

A SENSE OF AUDIENCE IN THE GOSPELS

---

A DISSEPTATION  
SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE  
TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF  
HUMANITIES AND FINE ARTS

BY  
CLETA MILDRED HALL JONES BA, BA, MA

---

DENTON, TEXAS  
AUGUST, 1985

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To Dr. William E. Tanner, who inspired this study and worked diligently to make it come to fruition, I wish to express gratitude for his dynamic, wise leadership. His unstinting gifts of vision, patience, knowledge, and time were magnificently given and humbly received. To Drs. Dean Bishop, Leslie Kreps, Fred Tarpley, and Florence Winston I express my special thanks for their invaluable counsel and gracious encouragement. I wish to thank my dear friend, Jo Hall Church, for her many encouragements and stimulating discussions; moreover, to her and her family, Donald, John, and Joe, I wish to acknowledge my love and appreciation for providing me a warm, Christian home for the duration of this work.

I would like to express my appreciation and gratitude to Dr. Kenneth Pike for his inspiration and cooperation in this study. Through his efforts, Dr. Mildred Larsen of the Summer Institute of Linguistics graciously provided the research materials by Ethel Wallis. I especially thank Mr. and Mrs. A. R. Allsup not only for the Allsup-Lane Scholarship which made this study possible but for their prayers, their example in Christian living, and their love.

Also, to my pastors, Owen and Irene Cain, and the



Romans VIII Ministry of which I am a part, I owe a debt of gratitude for their faithfulness in teaching and living the Word. Their examples of Christian living are my uncited, living commentary on the Gospels. Furthermore, I thank my dear friends Alecia and Florence Winston, Dorothy Castle, and Patricia and Robert Sawyer for their wise, loving, and prayerful encouragement.

To my parents, Walker and Mattie Jones, and to my grandmother, Fannie Jones, who now live beyond the veil of rhetoric in the presence of the Word, I owe ineffable love and gratitude for making our home a branch of the New Testament Church. To my sister, Lilla Jones Carlile, and my brothers, Leo and Thomas Jones, and my second parents, Carlton and Velma Jones, I express my gratitude for nurturing me with family love in the physical absence of our dear mother and father. Though they have not understood the intricacies of the tagmemic deconstruction matrix, the importance of finding new ways to understand the Scriptures has motivated them to cheer me on. Finally, I am indebted to my godchildren, Scott and Buz Sawyer and Carol Church Wood, because their love demands that I practice the principles of Christ's love.

With love and reverence I dedicate this study to  
Matthew's Messiah-king, Mark's suffering Servant,  
Luke's ideal Man, and John's eternal Word. I  
praise Him.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	iii
Chapter	
I. TAGMEMIC PERSPECTIVES OF THE GOSPEL	
AUDIENCES . . . . .	1
II. THE STATIC PERSPECTIVE . . . . .	43
III. THE DYNAMIC PERSPECTIVE . . . . .	93
IV. THE RELATIVE PERSPECTIVE . . . . .	145
V. AUDIENCE UNITY IN THE GOSPELS . . . . .	196
WORKS CITED . . . . .	218

## CHAPTER I

### TAGMEMIC PERSPECTIVES OF THE GOSPEL AUDIENCES

In the beginning was the Word,  
and the Word was with God, and the  
Word was God. The same was in the  
beginning with God. . . . In him was  
life; and the life was the light of  
men. . . . There was a man sent from  
God, whose name was John. The same  
came for a witness, to bear witness  
of the light, that all men through  
him might believe. . . . And the Word  
was made flesh and dwelt among us  
(and we beheld his glory, the glory  
of the only begotten of the Father,)  
full of grace and truth. And John  
bear witness of him, and cried,  
saying, This was he of whom I  
spake. . . . (John 1:1,2,4,6,7,14,15)<sup>1</sup>

The King James Version, one of English literature's  
greatest treasures since 1611, has continued to "capture the  
minds of its readers and to enter into the written language"

(Maier and Tollers 253). Renaissance men of letters produced a version which married together original translations from the Biblical languages with two earlier English Bibles, William Tyndale's (1525) and Miles Coverdale's (1535).

Though the scholarly accuracy of King James' editors has been surpassed by a number of modern translators, the essential validity of the King James Version need not be impugned. No recent translation can be said "to equal or even approach the literary structure" of the King James Version (R. M. Frye 263) because it is "persuasively marked by what Aristotle would call 'the perfection of style,' which is 'to be clear without being mean'" (263).

Furthermore, Tucker Brooke contends that it remains "the perfect and final thing it is because of the genius its translators showed for compromise and lucidity" (Baugh 593).

Even though the literary taste and training of the King James scholars allowed them "to do full justice to the tone and meaning of the Bible" (R. M. Frye 253) and to produce one of such lasting merit, biblical and literary scholars continue to probe, analyze, and evaluate this version to understand better its meaning, structure, and style. One principal interest centers on the four Gospels; Bible and literary scholars generally agree on the purpose of the Gospels, yet they have failed to agree among offered explanations for their differences.

New Testament scholars especially have tried to account for differences among the four Gospels (Wallas "Contrastive Plots" 3). Most scholars acknowledge the power and authority of Jesus's words and recognize this same power and authority in the words of His disciples when these twelve spoke in His name. Perhaps an examination that accounts for the differences in the Gospels by considering a gradual geographical, conceptual, and spiritual expansion of Matthew's, Mark's, Luke's, and John's speaking Christ's words to an ever changing though originally homogenous, audience--an audience that begins with a Jewish one before widening to a universal one--can offer an acceptable explanation for them. Indeed, Christ's last prophecy to His disciples before He ascended to heaven describes the spiraling audience from the locus amoenis of Jerusalem to the ends of the earth: "But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth" (Acts 1:8). A rhetorical analysis of the adjustments made in the Gospels for these audiences in Jerusalem, all Judea, Samaria, and the world may account for observed differences and explain what purposes these differences serve.

A tagmemic analysis of audience can help readers under-

stand those differences by demonstrating that each one was written for a different audience. This study explores the changing audience from the static Judeo-Christian one of Matthew to the universal one of John.

Some literary scholars are convinced by Father Walter J. Ong's argument that the idea of a general reading audience is not plausible. Ong contends that only "The orator has before him an audience which is a true audience, a collectivity" (11). Furthermore, he maintains that "There is no such collective noun for readers" because "'Readers' is a plural" and does not form a collectivity (11). Consequently, Ong concludes that all reading audiences, even those of historians, are projected by their writers and as such are created by their authors' imaginations.<sup>2</sup>

Pike, in speaking of what he conceives to be the "universe of discourse" disagrees with Ong. In speaking of a broadening context in relation to the universe of discourse, Pike specifies that "This [universe of discourse] refers to the general or temporary or permanent frame of reference, either tacit or explicit, within which social interchange is taking place; it can include topic, style, genre, discipline, or general speaker or hearer [emphasis added] . . . ." (Linguistic Concepts 126). In addition, the universe of discourse "can include general relation to the situation in respect to space, time, society . . ."

(126). Even though Pike never specifically refers to a static, dynamic, or universal audience per se, his tagmemic theory of invention contains conceptual, analytical elements which logically apply to what could be termed as static, dynamic, and relative or universal audiences. For this purpose, the tagmemic inventional heuristic is modified here into a tagmemic deconstruction matrix that provides an instrument for deconstructing the texts of the Gospels to ascertain particular features and adjustments their writers included for their preselected audiences. Moreover, in his definition of the universe of discourse, Pike concedes the existence of a universal element of discourse with the possibility of a general speaker [a term which would include a general writer] and a general hearer [or reading audience]. Implicit in his theory is reader based prose (that written with the audience in mind) as opposed to writer based prose (that written with the writer in mind.)

Although Pike's tagmemic theory, when applied to audience, is used generally to generate information for constructing a work, this study will use its conceptual features of particle, wave, and field subject expansion to analyze and to identify rhetorical elements, features, and devices, which have been utilized in the composition of the Gospels and to ascertain their use for achieving identifi-



## The Tagmemic Heuristic

### PARTICLE

<u>Contrast</u>	<u>Variation</u>	<u>Distribution</u>
1) View the unit as an isolated, static entity.  What are its contrastive features, i.e., the features that differentiate it from similar things and serve to identify it?	4) View the unit as a specific variant form of the concept, i.e., as one among a group of instances that illustrate the concept.  What is the <u>range</u> of physical variation of the concept, i.e., how can instances vary without becoming something else?	7) View the unit as part of a larger context.  How is it appropriately or typically classified? What is its typical position in a temporal sequence? In space, i.e., in a scene or geographical array. In a system of classes?

---

### WAVE

2) View the unit as a dynamic object or event.  What physical features distinguish it from similar objects or events? In particular, what is its nucleus?	5) View the unit as a dynamic process.  How is it changing?	8) View the unit as a part of a larger, dynamic context.  How does it interact with and merge into its environment? Are its borders clear-cut or indeterminate?
---	---	---

---

Figure 1

## WAVE

### Contrast

- 3) View the unit as an abstract, multi-dimensional system.

How are the components organized in relation to one another? More specifically, how are they related by class, in class systems, in temporal sequence, and in space?

### Variation

- 6) View the unit as a multidimensional physical system.

How do particular instances of the system vary?

### Distribution

- 9) View the unit as an abstract system within a larger system.

What is its position in the larger system? What systemic features and components make it a part of the larger system?

cation with the audience. In other words these characteristics will provide an orderly method of deconstructing the four Gospels in order to examine evidence that will determine the extent that each Gospel is reader based. Essentially, Pike's tagmemic theory is based on this assumption: underlying all human experience are universal invariants which characterize rationality (Pike, "Beyond the Sentence" 129). From this assumption, Pike argues that to comprehend any subject, one must view it from three different perspectives (Figure 1, 6-7). One first views it from the static perspective, identifying it as a unique particle which is different from everything else yet which has some small degree of variation and distribution into a larger field. Matthew's presentation of Jesus as the Jewish Messiah-king of the kingdom of heaven will be examined to discern its feature which help it achieve stasis. When viewed from stasis, Matthew, the Gospel bridge which spans and unites the Old and New Testaments, links the Jewish religion to Christianity. He presents to a Jewish audience Jesus as Messiah-king who has come in fulfillment of Jewish prophecy by means of the referential use of rhetorical phrases and allusions, titles and terms, selection and arrangement, and forms, thus establishing stasis for the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

The next step in viewing a subject in a threefold

perspective notes processes of change or wave, features which maintain identification although a particular may change and be distributed into an even wider field or matrix. The Gospels of Mark and Luke both represent this process of change in which Jesus, the Jewish Messiah-king, is presented to Roman and Greek audiences as not only the Messiah-king but also as the Son of God who is God's suffering Servant and as the second Adam who has redeemed all men from the penalty of death levied upon them because of the sin of the first Adam. Mark and Luke both achieve this dynamic view of Jesus by referential use of rhetorical phrases and allusions, terms and titles, selection and arrangement, and forms.

Finally, the third of Pike's threefold perspectives of a subject views a subject as a field with unique features, variations, and distributions so that it might be better understood in the context of the larger system of which it is but a part. This third perspective constitutes the relative or universal view. John will be examined for features to ascertain the extent that it presents the relative or universal perspective of the Gospels by presenting Jesus not only as the Son of God but primarily as the Logos, or the Word-of-God-made-flesh. John differs from the other Evangelists because, instead of appealing to his audience with referential use of rhetorical phrases and allusions,

he employs syntactical units and explicit metaphors. However, employing the same rhetorical strategies of the three synoptic Gospel writers, he does use rhetorical terms and titles, selection and arrangements, and forms as devices for audience identification. Thus he completes the last span that anchors the metamorphosing bridge of transition from the static worship of the Jewish God of the Mosaic Law to the universal worship of the Logos, or the Word-made-flesh, of Christianity.

After examining features that reveal a sense of audience in the Gospels, this tagmemic analysis will clarify the intended audience of each Gospel in an effort to understand the reason for the differences in their rhetorical emphases, patterns, and devices.<sup>3</sup>

Generally speaking, all four Gospels are addressed to the new Israel of the Christian faith and their opponents in the same manner that the Old Testament prophets addressed their prophecies to the old Israel of the Old Testament and their opponents.<sup>4</sup> While each Gospel writer was required to some extent to project the audiences of his work (Bedford Bibliography 14),<sup>5</sup> he was experientially acquainted with the ethical, political, and spiritual conditions that characterized his particular audiences; therefore, he knew his audience and specifically addressed his Gospel to their ethical, political, and

spiritual frames of mind.

The aim of each of the Gospel writers was to persuade his particular audience that Jesus came as the fulfillment of the Word of God as written in the Law of Moses and the writings of the prophets. The importance of ever growing audiences which understood increasingly God's Word is an ever-expanding theme which unites the Old Testament writings and is fulfilled in the Word-made-flesh in the New. The history of God's written Word holds the most vital aspect of the hypothesis that the four individual Gospels are inter-dependent parts of the whole Gospel of Jesus Christ. As such they constitute the transition from the Jewish religion based on the Old Testament Scriptures to the Christian religion based on the life and teaching of Jesus. Because of its centrality, this study will briefly trace later in this chapter the history of Word in the Old Testament as a contextual background for the fulfillment of the Word for Matthew's Jewish audience which achieves stasis as it bridges the gap between the Old Testament and the New. The writers of Mark's and Luke's Gospels emphasize change. Both consciously select characteristics which are expected by their Roman and Greek audiences. These features establish the dynamic perspective. Finally, the Evangelist John utilizes rhetorical features that extend his appeal to a universal audience.

To examine rhetorical evidence of audience awareness from the writers of the Gospels, a tagmemic analysis of audience--with its particle, wave, and field subject expansion--offers an orderly method of deconstructing of conceptual features which allow study of unique consideration of each writer for his audience and the relationships among those audiences. Because of the guidance for deconstruction, it seems ideally suited to a study of a sense of audience in the four Gospels. This tagmemic analysis will help to establish three features of the audiences by answering these questions: What or who made up the original audiences of each of the Gospels? How or did these audiences change? What is the nature of these audiences? It seems logical to believe that answers to these questions will provide such information which will allow for a considered judgment to be made concerning the reason for the differences in and purposes for the four Gospels. In an effort to understand the problem which the Synoptic Gospels and the Gospel of John pose, perhaps it would be helpful to think of them not as they are commonly classified but rather as "the three witnesses and a manual on "how to be a witness."6

True to the manner of Jewish thinking, the three synoptic Gospels are in keeping with the two or three witnesses required to establish a legal fact in Jewish Law (Deut. 19:15).7 That the Gospels are witnesses can be clearly

understood in the light of Matthew 24:14: "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come."<sup>8</sup>

John the Baptist was "witness of him" in that he martureo, bore record, obtained an honest report, testified of, gave testimony of Jesus (John 1:14-15).<sup>9</sup> The Jews who believed in Christ would understand the connection among the New Testament concept of "witness," the Old Testament legal concept of the two or three witnesses, and the Old Testament spiritual concept of the Tabernacle of Witness in the wilderness where God's presence dwelt among His covenanted people. His presence sealed, or witnessed, and legalized that covenant (Num. 17:7,8;18:3).

Jesus said Himself that His works were His witnesses (John 5:35-36). When the Evangelist John states the purpose of his Gospel, he refers to Jesus's works as "signs" or "marks" that "indicate or signify":<sup>10</sup>

And many other signs [emphasis added] truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name. (John 20:30-31)

These "signs" or works are indeed the witnesses of "the Word made flesh" (John 1:14). In the light of Christ's last



prophetic charge given in Acts 1:8 and in what John stated to be the purpose of his Gospel in John 20:30-31, it is reasonable to assume that the other Evangelists<sup>11</sup> wrote for the same purpose of deepening and strengthening "the faith of the particular [emphasis added] community for which he writes" (Strachan 10). Each Evangelist selects, emphasizes, and depicts the person and works of Jesus in such a way that would achieve identification with a particular audience, thus witnesses what he has heard, seen, and believes about Jesus.

Each Evangelist presents the-Word-made-flesh as he perceives what he and his witnesses have seen; therefore, the threefold establishment of the Word in the synoptic Gospels corresponds to the Jewish requirement prescribed by the Mosaic law in the binding of legal agreements between God/men and man/men. In addition, the Gospel According to John corresponds to the Jewish Talmudic practice of procedural instructions.<sup>12</sup> Both practices were an integral part of Jewish thought, whether it be a Judean idea, a Samaritan idea, a Roman idea, or an Hellenic idea. As the result of this arrangement, the four Gospels as a whole constitute a process of change from the highly ethnic Jewish religion where the Word was obscured in the symbolism of tabernacle worship and the sayings of the prophets to the pan-ethnic Christian religion where the Word was incarnated

in Jesus who was perfect Man and perfect God, according to the writer of Hebrews (5:8,9).

The rhetorical argument in both Old and New Testaments unfolds an ever-expanding sense of audience which serves as a bridge which spans from Judaism's Word in stone to Christianity's Word Incarnate. A brief review of Old Testament importance of the Word in the establishment of God's Edenic Kingdom, His Priestly Kingdom, and His Davidic Kingdom will support and re-fortify the span between the Old and New Testaments.

Since the New Covenant, or Testament, issues from under the Old Covenant, or Testament, and expands it, making it more than what it was, it is important to notice how the emphasis on the Word dominates the King James Version from its beginning with the creation story in Genesis, Chapter 1, where the mighty power of God's spoken words bring into existence the world. Here a word, a symbol for one of God's creations, a sound, once uttered, brings into being the creation. The word "light" is reified, and "there was light." In turn, firmament, water, land followed from verba to res. God, who is pure spiritual Being without beginning, exercised His creative authority to make the abstract beginning of the world concrete through reification.

God said, Let there be light: and there was light.

God said, Let there be firmament . . . , and it was so.

God said, Let the waters under the firmament be gathered together unto one place, and the dry land appear; and it was so.

God said. Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree . . . : and it was so.

God said, Let there be light in the firmament or the heavens to divide the day from the night . . . : and it was so.

And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly . . . : and God saw that it was good.

And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind . . . : and it was so. [Emphasis added throughout] (Gen. 1:3,6,9,11, 14,15,20,24)

Thus God spoke the prelapsarian, Edenic world into existence, using no other creative force other than His own Word, presented in the King James Version in rhetorically balanced language.

Although He created man in his own image and gave man power to speak authoritatively and creatively (Gen.1:27), this theocratic kingdom, designed to establish gradually God's kingdom on earth, rested upon man's complete obedience

to God and man's willingness to have his self-determination restricted. God gave Adam limited power to use words when He allowed him to name every living creature (Gen. 1:19); this gift reflects the authority God gave him over all the creation (Gen. 1:28-30). It is evident that the power scope of his use of words was indeed restricted because God forbade him the fruit from the tree of knowledge of good and evil. The serpent's temptation to eat did not involve merely the sensual desire to taste forbidden fruit, rather it involved the temptation to reach for forbidden power to "be as gods, knowing good and evil" (sapientia) (Gen. 3:5). Eve fell because she desired to be as God; Adam fell because he unquestioningly followed her into disobedience of God's Word. Consequently, the Edenic Kingdom which God spoke into existence fell because man believed the half-true, corrupt words of the arch enemy.

Nevertheless, God patiently bore with a select family of people whom He had chosen to be His special representatives on earth. He made a covenant with Noah and his descendents through his son, Shem (Gen. 11:10-26). The writer of Hebrews explains that Noah obeyed God under adverse circumstances. When he did so, he, through his preaching of righteousness, condemned a world which had rebelled against the judgment of God's word (Heb. 11:7). Noah by his righteousness condemned a world which had rebelled against God's

words of judgment (Heb. 11:7). But then, in the New Testament, Peter declares that Noah was a "preacher of righteousness" (II Pet. 2:15) because he spoke for a righteous God. These two New Testament writers speak of a Noah who gained God's approval in the same manner that Abraham did. Noah obeyed God; he believed God; and when God called him His friend (II Chron. 20:7; Isa. 41:8), he also spoke for Him.

Progressively God brought His people closer to a formally ordained priesthood, speakers of God's Word. Just before Israel entered into an eternal covenant with God at Sinai, God commanded Moses to remind the Israelites of what He had done to the Egyptians and how He had miraculously born them "on eagle's wings, and brought" them to Himself. He promised Israel through Moses that "if you will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine: And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation" (Exod. 19:4-6). Before God could establish a kingdom, He needed men who would faithfully speak His words, and thereby become mediators between Himself and all mankind.

