

Chapter 4

NARRATIVE SPACE

4.1 Introduction

In the first chapter, it was mentioned that a combination of an analysis of the narrative point of view and a social scientific analysis would be used to explore the inclusive structure (character) of Matthew's community and to argue that it was not an egalitarian structured society. In order for this combination to be made, it is necessary to first read the text to make it possible to understand the move from the micro-social world of the text to its macro-social world (see Van Eck 1995:245).

Before starting an analysis of the narrative point of view in the Gospel of Matthew, it would be helpful to briefly recap on the distinction between emics and etics. According to Gottwald (1979:785), "Etic refers to cultural explanations whose criteria derive from a body of theory and method shared in a community of scientific observers." Emics is the native point of view in a social description of a culture and its societal arrangements (see Dozeman 1989:87-101). In the case of the Gospel of Matthew, the plot of the narrative may be regarded as an arrangement of the events of Jesus' ministry's activities (Humphries-Brooks 1993:55). Therefore, some elements are encoded and decoded for the communication from an insider's point of view (Van Aarde 1991a:104-105; see Van Eck 1995:245). What evidence is there for this inside point of view in the narrative? It is possible to find such evidence in the ideological perspective of the narrator.¹ The Gospel of Matthew is a narrative written from the point of view of the narrator after the event. This after-the-event point of view enabled the narrator to present the plot of his story from the ideological perspective of reader involvement (Van Aarde 1991a:104; 1994:127). According to Van Aarde (1994:35; 1997:129-130), in the Gospel of Matthew, the narrator's ideological perspective coincides with that of the author, and with the perspective of the protagonist. Moreover, Van Aarde mentions that this ideological perspective also influences the viewpoint of the characters who are narrated from the dominant perspective of the narrator. Clearly the ideological perspective of the narrator

can help the reader to understand the narrator's evaluation of the situation of his society (see Humphries-Brooks 1993:64). In the case of Matthew's narrative, the narrator's conflict situation was inclusive of a structured community. One can understand the characteristics of the structure of the society by focusing on the narrator's inside (native) ideological perspective.

An analysis of the spatial designations in Matthew's Gospel can help to discover the "inclusiveness" as it applies to Jesus' movement in terms of space in Matthew². From this discussion will emerge the narrative point of view analysis of the text. Such a description of the topographical level³ portrays what kind of characters was included in Matthew's Gospel. This section will not be considering an exegetical approach rather than the narrator's perspective (intention) of narrative structure of Jesus ministry. Hence, this Jesus' inclusive ministry was a reflection of Matthew's community.

4.2 Space in Matthew

4.2.1 Introduction

The ideological perspective that the narrator pertains to, is the distinction between setting and focal space. The narrator designates a setting as a focal space, while the author makes specific spatial arrangements in the narrative. Van Aarde (1991a:117) puts it as follows: "Spatial arrangement in narrative material is tied to the temporal sequence of a story." The narrator's setting contributes to the structure, plot or characterization in the narrative. A particular focal space can probably be seen as symbolic. It describes social life in terms of certain beliefs, attitudes and values of the characters and their status in the social situation of the text.

According to Joubert (1990:338), one of the important functions of ideology in any society is to define and limit the linguistic and cultural practices of members of that society. These ideologies are expressed through language as a symbol. It is possible that focal spaces can be read as symbols. Van Eck (1995:246) claims that the sociology of knowledge can be used with regard to its understanding of the relationship between the symbolic and the social universe.

In the following section, important places are indicated where the Matthean intention of his inclusive community through Jesus' ministry took place, such as the villages and houses depicted by the narrator of Matthew. On the one hand, Galilee was receptive to the inclusiveness of the teaching of Jesus, as there are indications that Jesus' teaching had authority over the people of Galilee. On the other hand, in Jerusalem, the religious leaders and the crowd rejected Jesus' ministry. This implies that Matthew's interpretation of Jesus' inclusive ministry started in Galilee and moved to Jerusalem. In Galilee, his ministry was more successful than in Jerusalem in Matthew's narrative.

However, according to Matthew's depiction of Jesus, the inclusive ministry came into conflict with the views of his opponents from Galilee and elsewhere, particularly Jerusalem. It is different from Mark's narrative of Jesus' ministry. According to Mark's perspective, Jesus' ministry was successful in Galilee, but not in Jerusalem (Van Eck 1995: 245-281). This clearly indicates that Matthew's narrative point of view of Jesus' inclusive ministry conflicted with that of Israelite leaders from both Galilee (for example Mt 9:1-8, 9-13) and Jerusalem. Mark's narrative point of view of Jesus' ministry, on the other hand, narrated a conflict only with the view of leaders in Jerusalem.

4.2.2 The notion of space

Before turning to a discussion of the structure of space in Matthew, a few observations regarding the concept space may be helpful. Most modern scholars have probably used the term "space" to designate the physical or geographical setting or place. However, some have expressed the opinion that some of these aspects in a text are not spatial designations. According to Vandermoere (1982:34), the narrator presents space as supra-spatial or supra-temporal. This means that the author's position is not only supra-spatial, he dramatizes himself in the fictional world (Vandermoere 1982:124).

This study is only concerned with spatial designations in the text of the Gospel of Matthew. This spatial description reflects Matthew's intention for his inclusive community. For these notions of space I am greatly indebted to the insights of scholars such as Van Aarde

(1991a:117-118), Van Eck (1995:247-8), Dozeman (1989:87-101) and Rabkin (1977:253-270), especially Van Eck's analysis of Mark in his book *Galilee and Jerusalem in Mark's Story of Jesus*.

Firstly, space refers to the setting in which characters live, act and move: for instance, in Matthew; Galilee, Jerusalem and Nazareth are important settings in the narrative. The disciples or crowds came to Jesus there (cf Mt 5:1; 8:1). Secondly, the portrayal of space includes the manner in which certain settings are presented: for instance, in Matthew 8:24, a storm was rising and made waves on the lake. Thirdly, reference to space includes the implicit or explicit emotional value of certain settings. An example of this is the fear created by a stormy sea (Mt 8:25), on the expressions "outside into the darkness" and the "gnashing of teeth" (Mt 22:13). Fourthly, space can be a non-spatial designation and sometimes non-spatial designations are described in spatial terms. Jesus' teaching about the kingdom of God is an example of a non-spatial designation (Mt 22:1-14; 25:1-46) and another example is that of the man scattering seed in his field in the parable of the sower (Mt 13). Fifthly, space can refer to the boundary of /a location between certain settings, like Jesus on the way of his ministry. People come into the circle of his religious movement as disciples and crowds. It shows us the boundary of Matthew's community. Sixthly, space designates settings of human experience (see Van Eck 1995:248). Jerusalem, as the place where Jesus is going to die, as experienced by the disciples.

These criteria are used in relation to what can be regarded as spatial designations in Matthew's narrative. In the next section, the spatial designations of Jesus' ministry in Matthew's narrative are looked at in terms of these criteria. However, Jesus' ministry does not imply that the context in which it took place was an egalitarian structured society (Elliott 2003:75-90).

4.2.3 The spatial designations of Jesus' inclusive ministry

The spatial designations of Matthew's narrative are followed by the plot line in the Gospel of Matthew. Plot is the sequential arrangement of episodes into a unified action (see Egan

1978:455-473; see Matera 1987:235-236; Powell 1992:169). According to Edward (1985:9), the individual episodes of the Gospel were composed as parts of a comprehensive whole, and not as isolated pericopes. The arrangement of the episodes carries with it implicit assumptions about causality, as sequence implies cause and effect (see Matera 1987:239-240). Lotman (1977:240) clearly indicates that plot implies a time frame and reality, but also with spatial and achronic information. These aspects are like maps according to which one can follow the narrator's designations for the outline of the plot.

In the case of Matthew, the plot⁴ is the arrangement of the events of Jesus' life of inclusive ministry (see Section 4.1; Powell 1992:187-204). This means that the events of Jesus' life are described according to spatial designations in the Gospel of Matthew. This designation considers Matthew's inclusive structured society. Matthew's arrangement of episodes can be seen as fourfold. In Matthew 2:23-4:11, Jesus prepares for his ministry. From Matthew 4:12-18:35, Jesus conducts his public ministry (inclusive) of all people in Galilee. In Matthew 19:1-20:34, Jesus travels from Galilee to Jerusalem. Matthew 21:1-28:20 present Jesus' last week in and near Jerusalem, and the suffering, death and resurrection (Combrink 1983: 62; Boring 1994:593)⁵.

The first section (2:23-4:11) of the Gospel of Matthew presents as an arrangement of episodes: the genealogy of Jesus, the birth of Jesus, the visit of the Magi, the flight from Herod, the baptism by John the Baptist and the temptation (see Humphries-Brooks 1993:55). These episodes took place at Nazareth (Mt 2:23), in Galilee and at the Jordan River (Mt 3:13).

The arrangement of episodes of the second section (4:12-18:35) includes the calling of the first disciples, the teaching on the Mount, the healings and driving out of demons, Jesus' sending out the twelve disciples to mission, the healing on the Sabbath day, and Jesus' feeding of the five thousand. These events took place in Capernaum (Mt 4:13), at the Sea of Galilee (Mt 4:18), in synagogues (Mt 4:23), on a Mountain (Mt 5:1), in Capernaum (Mt 8:5), at Peter's house (Mt 8:14), in the region of the Gadarenes (Mt 8:28), in Jesus' home town (Mt 9:1), in a synagogue (Mt 12:9), by the lake (Mt 13:1), in a synagogue (Mt 13:54), at a solitary place (Mt 14:13), in Gennesaret (Mt 14:34), in the region of Tyre and Sidon (Mt 15:21), at the

Sea of Galilee and on a mountainside (Mt 15:29), in Magadan (15:39), the region of Caesarea Philippi (Mt 16:13), on a high mountain (Mt 17:1), in Galilee (Mt 17:22), and in Capernaum (Mt 17:24).

The third arranged set of episodes Matthew 19:1-20:34 presents Jesus on the way from Galilee to Jerusalem. The episodes took place in the region of Judea (Mt 19:1), in Jericho (Mt 20:29). In the final set of episodes Jesus goes to the Jerusalem temple and around Jerusalem. The episodes took place in Bethphage (Mt 21:1), in Jerusalem (Mt 21:10), at the temple (Mt 21:12), in the city of Bethany (Mt 21:17), on the road (Mt 21:19), in the temple court (Mt 21:23), on the Mount of Olives (Mt 24:3), at Simon's house in Bethany (Mt 26:6), in Gethsemane (Mt 26:36), at the high priest Caiaphas' house (Mt 26:57), at Golgotha (Mt 27:33), and in Galilee (Mt 28:16).

These important episodes of Jesus' ministry in Matthew's narrative are building blocks in the constitution of the plot with time indication and they contain Jesus' speeches (Humphries-Brooks 1993:57): "The speeches maximize the spatial perception of the audience; the text relates and relativises plot and speech forms and each form is spatially related." Jesus' speeches occupy the central space in the Gospel of Matthew. The narrator informs the reader about Jesus' ministry through the designation of this spatial arrangement of episodes in the Gospel of Matthew. Hence, Jesus' inclusive ministry is depicted in terms of the narrator's spatial designations for his inclusive community. Jesus's inclusive ministry illustrates that the Matthean community was not an egalitarian structured society.

4.2.4 Narrative point of view at the topographical level

4.2.4.1 Introduction

The discussion above focused on the different spatial settings in Matthew in which Jesus' activities took place. These emic data are used as an important tool for understanding the narrator's point of view. In this section, the settings in which Jesus' ministry took place and the spatial designations that Jesus referred to, are investigated as aspects of his ministry.

4.2.4.2 Settings in which Jesus' activities took place

The emic data refers to the different settings mentioned in the text of Matthew's Gospel. This is useful, as the settings of Galilee and Jerusalem have inclusive implications in the Gospel of Matthew (see 4.2.1). Therefore, Matthew's information about where Jesus' activities took place has implications for space as a narrative element in his Gospel. It is looked at as follows: firstly, attention is paid to the larger setting/areas in which Jesus travelled, healed and taught (cf Van Eck 1995:257); and secondly, more specific settings in which Jesus' activities aimed at inclusivity took place are examined.

