonical christological development with these statements, for it is clear that Jesus is seen as both human

and divine, both sage and Wisdom, even if Matthew nowhere directly uses the term *theos* of Jesus. For this evangelist, the one who was Wisdom and Immanuel was of course not less than divine and yet fully human. In his view it was wise to say this much, but perhaps unwise to try to say more. There was, however, one Gospel writer who dared to say more, as we will see when we turn to the Fourth Gospel, after we have examined Luke-Acts.

NOTES

1. R. Schnackenburg, *Jesus in the Gospels: A Biblical Christology*, trans. O. C. Dean (Louisville: Westminster/J. Knox, 1995), pp. 321-22.
2. See H. C. Kee, "Christology in Mark's Gospel," in *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Era*, ed. J. Neusner, W. S. Green, and E. Frerichs (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), pp. 187-208.
3. The issue still receives significant play and is given fresh life in books such as *The Messianic Secret*, ed. C. Tuckett (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983).
4. See my discussion in *The Christology of Jesus* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1990), pp. 261-67.
5. See J. D. G. Dunn, "The Messianic Secret in Mark," in *The Messianic Secret*, ed. Tuckett, pp. 116-31.
6. See pp. 53ff. above.
7. See pp. 24ff. above.
8. In other words, I think Mark's ending was lost, probably because Matthew's Gospel, a much fuller and complete Gospel quickly became the church's favorite in the second century. Moreover, since Matthew contained 95 percent or more of Mark (and half of that is a verbatim copy of Mark), Mark's Gospel was quickly eclipsed and fell into disuse in most circles. It is quite easy to see how the original ending could be lost, because ancient documents tended to be left with the end edge exposed to the elements. Even in ancient times people were lazy about rewinding things. Perhaps only one verbatim column of the original document was lost, and perhaps we may see the substance of what it looked like in Matt. 28:9-10, 16-20.
9. See R. A. Burridge, *What are the Gospels?* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).
10. See the discussion in Schnackenburg, *Jesus in the Gospels*, pp. 17-73.
11. There is some textual uncertainty here since some manuscripts don't have the phrase "Son of God," but it is supported by a wide array of early and important manuscripts including Aleph-a and B, and D and is probably the original reading.
12. J. D. Kingsbury, *The Christology of Mark* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984).

13. It is not convincing to argue, as Neyrey does, that the use of "Son of God" in this Gospel has no overtones of divinity because the term was used in the Old Testament of God's chosen people as a whole (Exod. 4:22; Deut. 14:1; Hos. 2:1). This logic overlooks two important factors: (1) Jesus alone is being singled out at the baptismal and transfiguration scenes (and elsewhere) as God's unique Son in a way that echoes the material in the Psalms, where the king is singled out in this fashion; (2) Jesus' disciples as a group are never called the Son of God or the sons of God in this Gospel.

14. See the discussion of P. J. Achtemeier, "Mark, Gospel of," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 4:551-53.

15. See E. Richard, *Jesus: One and Many. The Christological Concept of New Testament Authors* (Wilmington, Del.: M. Glazier, 1988), p. 117.

16. Schnackenburg, *Jesus in the Gospels*, p. 52.

17. Achtemeier, "Mark," p. 553.

18. I personally would not see Mark 12:25-37 as evidence that Mark thought Jesus denied that he was David's Son. Rather, he is denying a false understanding of that sonship that considers the Messiah only David's human heir and not also someone much greater than David.

19. See Schnackenburg, *Jesus in the Gospels*, pp. 58-59.

20. *Ibid.*, p. 39.

21. *Ibid.*, p. 52.

22. But see *ibid.*, pp. 48-49.

23. Richard rightly points out that in Mark there are only two instances where Son of Man is used of Jesus as he acts in the present on earth, while the vast majority of instances have to do with the coming suffering of the Son of Man or his future return from heaven (*Jesus: One and Many*, pp. 110-11). This must count against the suggestion that the earliest Son of Man sayings were noneschatological in character and were simply an oblique form of self-reference, something like "a person in my position."