At Sinai, God formally established the foundations for a new world-wide kingdom in the covenant of words which He had made first with Abraham (Gen. 12) and which He later

reaffirmed to Isaac (Gen. 26:1-5), then to Jacob (Gen. 28:12-14), to Judah (Gen. 49:8-12), and to David, Judah's descendant (II Sam. 7:13-16; Psa. 89:3-4). The Ten Commandments and the Judgments, or Ordinances (Exod. 20-23), provided a path of written words which would guide the Israelites from the elemental "letter of the law" to a more mature "spirit of the law." Nevertheless, from the time of Moses's burning bush experience where he received Jehovah's charge to go "unto Pharaoh, that thou mayest bring forth my people the Children of Israel out of Egypt (Exod. 3:10)," Moses and Israel found it difficult to speak the creative, authoritative Word of God. For example, Moses's first excuse was that the Israelites would not believe him (i.e., that he spoke for God), and his next excuse was that he was not eloquent and was "slow of speech" (Exod. 4:1,10). Although God promised to "be with thy mouth, and teach thee what thou shalt say," Moses still begged not to be sent to bring Israel out of Pharaoh's bondage (Exod. 4:12); God was angry with Moses for the first time. Even so, He did allow Moses's brother, Aaron, to become Moses's mouthpiece (Exod. 4:14-15). Thus God made it clear to Moses and to Aaron that speaking and functioning in His Word was a required constituent of their relationship with Him.

The second time God became angry with Moses had to do with Moses's disobedience in the Wilderness of Zin. Moses

had led the grumbling, murmuring, rumor-ridden tribes (numbering from three to six million) from Egypt to Sinai.<sup>13</sup> While journeying, the Israelites had complained about the lack of water (Exod. 17:1-7; Num. 20:2,3) and the absence of meat (Num. 11:4); they tired of the heavenly bread they were given (Num. 11:6; 21:5), and they imagined that Moses had brought them to the desert to slay them of thirst (Exod. 11:3). Earlier, Moses had endured individual groups who resisted his authority to speak the Word of God which God had especially given him. Even his own sister and brother had rebelled against his God-given authority to speak for God (Num. 12:1-2). By the time he had spent approximately two years of leading such a querulous nation, his patience had greatly diminished. Because they had no water, they were faced with the deprivation of an essential element of physical salvation.

As the Israelites journeyed through Sinai, Moses evidently grew careless about following God's instructions. On a pre-Sinai occasion, at Rephrdim, when the Israelites had complained to Moses about the lack of water, Moses had interceded with God, and He had commanded Moses to strike "the rock in Horeb" so that the needed water might spring from it. Moses had obeyed, thus providing a plentiful supply of water (Exod. 17:1-6). Afterwards, when Moses and the Israelites had received the written Ten Commandments and

Judgments at Sinai, their need for water still existed, but God's method of giving it to them had changed in order to allow them to learn how to function in the power of His Word. When the people of Israel murmured again for water--this time in the Wilderness of Zin, near Kadesh-Barnea--God commanded Moses and Aaron to call the people to assemble; Moses and Aaron were then to take Aaron's rod (the symbol of Aaron's priestly authority) and "speak ye unto the rock before their eyes; and it shall give forth his water, and then shalt bring to them water out of the rock: so thou shalt give the congregation and their beasts drink" (Num. 20:8). Moses did as God commanded him in that he took the rod and called the congregation of Israel together. Lamentably, he did not follow completely God's instructions. In anger he said to them: "Hear now, ye rebels; must we fetch you water out of this rock? And Moses lifted up his hand, and with his rod he smote the rock twice: and the congregation drank, and their beasts also" (Num. 20:9-11).

In this manner Moses arrogantly disobeyed God's specific instructions to speak, preferring to smite the rock a second time, thus venting his own anger and pretending supernatural power of God before the people of Israel. This disobedience, however, brought quick judgment from God who reprimanded him for his unbelief and for failing "to sanctify me in the eyes of the children of Israel"; further-



more, God declared to Moses and Aaron, "ye shall not bring this congregation into the land which I have given them" (Num. 20:12).

"For this arrogance," Merrill Tenney maintains, "Moses was forbidden to enter the Promised Land" (526). Further, he contends that Moses's disobedience stems from his having "exceeded his instructions [to speak to the rock]" and from his taking "some of the credit for the miracle" by striking the rock a second time from which the water came (Num. 20: 1-13).

In Sinai before God had sent Moses to Egypt, God had been more tolerant of his (Moses's) excuses not to obey God's command to be His spokesman at Pharoah's court because he lacked self-confidence in his physical ability to speak. After Moses accepted His command, God proved His power to Moses in so many ways during the stay in Egypt and the return journey through Sinai. When God wrote His Commandments in stone so that the Israelites might have His Word at all times, Moses's disobedience, founded in pride and aggrandizement, was without excuse. At Sinai Israel had sworn to obey God's Word, agreeing to become His "peculiar treasure," His "kingdom of priests" (Exod. 19:5,6); thereafter God exacted a more stringent type of adherence to His Word, especially from the two men, Moses, the chief lawgiver, and Aaron, the chief priest of this kingdom of

priests.

Moses's disobedience in not speaking to the rock had dire consequences: it kept him out of Canaan, the ultimate destination of Israel. Even though Moses begged God to relent and "let me go over and see the good land that is beyond Jordan," God refused his petition and forbid him to pray about it again (Deut. 3:25-26). Even as Moses failed to obey God's Word, Israel in Canaan failed to obey Him completely. Consequently, during the Period of the Judges (from the death of Joshua to the reign of Saul), this nation of priests became so fragmented that God raised up twelve men and one woman, Deborah, to deliver Israel from its enemies. They were not united in their obedience to God's Word with regard to each other nor with regard to their neighbors. They neglected to assume their responsibility to safeguard the promise of salvation, to be God's spokesmen to the world, and to be the medium for the Word.

A modern Jewish scholar, Arthur Hertsberg, establishes the importance of the Law to Jews and concludes that God's Word belongs to humankind. He points out that God "made covenant with a particular people that it should be His priesthood" (11). Hertsberg continues by arguing that "to these Jewish slaves which God had just redeemed from Egypt, He revealed the Torah, the Law which they were to obey, as the particular burden of the Jews and as a sign of their

unique destiny in the world" (11). Moreover, Hertsberg argues that God is not only the God of Israel but also of all mankind because He loves all mankind. Further he explains that God "taught all men His way of redemption, the Torah, in His revelation in the desert of Sinai, to show that, like the desert, the Law belongs to anyone who dares claim it" (11). Nevertheless, Jewish and Christian scholars alike would have to agree that Jewish priestly commitment to the guardianship of the Word of God (the Law) was diminishing rather than increasing, so much so that by the time Samuel replaced Eli as Judge in Israel, Israelite communities were little more than a dissembling, tribal confederacy which had become extremely vulnerable to military and pagan religious pressures put on it by neighboring, non-Jewish tribes.

Even so, in this state of political and religious dissipation, a forward movement continued to establish God's redemptive Word in the world by way of further establishing Israel as His covenant people. Instead of becoming God's "peculiar treasure" [an especially precious treasure]<sup>14</sup> and drawing their needed strength from the Word of His Law, thus allowing Him to govern and protect them, Israelite leaders rejected their peculiar relationship to God and His leadership and insisted on being allowed to have a king as did their neighboring tribes. God commissioned Samuel to anoint

Saul, a Benjaminite, as the first king of Israel. Carl DeVries evaluates Saul and pinpoints his fault: "Though he was a brave leader he was not a good soldier, for he was not aware of the necessity for absolute obedience"

(Zondervan 756). Saul, too impatient to wait upon God's instructions which were to be given him by Samuel (I Sam. 13:13-14; 15:22), offered pre-battle, blood sacrifices, an exclusive ritual performed by priests. He disobeyed God in this incident; furthermore, he disobeyed God's voice in sparing Agag, King of the Amalekites, and the best of the sheep and oxen taken from the Amalekites, all the while contending that he had only spared the best of these spoils of war so that they might be sacrificed unto God (II Sam. 15:15). God disqualified Saul as King of Israel because he failed to recognize that obedience to God's voice, or Word, is better than offering sacrifices. Saul as king, presumed to be priest as well. Only an heir of David's could both be king and priest of Israel.

In spite of God's having only allowed Israel to be ruled by a king as a second best choice, Saul's disqualification as king left a vacancy in leadership. Consequently, God instructed Samuel to anoint David of the tribe of Judah to be the future king of Israel. Now, the real importance of Jacob's deathbed blessing upon his son, Judah, becomes clear:

Judah, thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise: thy hand shall be in the neck of thine enemies; thy father's children shall bow down before thee. . . . The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be.

(Gen. 49:8,10)

God raised up out of Judah's seed, David; out of David, He established the royal house from which would come Jesus, the rightful heir to David's throne. During David's reign, Israel flourished spiritually, economically, and militarily. The land between the brook Egypt and the river Euphrates which God had given Abraham and his descendents (Gen. 15:18; Deut. 1:7,8), David's army took, settled, and taxed. David followed God's Word.

Solomon--who succeeded his father, David--brought the Davidic kingdom to its "greatest geographical extension and material prosperity" (DeVries, Zondervan 801). Even with this success, DeVries laments, "Solomon in his later years lost his spiritual discernment and for the sake of political advantage and voluptuous living succumbed to apostasy" (801). Because Solomon introduced so many pagan cults, irreparable harm came to the spiritual, moral, and political fiber of Israel. The end of even a semblance of an united

kingdom came during the reign of Rehoboam, Solomon's son. Israel's internecine feuds brought about the divided kingdom of Israel (the ten northern tribes) and Judah (Benjamin and Judah).

The Word of God had become eroded with pagan religious practices. The hearts and minds of Israelites were less and less those of God-fearing, covenant-keeping people and had become more and more the minds of pagan, agrarian materialists. Though Israel was warned by the prophetic preaching of the great prophets Isaiah and Jeremiah and Amos, they abandoned their love of the Word of God. For this sin, God allowed the northern kingdom of Israel to go into Assyrian captivity in 722 BC and the kingdom of Judah to go into Babylonian captivity in 536 BC.<sup>15</sup>

And so the establishment of God's Word as the means of man's right relationship with God moved forward. The Edenic kingdom fell because Adam and Eve disobeyed God's Word; the priestly kingdom failed because the Israelites ceased to love and obey God's Word; and the Davidic kingdom disintegrated because God's Word ceased to be pre-eminent in Israel; nevertheless, Jewish hearts and minds had been planted with the Word of God. Even in Israel's and Judah's seemingly hopeless condition in Assyria and Babylon, these two brother kingdoms were re-united in God's punishment. Ezekiel and Daniel, two great prophets of the Captivity Era, reminded

the vanquished Jews that they were still God's chosen people and that God would re-establish them again in the land He had given Abraham, their father (Gen. 15:18).

Also during the captivity, the prophets Hosea (11:2), Joel (2:28, 32; 3:13,14), Micah (5:2-5), and Zechariah (3:8; 9:9; 12:8; 12:10) began to preach of the coming Messiah who would take away the sin of the world and would heal their land. He it was of whom John spoke: "And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth" (John 1:14). It was this Word-made-flesh who would be the second Adam, a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek, and the legal heir to David's throne (Psa. 110:1-4; Heb. 5:6; Matt. 22:41-44). The Gospels, through proffering His cardinal teaching and selected supporting facts of His life, present Jesus as legal heir to David's throne, Melchizedekan priest, and second Adam. Additionally, the Gospels present Him as a prophet greater than Jonah (Matt. 12:41) with a place of spiritual authority greater than that of Abraham's (John 8:53). These qualifications, Gospel evidence argues, prove that Jesus and His kingdom of Heaven are the complete fulfillment of God's Word for man (John 14:6).

The Word of God in Old Testament Scriptures has been presented in historical, poetical, and prophetic literary

forms; yet, to reveal Jesus as the Word-made-flesh, the Evangelists were inspired to create a new literary genre especially suited for preaching and teaching. This new literary genre was an expedient one designed to persuade particular audiences of Jesus's teachings in the manner most relevant to their particular value system and need. The Gospel literary form, though not a classical one in terms of Greek and Roman classical literature, nevertheless, is a very effective vehicle for presenting the Hero, Jesus.

While it is indeed obvious that the literary form of the Gospels is not epic poetry, nor that they were written with the purpose of presenting a tragic hero since Jesus's character is without moral flaw, the literary structure of each Gospel does focus upon a super-hero, Jesus Christ. On the other hand, neither are the Gospels merely biographical regardless of the large amount of biographical information which they convey. The Gospel genre is a complex one which allows a great deal of variation in arrangement, internal form, and style. No doubt this complexity has contributed greatly to the differences in the four Gospels. In spite of these differences in presentation within the gospel genre, a continually intensifying forward movement in each focuses on the central message that Jesus is the Christ, reified in the Gospels' presentation of the super-hero, the Word-made-flesh, which had been promised to Abraham, Moses, and the



prophets.

After a brief review of the origin of the Gospels that positions them within the context of the forward movement of their ever-expanding audiences, attention turns to the particular methodology to be used here for analysis of their audiences. First, a summary of the tagmemic theory as a problem-solving heuristic will be briefly outlined. Following this summary will be an explanation of how the methodology will be applied. An explanation of the origin and purpose of this methodology and application of it will make this approach clear.

Though Leonard Bloomfield, in Language (1933) first used the term tagmeme, but in a very different sense than Pike,<sup>16</sup> Kenneth Pike is credited with authoring the theory for use in linguistical analysis of languages. Originally, Pike applied his theory as an instrument of perceiving problematic data in language and in human behavior (Linguistic Concepts Preface xiii-xvi). In his article, "Beyond the Sentence," Pike reasoned that "certain universal invariants underlie all human experience as characteristics of rationality itself" (129). With this assumption in mind, he devised the tagmemic method and developed it for "discovering the semantic, phonological, and grammatical systems of languages which have no alphabet, written grammar, or dictionary" (Young 128). Later working with

rhetoricians Richard Young and Alton Becker (Rhetoric: Discovery and Change, 1970), Pike collaborated in the area of problematic rhetorical composition in an effort to create a formula for a tagmemic process of invention; this formula "consists of a series of heuristic procedures [an explicit plan or guide in the solutions of problems] for increasing the effectiveness of the process of inquiry"; it also "provides procedures for analyzing and formulating problems, for exploring problematic data, and for testing hypotheses" (Young 128).

To briefly summarize the tagmemic theory of invention, tagmemicists believe in order to know a thing, or a subject, a person must perceive three aspects of that thing's existence. First, the perceiver must know how a thing differs from everything else and second, how much it can vary and still be itself. Third, the perceiver must comprehend how a thing relates to larger systems of which it is a part. Furthermore, the tagmemic theory allows the perceiver to view anything, whether it be concrete or abstract, from three perspectives: (1) as a particle with its unique features, variations, and distribution into a larger field, (2) as a wave or process of change, also with its distinct features, variations, and distribution into a larger context and (3) as a field, again with its features, variations, distribution into a greater matrix of its

species or genre. Taken all together, these six items provide the nine-item heuristic which Young, Becker, and Pike put into a framework in Rhetoric: Discovery and Change. This nine-cell, tagmemic grid will be used as the basic tool for examining the sense of audience in the Gospels in an effort to account for the differences among them (see the tagmemic heuristic procedure, Fig. 1, 6).<sup>17</sup>

In adapting the tagmemic theory as a tool adequate for a rhetorical analysis of the adjustments made in the Gospels for audiences, which may indeed account for the differences in them and explain what purpose these differences serve, the Gospels must be considered as a literary whole which is separate but contextually related to the books of the Old Testament and is separate but foundationally related to the remaining books of the New Testament. Furthermore, to ascertain the sense of audience in the Gospels, it is important to establish that the central figure in them is Jesus who is not a tragic hero but rather He is a sinless (flawless), divine super-hero. Because He is the super-hero, He dominates all four Gospels. Answers to three relevant questions which must be answered before this quest has finished will establish this dominance. First, what is Jesus to each Evangelist and to his audience? Second, how does each Gospel's referential framework or structure vary in the portrayal of Jesus? Third, why are these changes

significant? The answers to these questions will identify characteristics which can help establish an explanation of the differences in the Gospels and enlighten readers as to rhetorical effects of these differences.

Finally, in an effort to answer these questions concerning a sense of audience in the Gospels, it is necessary to apply the nine-cell tagmemic heuristic. In "Invention: A Topological Survey," Young defines heuristic procedures as "specific plans for analyzing and searching which focus attention, guide reason, stimulate memory, and encourage intuition."<sup>18</sup> By applying the tagmemic heuristic, the preliminary research done for this study supports the hypothesis that a spiraling sense of audience exists in the Gospels which began with Israel and concludes with the world. A study of audience will provide insight into the different functions of the Gospels and simultaneously allow an acute discernment of them not just as parallel structures but also as integral parts of a meaningful whole.

Establishing then the hypothesis that the differences in the Gospels are a result of adjustments made for audiences and that the variations in audiences constitute a process of change from the particular of Judaism to the universal of Christianity, the hero of the Gospels will be observed in Matthew from a particle point of view, in both Mark and Luke He will be viewed from the wave perspective,

and in John He will be studied from the tagmemic field perspective.

Since the basis of this study is a translation, this heuristic device cannot be utilized to examine these four books linguistically. Instead, it will be modified to examine how each Evangelist (in the King James Version) rhetorically adapted his material for his audience through selection, referential framework, and arrangement. An examination of rhetorical elements should provide answers to such questions as: In what role does the Evangelist see the super-hero, Jesus, and expects his audience to see Him? How does the referential framework of one Gospel vary from another? What rhetorical effect results from the conscious selection of details by an Evangelist?

This tagmemic probe allows a tri-dimensional examination in Chapter II of Jesus as super-hero. The three perspectives of this tagmemic analysis determine if Matthew's particular depiction of Jesus as the promised Messiah (in Old Testament prophecy) and heir to David's throne constitute stasis in the ethnic religion of Judaism whose deliverer has come to re-establish moral or religious order, David's throne, and the the glory of Israel. A paradigmatic arrangement of rhetorical features in Matthew will identify particular elements that help the writer appeal to his Jewish audience. The range and distribution

of the static rhetorical features found in Matthew confirm stasis even though a perceptible movement of change is evident. Because stasis has within it the seed for becoming, it anticipates change or movement. To perceive the range of stasis and the possibility of movement, the variation and distribution within stasis may be seen in the rhetorical features found in Matthew. These rhetorical characteristics not only confirm stasis but anticipate both movement and change. The perceived movement in Matthew is the seed for the dynamic perspective in Mark and Luke as well as the relative one in John.

Chapter III, Mark's and Luke's presentation of Jesus will be deconstructed to discern rhetorical characteristics that result in its being presented principally from the dynamic perspective. This chapter will investigate the extent to which Mark, when writing to a Roman audience, and Luke, when writing to a Greek audience, portray Jesus as a hero in terms of Roman and Greek values; hence Mark's depiction of Jesus as the almighty God who did powerful miracles, the dutiful Son who became the suffering servant, and the hero who came to establish order not only in men's hearts but also in governments would especially appeal to a Roman audience's level of understanding. In the same manner, Luke's presentation of Jesus as the second Adam, the ultimate prophet, to a Hellenized audience would appeal to

the philosophical principles and expectations Greeks had for the perfect man, one who would have that perfected knowledge of the ultimate prophet and one who would characterize perfection in manhood.

Also this chapter will catalogue evidence of change in the forward movement of the Word-made-flesh. The super-Hero is seen one step away from the ethnicity of His Jewish messiahship and greatly resembles the Augustan prototype of ruler whose major mission would have been to establish physical order. Continuing in this movement away from His Jewish identification, He is seen as the idealistic perfection of manhood, an Alexander-type of God/man who would appeal to the Hellenistic obsession with perfection and prophecy. Since Greeks required these qualifications a prerequisites for a ruler, one who possessed them would be able to establish universal, intellectual order.

Chapter IV will consist of an examination of the Gospel of John. A tagmemic analysis reveals evidence that the relative or field perspective dominates. John's portrayal of Jesus is couched in abstract terminology as he presents the hero, Jesus, as the Word-made-flesh and as the spiritual deliverer from evil. His Gospel seems especially constructed to fulfill the expectations of a universal audience instead of a particular ethnic or culturally related audience. It seems to have been written as procedural

instruction for a universal audience to guide it to believe that Jesus was the "Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world" (John 1:29) and thereby become at one with the Spirit of God. The hero of John's manual on how to become a believer resembles neither David, nor Augustus, nor certainly Alexander. Rather, He stands apart as God.