The insights of Kingsbury (1975/1989), Meier (1979), Heil (1979, 1991, 1998), Van Aarde (1994), Howell (1990), Combrink (1983), Anderson (1984-1985), Edwards (1985), Ellis (1985), Matera (1987), Bauer (1988), Charette (1992), Verseput (1992), Powell (1992), Davies (1993), Humphries-Brooks (1993), Erickson (1996), Carter (1992, 1997, 2000), Freyne (2001), and Waters (2003) were particularly helpful in this discussion.

4.2.4.2.1 The larger settings/areas in which Jesus' activities took place

The data regarding the larger settings in which Jesus travelled for his inclusive ministry is set out in Section 4.2.3. The above spatial structure in Matthew shows how and where Jesus' ministry took place. It is clear from Matthew's perspective of Jesus' ministry that it accepted all people. In the case of Galilee, Jesus' ministry of inclusivity was also seemingly accepted by the people of Galilee. According to Matthew's narrative, they even followed Jesus on his journey to Jerusalem. However, the people of Jerusalem (especially the religious leaders of Israel) rejected Jesus' inclusive ministry (teaching). Jesus' ministry is discussed below in the divisions set out above.

4.2.4.2.1.1 Jesus prepares for his inclusive ministry: Matthew 2:23-4:11

In Matthew 2:23, the narrator tells the reader that Jesus' place of birth is the village of Nazareth⁶ in Galilee (Schnackenburg 2002:27; Van der Merwe 1977: 17; see the case of Mark, Van Eck 1995:259). It is evident from the historical background that the city of Sepphoris was

a significant place for the Herodian-Roman government, which was based in Judea (Keener 1999:113; Chancey 2002:58-61). The city of Sepphoris was a “place of interest”(focal space) where the products of peasants were consumed. As a Greek-Roman city this place can be regarded as an example of a hierarchical community. However, the village of Nazareth was insignificant. In the eyes of the Jerusalem urban elite, the village of Nazareth seemed powerless and whoever came from it, was worthless (John 1:46) (Jones 1994:14). This argument indicates that the life of the village of Nazareth was like that of the peasant of the lower class in the eyes of Jerusalem’s elite (Keener 1997:74). The ancient society of Galilee was not egalitarian but hierarchical. Moreover, Chancey (2002:56) points out that the people of Galilee experienced class conflict, that is, the urban-rural distrust during the Jewish war.

Kingsbury (1975:16; Luz 1989:150) argues that Jesus resided in Nazareth in Galilee, the region, which God decreed for Jesus’ public ministry in Matthew’s narrative. The name of his town, Nazareth, indicates that Jesus was a Nazirite. According to Israelite tradition, the term “Nazirite” refers to consecration to serve God. Like Samson (Judg 13:1-16:31), the Nazirite did God’s will. Similarly, Jesus saved the people (Mt 1:21) (Carter 2000a:89; Kupp 1996:62-63). Hence, the term Nazirite implies the Messiah’s connection with Nazareth⁷ (Stendahl 1960:94-105, see France 1981:237-240) and he saved his people through his ministry. Although, Nazareth was humanly insignificant, Matthew emphasizes that it was divinely significant. Israelite leaders may have been inclined to question, “Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?” (Jn 1:46), but Matthew turns their objection around by showing divine significance in the choice of Nazareth as Jesus’ hometown (Keener 1997:74). In Mt 2:13-15 and 2:19-23 the narrator’s perspective as conveyed to the reader, shows the Israelite leader (King Herod) as antagonist (but Herod’s plan to kill Jesus, fails⁸) and Jesus as the protagonist, carrying out God’s will to include all people (Luz 1989:35). Matthew depicted Jesus’ ministry as one of inclusivity in Galilee, but the city of Jerusalem rejected Jesus’ teaching and its religious leaders excluded it from his ministry (see Carter 2000a: 89)⁹. Moreover, Matthew 1:17-2:23 (with its references to “my people Israel”, “God with us”, “the Magi from the East”, the use of Old Testament quotations, Herod’s killing of the infant Israelite boys) as “the

infancy Gospel” lays the foundation for main elements of the framework of the story. The narrator reports to the reader that these events are in full accord with God’s intention. There is therefore no doubt about the authority of the narrative, nor can there be any doubt about the Messianic nature of Jesus (Edwards 1985:15; see Luz 1989:43).

According to Matthew 3:13, Jesus came from Galilee to Jordan to be baptized by John. In fact, at this point, with Matthew’s story of Jesus’ baptism, it is proclaimed that Jesus was the Son of God¹⁰ (Mt 3:16-17). The narrator tells the reader that Jesus would do the will of God to save God’s people. According to Kingsbury (1975:14-15; see Hagner 1993:58; Bauer 1992:359), Matthew’s perspective expressed in Matthew 3:17 relates to the narrations in Chapters 1 and 2. In Chapter 1 and 2, Matthew portrays Jesus as the only Son of God through the word of the ancient prophet (Mt 2:15). This means that in Chapters 1 and 2, the divine sonship¹¹ of Jesus is indirectly revealed by the narrator (cf Mt 11:25-27; 16:13-17; 27:51-54), but in Chapter 3 directly. Matthew designates the baptism of Jesus as his proclamation as the Son of God (Schnackenburg 2002:35; see Carter 2000a:104). According to Matthew 1:1-4:11, the beginning of Jesus’ ministry to Israel, was the natural outcome of the preparatory events for Jesus’ messianic ministry of preaching, teaching and healing (Matera 1987:244).

In Matthew 4:11, the narrator introduces Jesus to his readers as the Son of God. The motif expressed in “look, angels came to him and were ministering to him,” has an Israelite background. The angels did not simply come to minister to a faithful Israelite but to call special attention to the victory of the obedient Son¹². The verse is thus symbolic of the true identity of the Son (Hagner 1993:69). According to Kingsbury (1997:16-17), Matthew presents Jesus in a unique filial relationship with God: “Jesus is the wholly obedient, supreme agent of God, whom he designates as Father.” It is indicated that through the temptation of Jesus, Satan tested him to see whether he was God’s Son (Mt 4:6; Combrink 1983:79; Matera 1987:245; see Ellis 1985:31). Three times Satan tried to break Jesus’ faith in God. However, Jesus resisted Satan’s temptations and he confirmed himself as the Son of God. Hence, Matthew’s intention with the story of Jesus’ temptation (Mt 4:1-11) was to indicate that the devil challenged the relationship (Sonship) of Jesus and God, which was declared in Mt 3:16-

17 (Sonship). Jesus passed Satan's tests, and would be faithful in carrying out God's will for the salvation of his people (by preaching the kingdom of God). The links between the stories of Jesus' baptism and temptation indicate the nature of his Sonship and ministry (see Hagner 1993:69-70). The narrator's intention with the temptation of Jesus is an important part in preparation for the passion narrative. He was also later tempted to prove that he was "the Son of God" by coming down from the cross and avoiding suffering and death (Mt 27:40) (Senior¹³1976:323; see Howell 1990:125-126). In other words, the temptation of Jesus tests Jesus' identity (Mt 4:6) (Carter 1992:474).

To summarize the emic data with regard to the spatial designations in Matthew 2:23-4:11: the narrator's point of view of Jesus' preparation for his ministry can be described as follows: in this section, the narrator describes Jesus' native village as that of Nazareth in Galilee (Mt 2:23), which was a hierarchical structured society. The narrator's intention in recounting the preparation of Jesus' ministry was to show that Jesus would do God's will in order for the inclusive salvation of his people. The Israelite leaders (like Herod) were the antagonists of Jesus' ministry in Matthew's narrative. The narrator informs the readers about Jesus' true identity, that is, that he was the Son of God.¹⁴ He also informs them about Jesus' preparation for an inclusive ministry. This was God's will, for different levels of people to be included in Jesus' ministry. The intention of this narrative shows us that Matthew's community was ready for an inclusive structured society.

4.2.4.2.1.2 Jesus' inclusive ministry in Galilee: Matthew 4:12-18:35

From the above section, it is evident that the narrator depicts Jesus as the Son of God, through his preparation for and the performance of his ministry to a hierarchical structured society. In this section, Jesus' ministry in Galilee is examined. The narrator informs the reader that the region of Galilee was where Jesus began his inclusive ministry of salvation (Davies and Allison 1988:404). In relation to Matthew 4:12, the narrator's reference to John's imprisonment is an important time signal which relates to the ministry of Jesus and his disciples (Keener 1997:95; Hagner 1993:72; Morris 1992:79-80; cf Combrink 1983:79). This

is the turning point of the narrative: “from that time on Jesus began to preach, ‘Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is near’”¹⁵ (Mt 4:17). It is therefore clearly indicated that Galilee was Jesus’ main interest, because it was where his first public ministry activities would take place (see Carter 1997:16-17). In Matthew 4:13, the narrator informs us again that the ministry of Jesus was situated in the “land of Zebulon and land of Naphtali, the way to the sea, along the Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles¹⁶ the people living in darkness have seen a great light; on those living in the land of the shadow of death a light has dawned”¹⁷ (Mt 4:15-16). It is implied that those who live in darkness might see the light. Here, the narrator shows the readers that Jesus commences his task of including people who lived in darkness, both those of Galilee and the Gentiles¹⁸ (Chancey 2002:177; see Combrink 1983:79-80; Edwards 1985:18). According to Matthew, Jesus’ inclusive ministry led him to the outskirts of Galilee where he had contact with Gentiles. However, Chancey (2002:179) has argued that Jesus’s ministry was concerned mostly with the Israelites. For example, the settlement of Tyre had a large population of Israelites.

The narrator introduces “Galilee of the Gentiles” to the reader because his point of view of the mission to the Gentiles is reflected in that phrase (Keener 1999:145). The words “Galilee of the Gentiles” alert the reader that even those “who have sat in great darkness”- the Gentiles- will, in time, see “a great light” (Mt 4:16) (see Gundry 1967:59-60; Patte 1987:56; Carter 2000b: 503-520).

Another argument advanced by the narrator is that the Pharisaic opponents centred in the region of Galilee. Of course, Vermes (1973:56-57; Neusner; Keener 1999:146; Hagner 1993:72) believe that the Pharisees on the whole were probably more concentrated in Jerusalem, rather than in Galilee. The Pharisaic movement was primarily urban while Jesus’ movement was situated in a more rural area (Keener 1999:146; cf Judge 1960:60-61). It seems that Matthew’s depiction of Jesus’ inclusive ministry involved the lower classes of people who were mostly outside the city (see Chapter 3), and that the Matthean community was not an egalitarian structured society.

In Matthew 4:18, the narrator introduces the help of the protagonist (cf Morris 1992:86):

Jesus called his first followers at the Sea of Galilee.¹⁹ Jesus promised that: “I will make you fishers of men” (Mt 4:19). The narrator informs the reader that Jesus included some followers (Jesus calls his disciples, but the word “disciple” had not yet been used) to his ministry and that they helped with Jesus’ inclusive ministry (Mt 4:20), which Matthew has received from tradition, Jesus promised the disciples that they would be assisting him by winning people to the movement that he has initiated. Hence, the narrator predicts that the disciples would fulfill Jesus’ inclusive ministry²⁰ (Edwards 1985:18).

According to the narrator, Jesus’ disciples were called from different social classes (see chapter 3.4). Peter and his brother Andrew were fishermen. Their social ranking is very low (Keener 1999:151; 1997:98-99), while Matthew was a tax collector, who came from the elite retainers (Mt 10:3). This shows that the Matthean community was not an egalitarian structured society, because its members had come from different social levels. Schüssler Fiorenza (1993:220) argued that Jesus’s religious movement required the rejection of the natural institution of the family²¹ and its patriarchal structure. However, Matthew’s depiction of Jesus’ purpose in calling his disciples was not to form an egalitarian movement. Jesus’ instruction to his disciples concerns the re-ordering of all conventional national priorities (Elliott 2003:78). According to Keener (1999:152), Jesus’ ministry was “seasonal”, so that his disciples could return to support their family at certain periods of the year. Some of the women who had followed him (Mt 27:55-56) did not appear to have their spouses to accompany them. This demonstrates strong evidence that Jesus’s ministry had not overlooked the nature of the family in an absolute sense.