24. It is my view that both Matthew and John, like Mark, should be seen as examples of ancient biographies, with Jesus as the central subject matter. This distinguishes these Gospels from Luke's, because his purposes are more specifically historical. Luke does not follow biographical conventions at the beginning of his Gospel, offering instead a historical prologue followed by a chapter not on Jesus but on the Baptist and his family. This was not how biographical works were meant to begin. Luke's interest is more broadly in salvation history; the other Gospels in Jesus as savior, Lord, etc. This is why, I submit, that there is not as much christological substance or development in Luke's work as we find in the other Gospels.

25. A fuller version of this discussion can be found in my *Jesus the Sage: The Pilgrimage of Wisdom* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994), pp. 335-80.

26. Richard, for example, rightly notes that in Matthew Jesus refers to God as my Father some sixteen times, and all but two of these instances are unique

to Matthew and reflect his editing of Mark, Q, or other sources (*Jesus: One and Many*, p. 151).

27. On *yabbaʿ*, see pp. 61ff. above in regard to its use of mere mortals.

28. Here we have a salient difference between Matthew and John. The latter's primary target audience may well have been Gentiles (by which I mean that Gentiles were the ones with whom the Christian teachers were to share these Johannine traditions), unlike Matthew—hence the more universal and less Jewish approach to a host of matters, including the Jewishness of Jesus in John. Jesus is seen in John as the universal Wisdom that made the world, in Matthew as the embodiment of God's revelation to God's people Israel, as the Son of David.

29. See Schnackenburg, *Jesus in the Gospels*, pp. 75–76.

30. See J. D. Kingsbury, *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975).

31. See Schnackenburg, *Jesus in the Gospels*, p. 101.

32. It is possible that Son of Man did not become a prominent title used to confess Jesus even in Jewish Christian circles because it did not really describe his role now in heaven, but rather only his roles on earth, either at his first or at his second coming. In other words, it did not describe his present relationship with the church, which is what many of these titles such as Lord do describe.

33. As in Luke, Son of God does say something about Jesus' nature, not just his roles or tasks.

34. The spread of the term throughout Matthew distinguishes this Gospel from both Mark and Luke, which do not really use the term until the climax of the Gospel in the passion material.

35. Schnackenburg, *Jesus in the Gospels*, p. 99.

36. Certainly part of the significance of the virgin conception story is to make clear that God alone is Jesus' Father, and thus that Jesus has divine parentage, which must affect how one evaluates Jesus' character and career. See Richard, *Jesus: One and Many*, p. 150.

37. Richard rightly stresses that the Immanuel terminology is no mere label but indicates God's actual existential presence in the life of Jesus (*Jesus: One and Many*, p. 154).

38. Matthew is careful not to call such a person a *sophos*; rather, he uses the phrase *andri phronimo* lest it be thought that Jesus' disciples could be sages just like Jesus. No, their wisdom is of a derivative sort, depending on the teaching of the Master.

39. See *Jesus the Sage*, pp. 349–68.

6

Lord and Savior: The Christology of Luke-Acts

IF THERE IS A CASE to be made for one of the New Testament writers being both a Gentile and an ancient Greco-Roman historian that case must be made for Luke. These factors seem to have affected Luke's christological perspective, but it is also likely that we must add to the discussion of Luke's Christology the probability that Luke's audience was Gentile. We may see these factors coming into play when Christ is designated Savior of both Jews and Gentiles in Luke-Acts (see, e.g., Luke 2:11, 30–32), but there are other ways these factors affect Luke's presentation of Jesus. For example, it has been widely noted that Luke deals with his christological titles with some historical sensitivity.¹ Thus, for example, while Luke himself calls Jesus "Lord" in the narrative framework of his Gospel in the full Christian sense of the term (see Luke 7:13), he is careful to avoid placing such a full Christian usage on the lips of his characters in the Gospel narrative (see below). These factors need to be taken into account as we examine the christological material in Luke-Acts.

There was a time when it was thought of Acts as it has been thought of Mark, that at most one could find a rudimentary Christology here. In more recent years C. H. Talbert, I. H. Marshall, and others have shown Luke to be a masterful theologian as well as a historian even though he does present us with various examples of primitive christological reflection, especially in Acts. I will begin my discussion of Lukan Christology with Acts for two unrelated reasons. The first is that I think C. K. Barrett is likely right that Luke's Gospel has been revised or smoothed out through the editorial process in a way that is not true of Acts. If this is so, it means we are more likely to find prim-