Chapter V will summarize the conclusions reached in this study and restate the adapted tagmemic theory as applied to the sense of audience in the Gospels. This analysis should bring into sharp focus a process of change in that the Jewish religion's word of hope as delivered in the Old Testament is reified in the reality of the superhero, Jesus, of the Gospels and that this reality constitutes the basis of the Christian religion. Moreover, this study will demonstrate that the four Gospels are indispensable links in this process of change and that each Gospel bonds inseparably one Gospel to the next in the spiraling process of appealing to an audience.



## Notes

1

All Biblical citations will be made from the King James Version of the Bible.

2

Walter J. Ong, S.J., "The Writer's Audience Is Always a Fiction," PMLA, 90 (January 1975): 9-21.

3

Kerygma is a Greek word which means "proclamation," especially as it pertains to the proclaiming of the Gospel. Sometimes the word kerygma "may refer to the content of the gospel, to the message of the sermon, or to the preaching itself" (Dictionary of Theology 688).

In a true sense, the audiences of each of these Gospels should be considered as listening audiences for two reasons. First, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John are kerygmatic histories of Jesus as preached by the Apostles Matthew, Peter, Paul, and John respectively. Then all four Gospels were written to be read aloud to the different churches.

4

Traditionally, scholars have maintained that Mark wrote what Peter dictated; although Luke's Gospel is epistolary, scholars believe that the preaching of the Apostle Paul is the origin of much of Luke's Gospel material. Matthew's and John's Gospels flowed from their

having preached their Gospel materials before ever having committed it to writing.

5

Robert Gorrell, Patricia Bizzell, and Bruce Hertzberg have prepared the following abstract for Ong's article, "The Writer's Audience Is Always a Fiction" for the Bedford Bibliography:

Writers project audiences for their work by imagining the presumptive audiences of other pieces of writing. Readers seem willing to be fictionalized in this way--to be the audience projected by the writer--as long as the reader's role is familiar or the writer creates a new role persuasively. Thus, the writer's style or voice is a way of addressing an imagined audience that will respond in the desired way (14).

6

Ethel Wallis, in her "Four Gospels, Four Discourse Genre" (10-11), refers to the Gospel According to John as being a handbook on "How to Believe." Inherent in being a Christian believer is the act of Christian witnessing. W. E. Vine writes that the word witness, as it is used in chapters 11 and 12 of Hebrews, is synonymous with believer. The Christian believer is one, Vine argues, whose life and actions testify to the worth and effect of faith in the Gospel of Christ and whose faith receives witness in the

Scriptures, according to 1 Peter 5:1 (225).

7

According to James Strong the Hebrew word which has been translated witness, or testimony (used in establishing a legal fact), comes from the root word 'uwd which means to protest, testify (as by reiteration), to admonish, charge, call to record, relieve, rob, stand upright, give warning, witness, testify (85-86).

8

In the "Greek Lexicon" of Strong's Concordance (3143), Strong translates the Greek word maturion in Matthew 24:14 as witness. A broader definition would indicate that witness here means "something evidential, i.e. (general) evidence given or (specific) the Decalogue (in the sacred tabernacle): --to be testified, testimony, witness" (46).

9

In the "Greek Lexicon" of Strong's Concordance (3140), the Greek word martureo is translated from a root word meaning "to be a witness," i.e. "to testify (literally or figuratively):--charge, give evidence, report, to be well reported of, testify" (46).

10

See 4591 in the "Greek Lexicon" of Strong's Concordance. The Greek word semaino comes from the root sema and means "a mark, to indicate or signify" (65).

11

At times each of the writers of the four Gospels will be referred to as Evangelist or conjointly as

Evangelists.

12

Hereafter, the Gospel According to Matthew, the Gospel According to Mark, the Gospel According to Luke, and the Gospel According to John will be referred to respectively as Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. See note 2, ch. 2.

13

In a very real sense the Synoptic Gospels are parallel witnesses of the life, teachings, and death of Jesus; on the other hand, it is clear that John is procedural in that John explains to his audience how to become a believer. In this respect John corresponds to the Talmudic writings which interpreted, commented upon, and applied the Torah as a standard of conduct for Jews.

14

Henry H. Halley writes that at the time the Israelites left Egypt (Num. 1:46) that the men above twenty years of age numbered 600,000. Halley contends that this number reflects a total population of approximately three million. He reasons that since Genesis 46:27 states that the family of Jacob, when it went to Egypt, numbered seventy persons and increased to 600,000 males above twenty years of age (Num. 1:46) by the time of the exodus 430 years later (Exod. 12:40-41), that this would indicate that the population of Israel in Egypt doubled once every twenty-five years. Halley estimates that 600,000 males above the age of

twenty would reflect a total population of three million or so. Considering that it took the Israelites approximately forty-two years to reach Canaan and that the population doubled each twenty-five years, he estimates that about six million Israelites went into Canaan (109).

15

The Hebrew word gullah in Exodus 19:5 ("and ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me") which is translated peculiar, means an especially precious, unique treasure. See 5459 in the "Hebrew Lexicon" of Strong's Concordance (776).

16

See Merrill F. Unger's Unger's Bible Handbook (Chicago: Moody, 1967), 233, 254.

17

Figure 1 has been taken from Richard E. Young, Alton L. Becker, and Kenneth L. Pike's Rhetoric: Discovery and Change (New York: Harcourt, 1970), 127.

18

Richard E. Young, "Invention: A Topological Survey," Teaching Composition: 10 Bibliographical Essays, ed. Gary Tate (Fort Worth, TX: Texas Christian UP, 1976).

## CHAPTER II

### THE STATIC PERSPECTIVE

The Gospel According to Matthew, the most Jewish, hence the most authentic, portrait of Jesus, the son of David, the super-hero of all the four Gospels, reconciles some of the differences among the four Gospels, or four godspells, or God stories.<sup>1</sup> The emphasis on Jesus as Messiah in the main records the static perspective. Within this static perspective resides rhetorical features that anticipate the dynamic and relative perspectives of the other Gospels. A tagmemic examination of Matthew's<sup>2</sup> particular depiction of Jesus as the Messiah and heir of David's throne whom the Old Testament prophets had promised centuries ago shows that this Gospel achieves stasis. As stasis, it links and binds one to the other, the Old and New Testaments, and acts as a bridge from the Mosaic Law to the new law of the kingdom of heaven.

A tagmemic analysis, with its multilevel conceptual organization perception, reveals the unique feature of Matthew which enabled the Evangelist to appeal to a Jewish audience of Christian Jews and their Jewish opponents; additionally, it establishes Matthew as the stasis/foundation, in other words the particle aspect of the

tagmemic perception, of an exclusive Judaism which contained within its unique identification of a promised messiah<sup>3</sup> perceptible movements of change which ultimately culminated in the universally inclusive new branch of Judaism--Christianity.

The writer places his emphasis on pathos rather than logos. This writer at all times adjusts his material by considering the expectation of his Jewish audience. The evidence from this analysis of this Gospel shows it to have arrived at stasis because it conforms to the rubrics of the Mosaic Law of the Old Testament.

Since it is evident that the canonical fathers who arranged the Gospels and the other books of the New Testament did not arrange them chronologically and since it is also known that the fathers of the Church always placed Matthew first in their arrangement of the Gospels even though they were aware that Mark's Gospel had been written first, this analysis demonstrates that in at least the Gospels, these compilers used a rhetorical arrangement based on the need of a new faith which had just emerged from an old religion. The compilers recognized that Matthew functioned both as a link to the Old Testament and as a starting point for a journey through the New Testament. Considering the Gospels as disparate parts of the whole Gospel of Jesus Christ, the canonical fathers appear to have

arranged them in an order which supports an internal movement of audience appeal. The arrangements of the Gospels appeal first to a Jewish audience (static), then to a Roman, next to a Greek (both dynamic), and finally to a universal audience (relative).

A modern rhetorical theory, Pike's tagmemic theory of audience, helps in understanding the significance of the perceived internal movement of audience appeal in the Gospels. Pike assumes that "universal invariants underlie all human experience as characteristic of rationality itself" (Pike, "Beyond the Sentence" 129); he bases his hypothesis (see Fig. 1, 6-7) upon this assumption.

The audience, in viewing Matthew as the first aspect (stasis) of knowing the Gospel of Jesus Christ, understands clearly that Matthew's primary emphasis is to identify Jesus as the Jewish Messiah-King while, at the same time, he interjects an underlying movement toward presenting Him as the universal Savior. Even though this Gospel focuses primarily on static features of an audience, it contains within it the energy that gyrates into an ever-increasing spiral that will eventually encompass a universal audience. In this way, Matthew adumbrates as well as adds a cohesiveness among the four Gospels. Consequently, using a tagmemic analysis to examine Matthew's Gospel for rhetorical features that indicate the particular category to which it



best belongs reveals that the particle aspect (stasis) of knowing the subject of Jesus as the hero-Savior of the Gospels dominates. A close reading identifies how Matthew adapts and adjusts his materials for his Jewish audience. Further, a rhetorical analysis of the four Gospels shows each one to be an interdependent part of the whole, and as such the four together constitute a transition from the Jewish religion based on Old Testament Scriptures to the Christian religion based on the life and teachings of Jesus.

A sense of audience in Matthew's Gospel involves a consideration of its authorship and affirms that since Christian literature began to appear, the measure of its authenticity rested upon apostolic authorship.<sup>4</sup> An examination of Matthean authorship will establish the credibility of the first Gospel's perspective of Jesus.

As early as AD 125, the four Gospels were "assembled into a collection for use in the churches, and were given the titles: 'According to Matthew,' 'According to Mark'" (Hendriksen 4). Early second-century Christians accepted the Gospels as one story because the early Church thought of them as a unit (Love 13). Also, the early Church and its leaders accepted Matthew's Gospel as divinely inspired Scripture (Grant 127) and the Apostle Matthew as its author (Hendriksen 3).

The Apostle Matthew's authorship of the Gospel bearing

his name was not seriously questioned until nineteenth-and-twentieth-century conservative Bible scholars such as E. J. Goodspeed, A. H. McNeile, W. C. Allen, and B. M. Metzger, examined the internal evidence of Matthew's authorship (Hendriksen 92). R. V. G. Tasker, another of these, rejects a Matthean authorship of the first Gospel because its author incorporated into his ninety-five percent of Mark's Gospel. Tasker contends that an apostle who was "an eye-witness of the most of the ministry of Jesus would not have used as a primary source a Gospel composed by one who was not an original follower of the Lord" (34). Robert M. Grant refutes Tasker's argument by contending that an apostle might have been convinced that Mark's Gospel [written circa AD 65], though largely complete, still needed the additional material which was available to Matthew. Furthermore, Grant argues, "an apostle who proclaimed the gospel among Jews might have believed that Jewish Christianity, though ultimately only a part of catholic Christianity, deserved more adequate representation than it found in Mark" (129).

Despite the doubt raised about the identity of the author of the first Gospel, some New Testament scholars maintain still that the Apostle Matthew actually wrote the Gospel bearing his name (Hendriksen 93) for Greek-speaking Jewish Christians and that he "gives to his readers the Gospel of Jesus as it was generally received in the great

Jewish churches of Palestine and Syria where Judaism was fiercest in its attacks and Saint Peter highly honoured" (Major 226). Major, however, argues for Antioch as the place of origin of this Gospel because Matthew holds such great respect for Saint Peter who was so highly esteemed, especially in Antioch (Syria), by the conservative non-Judaistic faction of the early Christian Church (226).

Regardless of the disagreement among Bible scholars as to the positive identification of the author of the first Gospel, most of them do agree that he was a Greek-speaking, Jewish Christian. Spivey and Smith maintain that he was "possibly a Christian scribe, similar to the Jewish scribes of the Law" (116) while Brownrigg insists that "his Gospel is in fact carefully compiled from at least three sources." Further, he holds that "Matthew the tax-collector may have been responsible for one source, or for their skillful collation" (306). Spivey and Smith conclude that the author, or authors, of Matthew used almost the whole of Mark's Gospel, adapted, and expanded it. Moreover, they recognize the possibility of two additional types of materials. One of these, known as Quelle (abbr. Q),<sup>5</sup> is derived from "sayings common to Luke." The other, is derived from the Matthean tradition, either from an "oral tradition" or perhaps a unknown "written source" or possibly "sources" (116). These positions represent the

variety of informed opinion about the authorship of Matthew.

Even though the majority of scholars now agree that the New Testament was substantially complete by AD 100 (Bruce 12), that Mark was written first (Grant 110), and that possibly the Apostle Matthew was the compiler of only one of the Gospel of Matthew's sources, still they agree that the Gospel was compiled and adapted by a Greek-speaking, Jewish Christian perhaps as early as AD 70 (Bruce 12) or as late as AD 100; moreover, they agree that the author addresses both Jewish Christians and their Jewish opponents in Syria (Spivey and Smith 116). This study accepts this consensus of scholarly opinion: the redactor-author of Matthew, whoever he might have been, was a Greek-speaking, Jewish Christian who adapted his materials for Jewish audiences. Following tradition, this study will refer to this redactor-author as Matthew the Apostle.

Another important aspect of Gospel scholarship remains constant: in every New Testament manuscript, Matthew always comes first. William Barclay contends that this is so not because Matthew was written first (some of Paul's letters were written some forty years before Matthew, and Mark was written as much as twenty-five years earlier), but rather Matthew was placed first because this Gospel is the bridge between the Scriptures of the Old Testament and the remainder of the New Testament books (6).

Most Matthean scholars place greater importance on divine communication of the Word than they do on the redactor-author's actual identity. While Classical Greek and Roman writers may have "stood above their material as artists," this ethical association, i.e. writer-work, is not so with the four authors of the Gospels (who, also in the traditional sense, will be referred to throughout as the Evangelists); these four writers were "only devoutly ordering for local believers the testimonies provided for them by tradition not as biography but as the cult story of faith" (Wilder 39). Nevertheless, their Gospels do consist of "personal word and address" (Wilder 39) whose four interpretations were unique creations; yet, they sufficiently agree among themselves for their audiences "to regard the particular interpretation of each as a variation within a basic unity . . . ." (Guthrie 108), the one Gospel of Jesus Christ.

This brief review of Matthean authorship supplies the basis for further examination of Matthew. From the perspective of these established points about the Gospel, the analysis will be formed. First, although Matthew was compiled from at least three different sources, its first Greek manuscript<sup>6</sup> was redacted by a Jewish Christian who spoke Greek, Aramaic, and perhaps Hebrew; this Gospel compiler will be known throughout this study as Matthew or

the Evangelist. Although this compiler-author used at least two sources other than his own, much in the same spirit of the medieval writer who adapted an earlier literary classic and made from it a new literary creation entirely his own, so Matthew created a Gospel which bears the imprint of his particular character and authority.

Whether or not Matthew ever heard or read of Aristotle's Rhetoric has never been determined; however, he appears to employ a principle similar to Aristotle's first ethical proof which Lane Cooper translates as the speaker's [writer's] "intelligence" (Rhetoric 2.1), which Rhys Roberts translates as "good sense" (Rhetoric 1378a), and which James Kinneavy in his interpretation of Aristotle states is evident when the writer does "appear to have a practical knowledge about the reality at issue" (238). This rhetorical principle can be seen in Matthew's reportorial style, which is detailed and knowledgeable of the Law of Moses, the writings of the prophets, and the life and teachings of Jesus. Also, he seems to demonstrate Aristotle's second ethical or artistic proof because he demonstrates what Cooper translates as "character" (Rhetoric 2.1), Roberts as "good moral character" (Rhetoric 1378a), and Kinneavy interprets as having "the good of the audience at heart" (238) because Matthew evinces an evangelistic concern that his reader/listener accept Jesus's (the Messiah's) salvation.

In addition, Aristotle's third ethical proof, which both Cooper (Rhetoric 2.1) and Roberts (Rhetoric 1378a) translate as "goodwill," seems to be present in Matthew's Gospel because the Evangelist creates an almost ethereal portrait of himself in that he never interjects his own opinion or what can be determined to be first-hand information; nevertheless, using the sincerity and zeal which flow from his belief that Jesus is God's promised Messiah, "he portrays himself as a person who would not deceive the audience in the matter at hand" (Kinneavy 238). Perhaps without ever having known that Aristotle had codified these universal principles of ethical proof in his Rhetoric, Matthew achieves identification with his audience by using them; Burke's Rhetoric of Motives (64) (influenced by Aristotle) maintains that a writer's identification with his audience is the most important aspect of rhetoric.

Though a tagmemic analysis will demonstrate the identification achieved between author and reader and though an analysis will help to understand certain differences among the Gospels and the purposes those differences serve, it is important first to clarify Matthew's uses of a type of pathetic argument in that he appeals to the emotions of his audience. Because he is writing to Jewish Christians whose lives are obviously in jeopardy (Scott 19) and because he is

writing to Jews who have not yet accepted Jesus as the Messiah and Savior of all mankind, he utilizes emotion to persuade his Jewish audience much in the same way that some twentieth-century Christian ministers of the Gospel do: he stirs emotion by creating a sense of hope and expediency in the act of embracing Jesus as the Messiah-king who can help them in perilous times, he stirs the emotion of pride in appealing to their knowledge of the Mosaic Law and the writings of the prophets, and he stirs emotions by challenging his audience to accept Jesus as the fulfillment of their national destiny as promised by Moses and the prophets. In other words, he uses audience-based emotional appeals which can be viewed as an extension of Aristotelean pathos. These appeals are not emotions which Aristotle specifically listed in his Rhetoric (1378a-1389a) because, as Kinneavy points out, Aristotle almost completely neglected to deal with religious emotions (243); nonetheless, these three appeals do invoke emotions that do constitute a type of pathetic argument. Matthew, as redactor-author is almost as completely hidden in the "stuff" of his source materials as the reluctant newly chosen King Saul was hidden among the military baggage of Israel (1 Sam. 10:22); yet, the writer does appeal to his audience through the use of emotional argumentation.

Finally, Matthew does use a type of logical argumenta-



tion which resembles the type of rhetorical logic which Aristotle presents in his Rhetoric (1394a-1402a) and is an appearance of rationality used to persuade (Kinneavy 245). While Matthew may not have known Aristotle's Rhetoric, he does rely on topoi, enthymemes, and examples, and in fact presents Jesus who teaches with parables (a type of example) and interpretations of parables (sometimes a type of enthymeme); Jesus's rhetoric is effective because as the teacher (Jesus) which Matthew presents, He instructs with authority "and not as the scribes" (Matt. 7:28). The basis of Matthew's argument rests not necessarily upon human reason, but rather it rests upon the audience's willingness to believe that Jesus had come to fulfill the Law of Moses and the foretelling of the prophets as Messiah-king, that the miraculous works which He did were from God and that He arose from the dead and ascended to God to await His return to earth as King of kings and Lord of lords. The Evangelist argues from the reasonableness of a faith anchored in the traditional values of the Mosaic Law and the prophets instead of the reasonableness of the traditional values of Greek religion and philosophy as Aristotle might have held.

Matthew is the first integral part of the other two synoptic Gospels and John; as such, it will be examined as the seminal account of Christ upon which the arrangement of

the other Gospels and the remaining New Testament books logically rest. Since the Evangelist, having established his authority and credibility, appeals emotionally to his narrative audience and not to the audience of the logia,<sup>7</sup> or the words Jesus addressed to His various audiences (Hertzog 16), this study will only be concerned with the Evangelist's audience as "that body present to his literature" (Langellier 17). Finally, this study will approach an examination of Matthew as seen through the eyes of faith (not reason) as presented in the King James Version, as its central theme.

In order to inaugurate effectively an investigation into the reason for the differences in the Gospels and the purpose these differences serve, a brief review of what New Testament scholars consider to be Matthew's purpose in writing this Gospel will help clarify the historical and religious contexts of the Evangelist's literary intent and his audience's needs in reading his Gospel.

The first step in reviewing what scholars say concerning Matthew's purpose in writing will be to ascertain what caused the second generation Christians to record oral tradition, especially when it had been forbidden by rabbis (Grant 107-08). Robert Grant argues that the Evangelists wrote their Gospels because of the persecution of Roman Christians in AD 64, the death of James (head of the Church

in Jerusalem) in AD 62, the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70, and probably most important of all, the deaths of some of the eyewitness apostles. Since the early Church preached the theological significance of the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus, the memories of those who witnessed these events were essential in authenticating the validity of the foundation of Christian doctrine; hence, when "these eyewitnesses grew old or died, it was obviously necessary to commit their narratives to writing" (107-08).