In Matthew 4:23²², the narrator informs us that Jesus went throughout Galilee, teaching in their synagogues²³, preaching to, and healing people. Preaching involves the proclamation of the kingdom of heaven (Mt 4:23). Teaching was regarded as an instruction for his disciples, and healing (driving out demons) bore witness to the presence of the kingdom of God.

Matthew’s interpretation of Jesus revealed the kingdom to Israel through those three activities (Bauer 1992:359). The purpose of all of those activities of Jesus was for the inclusiveness of his people. It is therefore the narrator’s intention to show that Jesus’ ministry

took place to include people who were coming from a number of places, to be cured as his own community. In the pericope Matthew 4:23-25, the narrator tells us that Jesus' ministry included people who suffered from various diseases, who were suffering from severe pain, and who were paralyzed. From the narrator's perspective, Jesus' ministry included all kinds of people. The places of origin of those who came to Jesus are also clearly indicated. They came from Syria, Galilee, and the Decapolis, Jerusalem, Judea and the region across the Jordan. Therefore, it seemed that Jesus' ministry was not limited to any particular stratification and location in Matthew's narrative.

In Matthew 5:1, the narrator depicted that Jesus had moved to and sat on the mountainside. Matthew 5 to 7 and 8 to 9 are related to Matthew 4:23-25 (see the above). It has been demonstrated that Chapters 5 to 7 deal with Jesus' teaching and Chapters 8 to 9 with healing (Du Toit 1977:35; Combrink 1983:80). Jesus presented himself to his disciples and Israel as the Messiah who teaches (Mt 5:2-7:29). However, the narrator does not clearly mention whether Jesus taught the crowds or only his disciples²⁴. They (the crowds or his disciples) were probably the audience, because Matthew portrays the crowds as potential followers (Edwards 1985:19; cf Schnackenburg 2002:46). The narrator informs the reader of two things in the Sermon on the Mount (Mt 5:1-7; 7:29). Firstly, there was the tension between Jesus and his opponents of their teachers of the law²⁵ (antagonists) in the narrative, where Jesus' perspective of "righteousness that exceeds" was contrasted with the Scribes and Pharisees' perspective of righteousness²⁶ (cf Mt 6:5; 7:21-23) (Combrink 1983:81; cf Tannehill 1980:138-150) Secondly, the result of this kind of conflict is depicted. The narrator implies that they persecuted Jesus and his disciples. It probably indicates that this persecution by the Roman Empire²⁷ was not a political one (Shin 1999:3-42; cf Mt 5:38-48); it was addressed to the audience of Jesus (probably Matthean community). Jesus had already challenged the *status quo*, its commitments, power structures and beneficiaries (Mt 5:3-9) (Carter 2000a:136).

In Matthew 8 to 9, the healing ministry is related to miracle stories. Jesus came down from the mountainside and large crowds followed him (Mt 8:1) (see Vledder 1997:173). The crowds who heard Jesus' message on the mountain continued to follow him (Mt 5-7). Here,

the narrator suddenly changes the context into a healing scene. The narrator introduces a new development of Jesus' ministry to include people through the healing of all kinds of diseases in the region of Galilee (Mt 9:1-34) and in the Gentile territory (Mt 8:18-34).

In Matthew 8:2, a leprous man came to Jesus and asked him to be cleansed of his disease. According to Israelite tradition, a person with leprosy was placed in social isolation because it was regarded as a dangerous disease.²⁸ Jesus broke the prescribed traditional rule by touching an unclean person and healed the man who was suffering from leprosy. Thus, it clearly confirmed that the narrator's picture of Jesus' ministry includes unclean people as the class of the expendables or the unclean and degraded class (Lenski 1966:281, see Chapter 3).

Jesus entered Capernaum (Mt 8:5), his home-town as the center of Jesus' Galilean ministry (see Mt 4:13), being near the border and on a major trade route, the town probably had a contingent of Roman soldiers²⁹, where he healed a centurion's servant³⁰. The centurion was a Gentile and had some authority³¹ (Davies and Allison 1991:19). Moreover, the centurion requested to Jesus that his slave be cured. The centurion was a religious outcast³² in Israelite society and his slave was of the lower class in both Israelite and Roman society. The narrator informs the reader that Jesus' ministry not only crossed the boundary between Israelite and non-Israelite, but also the boundary between clean and unclean as did Matthew's inclusive structured society (see Patte 1987:114; Vledder 1997:181).

Jesus healed Peter's mother-in-law who was lying in bed with a fever (Mt 8:14). As usual, in the ancient world fever is a disease itself rather than something that accompanies other diseases (Hagner 1993:209). The status of women was normally lower; in the case of Peter's mother-in-law she was unclean, because she was ill. However, Jesus touched her and healed her. Touching a person with a fever was forbidden in rabbinic tradition (see Str-B 1:479-480). Moreover, in Israel, there was a teaching that a man should not make contact with a woman's hand, not even with money from his hand to hers (*Ber.* 61a). Jesus did not consider her social position and physical situation as untouchable. The narrator's attention to Jesus' ministry even included women and the sick.

The narrator informs that in the evenings Jesus drove out demons and healed all the sick

(Mt 8:16). Verses 16-17 of Chapter 8 are the narrator's confirmation of Jesus' authority with his miracle ministry to include all people. Then Jesus entered the region of the Gadarenes³³ and healed the two demon-possessed men (Mt 8:28-34). Of all the people Jesus could meet in Gadarenes, our attention is focused on two marginal people who live in the tombs. Their tombs were unclean (Keener 1997:183). Hence, the two demoniacs belong to the expendables, the bottom level of society. The two men lived physically on the margins, away from households, which defined gender and social roles, and economic and political involvement. This episode is set in a Gentile territory³⁴ on the far side of the lake of Galilee. The narrator of Matthew's Gospel mentions that Jesus openly went into Gentile world. The narrator informs the reader about Jesus' identification with the Gentile world, but the Israelite leaders excluded the unclean and Gentiles from their society. Jesus encountered unclean persons and animals, such as pigs, in the region (Mt 8:28, 30). In this episode, the narrator implies that Jesus involved himself with the unclean classes (see Chapter 3; Lenski 1966:281; Vledder 1997:197).

The narrator informs us about the cost of following Jesus by narrating the episode from Matthew 8:21-22. Another disciple said to him "Lord, first let me go and bury my father³⁵." But Jesus told him, let the dead bury their own dead³⁶. Those who follow Jesus need to stop to bury their father. The Israelites regarded the burial of one's father and mother as very important (see Gen 50:5-14; Tob 6:14). Where burial of the dead supersedes other religious duties; in Leviticus 21:2 priests are allowed the defilement of touching the dead in the case of close family members. Theissen (1992:60-93) suggested that Matthew 8:21-22 indicates an abandonment of the biological family. This implies that Jesus' ministry intended to be egalitarian as evidence of his rejection of the natural patriarchal family structure. Matthew 10:34-36 also suggests that Jesus was against biological families. He declared that one should not love one's own family more than Christ. It seems these verses indicate that Jesus was egalitarian in his outlook. However, Jones (1994:55) points out that this claim of discipleship must be understood as taking the first place. In other words, Jesus' ministry had priority over social obligations including those of family and of one's society, but religious obligations

were considered to be the ultimate (Kenner 1997:179). In view of this, Jesus declared that the biological family was of secondary significance to God's reign (Elliott 2003:78). Thus, these passages do not indicate Jesus as an egalitarian in Matthew's narrative.

After Jesus crossed the lake and came to his own town, which is not specifically named, but which is logically known as Capernaum (cf. 4:13), he healed and forgave a paralytic man's sins³⁷ (Mt 9:1-8). From the beginning, the narrative is focused on forgiving sins. The "forgiveness of sins" is an important Matthean theme. From the beginning the First Evangelist had introduced the Son of God as the one who will save his people from their sins (Mt 1:21). And in Matthew 26:28, Jesus' death is plainly stated to be 'for the forgiveness of sins'. Jesus was in conflict with some of the religious leaders (some teachers of the Law) concerning the authority to forgive sins. The scribes believe that when Jesus grants God's forgiveness of sins, he arbitrarily puts himself on the same level with God and claims divine prerogatives for himself. The narrator emphasized that Jesus had the authority to forgiveness. It confirms that Matthew's depiction of Jesus' ministry is inclusive of all human beings as sinners.

Jesus called the tax collector Matthew and ate with many tax collectors and sinners (outcasts)³⁸ (Mt 9:9-13) (see Kingsbury 1997:19). The Pharisees sees this meal that Jesus ate with them and blamed him in Matthew's narrative. The people of Israel in ancient Palestine had several reasons to dislike tax collectors. Firstly, Palestine's local Israelite aristocracies undoubtedly arranged for tax collection (Sanders 1990:46-47). Secondly, the Roman Empire sometimes had to take precautions to keep tax gatherers from overcharging people (Lk 3:12-13). In some parts of the Empire, taxation was so oppressive that laborers fielded their land, at times to the point that entire villages were depopulated (Lewis 1983:164-166). Here, the narrator also informs us of the conflict between Jesus and the Pharisees. Jesus launched an ideological challenge to the religious leaders' perspective of exclusiveness. Matthew's interpretation of Jesus included sinners in the kingdom of God without the required Israelite Law (cf Davies and Allison 1991:102). In Matthew 9:18 an Israelite unnamed ruler³⁹ (leader) came to Jesus and asked him to heal his daughter. On the way to the ruler's house, a woman touched Jesus' garment in the hope of being cured (Mt 9:20-22). Why does she come to Jesus

from the rear and how is she satisfied with touching his garment? It is probably because she was shy as she was labelled in the Israelite society, as unclean. Her faith in crossing religious boundaries in order to touch Jesus' garment healed her. The narrator's depiction to the reader is that Jesus' inclusive ministry was even meant for an unclean woman. This incident indicates that Jesus' inclusive ministry accepted the woman in crossing the boundaries of both gender and ritual cleanliness within her faith (Luz 2001:42; Wainwright 1991:89-90). Jesus also touched two blind men's eyes and healed them (Mt 9:27-31). To be blind in that culture was to be a social outcast. Blindness was frequently regarded as the judgement of God (Gen 19:11; Exod 4:11; cf John 9:2), and it put serious religious limitations upon the blind. In Matthew's narrative, the blind men indicated that as Jesus was an inclusive messianic figure, he would be able to give them sight (Hagner 1993:253). Jesus healed a dumb man and drove out a demon (Mt 9:32-34). In here, the Pharisees already had to evaluate Jesus in a hostile manner. They do not deny the power of Jesus, but attribute the exorcism to black magic, as a deed performed in the name of the prince of demons.

To summarize, in Matthew 8 to 9 the narrator informs the reader that Jesus' ministry took place all around towns and villages near the Sea of Galilee, where he taught and healed every disease and sickness (Mt 9:35). Matthew's depiction is that Jesus was interested in the lower classes and included them through his ministry. Yet, Matthew's intention of Jesus' inclusive ministry does not indicate that the society as such was egalitarian in structure.