These early Christians had recognized that eyewitness accounts of Jesus's resurrection were fundamental to the Church's teaching that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God. Because the details of the life of Jesus and His teachings were common knowledge, the apostles and other eyewitnesses had not earlier recorded them. Moreover, evidence given orally by witnesses was credible because their audiences could see the glow of divine anointing in the apostles' eyes (Tasker 13). These eyewitnesses of the events in Jesus's life awaited so intensely His imminent return that they did not deem it necessary to record their memories of Him (Tasker 13). Too, obvious problems of literacy and multiple copies of an account existed.

Finally, in the last quarter of the first century, when the Church was well established, Matthew wrote to churches comprised of converted Jews which were attempting to codify

the teachings of Jesus and to "turn the great principles of His teachings into rules of conduct" (Tasker 42). He, along with the other synoptic Evangelists, was concerned with the historical Jesus because he was conscious that some meaning lay beneath the surface in each action or event of Jesus's life and teaching (Scott 120). On the other hand, as German redaction critics (Bornkamm, Marzson, Conzelmann, and Haenchen) have pointed out, Matthew and the other Evangelists wrote from the point of view of their faith that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God. These critics are convinced that the writers of all four Gospels "manipulated their materials to express their theological viewpoints" (Guthrie 107).

Almost unanimously, New Testament scholars agree that Matthew wrote to convince Jewish Christians and Jews that Jesus was the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy concerning the Messiah (Tasker 14). He aimed "to elaborate what is implicit in Mark, viz. that Jesus was not only the Christ, but the Christ, the son of David . . ." (Tasker 35). Matthew adapted and elaborated Mark's material so "that it would be of great value to the Christians and their controversies with the Jews" (Tasker 35). Writing in an era when the memory of Pompey's conquest of Jerusalem in AD 63 was vivid and when the memory of Rome's first puppet King Antipater and his son, Herod, descendants of Esau, were

painfully present, Matthew carefully portrays this Jewish Messiah, Jesus, according to the law and the prophets (Halley 404). He strengthens his argument that Jesus is the Christ, the Messianic super-hero, by demonstrating that His genealogy, birth, baptism, temptation, ministry, death, and resurrection were all in fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy. Matthew argues that Jesus was born, lived, died, and arose again "that it might be fulfilled by the prophet" (Matt. 1:22).

The Evangelist identifies every aspect of his hero's life and teaching in the context of the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy. For this reason, Matthew found it appropriate to present Jesus's Davidic credentials to his Jewish audience: "the book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham" (Matt. 1:1). With authoritative incisiveness, the Evangelist begins with Abraham (Matt. 1:2), the father of the Jewish faith, the most authoritative figure in their Jewish theology, and he traces descendingly Jesus's ancestry from Abraham to David (1:6), from David to Jechonias, who was carried away into Babylonian exile (1:11), and from Jechonias to Jesus.

Matthew calls attention to the parallels of fourteen generations from Abraham to David, fourteen generations from David to Jechonias, and fourteen generations from Jechonias (or Babylonian captivity) to Jesus.<sup>8</sup> Hendriksen agrees with

many other New Testament scholars that Matthew attaches a great significance to Jesus's being the apex of these three sets of fourteen. His Jewish audience was aware of the Judaistic teaching that the number three is one signifying divine completeness or perfection and that the number four signifies fullness or perfection of "the earth and/or heavens and the four winds"<sup>9</sup> (110). In Scripture the number seven for Jewish theological thinkers often indicated the totality ordained by God. Since fourteen is twice the number of seven, the emphasis of the totality of God doubles in intensity in Matthew's geneology. The three periods of fourteen generations involve six times the number seven which, according to Hendriksen, "immediately introduces the seventh seven, reduplicated completeness, perfection" (110). Hendriksen expands his argument by explaining that Matthew's genealogy is a structured argument of sevens which continues with the story of this Savior" who is, Hendriksen adds, "the One who not only completes or fulfills the old, but definitively ushers in the new" (110).<sup>10</sup> Furthermore, Hendriksen argues that these three stages of fourteen generations in Matthew's genealogy symbolize the course of redemptive history which was God's eternal plan "being perfectly realized" (110).

Another distinct feature of Matthew's genealogy which reflects the particular care the Evangelist takes in

identifying Jesus as the Messiah-hero for his Jewish audience materializes in an unusual inclusion (for Old Testament genealogies) of five women. The first woman is the widow, Tamar, the daughter-in-law of Judah, whose incestuous relationship with her father-in-law produced one of King David's ancestors. The second is the Canaanite, Rahab, a sacred prostitute in a pagan religion who later married a noble Israelite; the third is the Moabite, Ruth, who married Boaz and bore him Obed, the grandfather of David. Next is Bathsheba, the wife of Uriah; David committed adultery with her and designed the death of her husband. The last woman in Matthew's genealogy of Jesus is Mary, the Lord's mother upon whom aspersions were cast concerning her sexual purity.<sup>11</sup> Spivey and Smith (118), Major (229), and Hendriksen (110-11) reflect the accepted scholarly opinion that Matthew included these five women, four of whom were probably foreigners, to suggest "a possibility of the unexpected; the Christ who comes may not correspond to the image of the Messiah for whom Israel was waiting" (Spivey and Smith 118). When Matthew identifies Jesus as the Jewish Messiah, he is recognizing the needs of his audience and breaks with Jewish genealogical tradition. Thus he allows his audience to find meaning within a familiar tradition which helps the audience to identify with this Gospel.

Adjusting to these needs of the Christian element of his Jewish audience, Matthew provided a logical defense which Jewish Christians might use against non-Christian Jews. In spite of the questionable conduct of these first four women, all ancestors of King David, God acted through each of them. For example, in spite of Tamar's duplicity in involving her father-in-law Judah in an incestuous relationship, God allowed her to become the mother of a son whose blood would flow in royal David's veins. Right after the Israelites entered Canaan, God honored Rahab, a prostitute in the city of Jericho, by allowing her to be the great-grandmother of Obed, the father of Jesse, who was the father of David. Even though Bathsheba committed adultery David, God honored her in that He allowed her to become the mother of King Solomon. Finally, in spite of the accusations of immorality brought against Mary, a descendent of King David, who was also used by God to become the mother of a son whom David in spirit called "Lord" (Matt. 22:44), God honored this Virgin by selecting her as the mother of Jesus Christ.

Another feature of this genealogy which many New Testament thinkers feel Matthew purposefully interpreted for his Jewish audience may be observed in that Matthew, the Jewish tax-collector, presents a genealogy of Jesus's legal father, Joseph, through whom He could claim, according to prophecy, to be the legitimate seed of David and thus be



heir to David's throne (Matt. 1:16). From Mary and by way of Mary, He also could claim to be David's royal heir (Matt. 1:16). Matthew's double genealogical witness would establish a greater legalistic weight of authority for his Jewish-Christian audience as well as gain some measure of respect from his Jewish opposition because they would understand this double emphasis of Jesus's identification as the Messiah, the Son of David, and the Messiah, the Son of God.

What Matthew has implied in the genealogy of Jesus, he now clearly teaches in the story of Jesus's birth (Hendrikson 130). He writes: "Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When his mother Mary was espoused [betrothed or engaged] to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost" (Matt. 1:18). Narrating the account of Jesus's birth, Matthew adroitly adjusts his account to further defending Jesus's legitimate right to David's throne, thus emphasizing the authority of His claim to be the Messiah, the son of David, the Son of God. The Evangelist's narration-exposition depends upon his Jewish readers' knowledge of Mosaic marital laws.

Mary's espousal, or betrothal, to Joseph was a serious and binding agreement which had been made in the presence of witnesses. Strictly speaking, betrothal constituted marriage in the eyes of Jewish law; Mary and Joseph were called wife and husband. Even so, a Jewish marriage was

not usually consummated until a year or two after the betrothal. Until that time, the bride as well as the bridegroom lived apart in parents' homes. Also, until the time of their marriage's consummation, the bride and bridegroom only communicated by means of "a friend of the bridegroom" (Freeman 330). An espousal was a serious agreement governed by the Law of Moses; it could only be terminated by divorce or death.

Matthew relates that when Mary's pregnancy became known, Joseph reacted to the dilemma of her possible unfaithfulness to him with justness under the Mosaic Law and great compassion in that he was not willing to divorce her publicly because that action would bring about the legal charge of adultery, one punishable by being stoned to death. His focus on this dilemma--rather than the wonder of the virgin birth--seems designed especially to appeal to the sympathetic understanding of a Jewish audience. Matthew creates a sympathy for Joseph who pondered whether or not Mary truly had been unfaithful to him or truly was with child by the Holy Ghost. He tells of Joseph's dream and how angel of the Lord appeared in it to tell him, "Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived of her is of the Holy Ghost" (1:20). Continuing, the angel told him "she shall bring forth a son, and thou shall call his name JESUS: for he shall save

his people from their sins" (Matt. 1:21). In Matthew's account, the angel succinctly concluded his message to Joseph by assuring him that in the conception and birth of Jesus, God's higher-than-Moses's Law was in effect and that "all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, Isaiah, [Isa. 7:14] saying, "Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God is with us" (Matt. 1:22-23). Thus, Matthew, in writing to his Jewish audience, firmly places the story of Jesus's birth in the framework of Hebrew messianic prophecy in order to assure them that certainly Jesus was the son of David who came to minister only to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (10:6; 15:24).

Regardless of the apparent adjustments of Matthew's genealogical and birth/infancy materials for his Jewish audience, small but perceptible evidences of change in theological scope are present. The inclusion of women in this genealogy of the Jewish Messiah and the unorthodox virgin birth of a Savior who would save His people (whomever they might be--they are not designated as Jewish) from their sins begin to intimate that this Messiah will not only save the Jews from their sins but also the Gentiles, such as the three Magi who worship Him and pay tribute to His sovereignty with their symbolic gifts of gold (material

possessions), frankincense (symbolic of worship or prayer) and myrrh (also symbolic of worship or prayer).<sup>12</sup>

While this study accepts the importance of these evidences of change within the Matthean presentation of Jesus's geneology, birth, and infancy, it stresses that the Evangelist tailored his material to achieve a positive identification of Jesus as a Jewish Messiah in a Jewish style for a Jewish audience. In no manner does he leave any doubt that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah-king who was prophesied to come (Matt. 2:2; Isa. 60:3), to be born in Bethlehem of Judea (Matt. 2:6; Micah 5:2), to flee to Egypt (Matt. 2:15; Hosea 11:1), and to become identified as a Nazarene (Matt. 2:23; Isa. 9:1-2). Already these Matthean-audience adjustments of material have begun to provide some insights into the reasons for the differences among the Gospels and to suggest a possible purpose for them. This analysis of audience shows Matthew's adjustment of materials for his audience: one can see that this Messiah-king, viewed as an isolated static entity, is neither like any other king in Jewish history nor any other king in world history because His birth, infancy, regional identity, and future role had been prophesied centuries before. Once the audience completely identifies with Matthew through pathetic appeal, the particle aspect of stasis is achieved. Later, Matthew extends stasis to include range (variation) and

distribution through rhetorical devices and referential framework.

In establishing Jesus's messianic identity by way of His genealogy and birth/infancy accounts, Matthew has laid the unmoveable cornerstone of his argument that Jesus is indeed that Messiah, the son of Abraham and David, who was foretold by Old Testament prophets, and who, Himself, said that He came not to minister to the Gentiles (not even the Samaritans who were descendents of Jews and Gentiles) but "rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. 10:5-6). The Evangelist has created a pathos with his Jewish audience which is almost palpable.

Thus, having established Jesus as the long awaited Jewish Messiah-king, Matthew continues to adjust his material to meet his audience's expectation and to convince them not only to view Jesus as Messiah, but also as the Christ, the Son of God. This radically new way of perceiving Jesus seemed to challenge the first commandment which governed the lives of this audience, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me" (Exod. 20:3). God instructed Moses to teach the Israelites this commandment, re-worded in the Scripture verse known to the Jews as the Shema in the Jewish devotional: "Hear, O Israel: the LORD our God is one LORD" (Deut. 6:4).<sup>13</sup> This particular commandment, so much a part of Jewish religious life, makes repugnant the

idea of another god. The psychological and religious forces prevalent among this Jewish audience would reject as totally unacceptable this position. While steadfastly holding before his Jewish audience Jesus's Messiah identification, Matthew quietly introduces an idea especially abhorrent to the earnestly monotheistical Jews. This small movement toward change constitutes an extension of the original idea of Jesus's Messiahship and satisfies the concept of a tagmemic variation (an extension of particle) within Matthew's stasis presentation of Jesus (see Fig. 1, 6-7). Thus, he introduces a range of the Messiah which expands throughout his Gospel which Mark extends in his to a fully developed dynamic perception. To move from a particle perception of stasis through variation and distribution of stasis to a dynamic perception is to move from the world of ethics (Matthew) to the world of politics (Mark and Luke). Showing great consideration for his audience, Matthew gently and obliquely hints of a spiraling audience though he constantly reaffirms his argument that Jesus came to fulfill the Law of Moses. By constantly focusing on the Law of Moses, Matthew centers on stasis. Yet, he includes more than particle elements of the Law. He fully develops his stasis by extending particle into both variation and distribution of particle. In this way, his Gospel ranges from the Mosaic Law to the preaching of the kingdom of

heaven in the Sermon on the Mount. Though movement occurs it does not go beyond stasis. All of these rhetorical features direct the audience's attention constantly to the concept of "What is it?" with the response, "Moses's Law." As long as the audience can answer without hesitation, the Gospel writer has achieved identification and stasis with his audience. He accomplishes his audience identification with referential use of rhetorical phrases and allusions, titles and terms, selection and arrangement, and forms.

One instance of Matthew's successful use of rhetorical phrases can be seen in "the kingdom of heaven." He uses the phrase "the kingdom of heaven" more than any other Gospel writer<sup>14</sup> because he emphasizes the kingship of Jesus. Having earlier established Jesus's royal lineage and birth, Matthew now presents the man, Jesus, as King of the kingdom of heaven as He appeared at the Jordan River for baptism by John the Baptist (Matt. 3:13). Continuing to appeal to his Jewish audience, Matthew portrays Jesus in the baptismal pericope.<sup>15</sup> As a sinless Messiah, He has come as the Savior for a sinful Israel (Kingsbury 65) who needed the same drastic change of heart as was symbolized in proselyte baptism into Judaism (Hendriksen 200). As a priest now thirty years of age, He, in the practice of priests, has come for ceremonial cleansing which precedes public ministry (Exod. 30:17-21), and most importantly, as the perfectly

obedient Son whose heavenly Father audibly declares from heaven: "This is my beloved Son in Whom I am well pleased" (Matt. 3:17).

Kingsbury points out that in the first part of Matthew's description of Jesus's person and origin (stasis), the over-riding emphasis is on Jesus as the Messiah, the son of David; yet, the Evangelist obliquely announces Jesus's Godhead through dialogue filled with allusion to evoke the concept of Godhead in those who know the Old Testament. Thereby, he offers a variation and an extension of the particle perspective. This movement prepares his audience for additional movement toward distribution. When the writer has the particle, the variation, and the distribution perspectives, he has provided the full range of stasis and guided his audience from the Mosiac Law to the Sermon on the Mount which preaches "the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Kingsbury contends that Matthew believed the truth of this announcement first had to be proclaimed by God in order for it to carry the authoritative weight necessary to command the respect of his Jewish audience who, according to Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy (21), were both Christian Jews and enemy Jews. Kingsbury concludes that the truth of Jesus's divinity can only be known by revelation (Matt. 16:16-17); thus Matthew adjusts his material for the skeptical Jewish element of his audience by alluding "to this truth with



circumlocutions (1:16,18,20), with metaphors (2:8-9,11,13-14,20-21:3:11), with a term ('son') that is susceptible to dual meaning (1:21,23,25) . . . , and with the softly sounded "word of the Lord spoken through the prophet (1:22-23;2:15)" (Kingsbury 70). Matthew presents Jesus to his audience as King of the kingdom of heaven; but he reports that God, the Father, presents Jesus as His Son. With these rhetorical devices Matthew ranges his static view from particle (Jesus as Messiah) through variation (Jesus as Son) to distribution (Jesus as the Savior of the world).

He also achieves variation with another rhetorical device which relies on the use of titles. For instances, Matthew's account of God speaking from heaven and publicly acknowledging Jesus as God by calling Him "Son" is but one example of what Spivey and Smith call "a possibility of the unexpected; the Christ who comes may not correspond to the image of the Messiah [particle perspective] for whom Israel was waiting" (118). Matthew's Jesus is a Jew of the Jews, and He is the legal heir to the Davidic throne; therefore, he has all the qualifications prophesied by Jewish prophets; yet, He has a divine qualification which orthodox Jews were unwilling to accept. This variation of the particle perspective remains a central difference between Judaism and Christianity. Nevertheless, with this single rhetorical device, Matthew establishes Jesus's identity for his

audience and has begun skillfully the process of convincing them that Jesus is also the God of the kingdom of heaven. Matthew continues his rhetorical strategy and fortifies his Messiah-king depiction of Jesus when he cautiously introduces the new aspect of Jesus's kingship--His divinity (another variation). One major feature used by the writer of Matthew to emphasize Jesus's divinity can be seen in his conscious selection of details. While Mark's Gospel (a major source for Matthew's and Luke's) scarcely mentions Jesus's temptation in the wilderness, Matthew utilizes the temptation pericope to strengthen his argument that Jesus, the Messiah, is also God's Son (a variation). The first Evangelist steadily maintains his Judaistic approach to the argument that Jesus has come to fulfill prophecy (particle perspective) even in his temptation account. In his relating Jesus's threefold temptation by Satan, he arranges their order of occurrence in a manner more in harmony with his portrayal of Jesus as the Davidic Messiah, the King of the Jews, and not in the order that Luke chose, which (with the exception of the first temptation) follows the order of the Scriptural authority in Deuteronomy, the source of both Satan's temptations and Jesus's replies to them. This range extends into the distribution perspective. He begins with the physical realm of vulnerability (particle). Immediately through this allusion, his audience would immediately recall

the experiences of Moses's forty-day fast on Mount Horeb (Exod. 34:2,28) and Elijah's experience of physical hunger on his way to that same mountain (Hendriksen 224, 1 Kings 19:8). The association of Jesus with Old Testament parallels would prepare an audience to move from the particle perspective of Jesus as vulnerable to suggested variations.

Matthew's sequential order of Jesus's temptations deviates from Luke's order. A third rhetorical strategy, form, supports Matthew's presentation. The tempter's taunt, "If thou be the Son of God, command these stones be made bread" (4:3), is Satan's immediate contesting of God's baptismal declaration of Jesus' divinity. Matthew not only presents the threat this God-man poses to Satan's power on earth but also he presents God's Adversary, the Devil, using the title (though derogatorily), "the Son of God." Rhetorically, the temptation is only possible through variation of Jesus as God-man (the variation perspective). Satan directs his first attack toward Jesus's greatest weakness, His humanity, as manifested in His need for food. Again, Matthew's audience would have also remembered that their first father, Adam, who sinned because he ate the forbidden food and that their fathers in the desert of Sinai who sinned because they grumbled for lack of bread. Furthermore, his audience would have known that the answer Jesus gave to the tempter in the wilderness should have been

Adam's in the Garden of Eden and the Israelites's in the desert. This temptation pericope's rhetorical effect comes from the juxtaposition of Matthew's variations against Old Testament allusions and prepares a Jewish audience to accept change.

Matthew, unlike Luke, quotes literally from Deuteronomy 8:3 to strengthen the particle perspective of stasis: "It is written man shall not live by bread alone but by every word that proceedeth from the mouth [*italics added*] of God."

While Luke eliminates this italicized anthropomorphic metaphor of Deuteronomy 8:3, the Jewish cultural mind-set of Matthew's audience demanded an exact quotation of this Scripture. By way of this precisely quoted Scripture, Matthew subtly, but forcefully, interjects into the consciousness of his audience that God's words are now being spoken by One whose authority exceeds that of the scribes (Matt. 7:28-29). His rhetorical strategy, though beginning with stasis, subtly moves away from the particle perspective to a variation.

Matthew writes that Satan tempted Jesus to prove His divinity by casting Himself down from a pinnacle of the Temple, a height of perhaps 450 feet (Hendriksen 228). This second temptation follows the same line of argument of verse three with the anaphoric opening "If thou be": "If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down: for it is written, He

shall give his angels charge over thee: and in their hands shall they bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone" (4:6). This second attempt to defeat Jesus before He began His ministry involved tempting Him to prove a point presumptuously rather than adhere to an obedience to God which would prohibit rash actions. Jesus realized that for Him to yield to this temptation "would amount to substituting presumption for faith, effrontery for submission to God's guidance" (Hendriksen 229). This rhetorical effect of Jesus's demonstrating the expected behavior of a Jewish audience confirms Matthew's reliance on the Law of Moses (particle) and preserves the static features of his presentation.

Just as Jesus was tempted to facilitate the physical aspect of being the Word-made-flesh and the temporal aspect of being accepted as the Messiah, King of the Jews, so was He tempted to facilitate conquering the spiritual kingdoms of the world. Satan, taking Jesus to the top of a high mountain, showed Him the glorious kingdoms of the world; he offered them to Jesus if only He would fall down and worship him just once (4:9). Scholars have seriously questioned whether or not Satan had the provincial power to make such an offer. Jesus, nevertheless, did not dispute the legitimacy of the offer; it is evident from His answer that He recognized this final temptation to be an easy compromise

with the problem of Satan and sin: "Get thee hence, Satan," He said, knowing that Satan cannot be vanquished with reason but only with faith; "For it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy god, and him only shalt thou serve" (Matt. 4:10). In this final temptation Matthew has moved from particle to distribution.

Matthew's temptation pericope provides proof that the Evangelist took care to quote exactly the Scripture found in Deuteronomy 8:3 and that he rearranged the Quelle source material which both he and Luke used since it is evident that they did not use Mark's account of the temptation of Jesus. His reason for this particular rearrangement of his materials argues that he did so in order to present more convincingly a Messiah who could pass not only the test of physical obedience (particle) whereas Adam failed, who could pass not only the test of temporal obedience whereas Moses, Saul, David, and Jonah had failed (variation), but that He also could, and did, pass the test of spiritual obedience whereas Adam and the whole human race had miserably failed (distribution). Only Matthew concludes this pericope of Jesus' temptation ordeal with the statement that when the Devil left Him, angels came and ministered to Him (4:11).

Perhaps the greatest rhetorical achievement of this temptation pericope however is that the Evangelist allows the temptations of Jesus's adversary to carry indirectly the

argument that Jesus was indeed the Son of God; and as the Son of God, He was now ready to assume His divine responsibility in this kingdom of heaven. This achievement, added to the facts that Matthew has adjusted his material to conform to the order and wording of Jewish Scriptures and has also emphasized the hierarchy of Jewish values in arranging Jesus's physical, temporal, and spiritual temptations, provides proof that the Evangelist continues to strengthen his static presentation of Jesus through his argument for Jesus's Messiahship; at the same time, Matthew has begun to lead his readers into the process of change in their view of Jesus. He makes it easier to see Him as the Son of God.

After having presented the Messiah-king's baptismal coronation and His triumph over God's adversary, Satan, Matthew widens the spiraling movement to change his Jewish audience's way of viewing Jesus by introducing it to the new ethics of the new law, one not written in stone as was Moses's but rather one written in the hearts of believers in Jesus. In addition to the rhetorical strategy of terms, allusions, phrases, and conscious selection of details, Matthew consciously imitates the form and pattern in the Pentateuch.

Matthew, in presenting this new law of the heart, chose the form most familiar and acceptable to his Jewish audience.

He chose to arrange the material available to him into five distinct parts which correspond to the pattern used by Moses when he, according to tradition, compiled his five books (Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy) which are commonly known as the Torah<sup>16</sup> (a Hebrew word meaning "direction") or as the Pentateuch (a Greek word referring to the five books or scrolls of Moses). W. D. Davis writes that Benjamin W. Bacon was probably the first to stimulate this approach to Matthew's Gospel (212) in "The 'Five Books' of Matthew against the Jews" (55-66) although many others have also used this approach with minor refinements and variations.<sup>17</sup> Bacon argues that the Gospel of Matthew, apart from the Prologue (the birth narrative, Matthew 1,2) and the Epilogue (from the last supper to the resurrection, Matthew 26-28), is divided into five parts, each of which is concluded with an almost identical formula: Matthew is structured to parallel Moses's five books of the Law.

Part one corresponds to Book 1 (Genesis) of the Pentateuch and has two major divisions: narrative materials, Matthew 3:1-4:25, and the Sermon on the Mount, Matthew 5:1-7:27. It concludes with the formulaic statement: "And when Jesus finished these saying . . ." (Matt. 7:28).

Part two parallels Book 2 (Exodus) of the Pentateuch. Its two major divisions are: narrative materials, Matthew 8:1-9:35, and the discourse on missions and martyrdom,



Matthew 9:36-10-42. Part two concludes with this formulaic statement: "And when Jesus had finished instructing his twelve disciples . . . " (Matt. 11:1).

Part three corresponds to Book 3 (Leviticus) of the Pentateuch. Its major divisions are narrative and debate materials, Matthew 11:2-12:50, and Jesus's teaching on the kingdom of heaven, Matthew 13:1-52. This part also concludes with a formulaic statement: "And when Jesus had finished these parables . . ." (Matt. 13:53).

Part four parallels Book 4 (Numbers) of the Pentateuch and has two major divisions: narrative and debate material, Matthew 13:54-17:21, and the discourse on Church administration, Matthew 17:22-18:35. In the same manner of the preceding parts, it also concludes with a formulaic statement: "Now when Jesus had finished these sayings . . ." (Matt. 19:21).

Part five, corresponding to Book 5 (Deuteronomy) of the Pentateuch, also has two major divisions: narrative and debate material, Matthew 19:2-22:46, and the Jesus's discourse on eschatology and His farewell address, Matthew 23:3-28:2. It also concludes with a formulaic saying in the same manner as all the other parts: "When Jesus finished all these sayings . . ." (Matt. 26:1). Bacon's arrangement supports his conclusion that Matthew's intention was to organize his Gospel of the new Israel (the

Church) in the same way that Moses organized God's Law of the old Israel (63-66).<sup>18</sup>

Clearly, this analysis establishes the correspondence between the two structures. Though some scholars do not accept this arrangement, most recognize the conscious artistry and rhetorical impact of balance between Matthew's presentation of Jesus's ascent of the mountain to present the code of the new law and Moses's ascent to Mount Sinai to accept the code of the old Law. The form of the Gospel strengthens the particle perspective of stasis because the form of the Gospel recalls the form of the Pentateuch. Even so, the particle perspective moves toward the variation perspective. Matthew is not the Pentateuch but it is like the Pentateuch and therefore it is a variation of it. When the concept of variation is understood and the movement away from the particle perspective is realized, the distribution of Matthew's Gospel is anticipated.

Moreover, that Matthew prefaced Jesus's first discourse, the Sermon on the Mount, with the nine Beatitudes (5:3-11) in the same manner that God prefaced the Mosaic Law with the Ten Commandments furthers the evidence he chose the pentateuchal arrangement to make the revolutionary teachings of Jesus acceptable to Jews (variation). Of all the Evangelists, only Matthew presents nine declarations of happiness. Furthermore, all but the last of the Beatitudes which

Matthew's Jesus lays in His Sermon on the Mount as the cornerstone of the kingdom of heaven specify the qualities of its spiritual law. This forthright, positive arrangement indicates that Matthew wanted to convince his audience that these Beatitudes are the apex and quintessence of the new spiritual law; they fulfill the Decalogue which was the apex and quintessence of the Law of Moses. Only Matthew of all the Evangelists has Jesus declare that His mission to earth was to fulfill the Law of Moses, not to destroy it (5:17-18). This parallel again is a variation of a particle perspective.

Matthew, ever conscious of his audience, relies upon tradition and deals largely with prophecy to establish the identity of Jesus as the Messiah-king (Thompson 1532). Emphasis on tradition underscores a static view of Jesus and limits his appeal to a select group. When he gives space to Jesus's discourses in order to explicate the code of the kingdom of heaven, he begins a perceptible movement toward a change the variation perspective of the Messiah-king. With this variation, Matthew, still using the reportorial style of a witness to a fact, adjusts his sources so that his Jewish readers might understand Jesus, the Messiah-king, in the context of the rulers of this world and of the world to come. The revolutions of the spiraling audience widen to the distribution perspective of Him. With this third

perspective, the static audience swells beyond its exclusivity, but it does not provide for the dynamic perspective of Mark and Luke nor for the comprehensive view of John.

Matthew's Gospel never deviates from its primary purpose. As this tagmemic analysis has indicated, the theme, "Jesus the Messiah has come in fulfillment of Jewish prophecy," dominates the whole of his Gospel; yet, the Evangelist, knowing the Jewish mind, quietly prepares his Jewish audience to see the Messiah-king in the context of the kingdom of heaven which preempts the exclusiveness of Judaism and embraces the inclusiveness of the world.

For example, Matthew prepares his audience for the distribution perspective by broadening their view of Jesus as the Messiah-king through his unique inclusion of Peter's confessing, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God" (17:16) and Jesus's giving Peter the "keys of the kingdom of heaven" (17:18-19). Though Peter has the authority (keys), that authority rests in his recognition of Christ as the Son of God. Peter's confession of Christ follows Jesus's questioning His disciples with "Whom do men say that I the Son of Man am?" (17:15). Blessing Peter after his confession, Jesus tells him in essence that only God, the heavenly Father, has revealed this truth to Peter; furthermore, Jesus tells Peter, "I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates

of hell shall not prevail against it" (17:18). As G. W. Bromiley points out, "In the Gospels the term [church, 'denoting an assembly'] is found only in Matthew 16:18 and 18:17. This paucity is perhaps explained by the fact that both these verses seem to envisage a situation still future" (Zondervan 170). Bromiley contends that this Church of which Jesus speaks will consist of those who have also made the Apostle Peter's confession, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," their own (170).

The last part of the blessing Jesus bestows upon Peter would be difficult for an unprepared Jewish mind to accept because it elevates Jesus to a Divine Being who has the power to relegate divine authority. Matthew, conscious of his audience, has carefully constructed his Gospel by anticipating those objections. His strategy has methodically moved from the particle perspective through the variation to the final one, the distribution perspective. The keys which Jesus gives to Peter ("the keys of the kingdom of heaven") represent that unacceptable authority over physical, temporal, and spiritual destinies. When Jesus declares that "whatsoever Thou shalt bind on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (17:19), He speaks words that might alienate a Jewish audience. To prevent alienation and to insure identification, Matthew places these words in the mouth of Peter, the most traditionally Jewish of all the Apostles.

That Matthew would present Jesus the Messiah giving such sweeping divine authority who confessed Him to be the Son of God strongly argues that Matthew's Gospel, in this manner, is preparing the Jewish audience to see that Jesus the Messiah-king, in relation to other earthly kings, has authority as God's Son on earth and in heaven.

Matthew also adjusts his materials for a Jewish audience when he includes a defense of Jesus's supernatural resurrection from the dead. Only Matthew reports these supernatural phenomena surrounding Jesus's death and resurrection: the dream of Pilate's wife (27:19), the earthquake when Jesus died (27:51), the appearance of resurrected saints (27:52), the watch at the tomb (27:62-66), and the earthquake that opened the empty tomb (28:2). In his rhetorical endeavor to convince his Jewish audience that Jesus was more than an earthly king endowed with limited spiritual powers, Matthew especially selects a panorama of supernatural elements surrounding Jesus's death and resurrection which set Him apart as being more than a Messiah-king. The first supernatural phenomenon, Pilate's wife's dream, creates a sense of supernatural expectancy for the Evangelist's audience. Pilate's wife sent word to her husband as he is just sitting down to hear Jesus's case: "Have nothing to do with that just man: For I have suffered many things this day in a dream because of him" (27:19).

The second and third supernatural events only confirm for Matthew's audience that Jesus is more than even a superhero; at the moment of Jesus's death, Matthew alone reports that "the earth did quake and the rocks rent; And the graves were opened and many bodies [Old Testament saints] which slept arose, And came out of the graves after his resurrection, and went into the city, and appeared unto many" (27:50-53). Matthew states that when the Roman centurion and his cohorts saw the destruction of the earthquake, "they feared greatly, saying, Truly this was the Son of God" (27:54). Matthew continues his argument that Jesus is more than the Messiah-king, David's son, by including accounts of other's confessing Him to be so. And he strengthens his audience appeal by including the account of the Old Testament saints being resurrected with Jesus.

The last supernatural occurrence surrounding Jesus's resurrection happened three days after Jesus's death. Matthew reports that the chief priest and Pharisees had requested a special watch set, which Pilate provided, before Jesus's tomb to insure that His disciples did not steal his body (27:62-66). When Magdalene and "the other Mary" came three days later to the tomb of Jesus, Matthew reports a great earthquake and a shining angel dressed in white descended from heaven and rolled back the stone which sealed Jesus's tomb to reveal that it was empty (28:1-3).

Thus the Evangelist continues to argue skillfully that even Jesus's death and resurrection were accompanied by supernatural signs which distinguished Him as God's Son. The placement of these events reinforce the rhetorical arrangement of the Gospel and help lead an audience to realize variation and distribution within stasis.

Matthew closes his Gospel with Jesus's great commission. Only he reports that Jesus, after His resurrection and before He ascended into heaven, said to His disciples, "All power is given unto me in heaven and earth" (28:18). This simple statement which declares His Godhead unequivocally prefaces His great commission to these eleven: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world" (28:19-20). Here Matthew presents His Jewish audience with an astounding re-statement of Isaiah 52:10 ("All the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God"): Jesus is not only God's Son, but He is also God who is equal with the Father and the Holy Ghost. Furthermore, He has come to save not only Israel but the world. In this way, through special proofs, Matthew anticipates the comprehensive view of Jesus's mission developed in John's Gospel. This Messiah is God--and His power extends to heaven--there is no other like



Him.

Using a tagmemic concept of audience to examine Matthew from the three perspectives of stasis has demonstrated how he adapts and adjusts his material for his audience. In so doing, he establishes his Gospel as the fulfillment of the Old Testament and the genesis of the New. This analysis reveals that inherent in stasis of knowing Jesus as the Messiah-king underlies the movement toward a changing view of Jesus (the Son of God variation). Moreover, Matthew, while steadily maintaining Jesus's Jewish messiahship, selects the source material that argues that He is more than God's Son (variation). He is God, and as such, He is the incomparable King of the kingdom of heaven (variation). Matthew's Gospel is seen as the Gospel matrix in which all the themes of the other Gospels are embedded.

## Notes

1

William Hendriksen in his New Testament Commentary: Exposition of the Gospel According to Matthew, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1973), defines godspell as "the spell or story that tells us what God, by means of the incarnation, earthly sojourn, mighty acts, suffering, death, and resurrection of his [sic] only Son, has done to save sinners. It is the evangel or 'message of good tidings,' the glad news or salvation addressed to a world lost in sin. This [definition] is the meaning of the term in biblical usage" (3).

2

The Gospel According to Matthew will be referred to as Matthew.

3

The title, messiah, will be capitalized only when referring especially to Jesus. Also, church will be capitalized when referring to the Church as a whole.

See pp. 3-7 above for explanation of Pike's tagmemic theory.

4

Norman Perrin, in his The New Testament: An Introduction: Proclamation and Parenthesis, Myth and History, (New York: Harcourt, 1974), succinctly reports what

countless other scholars have observed: "that all the writers of the New Testament were either apostles or closely associated with apostles" (6).

5

Julian Price Love points out in The Gospel and the Gospels (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1953), that Q is an abbreviation of the German word Quelle, meaning spring or source (19).

6

William Hendriksen (New Testament Commentary) points out that an early Bible scholar, Irenaeus, believed that this Gospel was originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic and then was translated into Greek (Note 41).

7

For a fuller definition of the theological term, logia, see Walter A. Elwell, ed. Evangelical Dictionary of Theology (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984), 644.

8

H. D. A. Major points out that in the Gospel of Matthew's text of Jesus's geneology, a name appears to be omitted in this third section which only contains thirteen names.

9

See Jeremiah 49:36; Daniel 8:8; Daniel 11:4; Zechariah 2:6; Mark 13:27; and Revelation 7:1.

10

See Matthew 9:16,17; and Matthew 26:28-29.

11

Major refers to what he terms "the Talmud's slanderous report" that Jesus was a bastard fathered by Pantherus, a Roman soldier, who seduced Miriam, a Jewish girl (228).

12

See William Hendriksen's New Testament Commentary, 172-73. Some may be interested that myrrh was used as an anesthetic when mingled with wine or when preparing a body for burial.

13

Merrill Tenney writes that the Shema, "Hear O Israel, the LORD our God is one LORD" (Deut.6:4), is probably "the most often quoted verse in the Bible, as every good Jew repeats it several times a day" (Zondervan 783).

14

In the King James Version of the New Testament, Matthew mentions the kingdom of heaven fifty-one times compared to Mark's twelve, Luke's forty-one, and John's five.

15

Northrop Frye, in The Great Code: The Bible and Literature, defines a pericope as "the short discontinuous unit normally marked by a paragraph sign in most copies of the AV [King James Version]" (215). He further explains the pericope as the "certain context or situation that leads us to a crucial act, such as a miraculous healing, or a crucial saying, such as a parable or moral pronouncement. Hence the

Gospels are, as one scholar says of Mark, a sequence of discontinuous epiphanies" (216). Frye states that the pericope consists of two parts: the most important part is the "kernel," as he calls it, or the miracle, parable, or the aphorism. The second part is its context or husk, or setting, in which the miracle or parable takes place.

16

See Zondervan Dictionary of the Bible, 861.

17

See W. D. Davis' Invitation to the New Testament (Garden City: Doubleday, 1966) 212; R. V. G. Tasker's The Nature and Purpose of the Gospels, 2nd Ed. (London: S. C. M. Ltd., 1945) 35; and Julian Price Love's The Gospel and the Gospels (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1953) 112, for discussions on Matthew's pentateuchal arrangement.

19

Several opinions exist about the arrangement of Matthew. W. D. Davis objects to Bacon's relegating the birth narratives, the passion, and the resurrection to places outside the main scheme of Matthew's Gospel (214). Moreover, Davis states that "the five part division of a document was frequent in Judaism" (214); he gives an example of the five books of Psalms. Consequently, he maintains "the five-fold division of Matthew may be a customary one which had no significance for Matthew's theology" (214). Nonetheless, Davis agrees with Bacon that Matthew was concerned with presenting the moral teachings of Jesus as

the Law of the Messiah, that is, as the true interpretation of the old law [of Moses]" (214). Both Bacon and Davis would agree that Matthew's presentation of Jesus as He [Jesus] ascends the mountain, which is the counterpart to Mount Sinai, and from there delivers His "Law," is evidence that the Evangelist adjusted his materials to appeal emotionally to a Jewish audience.

## CHAPTER III

### THE DYNAMIC PERSPECTIVE

Mark and Luke,<sup>1</sup> while faithfully acknowledging Jesus as the Messiah-king who has come in fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy, do not make His Messiah-kingship their dominant Christological perspective. Both Mark and Luke distinguish their Gospels from Matthew's by offering a dynamic perspective instead of a static one. Mark's major emphasis focuses upon the Son of God who became the Son of Man, the suffering Servant of God, to reveal God's glory through His death while Luke's major emphasis centers upon the Son of Man who came as the second Adam to atone for the sin of mankind inherited from the first father, Adam. Both these Gospels conjointly present a changing, dynamic perspective of Jesus.