In Matthew 10:5, Jesus sent the twelve disciples on a preaching mission to Israelite towns and villages. Jesus ordered the disciples to go to the lost sheep⁴⁰ of the house of Israel only. It seems that the narrator intended to show that Jesus' ministry was successful in Galilee and the surrounding region (Mt 4:12-9:38). Jesus continued his mission to the Gentiles, but the focus remained on Israel (Mt 10:5), in that Israel was the prime object of God's purpose in the salvation history (Carter 2000a: 234). However, the Matthean community mission included non-believing "Jews" and Gentiles as well (Duling 2003:1; for example Mt 10:6). The narrator depicted that Jesus' inclusive mission is both for "Jews" and Gentiles, because the Gospel of Matthew does not require male circumcision for the Gentiles; baptism is the only

required entry rite (Mt 28:19)⁴¹. According to Duling (2003:1-18), the Matthean community stands on the boundary “between” Israel and non-Israel in terms of ethnicity⁴². It indicates that the Matthean community was in the process of reconstructing its ethnic boundaries (cf Keener 1997:202). The narrator informs the reader that the Israelites were the descendants of the patriarchs and that they should inherit the promises, but because they did not believe, the title “sons of the kingdom” was taken by many who came from the east and the west (Mt 8:11-12). It is indicated that Israelites and many Gentiles, together, received a share in the future Kingdom (Charette 1992:69-70). The lost sheep of the house of Israel were the exiles of Israel. The narrator’s indication of evangelism to lost sheep points to the return of Israelite exiles (Charette 1992:70-71). According to Weaver (1990:84), the narrator indicated that “the lost sheep” are “sheep without a shepherd” among whom Jesus had been ministering (Mt 9:36; cf 9:35). The fact that Jesus instructed his disciples that the people of Israel were harassed and helpless means they were among Jesus’ inclusive ministry (Mt 9:36). The disciples of Jesus must likewise minister to these people, “the lost sheep of the house of Israel” (Weaver 1990:84; contra Waetjen 1976:133). Hence, the narrator reveals that Jesus’ ministry was inclusive of both Israelites and Gentiles. This argument partly suggests that the Matthean community was not an egalitarian structured society, because the disciples’ mission includes the Gentiles, not just Israelites by ethnicity.

In Matthew 10:24-25⁴³, we read: “A student is not above his teacher, nor a servant above his master. It is enough for the student to be like his teacher, and the servant like his master.” This implies that the Matthean community looked like an egalitarian structured society (see Elliott 2003:84; chapter 1). However, Matthew’s community context of Jesus’ teaching was not aimed at creating an egalitarian structure. According to Luz (2001:96), this passage has to be understood in the context of the suffering and persecution of Jesus’ community, which was a necessary experience for all his disciples because they were to be like their master. Thus, the egalitarian focus of this passage was not on a political or economic equality. By being persecuted, the disciples showed themselves to be the disciples of their teacher and Lord (Patte 1987:152).

After Jesus had finished instructing his twelve disciples, he went on to teach and preach in the towns of Galilee (Mt 11:1). Matthew's interpretation of Jesus invited all who were weary and burdened to come so that he could give them rest (Mt 11:28-30). Concerning "The yoke", the reader naturally assumes that this refers to those who are burdened with the effort to obey the Law and in this way to arrive at the goal of righteousness (cf Sir 6:25). However, it is not the Law itself that is burdensome but rather the overwhelming nomism of the Pharisees. Hence, these verses imply that, according to the narrator, the Matthean Jesus had an inclusive mind but the Pharisees had exclusive minds through the interpretation of the Law (cf Mt 22:1-14). They (those who are burdened) will find Jesus' yoke light, because he is a Master who will care for them (Mt 11:29). Jesus went into their synagogue (cf Mt 4:23)⁴⁴ and healed a man with a shriveled hand (Mt 12:9-10). Here, we can see the conflict between Jesus and the Pharisees in Matthew's narrative. The opponents obviously already know that Jesus will heal on the Sabbath, and be hostile toward the community. The narrator mentions that Matthew's intention of his inclusive community depicted through Jesus' ministry even took place at their synagogue and the conflict within the opponents. Then Jesus taught the crowd at a house. Jesus' mother and brothers visited him (Mt 12:46-50). The narrator again informs us of Jesus' inclusive mind in words such as "whoever does God's will is my brother and sister and mother." Jesus left the house⁴⁵ and went to sit at the sea, but a large crowd gathered around him, so that he got into a boat and sat in it (Mt 13:1-2). The place where he "sat beside the sea" was probably Capernaum in Galilee (Carter 2000a:282). Jesus taught the crowds and went to his home town, where he began teaching the people in their synagogue (Mt 13:53-54).

Jesus heard about the death of John the Baptist from John's disciples. He withdrew by boat to a solitary place. The large crowds came to Jesus and he had compassion on them and healed their sickness (Mt 14:13-14). Jesus' "compassion" is not simply a matter of a person being touched; it is the mercy of Israel's Messiah for his people. The mercy of healing of the sick from among the people is important in Matthew's narrative; it is that Matthew's interpretation of Jesus ministry is inclusive as is the intention of his own community. Then Jesus fed a large crowd in Gentile territory (see Van Aarde 1986:229-256). The narrator

portrays the crowds (women and children) as inclusive in the kingdom of God through Jesus' ministry (Gundry 1982:295; cf Carter 2000:308). They all ate and were satisfied, and the disciples picked up twelve basketfuls of broken pieces that were left over. The fact that "twelve" baskets are referred to in this pericope probably symbolizes the twelve tribes of Israel⁴⁶ (Hagner 1995:418). In Matthew 14:34 the narrator reports that Jesus landed in Gennesaret, a town close to Jesus' own territory of Capernaum. The people brought their sick ones to him. The narrator depicted again his community was inclusive through Jesus and engages in an inclusive ministry with healing. The narrator says anyone who touched Jesus' garment was healed (Mt 14:36). The religious leaders (the Pharisees and Scribes) came from Jerusalem with a question about the behaviour of the disciples, who did not wash their hands before they ate⁴⁷ (Mt 15:1-2). The narrator also informs the reader about the conflict between Jesus and the religious leaders. The location had not changed; Jesus was still in Gennesaret.

The narrator then notes that Jesus moved to the region of Tyre and Sidon (Mt 15:21). A non-Israelite (Canaanite) woman came and asked for mercy, announcing that her daughter was possessed by a demon. Jesus healed her daughter (Mt 15:28). According to Jackson (2003:787), the Canaanite woman in Matthew's narrative is an imitation of the story of Ruth. If Jesus allowed the Canaanite woman to follow him, it indicated that she was allowed to join the Matthean community. Jackson (2003:779-790; 2002:21) believes that Matthew's intertextual designation of the story of Ruth shows how Gentiles became members of the Matthean community.

The narrator informs us that Jesus left and went back to the Sea of Galilee. Then he went up on a mountainside and sat down (Mt 15:29). The motivation of "mountain" is an eschatological inclusive gathering of the people, healing, and messianic banquet, the pointing to the mountain as symbolic of Mount Zion and Zion eschatology in Matthew's Gospel⁴⁸ (Davies and Allison 1991:567; Hagner 1995:445). The narrator informs the readers that the Messiah returned to his home town and healed every type of illness. Jesus again fed a large crowd in a remote place⁴⁹ (Mt 15:32-33). After Jesus had sent the crowd away, he got into the boat and moved into the territory of Magadan (Mt 15:39). The religious leaders came and

confronted Jesus about their demand for a sign. Here the demand for “a sign from heaven” means that they wanted a miracle with a divine significance, a miracle that will show beyond all contradiction that God is with him. Jesus said⁵⁰ that the Israelite leaders’ role was that of puppets of Satan (Mt 16:1-4) (Van Aarde 1994:98). The narrator informs us that the religious leaders need faith for understanding Jesus’ miracle ministry as a sign from heaven (cf Hagner 1995:456). However, the disciples of Jesus failed to understand their Master’s teaching. Jesus and his disciples crossed the lake (Mt 16:5). The disciples understood Jesus’ teaching about the dangerous point of view of the Israelite leaders (Mt 15:10-20). The above discussion shows us that the narrator depicted Jesus’ inclusive ministry but the disciples sometimes could not understand it.

Jesus entered the region of Caesarea Philippi (Mt 16:13; cf Mt 4:15; 15:21). The city of Caesarea Philippi was some twenty miles north of the Sea of Galilee (Carter 2000a:332). The narrator says that this was the only time Jesus went very far beyond Galilee and in the northern direction, it was a Gentile town located (of course Jesus went to Tyre, to the north-east of Galilee; see Mt 15:21) (Edwards 1985:59; Davies and Allison 1991:616). Jesus now asks the disciples for their own opinion about him (Mt 16:15). Herod Antipas thought Jesus was John the Baptist (see Mt 14:2) and many Israelite people anticipated the return of Elijah, Jeremiah or one of the prophets. Peter as spokesman answers for himself as well as for the other disciples, “you are the Christ, the son of the living God.” “The Christ,” is the Greek word for “anointed one.” “Son of God” is Jesus’ unique dignity, attested by God himself. This was the second time a disciple of Jesus acknowledged him as the Christ, the Son of the living God (Mt 16:16). The first time was after Jesus walked on the water: “truly you are the Son of God” (Mt 14:33).

After six days⁵¹ Jesus went to a high mountain with Peter, John and the brother of James (Mt 17:1). There on the mountaintop Jesus was transfigured. They came down from the mountain (Mt 17:9) and approached the crowd (Mt 17:14). Jesus healed a boy from demon-possession (Mt 17:18). Jesus and his disciples (probably together with his followers) gathered in Galilee. Jesus repeated the prediction that the Son of Man would suffer and die (Mt 17:22-

23). The narrator encourages the reader to anticipate the coming difficulties of Jesus' passion for people's inclusion in the kingdom of God.

Afterwards, Jesus and his disciples moved into Capernaum (Mt 17:24). In Capernaum, three things happened. Jesus was in conflict with the authorities on the payment of taxes. Jesus taught the disciples who asked him who will be the greatest in the Kingdom of God (Mt 18:1) and that one must forgive one's brother seventy-seven times (Mt 18:21). The topographic location of Capernaum stresses the opposition against Jesus. Jerusalem, in Matthew's Gospel, was opposed to Jesus from a theological perspective (see Lohmeyer 1942:106-107). Therefore, the town of Capernaum was portrayed as being in opposition to Jesus, like Jerusalem (see Van Aarde 1994:221). The Israelite half-shekel or double drachma is tax for the support of the temple. It was to be paid annually by each free adult Israelite, excluding women, slaves and children. After the temple was destroyed, the Romans asked all Israelite people to pay tax to the Roman government⁵² (Keener 1997:282).

Jesus' greatest instruction concerned the Kingdom of God (Mt 18:1-5). The narrator depicted it within the context of Matthew's community. Yet, the Matthean community was not an egalitarian structured society. The word "great" implies position and honour; the high position in the kingdom included the governors and ministers (Luz 2001:426; cf Esth 10:3; 1 Macc 7:8). The narrator informs his readers that unless the members of the community change and become like little children, they will never enter the Kingdom of Heaven. It seems that the members of the Kingdom of God (the Matthean community) have no leadership structure (cf Morris 1992:460). However, children were without power or status and as such, were utterly dependent on their parents in the ancient world (Luz 2001:428; Harrington 1982:74). According to Luz (2001:428), the word "little" means "low" or "humble." Thus, the term "little children" implies spotlessness and low social status (Luz 2001:428). Hence, Jesus' instruction did not encompass any egalitarianism. The narrator did not emphasize equality of the members of the community in Jesus' instruction. He taught his disciples to become like children, by turning away from their previous status to live a humble life (Patte 1987:248). The humility of Jesus' disciples concerned their morality as his followers. However, this does

not necessarily imply that the disciples were equal.

Peter's inquiry to Jesus on how he must forgive a sinful brother marks a new division within the community discourse (Mt 18:21-22). Jesus could simply have answered "yes, it is not limited forgiveness." "Seventy-seven times" is not a limit of literally seventy-seven or even 490 times but it indicates that one must forgive an unlimited number of times. It is implied that the narrator's context reflected within Jesus' inclusive ministry, is to forgive a sinful brother without counting.

The emic data with regard to the spatial designations in Matthew 4:12-18:35 can be summarised as follows: the narrator describes Jesus' ministry as successful in Galilee and the towns around Galilee. The narrator depicts Jesus' activities as an inclusive ministry of healing (Mt 4:23-24; 8:2, 5, 16; 9:1-8, 18, 27-31; 12:9-10; 14:13-14, 35), Jesus drove out unclean spirits/demons (Mt 8:2, 5, 16, 28-34; 9:9-13, 27-31, 32-34; 15:21-28; 17:18), taught (Mt 4:17, 23; 5:1-7:29; 9:35; 10:5; 11:1; 13:53-54; 18:1, 21-35) and fed the crowds (Mt 14:13-21; 15:32-38). Jesus' ministry targeted the crowds. Jesus called his disciples (Mt 4:18-22) and worked with them as part of Jesus' ministry. Therefore, the narrator's native point of view of Jesus' ministry is one of inclusivity for all people. The narrator's depiction of Jesus' ministry is in context within his inclusive community.