These two Gospels layer an additional perspective of Jesus over the static one of Matthew by emphasizing features which distinguish the dynamic super-hero Jesus from these static ones that Matthew stresses. Central to these dynamic features are those that reconcile some of the differences among the four Gospels. When viewed through the changing process, Mark's and Luke's Gospels add a further

dimension to the super-hero Jesus. Instead of Matthew's Judeo-Christian perspective of Jesus and His divine mission, these two Evangelists adjust their source material for Mark's Roman and Luke's Greek audiences. Using tagmemics to identify features of the Gospels to ascertain how the Evangelists achieve a sense of audiences uncovers a process which merges characteristics of Jesus sufficiently different from Matthew to represent a dynamic perspective in the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

In the previous chapter, the tagmemic analysis of Matthew disclosed that the static presentation of his Gospel ranged from the particle into the larger contexts of variation and distribution as Matthew unveils his subject of Jesus as Jewish Messiah-king. In his variation and distribution, Matthew introduces two minor themes, Jesus as the Son of God and as the Son of Man, which in turn are augmented by Mark and Luke. These two themes in Matthew's Gospel become dominant focuses of Mark's and Luke's Gospels. As such they provide two additional witnesses, one Roman and the other Hellenistic, that Jesus of Nazareth is indeed the Jewish Messiah and He is the world's Son of God as well. It is on the basis of these three witnesses, all in keeping with the Mosaic Law's establishing of fact on the basis of two or three witnesses, that John will, at the close of the first century, write to the world his spiritual application



of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Mark's and Luke's audience appeals are as essential to the process of developing and interpreting the Gospel away from Jewish ethnicity as the Gospels are essential in bridging the logical gap of understanding between the Old Testament and the rest of the New Testament. As dynamic presentations of the life and teaching of Jesus, both writers make major contributions to this logical transition because of the manner in which they have adapted and adjusted their source material for their audiences.

A sense of audience often arises out of the ethical consciousness of the writer-creator, especially in the divine writings of the Old and New Testament Scriptures. For this reason to establish a sense of audiences in Mark and Luke, it is necessary to identify historically "Mark" and "Luke." Because the consensus of scholarly opinion holds that the measure of the Gospels' authenticity rests upon apostolic authorship (Perrin 6), an examination of Marcan and Lucan authorship will be the first step in establishing credibility of their dynamic perspectives of Jesus, the Son of God, the Son of Man.

Although Matthew's identity as an author is submerged and interwoven into the flow of his appeal to his Jewish audience, Mark's identity remains obvious. Eusebius writes that Papias [circa AD 70-150], the Bishop of Hierapolis,

quoted John the Elder [thought by many scholars to be the author of First, Second, and Third John] as saying that Mark was Peter's interpreter and that he [Mark] wrote, not in order, but as accurately as possible, the "many things he remembered" (Hiebert 9). Also, D. Edmond Hiebert points out that Irenaeus [circa AD 140-203], Bishop of Lyons, wrote in AD 185 in Against Heresies (3.1.1.) that Mark was a disciple and interpreter of Peter who "'transmitted to us in writing the things preached by Peter'" (11). Ten years later, Clement of Alexandria maintained that Mark was requested by many who had heard Peter's preaching in Rome to write down the things he had heard Peter say because Mark had been with Peter for a long time and had remembered Peter's sermons (Hiebert 11). Eusebius records that Origen [circa AD 230] claimed that Mark composed his Gospel under Peter's guidance (Hiebert 11). Hiebert agrees that "this assertion that Peter was personally connected with the actual production of the Gospel seems a natural heightening of the early tradition to underline the apostolic sanction of our gospel" (11). Vincent Taylor in his The Gospel According to St. Mark contends that Bible scholars are generally agreed that the author of Mark is the same Mark of Papias who is the same John Mark mentioned on several occasions in Acts, Paul's epistles, and Peter's epistles (15). Hiebert also concludes that "the picture of the New Testament Mark is in

full agreement with the Papias tradition" (12). Bible scholarship, then, accepts the traditional Mark, also called John Mark (Acts 12:12,25), as the author of Mark's Gospel.

After having reviewed scholarly opinion concerning the identity of the author of Mark, consideration of his known qualifications to write authoritatively concerning the life and teachings of Jesus catalogues his rhetorical strategies to appeal to his audience. Traditional scholars have established certain facts concerning Mark's background. He was John, surnamed Mark, the son of a Jerusalem widow whose home was a place where early Christians, including Peter, met (Acts 12:12-17). As a consequence of Mark's familiarity with the leaders of the early Church, he had an intimate understanding of the life and teachings of Jesus through eyewitnesses. That Mark also knew Jesus but was perhaps not old enough to be associated with His ministry is also thought to be true by traditional scholars (Hiebert 12). Hiebert writes that it "seems a natural assumption that the 'young man' in Gethsemane mentioned in Mark 14:51-52 who fled naked when Jesus was arrested by the High Priest's guards was John Mark, himself" (12).

Mark, among one of the first Christian missionaries, served as helper to his cousin Barnabas and Paul. On their missionary tour to Asia Minor, he accompanied them as their helper or attendant as far as Perga where, for some unknown

reason, he left them and returned to Jerusalem. Whatever Mark's reason for deserting Paul's first missionary campaign, Paul saw it as a serious hindrance to the missionary enterprise and refused to allow Mark to be a part of his and Barnabas's next missionary venture (Col. 4:10; Acts 15:36-40). Paul's refusal to accept Mark's services caused a separation between Paul and Barnabas. The split resulted in Barnabas's choosing Mark and Paul's choosing Silas as missionary partners (Acts 15:36-40).

Henry Halley writes that after this sharp separation, Paul and that Mark appeared in Rome together twelve years later (Col. 4:10; Phil. 24). Hiebert states that when Paul left Rome after he was released from his first imprisonment, Mark stayed behind. When Peter arrived in Rome, Mark joined him as helper-associate and became so close to him that Peter in 1 Peter 5:13, written shortly before Peter's martyrdom, referred to him as "Mark, my son." After Peter's death, five years still later, Paul, just before his martyrdom, was asking for Mark to come to him (2 Tim. 4:11). Thus, it seems that Mark in his later years became one of Paul's intimate and "beloved helpers" (Halley 457). Later Paul was reincarcerated in Rome; shortly before his death, he wrote to Timothy requesting that Mark be brought to him "for he is useful to me for ministering" (2 Tim. 4:11).

Thus, Mark was intimately acquainted with the two great leaders of the Christian Church: Peter the Apostle to the Jews and Paul the Apostle to the Gentiles.<sup>2</sup> In his impressionable youth, he had absorbed the happenings of the last days before Jesus's death, the events of His resurrection and ascension, and the evangelistic birth of the Church at Pentecost (Bromiley, Zondervan 170). Moreover, Mark had participated in the missionary journeys into Asia Minor, he was intimately acquainted with the first missionary church, the church at Antioch, and he had years of personal experience with the persecuted Church at Rome. All these personal experiences no doubt colored what he interpreted as Peter's Gospel and helped him shape his own presentation for a Roman audience. He particularly develops the theme of the Son of God who was willing to become the suffering Servant. Mark drew forth a Jesus who could understand personally the sufferings of a persecuted Roman Church.

Luke's name is mentioned only three times in the New Testament. Paul, in writing his letter to the Colossians, refers to Luke as the "beloved physician" (Col. 4:14). In both Philemon 24 and 2 Timothy 4:11 Paul refers to Luke as one of his "fellow workers." Halley points out that in all three of these passages, Luke is linked with Mark as being "fellow workers" of Paul which indicates that they were companions in the work of the Roman Church (485).

Although great controversies have arisen concerning the identity of the author of Luke's Gospel,<sup>3</sup> scholars accept as truth the following details concerning the identity of Luke, the author of Luke and Acts. He was a disciple of the apostles; probably, claims F. W. Farrar, he was one of Paul's first Gentile converts at the church at Antioch (Syria) (19). Traditional scholars also believe that after his conversion, Luke became a companion-secretary to Paul and retained this position until Paul's martyrdom. Some of these scholars argue that he wrote the Gospel of Luke in Thebes in Achaëa where later he died at the age of eighty-four (Manson 50).

T. W. Manson, a twentieth-century Biblical scholar, in considering the sources of material which Luke used in his Gospel, argues that Luke became acquainted with one of his major sources, Quelle, or Q, when he was yet in the church in Antioch. Manson writes that Luke may have possessed one of the earliest copies of Quelle in Greek (a major source which was also used by Matthew) and that, being Paul's missionary assistant, Luke found a need to adapt, to extend, and to adjust this manual of instruction for Church members into "a still more comprehensive and effective manual of instruction" (56).

Manson states that Luke doubtless had many opportunities to add to the Quelle source; for example, during

the two years when Paul was in prison in Caesarea and Luke attended him, Luke would have had ample opportunity to have added to his collection of material concerning the life and teaching of Jesus and to have incorporated those stories into the Quelle source. Manson argues that Luke's incorporation of his pre-Roman collection of material with the material of the Quelle source constitutes what scholars call "Proto-Luke" (56). Later, when Paul and Luke were in Rome, Luke became acquainted with Mark's Roman Gospel and recognized that it contained new material; however, Manson argues, Luke felt no need to appropriate any of it into his Proto-Lucan gospel for "edification seeing that it [Mark] was already used for that purpose in the Church" (56). Manson continues by saying that "the advisability of adding Marcan material to Proto-Luke would only become apparent when the decision was taken by Luke to present to the non-Christian world a full dress account of the Life of Jesus and the Beginnings [sic] of the Church" (56). He believes, along with most traditonal Bible thinkers, that Luke was circulated in manuscript at a time either during the Christian period of crisis between AD 64 and 70 or immediately following them and that the whole process of writing this Gospel may have occupied from fifteen to twenty-five years (56).

From this brief review of the authorship of Mark's and

Luke's Gospels, several important aspects relevant to audience appeal become apparent, thus supplying the basis for fuller examination of these Gospels. With these established points in mind, the tagmemic analysis of audience will be formed. First, both authors were in subservient but advantageously intimate positions to two of the most important Apostles in the early Church: Peter, the Apostle to the Jews, and Paul, the Apostle to the Gentiles. While Paul was not personally associated with Jesus's ministry, he had the advantage of knowing the Jewish religious hierarchy's objections to this sect which stems from their religion.<sup>4</sup>

On the other hand, Peter was one of Jesus's closest companions during the three years of His public ministry. Peter, James, and John were with Him at two very crucial times of His ministry. They saw His heavenly glory on the Mount of Transfiguration,<sup>5</sup> and they were chosen to watch and pray with Him in the Garden of Gethsemane on the night he was betrayed by Judas Iscariot.<sup>6</sup> Next, Mark and Luke drew not only on the knowledge these two Apostles had of the life and teaching of Jesus, but also on that of Peter's and Paul's Christian associates. Finally, these Gospel writers were not only helper-companions to Peter and Paul, but they were also witnesses to these Apostles' ultimate loyalty to Jesus--their martyrdom. Mark and Luke were exceptionally well-



qualified experientially and spiritually to write the Gospels which bear their names.

Mark and Luke wrote Gospels, as did Matthew, which bear the imprints of their particular characters and authority. Although the rhetorical style which they utilized to achieve credibility with their audiences is more apt to be influenced by the writers of Jewish Scriptures and although there is no proof that either of them were cognizant of the principles of Aristotle's Rhetoric or Logic, both employ rhetorical devices which are similar to Aristotelean rhetorical devices. In this sense, they both establish credibility by using Aristotelean ethical proofs which Lane Cooper translates as "intelligence, character, and goodwill" (Rhetoric 2.1) and which Rhys Roberts translates as "good sense, good moral character, and goodwill" (Rhetoric 1378a). They employ Aristotle's first ethical proof because they appear to have what Kinneavy interprets as "a practical knowledge about the reality at issue" (238). Mark's economical but vivid reportorial style indicates a facile knowledge of the actions or deeds in the life of Jesus as these mighty works relate to the cosmic conflict with Satan and evil.

Luke, employing a classical form used by Greek historians, demonstrates a knowledge of his source material as it relates to his presentation of Jesus as the second

Adam who redeemed all men from sin. His Gospel also provides evidence that Luke, in the true spirit of an historian, has not merely synthesized Marcan and Quelle sources--he has procured inside, privileged information concerning Jesus's birth, infancy, and boyhood<sup>7</sup> and concerning Herod and Pilate forgiving each other of past grievances at the trial of Jesus.<sup>8</sup> Luke had a sensitive, profound knowledge of the reality of his subject--Jesus, the Son of Man.

Mark's and Luke's evangelistic concern that their audience accept the salvation won for them by Jesus's victory over death, sin, and Satan indicates that they have "character" (Cooper 2.1), or "good moral character", or what Kinneavy interprets as having "the good of the audience at heart" (238) and provides proof that they both utilized the principle of Aristotle's second ethical proof. In addition, in both Gospels, the principle of Aristotle's third ethical proof may be seen when each portrays "goodwill" (Cooper 2.1 and Roberts 1378a) or "portrays himself as a person who would not deceive the audience in the matters at hand" (Kinneavy 238) in two distinct manners. Mark understands his Roman audience's patriotic objection to the charge of sedition which a Roman magistrate had brought against Jesus and the ignominious death which ensued from His conviction of the charge (Brandon 105-06). He skillfully achieves

identification with his Roman audience by accepting their patriotic repulsion of the charge of sedition against the Roman Empire. With compassionate zeal Mark pursues his argument that although Jesus was and is the almighty Son of God whose power was manifested in mighty works, according to prophecy, His shameful death was necessary in order that His glory might be revealed (Burkill 4-5). Mark, having displayed the cultural expectations of his audience, skillfully solidifies his identification with them. Luke also uses Aristotle's third ethical proof when he reflects in his Gospel the expectation of his audience, though Greek instead of Mark's Roman. Greeks require testimony or discourse to substantiate any public claim. Luke's striving for historical authenticity in presenting Jesus has a parade of witnesses who testify that He is the ideal Man who has redeemed the world from sin.

Before demonstrating that both Mark and Luke achieved a change in the way audiences viewed Jesus's life and teaching by application of the tagmemic theory in an overall effort to account for the differences in the four Gospels and to ascertain the purposes these differences serve the Christian Gospel, it is expedient also to briefly clarify Mark's and Luke's use of the universal principles of pathetic argument not unlike Aristotle's (Rhetoric 1389a). Both Evangelists wrote their Gospels in perilous times for

Christians, whether they be Jews, Romans, or Greeks.

Mark, writing to persecuted Roman Christians, employs emotions to convince his audience that even though Jesus was the Son of God, He was also the Son of Man who suffered rejection, infamy, and death in order that His salvific plan might be revealed. Mark uses emotion to persuade his Roman Christian audience that suffering and death for the cause of Christ is not scandalous but glorious by presenting Jesus's stoical determination to fulfill the predictions of the Jewish prophets that the Son of Man would die for the sins of His people. The Evangelist's portrayal of Jesus evokes sympathy in his audience because he shows Jesus to be the Son of God who became the Son of Man. The audience continues to respond emotionally because he shows that He has experienced the servitude and suffering of all men present. Mark's audience whose lives were arduous and imperiled emotionally identified with Jesus because Mark attributes the human condition to Him. As the Jesus which Mark narrates has been rejected and reviled, so had many of his Roman readers. As Mark's Jesus served, suffered, and died, so might his readers. As Jesus overcame suffering and seeming defeat by His death on the cross, so might they. As Jesus arose victoriously from the dead, so might they. This portrait is Mark's simple but eloquent pathetic appeal to his Roman audience. Mark's and Luke's addition of pathetic

appeal to Jesus as a Person changes the super-hero sufficiently to establish Him as a dynamic entity in these Gospels as opposed to the static entity of Matthew's.

Controversy still rages around the identification of Luke's intended audience. Jack Kingsbury, speaking for scholars such as H. D. A. Major (259) and F. W. Farrar (43; Note 3), considers the name "Theophilus," a Greek name meaning "lover of God," to be an ideal name for a representative audience of outsiders, i.e. Greeks (95). Representing the opposite position, other scholars such as Donald Guthrie find it "much more natural to regard Theophilus as a real person" (90). Scholars also continue to debate whether or not Theophilus was or was not Luke's fellow-Christian and whether or not his Gospel was meant for Christian or non-Christian audiences.<sup>9</sup> Though Donald Guthrie argues that "there is abundant evidence to suggest a Gentile destination" (90) and declares that "the Gospel may therefore be said to be designed for all who in the non-Christian world were not adverse to Christianity and were genuinely interested in having a historical account of its origins" (90), his argument stops short of recognizing Luke's full rhetorical purpose because he omits Luke's evangelistic appeal. From rhetorical features identified in the Gospel, it is evident that Luke constructs his Gospel upon the premise that his audience would accept the

salvation which Jesus had provided for them when they had the Word of the Gospel delivered in this rhetorical guise. Essentially, Luke addresses a non-Judaic, Hellenistically aculturated audience. He emotionally appeals to their preference for historically substantiated truth by qualified witnesses, to their value of idealism, and to their inclination to view man's condition from a universal perspective. Luke, as well as Mark, employs audience-based emotional appeals which can be viewed as an extension of Aristotelean pathos.

Mark and Luke, along with Matthew, do employ a type of logical argumentation. Their rhetorical logic, like Matthew's, resembles the logic which Aristototele explicates in his Rhetoric (1394a-1402a) and calls "an appearance of rationality used to persuade" (Kinneavy 245). Both Mark and Luke argue, as do all the Gospel writers, from the reasonableness of faith which is founded on the traditional values inherent in the Law of Moses and the writings of the Jewish prophets. Mark's inaugural words to his audience presume that they accept by faith that Jesus the Christ is the Son of God, for he, as Moses did in Genesis 1:1, makes no more philosophical nor theological effort to prove that Jesus is the Son of God than Moses did to prove that in the beginning God existed.

Luke's system of values which form the foundation of

his logic, however, is more Aristotelean than Mark's in that it appeals to a universal divine suffrage and depends upon a traditional system of values which extend beyond the scope of Jewish ethics and metaphysics and encompasses those of the Greeks as well.

Finally, even though both Evangelists wrote to non-Jewish audiences and despite Luke's utilizing a classical Greek literary form, both men are writing to persuade men to embrace a new religious faith. This new faith rests not nearly so much on an intellectual comprehension which might flow from a well-crafted logical treatise as it does upon a willingness to believe that Jesus was the Messiah-king, He was also the Son of God who became the Word-made-flesh to effect a salvation first for the Jew, but for the Roman and Greek as well. The basis of their logic and their faith, consequently, depended upon whether or not His works and words witnessed that He was indeed that revelation of God, the Word-made-flesh.

While Aristotelean rhetoric provided a way to establish the ethos, pathos, and logos of the writers' appeals to their audiences, a tagmemic analysis will provide a useful procedure to ascertain their sense of audiences in these two Gospels. Using the same tagmemic procedure to ascertain a sense of audience, Mark and Luke will be examined conjointly to determine features that contribute to the dynamic

perspectives. Evidence of change in the manner that they view Jesus's Messiah-kingship includes degrees of variation and distribution.

The first phase of this analysis will focus on the particular treatment of His Word-made-flesh. Mark, unlike Matthew and Luke, does not find it necessary to prepare His audience to believe the "good news" of Jesus Christ by presenting accounts of His birth and infancy; obviously, neither does he consider a genealogy necessary as an authoritative support for his argument that Jesus is the Son of God who became the suffering Servant of God in order that His glory might be revealed. Mark's Roman audience would appreciate his terse, direct approach: "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God" (1:1). He links to Matthew's static view of Jesus as the Messiah to Jesus as the Son of God. This direct opening abruptly introduces the dynamic perspective. Mark's aggressive opening directs his audience's attention to the difference between his presentation of the Gospel and Matthew's. Without proffering any prophetic or historical proof that Jesus is the Messiah-king, much less the Son of God, Mark tersely begins his perspective of Jesus where Matthew's ceased. In Hiebert's words, "Mark at once introduced Him in His official and public career as the busy worker for Jehovah. This initial identification of Jesus as 'the Son of God' (1:1) at once



underlined the basic truth that the service He rendered must be viewed in the light of His unique personality" (16). Mark simply presumes that his audience will accept his simple statement that this direct opening announces the "good news" of Jesus the Messiah (Matthew's static particle) who is also the Son of God (dynamic view).

Immediately by his sententious declaration that Jesus is the Christ and the Son of God he establishes the dynamic perspective. Instead of supporting this conclusive statement with prophetic proof, he alludes to the prophets Malachi's (3:1) and Isaiah's (40:3) prophecies to introduce John the Baptist the prophet-messenger who prepared the way for the coming of the Son of God (Mk. 1:2-3). In the next ten short verses (1:4-13), Mark recounts John the Baptist's ministry, Jesus's baptism by John, and Jesus's temptation in the wilderness. In the next seven verses of Chapter 1, Mark records his brief but succinct information concerning Jesus's calling His disciples (1:14-20). In twenty narrative verses Mark has dispensed with the information preliminary to the presentation of the authority and power of the Son of God's teaching and mighty works whereas Matthew did as much in 201 verses and Luke in 202 verses.