In Galilee, Jesus and his disciples (the helpers) are characterized as being successful with the "ministry of inclusiveness." The narrator emphasizes that Jesus' inclusive ministry was not only limited to the territory and the nation of Israel but was extended to other nations and countries. He went to the world of the Gentiles and healed them as well. Moreover, Jesus' ministry included females and low-level people (even unclean people). Jesus' inclusive ministry in the Gentile world is depicted in Matthew 4:15, 24; 8:28-30; 14:13-14 and 15:28. His inclusion of females (see Wainwright 2001a:126-137) amongst those that he healed is portrayed in Matthew 8:14-15; 9:22, 25 and 15:21-28, and his association with people of lower social strata and unclean people in Matthew 4:24; 8:2, 8:28-34; 9:3, 9-13, 32-34; 15:28 and 17:18.

However, Jesus' inclusive ministry was opposed by the antagonists in Matthew's narrative

(Mt 2:16; 9:3, 11; 12:2, 4, 24, 38; 15:1-2; 16:1, 12, 21; see Bauer 1988:65-67). The narrator informs the readers that Jesus was in conflict with the power group of Jerusalem (Mt 2:16). Jesus forgave the sins of sick people, but the teachers of the Law said he was blaspheming (Mt 9:3). They did not accept Jesus' authority to forgive sins. The narrator tells the readers to understand that God's forgiveness is connected with one's forgiveness of others (Charette 2000:61). It also indicates that Jesus' ministry included sinners. Jesus' ministry included all people, as he ate with the tax collectors and sinners (Mt 9:7). The Pharisees and members of the elite, the religious leaders and members of the governing class continued to maintain hierarchical and social stratification (see Vledder 1997:117-130). That is why they criticized Jesus' practice of including all kinds of people.

The narrator says that some religious leaders came from Jerusalem (Mt 15:1-2). They tested Jesus by asking about the hand-washing ritual required by the law of the elders. Hand washing before eating is a regular ritual law in Judaism. Jesus' answer to them was: "Why do you break the command of God for the sake of your tradition?" This means that in terms of the narrator's (Matthew community) perspective in Matthew 15:1-3, hand-washing before eating is not ritual law, but a special Pharisaic ritual (Luz 2001:330). This interpretation clearly indicates that Jesus' inclusive ministry came into conflict with the religious leaders' views concerning the interpretation of the Torah. The Matthean community did not refute on the basis of the traditional interpretation of the Torah, but the community was in conflict with Pharisaic ritual (their own view of the Law). Jesus also warned his disciples about the teaching of their religious leaders (Mt 16:1, 12). Jesus told his disciples that he would eventually suffer at the hands of the elders, the chief priests and teachers of the Law, and that he would be killed by them (in Jerusalem). It is clear that the conflict between Jesus and the religious leaders centred around the fact that Jesus' ministry included all people. According to Luz (2001:348), the religious leaders demanded a sign from heaven because they opposed Jesus' ministry. An example of his ministry is the two miraculous feedings in which great crowds participated in his teaching. The religious leaders maintained their hierarchical structure and excluded people of lower status.

The narrator's depiction of Jesus' ministry in Galilee (Mt 4:12-18:35) succeeded in including all kinds of people. Most of the crowds followed Jesus. The crowds that followed Jesus in Galilee and in the Gentile world included males and females, and people from many different classes. It clearly indicates that Matthew's depiction of Jesus' ministry was not concerned with "egalitarianism".

4.2.4.2.1.3 From Galilee to Jerusalem: Matthew 19:1-20:34

This section is Matthew's depiction of Jesus' journey from Galilee to Jerusalem. Jesus went from Galilee to the region of Judea beyond the Jordan (πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου) (Mt 19:1). The narrator tells us that Jesus' inclusive ministry continued on his way to Jerusalem and came into conflict with the view of religious leaders. Jesus' religious movement (inclusive ministry) moved from Galilee into the Transjordanian region (the region of Judea beyond the Jordan). The narrator informs the reader that there will be major conflict in Jerusalem (Luz 2001:488). Duling (2003:18) suggests that the ethnic stand of the Matthean community focuses on the boundary between Israelite and non-Israelite. However, to Luz (2001:488), the narrator is ignorant of the geographical-historical circumstances (it was Gentile world or not in Israel history).

The crowd followed Jesus and he performed miracles of healing as well (Mt 19:2). Jesus, the healing Messiah, remains faithful to his inclusive mission to all the people until the end. The religious leaders (some Pharisees) again tested the authority of Jesus by asking him whether a man could divorce his wife for any and every reason (Mt 19:3). This question asked by the Pharisees is seen as a form of tempting Jesus. The narrator tells us once more that Jesus included children in his ministry (Mt 19:13-15; cf Mt 18:1-4). The disciples did not accept the children but Jesus included them and blessed them. We have argued that children formed a lower social class. While Jesus was going up to Jerusalem with the twelve disciples, he proclaimed his imminent death again (Mt 19:17; cf Mt 16:21; 17:12, 22-23). On the way to Jerusalem, the mother of Zebedee's sons came to Jesus and requested that one of her two sons should sit at his right and the other at his left in his kingdom (Mt 20:20-21). She may have

been the sister of Mary the mother of Jesus (Hagner 1995:580; cf John 19:25). Sitting at Jesus' right and at his left in the kingdom indicated that these were the two places of highest honour. It implies that the ancient world, as the Mathean community, is not an egalitarian structured society. As Jesus and his disciples were leaving Jericho, a large crowd followed him. Jesus healed two blind men on the way. Not only is there physical blindness, but there is also blindness of the heart and of the thoughts (Luz 2001:549). The followers of Jesus rebuked them and told them to be quiet, but Jesus healed them (Mt 20:29-34). After healing them, the formerly blind men followed (becoming models of discipleship) Jesus on the way of the cross. The narrator tells the reader that Jesus is the inclusive messiah for the blind Pharisees and scribes in Matthew's narrative (cf Luz 2001:549; Mt 23:16-26).

To summarize: the narrator's depiction is that while Jesus was on his way to Jerusalem, the crowd was still following him. Jesus' inclusive ministry with the crowds continued (Mt 19:2). There was conflict on the way to Jerusalem; some Pharisees came to Jesus and asked about the law on divorce. The location of Jesus' ministry could change, but Jesus' inclusive ministry continued, so many people came from different stratas. Thus, the narrator's intention of his inclusive community is depicted through Jesus' ministry.

4.2.4.2.1.4 Jesus in Jerusalem: Matthew 21:1-28:20

In this section, Matthew's depiction of Jesus' ministry in Jerusalem is examined. It is implied that the narrator's depiction of Jesus' ministry took place not only in Jerusalem, but also near Jerusalem in the last week (Mt 21:1-27:66). Finally, Jesus' ministry took place at the crucifixion and after the resurrection in Jerusalem (Mt 28).

Jesus and his disciples approached Jerusalem and came to Bethphage on the Mount of Olives (Mt 21:1). The Mount of Olives was situated just across the Kidron valley from Jerusalem. The narrator's geographical note in Matthew 21:1 indicates that Jesus travelled on the road from Jericho (Mt 20:29) to Jerusalem. As he entered Jerusalem, the crowd also followed Jesus (Mt 21:8-9). The crowd repeatedly proclaimed Jesus as the messianic king. Matthew changed "many people" in Mark 11:8 to "the very large crowd" for a predictive

allusion to the numerous Gentiles that were going to enter the community in Matthew 21:8 (Gundry 1982:410). It implies that Jesus' inclusive ministry was reflected in the Matthean community. In the temple, Jesus cleansed the temple and healed the blind and the lame (Mt 21:10-14). Jesus' healing in the temple underlines his identity as the Son of David. The "blind and lame," had severely restricted access to the temple (probably to the court of the Gentiles) (cf Lev 21:18-19; 2Sam 5:8). Jesus left the temple and stayed overnight in Bethany (Mt 21:17). The narrator informs the reader that at this point a seemingly abrupt departure took place from the Israelite authorities and from the city itself. It was not yet time for the more escalated confrontation concerning the authority that Jesus claimed. The next morning, Jesus was on his way back to the temple (Mt 21:18). Jesus entered Jerusalem's temple court, and while he was teaching, the chief priests and the elders of the people came to him (Mt 21:23). The narrator informs the reader that Jesus' authority to teach (Mt 7:29), to heal and forgive (Mt 9:6, 8) was inclusive of all kinds of people, but the chief priests and the elders of the people refused to let Jesus' inclusive ministry take place. The narrator emphasizes Jesus' inclusive ministry through his teaching on the parable of the wedding banquet (Mt 22:1-13). The wedding hall was filled with guests (Mt 22:10). The guests probably included Gentiles, male and female, of any social stratification level and the poorest of the poor (Carter 2000a: 437; see Levine 1988:211-215; Hagner 1995:631) (see chapter 4.2.4. 2.3). This is strong evidence that Matthew's interpretation of Jesus' ministry was not egalitarian. The same day, the Sadducees came to Jesus and questioned him (Mt 22:23).

In Matthew 23:1 there is no indication of any change of place or time. Jesus instructed the crowds and his disciples about the indictment of his opponents. The narrator notes that the religious leaders were not in favour of inclusiveness because they liked to sit in important seats and the Pharisees were also called blind guides (Mt 23:26; see Mt 15:14). Jesus was in the temple (Mt 21:23-23:39). Jesus left the temple and sat on the Mount of Olives (Mt 24:1,3). Geographically the narrator notices that Jesus was outside the city of Jerusalem, overlooking the temple (on the Mount of Olives).

While Jesus was in Bethany at the home of a man known as Simon the Leper, an unnamed

woman came to him and poured very expensive perfume on his head (Mt 26:6-7). This anointing possibly has Messianic overtones (Anderson 2001:40). The disciples misunderstood the woman's action. However, Jesus explained that she had prepared him for burial (Mt 26:12). This unnamed woman's position was not high in Israelite society. She succeeded, but the disciples failed, as her actions brought honour for her but shame to the disciples (Anderson 2001:41). The narrator clearly tells the reader that Jesus' inclusive ministry encompassed even an unnamed woman. The position of the woman, who was Jesus' disciple was not higher than that of any other male disciple (cf Keener 1997:366).

Jesus ate the last supper with his disciples (Mt 26:17-29). By identifying his own mission with the Passover, Jesus indicates that he has come to enact the new redemption and new exodus promised by the biblical prophets (Keener 1997:367). It is the narrator's reference to the institution of a new covenant. Jesus spoke of his blood as the sign of the covenant, as his blood was poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins (Hagner 1995:773; Charette 1992:77). Jesus' blood was indicative of the inclusion of all people through salvation. Jesus said to his disciples: "After I am raised up, I will go ahead of you to Galilee" (Mt 26:32).