As Hiebert argues, the busy worker whom Mark presents in his Gospel "was the mighty Servant of Jehovah who, as the Son of God revealed His power over the visible and the

invisible world" (16). Mark's "preached history" (W. D. Davis 200) of the life of Jesus emphasizes the authority which the Messiah-king had over interpreting God, the Father's will (1:21-22) and the Mosaic Law (7:14-20), over the Sabbath (2:27-28) and the Temple (11:15-18), over the mystery of the kingdom of God (4:10-11) and the forgiveness of sin (2:5-12), and over unclean spirits (3:19-27) and nature (4:35-41; 6:45-52). In all of these instances where Jesus exercised His authority, He "assumes the prerogatives reserved in the Old Testament for God himself" (Davis 203).

So then, Mark presents the Messiah-king as the Son of God who has power over the physical world and over the spiritual world as well. Mark's special emphasis of Jesus's exercising authority over demonic forces is unparalleled by any of the other Gospel writers (Osborne 688). His establishment of the power Jesus had as the Son of God is essential to his introduction of Jesus as the suffering, obedient Servant of God who willingly obeyed His Father even to His death so that He might reveal the glory of God in His resurrection.

Luke, like Mark, establishes his perspective at the very beginning of his Gospel. Though direct, Luke is less abrupt than Mark in establishing his dynamic view. He, while writing for the edification of the Church, was more specifically writing for publication or for the instruction

of the non-Jewish outsider, whether he be Greek, Hellenized Roman, or Asian (Manson 55). Using the classical literary genre of Greek historians (addressing a patron), Luke sets forth his intentions to establish the credibility of his history of "the word" (1:2). He acknowledges that there have been other accounts from "eyewitnesses" and "ministers of the word" [logos] but that it "seemed good to me" . . . "from the very first to write unto thee [Theophilus] in order" . . . "that thou mightest know the certainty of those things. . ." (1:3-4).

In Chapter 1, immediately following this address to his patron which establishes his intent to write a history of the life and teaching of Jesus, Luke commences it with more background information on the circumstances of Jesus's birth than any other New Testament writer has given. He provides a vivid account of the parents of John the Baptist (Zacharias and Elizabeth) in the historical/political context of their time. He sensitively narrates this Levitical couple's hopeless, childless condition; he relates God's promise of a son to Zacharias by way of the archangel Gabriel who confronted him as he ministered in the Temple at Jerusalem. Luke relates the stories of Zacharias' doubt, his temporary aphasia, and Elizabeth's pregnancy all to introduce Elizabeth's cousin, Mary, who being pregnant with her divine Son came to visit her cousin in the sixth month

of Elizabeth's pregnancy. Thus, Luke modifies his material as a background for the miraculous conception and birth of Jesus which prepares the audience to believe that Jesus is the Son of God, that second Adam, who became the Word-made-flesh.

Luke emphasizes the prominent role the Holy Spirit plays in the life of Jesus because it is an important aspect of his identification of Jesus, the second Adam, the Savior of all men. John's father, Zacharias, had been promised that his son would "be filled with the Holy Spirit, even from his mother's womb" (1:15). When Elizabeth was six months pregnant, her cousin, Mary, came from Nazareth to visit her. As Mary, who had recently conceived a Son by the Holy Spirit, greeted Elizabeth, Elizabeth and her unborn baby, John, were filled with the Holy Spirit (1:35). Through the Holy Spirit, they both recognized that Mary's unborn child was indeed "the Lord" (1:31-43).

The explanation of a series of supernatural events preceding the birth of Jesus which were presided over by the Holy Spirit prepares Theophilus and the rest of Luke's audience to become willing to believe Jesus's divine credentials and to view the divine preparation of His forerunner, the prophet John, as the fulfillment of prophecy (Mal 3:1;4:6). John, the last representative of the Old Testament prophets, prepares the way and introduces the

second Adam, Jesus, who is the ultimate Prophet because He is, as Luke has intimated in 1:1, the ultimate truth which the Evangelist John in his Gospel will treat for a universal audience (John 14:6).<sup>11</sup> Having presented Theophilus with the introduction to "those things which are most surely believed among us" (1:2) concerning John's and Jesus's miraculous births, Luke further prepares his audience for the final identification of Jesus as the Son of God, the second Adam, by narrating the story of Jesus's ben Torah [New Testament term for bar mitzvah]. Luke expands his argument that Jesus is the Son of God and the second Adam (or the ideal man) through the flow of this narrative.

In the boyhood story of Jesus's ben Torah, which only Luke recounts, the Evangelist provides proof that even as a boy Jesus knew of His duty to obey His parents and that He was also aware of His unique Sonship to God (2:49). The audience learns that Jesus was aware of His divinity while at the same time, it is given a preview of this ultimate Prophet's ability to understand the things of God. When His parents, after three days of not being able to find Him, found Him in the Temple "sitting in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them, and asking them questions" (2:46), these learned men were "astonished at his understanding and answers" (2:47).

Luke delays the final announcement of Jesus's identity

until after he has related the preaching of John the Baptist and John's reiteration that he was not the Christ but that One would come after him who would "baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire" and would "thoroughly purge his floor, and will gather the wheat into his garner, but the chaff he will burn with fire unquenchable" (3:16-17).

Sometime afterward, as John was baptizing, Jesus appeared for baptism. Luke recalls that when He was baptized, the Holy Ghost descended in bodily form like a dove upon Him and the voice of God, the Father, spoke from heaven saying "Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased" (3:22). The Father's pronouncement is Luke's penultimate step in his unfolding identification of Jesus as the Son of God.

As E. J. Tinsley points out, Luke's genealogy follows his account of the baptism "and is not, as in Matthew, a preface to the whole book and the accounts of the nativity" (49). Furthermore, Tinsley maintains "this [placement] may be to reinforce, in a different way [,] the points just made. Jesus is the Son of David, a true heir to the Kingship of Israel; but Luke takes the genealogy back to Adam" while Matthew commences with Abraham and traces descendingly to Jesus (49). Luke's beginning with Jesus and tracing His lineage ascendingly back to "Adam, which was the Son of God" (3:38) would suggest that "Luke would have us see in Jesus, as Paul did, the new Adam who in his [Jesus's]

own life will rewrite the human story" (Tinsley 50). Luke's identification of Jesus as the Son of David, the Son of God, the Son of Adam, along with his emphasis on the Holy Ghost, the traditional Inspirer of prophets, his emphasis on prophets and prophecy per se, strongly suggest that the Gospel, which he adapted to Greek audiences, presents a Messiah who corresponds to the traditional Greek concept of the ideal man: He is God-like because, as brave Odysseus did, He comprehends political realities, as sapiental Nestor did, He understands spiritual realities, and as the god Apollo did, He knows the reality of the future as well.

In summary, Mark and Luke both identify Jesus as the Messiah-king as did Matthew; however, in the beginning of their Gospels, they immediately establish a different perspective of Jesus's messiahship than does the Matthean static perspective. Through their choices of introductory material and titles, they have each established their changing dynamic perspective of Jesus. Mark in 1:1 has positively identified Jesus as the Christ and also as the Son of God. He has supported his declaration with a battery of powerful examples of the Son of God's mighty works. Luke, in his historical approach to the Gospel, has identified Jesus as the Son of God, conceived by the Holy Ghost as well as the Son of Adam, conceived in the womb of the Virgin, Mary. Too, Luke has provided the stories of

witnesses to support his identification of Jesus.

Having established their dynamic perspectives of Jesus, views that echo and augment Matthew's static perspective, these two Evangelists definitely identify Jesus as the Messiah-king, or Christ, and the Son of God. Both Mark and Luke continue their portrayals of Him by the referential use of rhetorical phrases and allusions, terms and titles, selection and arrangement, and form. Using this rhetorical method, they add new dimensions to their dynamic identification which introduces variations that extend their initial concept of Him.

One of the phrases they employ to establish variation or an extension of Jesus as the Son of God is "the kingdom of God." It is logically appropriate that they use this phrase rather than Matthew's phrase "the kingdom of heaven," since both Evangelists are appealing to Gentile audiences. Scholars generally agree that Matthew used euphemistically the phrase, "the kingdom of heaven," in deference to his Jewish audience (Rhein, Note 14, 84). Because the Decalogue's strict commandment, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord [Jehovah] thy God in vain; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain" (Exod. 20:7), Jews deliberately avoid speaking the personal name of God, Jehovah, because "The name 'Jehovah' belongs especially to Him when he is dealing with His own, while



'God' is used more [in the Old Testament] when dealing with the Gentiles" (Fowler, Zondervan 408). Consequently, Matthew avoids any use of the names of God but uses instead the phrase "the kingdom of heaven."

While Mark's and Luke's use of the phrase "the kingdom of God" signifies that they are addressing non-Jewish Christians and non-Jewish outsiders, its use had a deeper significance (Rhein, Note 14, 84); their use of this phrase indicates a movement away from the exclusivity of the Jewish religion and toward the inclusivity of the Christian religion. For Mark and Luke, the Kingdom of God "represented a new era--an entirely new world, the result of a new creation." These two Evangelists believed that "the Kingdom of God on earth meant the death of an old age and the birth of something new. In Jesus'[s] teaching a radical point of departure from the traditional conception was his lack of nationalism" (Rhein 84-85).

Mark and Luke avoid using the Aramaic idiom "the kingdom of heaven," preferring to use the Greek idiomatic phrase "the kingdom of God" because they were addressing audiences who were not accustomed to Jewish religious phraseology (Ladd, Evangelical Dictionary, 607). At the same time, the phrase "the kingdom of God" is central to their dynamic perspective of Jesus since they both have identified Jesus boldly as the Christ [Messiah] and the Son

of God to a non-Jewish audience. For Mark's Gospel especially, the early identification of Jesus as the Son of God who has come to establish the kingdom of God as His realm on earth, develops his cosmic conflict theme.

Mark, writing to a people who understood the use of political sovereignty and military might, stresses Jesus's power over Satanic forces. Matthew, using Mark's Gospel as a source, chooses to emphasize the healing miracles (Osborne, Evangelical Dictionary 688). Mark chooses to emphasize the miracles of exorcism because they narratively reveal that even the demons recognized Jesus as the Son of God and loudly acknowledge His lordship (Mk. 1:24). Mark wrote his Gospel to encourage Roman Christians who, although they suffered persecution, had witnessed displays of military splendour and had heard of Rome's great conquests. They understood the value of governmental power. The Evangelist lifted up as an example to them the Son of God who had a kingdom given to Him by His Father mightier than the Roman Empire. Mark reveals a Jesus who, though He had the right and power to rule in this world, chose to become the suffering Servant of God so that He might ransom man from the curse of sin and so that God's glory might be revealed through His death and resurrection. Mark's choice of phraseology and arrangement of material to emphasize Jesus's authoritative teaching (1:22), His healing miracles (1:30-

31, 40-43), and especially His exorcism miracles (1:23-26, 32; 3:11) which are prominently displayed in the first half of his Gospel indicate that the Evangelist made these rhetorical choices to further his argument that Jesus is more than just the Christ--He is God. His Gospel, the Word-made-flesh, is the Kingdom of God. As God, He had power on earth and in heaven. As Grant Osborne points out, Mark pictures Jesus "as one who violently assaults sin and the cosmic forces of evil" (Evangelical Dictionary 688).<sup>12</sup>

Even though Mark redacted, adapted, and interpreted his sources to present Jesus as a commanding divine presence, he records that Jesus used a familiar term of endearment, one used by children who spoke Aramaic when speaking to their "daddies," when speaking to God (14:36). In fact, Mark highlights the filial relationship by quoting Jesus's use of the Aramaic term Abba usually translated as "Daddy" for His Father. Translators in the King James Version recognized the importance of the word Abba in establishing the Father and Son relationship and retained it. Jesus calls out Abba on the night before His crucifixion as He prays. No other Gospel writer other than Mark tells of Jesus's calling out Abba when praying in the Garden of Gethsemane the night of His arrest. Joachim Jeremias details the significance of the Aramaic Abba: "it [the familiarity] was something new,

something unique and unheard of, that Jesus dared to take this step and speak to God as a child speaks to his father, simply, intimately, secure" (21). Mark's Son of God, was not only the busy, powerful Servant for the Kingdom of God, but was also the loving, obedient Son who yoked the intimate term "Daddy" with the respectful "Father." At a moment He is Son and God. Mark's portrait of Jesus ranges through these variations and distribution and furthers his dynamic perspective.

Luke also has chosen the phrase "the kingdom of God, as the setting for his presentation of Jesus as the Son of God who became the Son of Adam to a Hellenistic audience who understood the intellectual quest for human perfection and moral might. He reports that the angel said to Mary that the Son she would conceive would be called "the Son of the Highest, and the Lord God shall give him the throne of his father David: And he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end" (Luke 1:32-33). Luke records in the Benedictus that Zacharias, under the anointing of the Holy Ghost, thanked God because He had "raised up an horn (Jesus as the symbol of power and mercy)<sup>12</sup> of salvation for us in the house of David" (Luke 1:69). Moreover, Luke adjusts his material to indicate that this "horn of salvation" was not merely for the Jews--it was for the Samaritans as well. Luke (along with Mark in 1:38)

even stresses Jesus's sense of urgency in preaching the kingdom of God "to other cities also: for therefore am I sent" (4:43). Luke included more references to Jesus's preaching the kingdom of God to Samaritans than any other Evangelist (Luke 9:51-56; 17:11-19).

Furthermore, Luke rhetorically uses the phrase "the kingdom of God" to introduce Jesus's Sermon on the Plain (which Matthew calls the Sermon on the Mount). Luke modifies his source material in such a manner that his interpretation of Jesus's kingdom-of-God teachings reflect a different emphasis than does Matthew's. Luke's dynamic perspective of Jesus, whom he has initially identified as the Son of God, changes radically with the variation of Jesus's becoming the Son of Man.

Luke's presenting the four beatitudes which he logically balances with the four corresponding woes (Luke 6:20-26) reflects Jesus's social, economic, and humanitarian concerns. Luke's Jesus voices a socio-economic concern in His: "Blessed be ye poor: for yours is the kingdom of God" (6:20). In Luke's second beatitude, he relates that Jesus said, "Blessed are ye that hunger now: for ye shall be filled" (6:21) which indicates Jesus's concern for the human condition. Again, Jesus articulates His compassion for those who suffer present hunger and promises that their sad human condition will be remedied.

According to Luke, in Jesus's third beatitude he evinces concern for those who weep and promise that they "shall laugh" (6:21). In Luke's fourth beatitude, Jesus said "Blessed are ye when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their company, and shall reproach you, and cast out your name as evil, for the son of man's sake" (6:22). Luke's Jesus is aware of the human condition because He is the Son of Man. As the Son of Man, He is joint heir, thus the "elder Brother" or "Kinsman Redeemer" of which Isaiah speaks in Chapters 40-53, to all men who embrace God's Word by faith in Jesus Christ.

Luke's interpretation of Jesus's teaching as presented in the Sermon on the Plain leaves no doubt that the Evangelist rhetorically adapts his source material to interpret the meaning of the kingdom of God: its King is compassionate toward the poor because He is also the Son of Man. This humanitarian perspective of Jesus constitutes a variation within Luke's initial changing, dynamic identification of Jesus as the Son of God.

Mark and Luke both emphasize Jesus's kingdom of God ministry and stress the importance Jesus placed on it. Mark and Luke write of His sending out the twelve disciples to preach the kingdom-of-God message of repentance, to heal the sick, and to cast out demons. Both Mark's (6:7-13) and Luke's (9:1-6) accounts contain a great sense of expediency

in Jesus's instructions to these preachers. Their accounts neither limit nor restrict those who may receive His message. For additional emphasis, Luke records that Jesus appointed another seventy men and sent them out two by two "into every city and place whither he himself would come" to preach that the "kingdom of God is come nigh unto you" (10:1,9).

Mark and Luke, by adapting for their respective audiences, have provided dynamic Roman and Greek identifications of Jesus which differ from Matthew's static Jewish identification of Him. In addition, rhetorically embedded within their changing perspectives of Him as the Son of God, lie perceptible movements of change or variation which enhance the audience's comprehension of Him. Mark's rhetorical development of the kingdom of God phrase presents a militant, commanding, powerful, active, Servant of God while Luke presents a royal, compassionate, sensitive, humane Son of Man.

Mark arranges his narrative Gospel to emphasize the action which propels the super-hero, Jesus, from His initial kingdom-of-God ministry of mighty acts to Peter's recognition of Him as the Christ to His crucifixion and finally to His resurrection. The Evangelist's narrative emphasis, the Aristotelean concept of a character's reversal of fortune (Poetics 1452b-1453a), which provides the form

for Mark's Gospel would be familiar to a Roman audience. Though Mark may not have known Aristotle's analysis of Oedipus Rex which explains the Aristotelean concept of character reversal, his Roman audience would respond to character reversal, a feature of tragedies they would have known (Grant 125-26). In his portrayal of Jesus his audience would respond to the reversal of Jesus's fortunes that comes after Peter's recognition that Jesus is the Christ (8:27-9:13).

Mark adjusts his material in yet another way to emphasize the dynamic actions of the super-hero, Jesus. He accelerates his account of Jesus's mighty acts through his use of conjunctions. Chapter 1 of Mark's Gospel deserves attention because thirty-eight of its forty-five verses begin with a coordinate conjunction. Beginning with the fifth verse only verses 8, 14, 16, and 24 open otherwise. This anaphoric rhetorical strategy allows Mark to introduce Jesus as God's busy servant who performs miracles, preaches and teaches. The linking of one activity to the other contrasts them. In addition, the pattern underscores the dynamic perspective of Jesus because it presses the narrative forward. This movement grips a Roman audience because of the array of activities which parallels the industry so much admired by the Roman culture. Movement coupled with the rhythmic, anaphoric force linked to the



array of activities deliver Mark's Gospel in a guise acceptable to his audience.

The following list contains the opening words of each of the forty-five verses. Of significance is that verses 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 14, 16, and 24 do not begin with a coordinate conjunction.

1. The beginning. . . .
2. As it is written. . . .
3. The voice of one crying. . . .
4. John did baptize. . . .
5. And there went out. . . .
6. And John was clothed. . . .
7. And preached saying. . . .
8. I indeed have baptized. . . .
9. And it came to pass. . . .
10. And straightway coming up. . . .
11. And there came a voice. . . .
12. And immediately. . . .
13. And he was there. . . .
14. Now after that Jesus. . . .
15. And saying the time is fulfilled. . . .
16. Now as he walked. . . .
17. And Jesus said. . . .
18. And straightway. . . .
19. And when he had gone. . . .

20. And straightway. . . .
21. And they went into Capernaum. . . .
22. And they were astonished. . . .
23. And there was in their synagogue. . . .
24. Saying, Let us alone. . . .
25. And Jesus rebuked. . . .
26. And when the unclean spirits. . . .
27. And they were all amazed. . . .
28. And immediately. . . .
29. And forthwith, when they were come. . .
30. But Simon's wife's mother lay sick. . .
31. And he came and took her. . . .
32. And at even, when the sun did set. . .
33. And all the city was gathered together  
at the door. . . .
34. And he healed many. . . .
35. And in the morning. . . .
36. And Simon and they . . . followed  
after him. . . .
37. And when they had found him. . . .
38. And he said unto them. . . .
39. And he preached. . . .
40. And there came a leper to him. . . .
41. And Jesus moved with compassion. . . .
42. And as soon as he had spoken. . . .

43. And he straitly charged him. . . .

44. And he saith unto him. . . .

45. And he went out. . . .

The phenomenal rhythmic movement easily spotted from the above list sets expectation in the audience for the dynamic presentation of Jesus that Mark makes. Mark portrays Jesus, the Son of God and the Son of Man, as a divine person of action, with forthrightness, authority, and power, all admirable traits in a Roman culture.

To further strengthen the rhythmic movement of his Gospel, Mark binds his narrative with adverbial links. These links, yet another strategy to capture his sense of urgency and movement, layer meanings on his form which throbs and pulsates with action. In all his Gospel, he uses the adverb "straightway" nineteen times (compared to Matthew's eight and Luke four) and the adverb "immediately" seventeen times (compared to Matthew's six and Luke's thirteen). Moreover, he alone writes that Jesus and His disciples were so busy ministering to the sick and demon-possessed that they had no time to eat. In Mark 3:30, he writes "And the multitude cometh together again, so that they could not so much as eat bread," while in Mark 6:31 he writes "For there were many coming and going, and they [the disciples and Jesus] had no leisure so much as to eat bread." Not only in this short portion of Mark's Gospel but

also in the rest of it, Mark moves the action of Jesus's busy life on the well-oiled wheels of coordinating conjunctions and adverbial indicators of time and place; consequently, the audience has a sense of immediacy and urgency achieved through his rhetorical strategies.