The narrator says the crucifixion of Jesus on Golgotha (Mt 27:33) completed (fulfilled) his inclusive mission. Jesus' arrest took place at Gethsemane (Mt 26:36). Gethsemane was probably on the Mount of Olives (Mt 26:30) (see Carter 2000a:510). In this place, Jesus prayed to God and focused on the obedience of the Son, as he accepted whatever the Father required. Judas came to Jesus and kissed him. It was a signal to those who were with him that the man was Jesus. Then all the disciples of Jesus left him (Mt 26:56). This is the beginning of the passion. A large crowd, sent by the chief priests and the elders of the people to arrest Jesus, took him to the house of Caiaphas, the high priest (Mt 26:57). The narrator tells us that 'the scribes and the elders were gathered together. This appears to be a reference to the Sanhedrin, the highest council in the land.'⁵³ Peter disowned Jesus during his trial by the Jerusalem council under Caiaphas (see Mt 26:69). The servant girl (Mt 26:69, 71) had perhaps been among the crowds who had seen Jesus teaching and recognized Peter as having been with him (Hagner 1995:806). The narrator clearly indicated Pilate's authorizing⁵⁴ of Jesus'

crucifixion (Mt 27:26). They condemned Jesus for blasphemy and they crucified him (Mt 27:35). Romans crucified their victims naked and public nakedness caused shame (Brown 1994:870). Jesus cried with a loud voice and gave up his spirit (Mt 27:50). The death of Jesus, the righteous one, bears for sinners the righteous wrath of God against sin. The narrator notes that Jesus' death on the cross was the point of completion of his inclusive ministry as his death has the power to save people from sin (Bauer 1988:102). Jesus' crucifixion is also maintained for Matthew's inclusively structured community.

The narrator says that the women who had followed Jesus from Galilee and had served him, were watching him die on the cross from a distance (Mt 27:55-57). This scene also indicates that these women cared for Jesus on his journey from Galilee up to Jerusalem (Anderson 2001:42-43; Osiek 2001:220). It implies that Jesus' inclusive ministry started in Galilee and his mission was completed when he died on the cross in Jerusalem. Moreover, women (two Marys) were also at the burial (Mt 27:61) and went to the tomb to "anoint" the body of Jesus (Mt 28:1).

Jesus was buried in a tomb, made by a man from Arimathea, named Joseph, and the women were witnesses to it (Mt 27:57-60) (see Osiek 2001:205-220). After the Sabbath, Jesus was raised from the dead (Mt 28:6). The women were invited into the tomb to see where Jesus "lay" as proof that the body was not there. He had gone ahead to Galilee; where the disciples would see him (Mt 28:7, 10). The narrator depicts the inclusive ministry of Jesus as ending with the disciples back in Galilee (Mt 28:16), where the story began and where they became his disciples. Here, the narrator emphasizes that Jesus' inclusive mission was handed over to his disciples' communities (Mt 28:18-20). The disciples are to "go" and "make disciples" of "all the nations," it is implied that Jesus' ministry was a universal mission. Waetjen (1976:256-257) says that the great commission was not only a duty for the eleven disciples, but as Jesus joined himself to the company of the eleven, it was no longer an individual mission to make new disciples; it became a duty for the disciples' communities. Therefore, each disciple's community was also an inclusive group for all kinds of stratification people.

In summary: the narrator's designation of Jesus' ministry in Jerusalem and its surroundings

was not very different from the ministry in Galilee. His inclusive ministry was activated from both Galilee and Jerusalem and its surroundings in Matthew's narrative. The religious leaders tried to obstruct Jesus' ministry in both the Galilee and Jerusalem areas. A slight difference is that Jesus' inclusive ministry succeeded better in Galilee than in Jerusalem. The crowd followed Jesus from Galilee. Jesus also healed people in the temple (Mt 21:14). The religious leaders were opposed to Jesus. Jesus' ministry was completed when he died on the cross. The disciples went back to Galilee as the new Israel for inclusive mission community. Hence, Jesus' inclusive ministry is reflected in Matthew's community as an inclusively structured society.

4.2.4.2.2 Specific settings in which Jesus' activities took place

From the above section, it is clear that the narrator's depiction of Jesus' inclusive ministry took place in Galilee, on the way to Jerusalem and in Jerusalem and its surroundings. In this section, the discussion focuses more specifically on certain spatial references in Matthew that can be seen as "settings in settings," like a city (village, town), a mountain, a boat and synagogue in Galilee, or a mountain, a house and the temple in Jerusalem (see Van Eck 1995:270 with regard to Mark).

The narrator's settings where Jesus' inclusive ministry of teaching, healing and exorcism took place are looked at in Galilee, on the way to and in Jerusalem. Jesus' ministry took place within the spatial reference of a city (village, town), houses, synagogues, mountains, boats and temples. In Jerusalem, Jesus' ministry took place on the mountain and in a house, but most evenings and at night Jesus was ministering outside the city of Jerusalem. The purpose of the discussion of these "settings in settings" is to discern whether there was a difference between Jesus' ministry in Galilee and Jerusalem. These settings are as below:

4: 23 ἐν ὅλη τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ

ἐν ταῖς

συναγωγαῖς

5: 1	εἰς τὸ ὄρος,
8: 5 εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ	
8: 6	ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ
8: 14	εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν
8: 23	εἰς τὸ πλοῖον
8: 28 εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γαδαρηνῶν	
9: 1	εἰς πλοῖον εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν πόλιν
9: 7	εἰς τὸν οἶκον
9: 10	ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ
9: 23	εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν
9: 28	εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν
9: 35 τὰς πόλεις πάσας καὶ τὰς κώμας	ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς
12: 9	εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν
13: 2	εἰς πλοῖον
13: 36	εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν

13: 54 εἰς τὴν πατρίδα

ἐν τῇ

συναγωγῇ

14: 13

ἐν πλοίῳ

ἔρημον

14: 32

εἰς τὸ

πλοῖον

14: 33

ἐν τῷ

πλοίῳ

14: 34 εἰς Γεννησαρέτ

15: 21 εἰς τὰ μέρη Τύρου καὶ Σιδῶνος

15: 29 τῆς Γαλιλαίας

εἰς τὸ

ὄρος

15: 39

εἰς τὸ

πλοῖον

εἰς τὰ ὄρια Μαγαδάν

16: 13 εἰς τὰ μέρη

Καισαρείας

17: 1

εἰς ὄρος

17: 24 εἰς Καφαρναούμ

17: 25

εἰς τὴν

οἰκίαν

21: 1

εἰς Βηθφαγή

εἰς τὸ

ὄρος τῶν ἔλαιων

21: 12

εἰς τὸ ἱερόν

21: 14		ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ
21: 17	εἰς Βηθανίαν	
21: 23		εἰς τὸ ἱερόν
24: 1		ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ
24: 3		ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους τῶν ἔλαιῶν
26: 6	ἐν Βηθανίᾳ	
		ἐν οἰκίᾳ
26: 36	Γεθσημανὶ	
26: 55		ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ
26: 58		τῆς αὐλῆς τοῦ ἀρχιερέως
26: 61		τὸν ναόν
27: 5		εἰς τὸν ναόν
27: 33	Γολγοθᾶ	
28: 16	εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν	
		εἰς τὸ ὄρος

According to the above tabulation, the narrator informs the reader that Jesus' ministry took place in the city, in a house, synagogue, on a mountain, on a boat and in the temple as spatial structures of certain "settings in settings" in Matthew's Gospel. This inclusive ministry is reported in Matthew 4:23 to 17:25 and clearly indicates that Jesus' inclusive ministry activities covered Galilee and its surroundings. In the last half of the Matthean narrative, from 21:1 to 28:16, Jesus' ministry took place on a mountain, in a house and in the temple. However, most of Jesus' ministry took place around the temple.

The narrator's point of view of Jesus' inclusive ministry can be looked at from the perspective of the above spatial structure. The narrator informs the reader that Jesus started his ministry in Galilee (Mt 4:23). Jesus went up a mountain and taught his disciples there (Mt 5:1). Matthew 5:1-2 could be directly related to the tradition of Moses' enthronement on Sinai: "the image of Moses sitting on Sinai, whether on a throne or some other seat, was

firmly established in the imagination of pre-Christian Jews. It was therefore a resource Matthew could have utilized, had he wished” (Allison 1993:179; see the above). Jesus sits on the mountain (the Moses sitting on Sinai) and taught people concerning the inclusiveness of the Kingdom of God. All the references to “the mountain” (Mt 4:8; 5:1-2; 15:29; 17:1-2) indicate that Jesus’ teaching and ministry included all people in the kingdom of God. The narrator tells the reader that Jesus came down from the mountain (Mt 8:1) and entered Capernaum (Mt 8:5). Jesus healed the servant of a centurion. Without a change in location Jesus entered Simon Peter’s house and healed Peter’s mother-in-law (Mt 8:14-15). When evening came, people who were demon-possessed and those who had suffered from many diseases were brought to Jesus and he healed them as well (Mt 8:16). Then Jesus got into the boat and his disciples followed him (Mt 8:23). The above discussion indicates that Matthew’s interpretation of Jesus’ ministry includes all kinds of people from different strata.

The narrator reports that Jesus moved into the region of the Gadarenes (Mt 8:28). Jesus met two demon-possessed men and he drove out the demons (Mt 8:28-34). Jesus got into a boat and crossed over to his home town where he healed a paralytic man (Mt 9:1-7). Jesus had dinner at Matthew’s house; many tax collectors and sinners came and ate with him (Mt 9:10). Jesus revived a dead girl and a woman who had been bleeding for twelve years (Mt 9:18-26). The majority of commentators argue that she was marginalised in Israelite society because of both gender and purity regulations (see Levine 2001a:70-77). However, Jesus healed her without any consideration of the purity regulation. Jesus entered a house and two blind men came to him; he healed them (Mt 9:27-30).

Jesus entered their synagogue and healed many sick people (Mt 12:9, 15, 22). On the same day (it has connections with Mt 12:15-50; see Carter 2000a: 282), Jesus came out of the house, got into a boat and taught the crowds (Mt 13:1). The narrator tells the reader that Jesus moved to his home town and taught the people in their synagogue (Mt 13:54). Jesus crossed over to Gennesaret and healed people (Mt 14:34-36). Jesus entered the region of Tyre and Sidon (Mt 15:21). He healed the Canaanite woman’s daughter (Mt 15:22-28). Jesus left there and sat on a mountainside, which was near the Sea of Galilee (Mt 15:29). The narrator tells the reader

that Jesus also healed the lame, the blind, the crippled and the mute (Mt 15:30). Jesus moved to Magadan (Mt 15:39). Jesus went to the region of Caesarea Philippi (Mt 16:13) and he and his disciples arrived in Capernaum (Mt 17:24).

The narrator's description of Jesus' inclusive ministry took place in Galilee in cities, in a house, in a synagogue, and on the mountain. The narrator's native point of view of Jesus' ministry in Galilee as "settings in settings" also confirms that Jesus' ministry was an inclusive one. Jesus' ministry repeated the same pattern as he moved around in the city of Galilee, in the house, on the Mount, in a synagogue and in the boat where he was teaching, healing and driving out demons, thereby including people. There is strong evidence that Jesus' inclusive ministry took place within a stratified society; it was a reflection that the Matthean community was not an egalitarian structured society. The narrator's depiction of this kind of Jesus' inclusive ministry is a reflection that his own community is an inclusive structured society.

Next, we look at Jesus' inclusive ministry in Jerusalem as depicted elsewhere than in Matthew's Gospel (21:1-28:16). In the Gospel of Mark, Jesus' activities in Jerusalem are portrayed as taking place in the temple (see Van Eck 1995:275-276). Jesus did not stay at the temple at night; in the evenings he always left the city to stay outside Jerusalem (Mk 11:1, 12; 14:13). It also indicated that Jesus' ministry did not take place outside Jerusalem (at night). However, the Gospel of Matthew differs from that of Mark. The narrator of Matthew also claims that Jesus went outside the city of Jerusalem at night but the narrator emphasizes that Jesus' inclusive ministry took place in the temple as well (cf Mt 21:14). The narrator of Mark emphasizes the conflict between Jesus and his opponents in some parts of Jerusalem.

Hence, Jesus' ministry took place in Galilee and in Jerusalem and the purpose was to include all kinds of people, who came from different social levels. Jesus' inclusive ministry was more limited in Jerusalem than in Galilee. His antagonists tried to maintain the stratification of their society.

To recap, Jesus' ministry took place in Galilee and in Jerusalem and the ministry was inclusive of all kinds of people. In Galilee, Jesus' inclusive ministry took place in the city, a

house, a synagogue, on a mountain and in a boat. In Jerusalem, Jesus' inclusive ministry took place on a mountain, in a house and in the temple. However, most of Jesus' inclusive ministry took place in the temple in some parts of Jerusalem. Hence, the purpose of Jesus' ministry in both Galilee and Jerusalem was to include all people in the spatial structure of Matthew's Gospel as in the context of his inclusive community.

4.2.4.2.3 Referential spatial designations

The most important point of Matthew's spatial references indicates that Jesus' ministry took place in order to include people into the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ (kingdom of God) (cf Mt 4:17). The kingdom of God is not indicated as a physical place. It is God's active domain of salvation (Du Toit 2000:545; Luz 1980:485).

Hence, the narrator describes how Jesus proclaimed the kingdom of God through teaching, preaching and healing. The narrator designates Jesus' inclusive teachings as follows:

- preparation for inclusive ministry (baptism and temptation) (Mt 3:16-17; 4:1-11);
- Jesus' proclamation that the kingdom of heaven is near (Mt 4:17);
- the healing of various diseases and driving out demons (Mt 4:23, 24; 8:2-4, 5-13, 14-15, 16, 28-34; 9:2-7, 18-26, 20-22, 27-31, 33, 35; 12:10-13, 15, 22; 14:35-36; 15:22-28, 30-31; 17:14-20; 19:2; 20:29-34; 21:14);
- teaching (Mt 5:1-7:29; 10:1; 13:2; 13:54; 22:2-14; 23:1-39);
- the forgiving of sins (Mt 9:2);
- eating with sinners and tax collectors (Mt 9:10);
- the claim that the Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath (Mt 12:8);
- "whoever does the will of my Father in heaven is my brother and sister and mother" (Mt 12:50);
- feeding those who are hungry (Mt 14:13-21; 15:32-38);
- Jesus' walking on the water (Mt 14:25);
- Jesus' acceptance of a little child (Mt 18:2-3; 19:13-15);

- Jesus' crucifixion (this completed his proclamation of the kingdom of heaven for the salvation all people) with his followers from Galilee present (Mt 27:35, 55-56);
- Jesus' commanding of his disciples to do God's will (to make disciples of all nations) (Mt 28:19).

In both Galilee and Jerusalem, the purpose of Jesus' ministry was to proclaim the kingdom of God. Its purpose was to proclaim the inclusion of all people. Hence, the narrator's point of view of Jesus' ministry is that it includes people as members of the kingdom of God (e.g., Mt 5:3, 10). Jesus' ministry took place in three ways. Healing was a significant method to include sick people. The sick people were unclean, but Jesus healed them and included them in his group of followers (cf Mt 4:25; 8:1; 9:1; 20:34; 27:55; see Kingsbury 1978b:56-73). Secondly, Jesus' ministry took place through his teaching. The Sermon on the Mount for example, functions as an admission to Matthew's community.

A closer look at Jesus' inclusive teachings reveals the following: The purpose of the parable of the wedding banquet (Mt 22:1-14) was to teach about the kingdom of God. The king invited all kinds of people, that is anyone whom his slaves could find (Mt 22:9). According to Carter (2000:436), the word "anyone" is an indication of the lower social class, and the Matthean community's mission was the inclusion of all people. Moreover, Jesus ate with the tax collectors and sinners (Mt 9:10). Finally, Jesus' inclusive ministry was completed when he died on the cross (Mt 27:35) and with his command to make disciples of all nations (28:18-20). These verses indicate that Jesus' death completed his inclusive mission, and that his command was an extension of his inclusive ministry through the community of the disciples. Therefore, the picture the narrator paints of Jesus' ministry is that it included people from Galilee to Jerusalem. One can therefore conclude that Jesus' inclusive ministry is a dominant theme in the Gospel of Matthew.

4.3 Conclusion

The narrator's point of view is presented here in terms of emic data to the reader in the Gospel of Matthew. The narrator informs the reader that Jesus Christ is the protagonist of the narrative and that his ministry is for the salvation of his people according to God's will in the context of their community. Hence, Matthew's context of his inclusive structured community depicted through Jesus was started by his inclusive salvation ministry. The preparation for Jesus' ministry indicated that he was truly the Son of God. The disciples were supportive and helped in Jesus' inclusive ministry. Jesus' ministry was targeted at the crowds (both Israelites and Gentiles). The religious leaders (the elite) were opposed to Jesus' inclusive ministry. Jesus' inclusive ministry started in Galilee and it reached its completion at his death on the cross at Jerusalem. In Jerusalem, the antagonists obstructed Jesus, but he completed his inclusive ministry there.

The narrator presents space as settings of interest: Galilee, on the way to Jerusalem, Jerusalem and its surroundings. The narrator indicates space more specifically: the city, synagogue, mountain, house, temple and so forth. In Galilee, Jesus' ministry was successful through healing, teaching and preaching. The narrator presents a picture to the readers showing the inclusive ministry in Galilee that the beneficiaries of the salvation are no longer only the physical descendants of Abraham and are also no longer restricted to the physical land of Israel (Charette 1992:82). Jesus came to save his people from their sins and included members of a new Israel (cf Mt 1:21). Jesus' ministry was intended to provide new membership to his people as the people of God in the context of Matthew's community. God's people include both Israelites and Gentiles through Jesus' salvation. On the way to Jerusalem, Jesus' ministry continued to include people through healing. The religious leaders opposed Jesus' inclusive ministry, but the crowd continued to follow him on his journey to Jerusalem. In Jerusalem and its surrounds, Jesus healed people and completed his inclusive ministry.

Hence, it is clearly understood that the narrator of Matthew's Gospel presents the structure of space as Jesus' inclusive ministry from Galilee to Jerusalem. Jesus' ministry was to include people through salvation; it was God's will that his people be saved. There are different

conflicts between Jesus and his opponents in the Gospels of Matthew and Mark. In the Gospel of Mark, Jesus' inclusive ministry is rejected by the religious leaders in Jerusalem, but not in Galilee (Kingsbury 1989:63-88). In Matthew's Gospel, Jesus' inclusive ministry is opposed by religious leaders from Galilee to Jerusalem, but Jesus' inclusive ministry was still open through salvation (see Freyne 2001:308; Catchpole 1992:271-279). The reason for the opposition to Jesus' inclusive ministry was that the religious leaders did not want to alter the stratification in their society, which might threaten their status.

This analysis of the narrative point of view leads one to conclude that Matthew's depiction of Jesus' inclusive ministry was for all people in the whole region from Galilee to Jerusalem. The religious leaders opposed Jesus' inclusive ministry, because they wanted to keep the social stratification intact and centred on the temple and ideologically supportive of hierarchical relationships. This means that Jesus' inclusive ministry took place within some aspect of an egalitarian structured society. However, Jesus completed his inclusive ministry when he died on the cross in Jerusalem. Jesus' inclusive ministry is a dominant perspective in Matthew's narrative. The narrator's narrative structure of Jesus's inclusive ministry reflected the context of Matthew's inclusive structure community. In the next chapter, we will look in more detail at Matthew's intention of his inclusive community through Jesus' inclusive ministry by means of a social scientific reading. The emic study of Jesus' inclusive ministry also forms the basis of the next Chapter.

¹ I use the concept of an "ideological perspective" to refer to what literary studies refer to as a "point of view". According to Van Aarde (1991:105-107), the ideological perspective is that from which the narrator/implied author observes the story-stuff of the narrative world and evaluates (selects and combines) it, with the result that the narrated world is arranged in a plot as an orchestration to the ideal/implied reader.

² The structural investigation of Matthew's gospel has been done in three ways. The earliest perspective divided the Gospel according to the *geographical or chronological* features in the text. Scholars such as Allen and Grensted (1929) used this approach. The twentieth-century investigation adopted some form of *topical* outline. This perspective was followed by Bacon's (1930) programmatic work, which divides the Gospel according to the alternation of narrative and discourse material. The third focus was on conceptual structure, which is in favour of an arrangement that builds around some crucial theme or concept (Strecker 1967, 1971; Trilling 1968; Thompson 1974; Meier 1975).

³ According to Van Aarde (1997:133), the poetics of the Gospel of Matthew displays two explicit topographical (temporal) levels, the pre-paschal and post-paschal (see more detail in Chapter 2).

⁴ For instance, according to Matera (1987:243-246), the kernels of Matthew's plot are a) the birth of Jesus (Mt 2:1), b) the beginning of Jesus' ministry (Mt 4:12-17), c) the question of John the Baptist (Mt 11:2-6), d) Jesus'

conversation at Caesarea Philippi (Mt 16:13-28), e) the cleansing of the Temple (Mt 21:1-17), f) the Great Commission (Mt 28:16-20). Matera's (1987:252-253) view of the above kernels of Matthew's plot concerns Israel's rejection of the Messiah and the reason for the spreading of the gospel to the Gentiles.

⁵ I combined into one what Combrink designated as two parts: the last week in and near Jerusalem (Mt 21:1-27:66) and the resurrection and appearances of the Lord (Mt 28: 1-20). I also designated Jesus' preparation for his ministry as one structure (Mt 2:23-4:11). According to some, this division is in keeping with Mark's geographical outline. Kingsbury divided Matthew as follows: the person of Jesus Messiah (Mt 1:1-4:16), the proclamation of Jesus Messiah (Mt 4:17-16:20), and the suffering, death and resurrection of Jesus Messiah (Mt 16:21-28:20). Kingsbury's division is a combination of Christological perspectives (see Chapter 2). However, some disagree with Kingsbury that Matthew 4:12 is the start of the Galilean ministry of Jesus (Anderson 1909: xxi; Farmer 1982: 138-140; Harrison 1964: 159). Some regard this to be 4:17 (Battenhouse 1937: 93; Robinson 1928:xix; Schweizer 1975:5), or 5:1 (Davidson: I, 345). It is argued that the journey of the ministry to Jerusalem starts in 19:1 (Anderson 1909:21; Farmer 1982:138-140; Harrison 1964:160) but other scholars also believe it to be at 16:13 (Klostermann 1971: contents page), in 16:21 (Senior 1977:15-16), and in 17:1 (Robinson 1928: ix-xx; Bauer 1988:23). I have explained some perspectives of Matthew's structural division. I will follow the geographical outline of Matthew.

⁶ The city of Nazareth is unknown in the Old Testament or any source earlier than the New Testament documents (Luz 1989:39).

⁷ The perspective of the messiah's connection with Nazareth is primarily concerned with the Old Testament situation. For instance, the discourse of Mt 2:13-23 is a reflection of Moses' exodus from Egypt (Erickson 1996: 13).

⁸ In Herod's attempt to kill the infant King, we encounter evil for the first time in the narrative. In Matthew's perspective, evil continually stands in opposition to the purposes of God (Luz 1989:43).

⁹ Carter's perspective is a socio-political one on Matthew's community, namely that Jesus was rejected by the central elite political and religious powers in Jerusalem.

¹⁰ It is evident from Qumran (4QFlor 10-14; 4QpsDanAa) that the title "son of God" had clear messianic significance in Israelism prior to the New Testament period. Jesus had sonship and messianic identity. Yet, as we see in the voice coming from heaven after the baptism, Jesus is called to be obedient not only as a Son but also as a Servant (Hagner 1993:69).

¹¹ My understanding of Sonship is the divine titles as "Lord", "God" and "Father". According to Mowery (1997:642-656), the narrator especially depicted the Lordship of Jesus in Matthew 1 and 2 (cf 1:20, 22, 24; 2:13,15, 19).

¹² The Son of God is not only the one revealed from heaven (cf 2:15; 16:16; 17:5) but especially the obedient one who subjects himself to God's will (Luz 1989:180).

¹³ According to Senior, the death scene has become a challenge to Jesus' Sonship as "Lord". Jesus' temptation story in Matthew also indicates that it foreshadows both Jesus' suffering and vindication as Son of God (Donaldson 1985:99-101).

¹⁴ The narrator of Matthew's Gospel presents a series of reliable witnesses to disclose the true identity of Jesus to the reader as Jesus the Christ, Son of Abraham, Son of David, Emmanuel, King of the Jews, Shepherd, the Coming One, the Son of God (Bauer 1988:77-83).

¹⁵ Jesus' words of "repent, for the kingdom of heaven is near" is an echo of John's message recorded in Matthew 3:2. John and Jesus therefore stand in continuity, and the message of John to the Israelite is equally a message to Matthew's community (Hagner 1993:47). However, Luz (1989:197) did not agree with the above view. Jesus begins his proclamation of the coming kingdom of heaven. He quotes verbatim the proclamation of John the Baptist (Mt 3:2). But the kingdom of heaven becomes clearly an entity which is still in the future (not until and only in Matthew 11:12 and 12:28 does the reader learn that it begins already now). Kingsbury (1989 [1975]:128-149) had a completely different interpretation of "the kingdom of God": according to him, the present and the future aspects are of equal value; the kingdom is growing in the time of Jesus, which Kingsbury counts from the

birth to the parousia (Mt 28:20).

¹⁶ Senior (Senior 1999:1-23) observed that Matthew's Gospel has a relative lack of attention of relationship with the Gentile world. He argued that the Gentile mission has a more prominent role in Matthew's narrative than a historical location between Israelite and Gentile worlds. By contrast, Carter (2004:259-282) believed that Matthew's Gospel concerning the Gentile world is much larger than the current debate recognizes.

¹⁷ Charette (1992:73) notes that "Jesus' ministry in Galilee is presented as the fulfillment of the salvation in Isaiah 8:22-9:2, which concerns the bright light that will break in upon the people who live in darkness."

¹⁸ The phrase "Galilee of the Gentiles" was a common designation for Galilee, resulting from what had historically been a rather large Gentile population (Schnackenburg 2002:40; Hagner 1993:73). According to Luz (1989:200), "for Matthew, the ecclesiological dimension evidently belongs to the history of proclamation of the ministry of Jesus. For this reason it has to become clear in the prologue also that the result and goal of the arrival of Jesus, the Son of God, in Galilee is the origin of the community. "Galilee of the Gentiles" is the place of origin of the community". However, we have already confirmed that the location of Matthew's community was the city of Antioch (see chapter 3).

¹⁹ The Sea of Galilee is called the lake of Gennesaret in Luke 5:1 and the Sea of Tiberias in John 12:1).

²⁰ In contrast, Jesus' healing and exorcism ministry in Matthew 4:17-23 demonstrates that God's authority is opposed by Satan's/Rome's control (Carter 2004:268).

²¹ Luz (1989:201) also agrees with this view of the break with the family. Jesus called his disciples not only in the emphatic "immediately" in the description of the leaving of nets and father, but also in the significance which the leaving of the physical father, in favor of obedience to the heavenly Father, has in the Gospel of Matthew as a whole (cf 8:21; 10:35-37; 19:29; 23:9).

²² Verse 23 is repeated almost word for word in 9:35. The only differences (besides the addition of ὁ Ἰησοῦς in 9:35) are that 9:35 has "all the cities and villages" for "the whole of Galilee" and omits the final words "among the people." According to Hagner (1993:79), if in 9:35, Matthew is not copying his own earlier summary, he may reflect a traditional summary that the ministry of Jesus might have contained in oral tradition. The summary of 9:35 may function as an inclusion with the present passage, enclosing the account of Jesus' teaching in chapters 5-7 and his healing in chapters 8-9. By the contrast, Luz (1989:203; cf Schniewind 1956:36) also believed that verse 23 is repeated almost word for word in 9:35. Verse 23 anticipated even the structure of these chapters: "the Messiah of the word, the preaching one", is described in chapters 5-7, "the Messiah of the deed, the healing one", in chapters 8-9.

²³ The teaching of Jesus "in their synagogues" indicates two things: Jesus turns to Israel and teaches as a teacher of Israel, in the synagogue (just as his miracles are meant for the chosen people). By contrast, "their synagogues" makes clear that the evangelist and his community have their own place outside these synagogues (see chapter 2.2). The synagogue refers to the assembly of the people as a religious, social and political meeting place (Rapinchuk 2004:214; Horsley 1999:71)

²⁴ It is clear that among the crowds there were true disciples in addition to the twelve special disciples. According to Davies and Allison (1988:419), the crowds in Matthew serve several functions. First and foremost, they follow Jesus wherever he goes and thereby show him to be a charismatic figure, indeed a sensation (Mt 4:25; 8:1,18; 11:7; 12:46; 15:30; 17:14; 19:2). Secondly, as an audience they are open and receptive, for they respond to the Messiah with amazement, astonishment, and reverential fear (Mt 9:8; 12:23; 15:31; 22:23). They, in fact, hold Jesus to be like John the Baptist (Mt 14:5; 21:26), a prophet (Mt 21:11,46), and they bless him when he enters the holy city (Mt 21:9). Thirdly, they are contrasted with the Pharisees (Mt 9:33-34; 15:1-10; 23:1). Jesus condemns the Jewish leaders, but he has compassion on the multitudes (Mt 9:36; 14:14; 15:32). Fourthly in Matthew 13:36 and 14:22-23 the crowd is clearly distinguished from the disciples, and there are places in Matthew where Jesus delivers esoteric teaching (Mt 16:21-28, 18:24-25). The crowd, then, cannot represent the church. Finally, the crowd is implicated in Jesus' death (Mt 26:47, 55; 27:20, 24).

²⁵ According to Hagner (1993:193-194; Luz 1989:456), Matthew's addition of "their" to "scribes" indicates a distance between the Israelite Christians of Matthew's community and the rabbinic authorities of the synagogue. This is an indication that the separation between the community and Israelism has already taken place: the scribes are on one side. The people who are astonished stand in the middle between "their" scribes and Jesus.

²⁶ Schnackenburg notes that “God’s guarantee of forgiveness and salvation, which Jesus proclaims, also generates a strong moral call to the disciples of Christ. The evangelist, who sees the defects and weaknesses in his community, inserts the new ethos of those who await the reign of God as an inalienable, integral part of his theology. This ethos is condensed in the programmatic address of the “Sermon on the Mount.” In contrast to Israelism with its legal piety, Jesus calls for a “righteousness” that surpasses that of the scribes and Pharisees (Mt 5:20). Jesus proclaims a morality, made possible through God’s boundless mercy, grounded in trust in his Father, and transcending legal prescriptions, that is directed to the love of God and reaches from love of siblings and love of neighbors all the way to love of enemies (Mt 5:43-48). The righteousness given and required by God, which is on a higher level than that of human beings, stamps Matthew’s attitude of piety (Mt 6:1-18). The quest for it makes all earthly concerns secondary, and overrules them (Mt 6:33). The execution of the will of God, or love in action, which is to be practiced in the community (reconciliation and forgiveness, Mt 5:23-24; 6:14-15; 18:31-35) and toward all people (works of mercy, Mt 25:31-46), ties the revelation of God and Christ to the practice of Christian living.”

²⁷ This view is not confirmed about the persecution of the Matthean community by the Roman Empire or its relationship with Israelism within the community (see Shin 1999:3-42).

²⁸ A skin disease was an important problem within society. It resulted in isolation from Jerusalem and other walled cities, and great social stigma was inevitable (Davies and Allison 1991:11; cf Plich 1986:102; 1988:62; Malina & Rohrbaugh 1992:71; see Vledder 1997:177).

²⁹ Galilee was under the rule of the tetrarch Herod Antipas and not under Roman rule during the ministry of Jesus (Gundry 1982:141; see Hagner 1993:203).

³⁰ It is still arguable whether it was the centurion’s son or servant. Matthew’s *παῖς* is probably to be taken as “son” rather than “servant” (*δοῦλος*), although the latter is far from impossible. If the *παῖς* was a servant and not a son, he was a servant very close to his master. This view is also a problem, as it was not an uncommon phenomenon in the ancient world (Hagner 1993:204).

³¹ A centurion in the Roman army was not a very high-ranking officer. A centurion was a person in authority in charge of 100 soldiers (see Harrington 1991:113; Martin 1978:14-22).

³² Roman soldiers participated in pagan religious oaths to the divine emperor (Jones 1971:212).

³³ Most Matthean scholars agree that Gadara was a pagan country (Patte 1987: 124; Gnilka 1986:321; Sanders & Davies 1989:169; Harrington 1991:120; Hare 1967:96; Vledder 1997:195).

³⁴ It was a predominantly Gentile region, as is shown by the reference to the herd of pigs, which would not be found in an Israelite area (Morris 1992:208).

³⁵ The interpretation of “to bury my father”, is that it is in the sense of “look after him until he dies” (for evidence that the phrase could have been understood in this sense) (Bailey’s (1980:26-27). This is required by the Torah.

³⁶ Scholars’ views are different against the interpretation of the dead. Scholars such as Luz (2001:19; see Gundry 1982:153) believed that it means really dead. However some other scholars (Keener 1997:180; Morris 1992:203; Davies and Allison 1991:56) believed that it means spiritually dead.

³⁷ The Israelite view of sickness is that it is a direct result of particular sins. Hence, Jesus explicitly forgave a paralytic man’s sins (Davies and Allison 1991:89).

³⁸ A sinner was identified, distinguished, and disapproved as one of those not living in accord with a group’s claims (Carter 2000:219). A sinner was considered to be someone outside Israelite society.

³⁹ Mark and Luke give him a name: Jairus. The word ‘a ruler’ can be translated in various ways: “a synagogue official”, “a president of the synagogue”, “one of the officials”, “a Jewish official”, His position as a synagogue official is probably correct (Morris 1992:228).

⁴⁰ “Lost sheep” here refers not to a portion of Israel but to all of Israel (Luz 2002:73; Hagner 1993:270).

⁴¹ Sim’s (1996:171-195) view is opposed to that of Duling. Sim believed that the Matthean “Christian Jewish” community must have required circumcision for male Gentile proselytes.

⁴² However, the interpretation of an only Israel mission differs in particularism. According to the salvation history perspective, which sees a clear distinction between the time of Jesus’ earthly ministry and the time following the resurrection and thus a movement from particularism to universalism: in the former, only Israel is in view; in the latter, the Gentiles are also in the view (Hagner 1993:271; Luz 2001:73).

⁴³ It is not really Jesus’ saying but it is the First Evangelist’s intention of his narrative.

⁴⁴ According to Luz (2001:187), Matthew writes here from the perspective of his reader or of his community that no longer belongs to the synagogue.

⁴⁵ The house that Jesus leaves has not been previously mentioned. It is only in retrospect that the reader notices that the previous story obviously took place in a house. Hagner (1993:368) mentioned that “the house” is probably Peter’s house in Capernaum (cf Mt 8:14).

⁴⁶ By contrast, the number twelve could not refer to the twelve disciples and the twelve tribes of Israel.

⁴⁷ The hand washing is not referring to physical cleanliness but ritual purity. There is no Old Testament reference concerning the ceremonial washing of hands before the eating of ordinary meals. Priests were instructed concerning the washing of hands before performing their temple duties. The rule of ritual purity had perhaps already been widely adopted by the general populace (Hagner 1995:431).

⁴⁸ By contrast, “the mountain” has no established symbolic meaning of Zion, because the mountain is sometimes also called a satanic place (Mt 4:8) and a place of teaching (Mt 5:1; 24:3) (Luz 2001:344).

⁴⁹ In the Markan source this second feeding, taking place in Gentile territory is probably the feeding of Gentiles (Mk 8:2-3). But it is certainly not the case in Matthew (Schnackenburg 2002:152; Luz 2001:345).

⁵⁰ According to Funk and the Jesus seminar (1998:39), it is not originally Jesus’ saying.

⁵¹ “Six days” is as a repetition of Moses’ going up Sinai after six days (Exod 24:16) (Hagner 1995:492).

⁵² By contrast, the rabbinic theory says that the temple tax was no longer collected after the destruction of the temple of Jerusalem (Luz 2001:414).

⁵³ It had seventy-one members of the Sanhedrin, the high priest being its president (Schnackenburg 2002:275).

⁵⁴ Past scholarly tradition is believed to have minimized Pilate’s involvement. A recent study claims that Pilate is a minor character and politically neutral for Jesus’ crucifixion (Carter 2004:275-276; 2003:1-54, 75-99; Bond 1998:129, 133).