The Gospel writers Mark and Luke also adjust to their audiences through the use of rhetorical terms and titles. Mark, further adapting his presentation in order to communicate his dynamic perspective of Jesus, relates that Jesus, in prophesying His own suffering, betrayal, condemnation, death, and resurrection, referred to Himself as "the Son of Man," thus using this title eleven<sup>13</sup> times as a surrogate for the personal pronoun "I." The repetition of this title contrasts Jesus the Messiah with Jesus the Son of Man (variation) and augments the dynamic perspective by focusing on the multiple roles of Jesus through repetition. By repeating this title, Mark focuses on Jesus's humanity, thus prepares his audience for the crucifixion.

Mark writes that Jesus said of Himself, "For even the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many" (10:45). Davis points out that Jesus avoided proclaiming Himself openly to be the Messiah-king, preferring rather the title the Son of Man because He knew that Jews in general would misunderstand

the humiliation of His servitude and suffering. Davis speculates that "His contemporaries would immediately have foisted upon him their traditional conception of the Messiah as one designed to slay their foes and lift them high" (206).

S. G. F. Brandon explains why a Roman audience would reject a deity who suffered and died on a cross. He writes that "For the Christians of Rome for whom he [Mark] wrote, the Roman cross was a scandal and offence" (105) because if Jesus is truly God He would have power to save Himself. Hence, for Romans, the suffering Son of God was a contradiction in terms. It was this contradiction that Mark proclaimed as the heart of his Gospel: Jesus, the Son of God, had chosen to suffer (Davis 206). The secret or mystery of the kingdom of God was that the Son of God was also the Son of Man; as such, though He was a miracle-worker, His kingdom could not be established until Satan and death were vanquished. Mark's rhetorical strategy reveals Jesus's strength gradually until He successfully conquers death, man's ultimate enemy. His portrayal of Jesus prevents the demons who recognize His divinity from proclaiming that divinity because a premature announcement of Jesus's divine sovereignty would prevent Him from plundering Satan's realm (3:27)<sup>14</sup> His suffering and death were necessary so that He might conquer death, Satan's chief

ally. The Roman audience discovers then that His suffering and death were not weaknesses as they would have thought at first. Rather, the cross becomes the symbol of strength when Jesus triumphs over death through His resurrection and establishes the Word in the kingdom of God. Thus, Mark emphasizes that the Son of Man's scandalous cross was necessary before Jesus could triumph over death and thereby establish the Word in the kingdom of God.

Because the Greek religion emphasizes prophecy in their worship of deities such as Apollo and the Oracle of Delphi, Luke's Gospel emphasizes Jesus's role as the ultimate Prophet or ideal man who understands the wisdom of the past (the Mosaic Law and the writings of the prophets), who comprehends the realities the present (the social/economical, political and spiritual), and who foresees the future of the kingdom of God. In Luke 4:17, the Evangelist writes of Jesus's preaching His first sermon in the synagogue at Nazareth. As He stood to preach, He read to the congregation these words from Isaiah 61:1,2: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised . . . (Luke 4:18-19). After he had read these words of the prophet, He said to the congregation of Jewish Nazarenes, "This day is this scripture

fulfilled in your ears" (Luke 4:21). Then, anticipating their rejection of Him, He acknowledged His awareness that as a prophet, He would be rejected by His own people (Luke 4:24).

Luke surrounds Jesus's life and ministry with references to the lives and works of prophets. He was heralded by the greatest prophet, John the Baptist (Luke 1:76; 7:16,26,28); and as an eight-day-old baby, He was recognized as the Messiah by the prophet Simeon in the Temple at Jerusalem (Luke 2:25-27). His ministry began in the same manner as that of a prophet--He was filled with the Holy Spirit at His baptism (3:21-23); His opponents scrutinized His works to see whether or not He was a prophet (7:39); and most important of all these, Jesus referred to Himself as a prophet when He set His face to go to Jerusalem and certain death (13:32-33). He said to the Pharisee who warned Him that Herod was determined to kill Him, "Go ye, and tell that fox, Behold, I cast out devils, and I do cures to day and to morrow, and the third day, I shall be perfected" (13:32). He continued by saying "Nevertheless, I must walk to day, and to morrow, and the day following: For it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem" (13:33). Twice Luke tells his audience that Jesus lamented and wept over Jerusalem, the city that kills the prophets, because they have rejected Him and will continue to do so (Luke 13:34-35;19:41-44).

Luke and the other Evangelists all present Jesus, the Messiah, in the context of the prophet John Baptist; it is only Luke, however, who has Jesus to begin His ministry by accepting the work and role of a prophet as recorded by Isaiah 61:1-2. In addition, Luke alone has Jesus acknowledge His prophetic role in terms of His suffering and death at Jerusalem. Luke writes that Jesus used the prophetic terminology of "it is necessary" with regard to the things He "must" accomplish.<sup>15</sup> Prophetic proof is a "significant aspect of Luke's writing" (Liefeld, Evangelical Dictionary 663). Since Luke's presentation utilizes the rhetorical strategy of identification, he draws upon the expectations of a Greek audience who would insist that a prophet display knowledge perfected.

Both Evangelists have skillfully employed titles and terms to interpret for their respective audiences the internally changing perspectives of their initial, dynamic perspective of Jesus. Mark's treatment of Jesus as suffering Servant and Luke's portrayal of Jesus as Prophet extend their dynamic perspectives that Jesus is more than just the Jewish Messiah-king. Additionally, they have selected and arranged their materials for their audiences to depict this changing perspective of the mission and character of Jesus. No where is their individual sense of audience more apparent than in their selection and arrangement of their accounts of



Jesus's temptation in the wilderness.

Mark's account of Jesus's temptation in the wilderness is the essence of brevity and force. He writes, "And immediately the Spirit driveth him [Jesus] into the wilderness. And he was tempted in the wilderness forty days, tempted of Satan; and he was with the wild beasts; and angels ministered unto him" (Mk. 1:12-13). His "immediately," "driveth," and repetition of "he was tempted," "tempted of Satan" batter the audience's senses with rhetorical brute force and evoke sympathy for His condition. Thus Mark uses the arrangement of material to establish pathos and audience appeal. Mark's conclusion, "And angels ministered unto him" suddenly lift the audience to a sense of triumph and relief. The Son of God has won and he is being divinely refreshed.

Luke's account, on the other hand, is much more expansive than Mark's and is arranged differently than Matthew's account. Luke writes, "And Jesus being full of the Holy Ghost [a prerequisite for a prophet] returned from Jordan, and was led by the Spirit into the wilderness" (Luke 4:1) whereas Matthew simply states "Then was Jesus led by the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil" (Matt, 4:1). Luke, even in the temptation pericope, portrays Jesus as the ultimate Prophet who overcame Satan in the wilderness whereas His father, Adam, failed in the Garden of Eden.

The arrangement of Luke's temptation pericope also demonstrates variation with Luke's changing dynamic perspective of Jesus. He, as did Matthew, begins with Jesus's being taunted by the Devil that if He were the Son of God, to turn stones into bread and thus relieve His physical need. Luke is not careful to quote the Old Testament Scriptural reply (Deut. 8:3) exactly. Instead of quoting the precise wording, "Man doth not live by bread alone but by every word that proceedeth from the mouth of the Lord doth live," Luke simplifies and makes this Scripture more abstract than Deuteronomy 8:3. He shortens it and excludes the anthropomorphic analogy "that proceedeth from the mouth of the Lord." Luke has Jesus answer the Devil, "It is written, That man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God" (4:4). Jesus triumphs over the Devil because He has by His example, returned man to the truth by obedience to God's commandments which He gave Adam in the Garden of Eden: man is to obey God's words. This obedience to God's Word shall be His [and man's] food.

Luke reverses Matthew's order of the second and third temptations in consideration for his audience. Luke prefers first to have Him tempted to compromise His loyalty to His Father over world dominions before He was tempted over religious acceptance, the more important of the two for the ideal Man and ultimate Prophet. In ranking these three

temptations in the order of their importance, Luke has interpreted the Devil's taking Jesus upon the high mountain and offering Him the kingdoms of the world if only He would worship the Devil. Luke places this temptation in the penultimate position because it is of lesser importance than the third temptation. While this second temptation entailed circumvention of Jesus's passion and crucifixion, the temptation to take the easy route to conquer the kingdoms of the world was humanly understandable. When Jesus stood upon the high mountain (the zenith of power for the Greeks), the Devil tempted Him to follow the path of Alexander and Cyrus. He was tempted to compromise His loyalty to God by avoiding the cosmic conflict with Satan which would cost Him His life. The first words of His answer to Satan were the same ones that Matthew (16:23) and Mark (8:33) say that Jesus used to answer Peter when Peter rebuked Jesus for saying that He must suffer and die. Jesus used the Word of God as recorded in Moses's Law, "Get thee behind me, Satan: For it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve" (Deut. 6:13).

In Luke's account of the third and most crucial temptation, Jesus is brought to the Temple in Jerusalem, which Luke does not designate as being the "holy city." Satan sets Jesus upon a pinnacle and tempts Him to prove that He is the Son of God by casting Himself down so that

the angels would supernaturally save Him from death. In the temptation pericope Luke arranges in ascending order Satan's temptation which echoes the messianic prophecy found in Psalms 91:11:12. After each temptation the audience would expect one of their deities to accept the offer. When Jesus refuses, the audience begins to recognize that as Prophet Jesus can know the future and in knowing the future He can know triumph beyond the immediate offers of Satan. If Jesus were to accept Satan's offers and if the angels saved Him from death, then the audience would be convinced that Jesus was a god like one of the Olympians instead of God the Omniscient. The Greeks expect a prophet to have perfected knowledge; yet as Luke has arranged this pericope, the Greeks' expectations are exceeded because Jesus does not resort to sensationalism. His perfected knowledge made Him aware that His role of a prophet requires that He must die. Even though in this pericope Jesus has three opportunities to escape death, He exceeds the expectations of the Greeks and chooses death because in death Jesus affirms that in death rests the ultimate of knowledge where the Word-in-flesh becomes Word.

Mark and Luke have also structured their Gospels according to forms most appropriate, thus effective, to communicating their perspectives of Jesus to their Roman and Greek audiences. Mark, in addressing his Roman audience has

chosen a form especially effective in portraying the powerful ministry of the Son of God, the monumental anguish of the suffering Servant, and the glorious triumph of the risen Lord.

Luke chose a classical Greek form which is superbly suited for his portrayal of Jesus to his Greek audience. In his prologue he defines his intentions and method. He sound the key of his approach by telling Theophilus that there has been many "ministers of the word," eyewitnesses" who had attempted to write down "in order those things which are most surely believed among us" (1:2). Spivey and Smith contend that Luke is divided into three main divisions. In the first main division, the Evangelist introduces a universal story with Simeon's and Anna's two-fold witness of His messiahship (1:5-2:52). His second main division concerns, according to Spivey and Smith, Jesus's gathering of witnesses to the Word in His Galilean ministry (3:1-9:50). The third main division of his Gospel involves the witnessing to the Word of the Kingdom on the journey to Jerusalem (9:51-19:27); the last main part of Luke's outline treats the subject of the true Israel or the Church, through the passion and resurrection (19:28-24:53).

Mark elucidates the major purpose of the Evangelist which is to persuade his audience that although Jesus was the Son of God, He chose to serve, suffer, and die to

conquer Satan and death. By His sacrificial death, God's kingdom and order will be established for all men, Mark argues. Spivey and Smith's outline of Luke delineates the Evangelist's emphasis on authentic witnesses of Jesus's life which is the Word. It is clear that Luke, in depicting Jesus as that perfect Son of Man, is emphasizing Jesus's prophetic ministry of the Word; Luke also presents the true Israel, the Church, which is the inheritor of the Word-made-flesh. Then, a recognition by the audiences of the form each Evangelist has chosen strengthens the identification of their audience with the Gospels. Too, forms merge the context and the meaning to establish a greater degree of range and variation in their dynamic, changing perspectives of Jesus's Messiah-kingship.

In summary, a tagmemic analysis of Mark and Luke has demonstrated that these two Evangelists have adapted and adjusted their materials to fulfill the expectations of their Roman and Greek audiences. As integral parts of the whole Gospel of Jesus Christ, they provide an ever-widening perspective of the super-hero, Jesus through their dynamic presentations. The dynamic perspectives revealed through this tagmemic analysis of Mark and Luke advance the static perspective found in Matthew's Gospel. Through this critical apparatus readers view the Gospels as an array and process instead of linear narrative.

By examining Mark's and Luke's referential use of rhetorical strategies such as phrases and allusions, terms and titles, selection and arrangement, and forms, this analysis has charted a perceptible movement of change within these Evangelists' changing, dynamic views of Jesus. The range and variation of their dynamic perspectives of Jesus's life and teaching are essential to Mark's and Luke's appeals to their audiences.

Finally, through dynamic perspectives their identification of Jesus as the Son of God extend the range and variation of their perspectives of Him to provide insight into His mighty cosmic power, His suffering servitude, His ideal manhood, and His function as the ultimate Prophet and Word-made-flesh. The Gospel, then, can no longer be viewed as a Jewish document. Rather, this tagmemic analysis reveals that because of the Mark's and Luke's adapting and adjusting their source materials for Roman and Greek audiences the Gospel of Jesus Christ moves toward a more universal appeal, thus creating a spiraling expectation of the super-hero's function.

## Notes

1

See Note 2, Chapter II.

2

In Acts 26:15-18, Pauls relates his encounter with Jesus on the road to Damascus. Paul tells King Agrippa that Jesus said to him:

For I have appeared unto thee for this purpose  
to make thee a minister and a witness both of  
these things which thou hast seen, and of those  
things in the which I will appear unto thee;  
Delivering thee from the people, and from the  
Gentiles, unto whom I now send thee.

In Galatians 1:1, Paul writes that he had been called by Jesus Christ to be an apostle; in Galatians 1:16, he states that he was called to "preach among the heathen. Finally, in Galatians 2:1-8, Paul recounts what happened at the Council of Jerusalem which was made up of Christians Jews and headed by James. Paul writes: "But contrariwise, when they [the Council] heard that the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter; (for he that wrought effectively in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision, the same was mighty in me toward the Gentiles:)" (Gal. 2:7-8).



3

See Donald M. Guthrie (91-103). After reviewing the criticism opposing a traditional Lucan authorship of Luke-Acts, Guthrie concludes that "there would appear to be far stronger grounds for retaining the tradition of Lucan authorship for both the Gospel and Acts than for rejecting it" (103).

4

See Acts 7:58 and Acts 8:1-3. Saul (later called Paul) watched the coats or cloaks of those that who stoned Stephen, the first Christian martyr. Later Saul became a leader in persecuting the early Church.

5

See Mark 9:2-9, Matthew 17:1-8, and Luke 9:28-36.

6

See Matthew 26:36-46, Mark 14:32-42, Luke 22:39-42,45, and John 18:1.

7

See Luke Chapters 1 and 2.

8

See Luke 23:1-12.

9

H. D. A. Major (259) argues that Luke's Gospel was intended for Christians and W. E. Bundy (4) argues that Luke's Gospel was written for a non-Christian audience.

10

Walter L. Liefeld (663) has for further information on Luke's unique emphasis on prophecy.

11

Howard Kee, Franklin Young, and Karlfried

Froehlich (119-23) offer further information on the cosmic conflict them in Mark's Gospel.

12

Horns in the Old Testament symbolized power. The prophet Zechariah refers to "casting down the horn [power] of the Gentiles" (1:18). Horns refer to nations and their sovereign power in Revelations 13:1;17:7,12,16. But horns also symbolize mercy. This double symbolic meaning is attached to the horns of the altar of burnt sacrificed in the Temple at Jerusalem. Were a man to accidentally shed blood, in order to escape the captital punishment prescribed by the Mosaic Law, he might flee to one of the seven cities of refuge described in Numbers 35:15-32 or he might flee to the Temple and catch hold of the horns of the altar where he would be safe from blood revengers of the family of the slain and from the Law. See Exodus 21:4. Also see James Freeman (150) for more on the subject.

13

See R. G. Gruenter (1035).

14

In Grant Osborne's "The Theology of Mark," Evangelical Theological Dictionary (688) he writes that "when the demons utter Jesus's name, they are not unwittingly acting as 'PR' agents, but rather are trying to gain control of him" by learning his "hidden name." Osborne states that "in the ancient world (as in many tribal areas today) one would gain power over a spirit-creature by learning his

'hidden name.'" When Jesus commanded the demons to be silent (1:25,34; 3:12) and when He compelled them to reveal their own names (5:7), this signified that He had triumphed over their Satanic forces. Osborne writes that "the authority and other blessings given Jesus's followers are the spoils from that victory" (688).

15

See Luke 2:49; 4:43; 9:22; 13:33; 24:7,26,44-47.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE RELATIVE PERSPECTIVE

The Gospel According to John completes the synoptic Gospels and delivers the Gospel of Jesus Christ to the world. While the Evangelist John acknowledges Jesus to be the Messiah, the Son of Man, and the Son of God, he primarily emphasizes Jesus as the eternal Word of God who became flesh so that all men who believe Him to be the Christ might have eternal life. John presents Jesus's public ministry in which He witnesses to His Godhead; and he presents His private ministry in which He teaches this truth to His disciples.<sup>1</sup> The public and private ministries together provide the procedural concepts of belief necessary for the universal religion, Christianity. When the public and private situations are yoked together, no place is excluded where the Gospel can be delivered. The audience then becomes limitless, and to accommodate this unrestricted audience John composed his Gospel for the most heterogeneous audience. To appeal to this wide audience the final Gospel proffers a spiritual interpretation of the life and teaching of Jesus Christ which allows the super-hero to be viewed from a universal vantage. To reflect a variety of features

for a heterogeneous audience, John presents the relative perspective of Jesus.

In John, Matthew's static perspective, by merging with Mark's and Luke's dynamic perspectives, extends the appeal of the Gospel to a universal audience instead of designing a Gospel for a limited audience as the other Gospel writers have done. In his delivery of the Gospel he reconciles the differences that exists among the other three Gospels and explains the differences theologically. This tagmemic analysis has revealed unique features of Matthew which enabled him to appeal to a Jewish audience. With its multilevel conceptual perspectives, a tagmemic analysis first established stasis which appealed to an exclusive Judaism because it contained within its unique identification of the Messiah-king perceptible movements of change foreshadowings of a universal religion. These perceptible movements of change and intimations of a wider audience appeal introduced two minor themes which become dominant focuses of Mark's and Luke's Gospels. Using tagmemics to identify features of these two Gospels has uncovered processes that the Evangelists used to achieve union with their pre-selected audiences. When the static is joined with additional features, they merge together to provide characteristics of Jesus sufficiently different from Matthew to represent a dynamic perspective in the Gospel of Jesus.

A tagmemic analysis has disclosed that Matthew's Gospel provides the Jewish witness that Jesus is the Messiah-king, that Mark's Gospel presents the Roman witness that Jesus is the mighty Son of God and the suffering Servant, and that Luke's Gospel establishes Jesus as the Greek witness and pictures Him as the Son of Adam, the ideal Man, and the perfected Revealer of God's Word. On the basis of these three witnesses, all in keeping with the Mosaic Law's requirement that a truth be established on the testimony of two or three witnesses, John circulates his spiritual application of the Gospel of Jesus first to the church at Ephesus, then to churches in Asia Minor, and finally to the world. This circulation accelerates the motion of the spiraling forces that extend the Gospel from a pre-selected to a universal audience. John's Jesus Himself publically witnesses and privately teaches that He is God, the Creator of the world, and the Giver of life and light to men.

John's audience appeal constitutes the last essential step in the process of developing and interpreting the Gospel away from Jewish ethnicity. Furthermore, it also completes the logical transition from the Old Testament to the remaining books of the New Testament. John's spiritual interpretation of Jesus provides the thought and symbolism which represent the universal religious quest. As the relative presentation of the life and teachings of Jesus,

the fourth Evangelist adapts his material to appeal not only to an audience of Hellenized Ephesians, not only to the seven churches of Asia Minor, but also to a world-wide audience as well.

As in all the other Gospels, a sense of audience in John involves a consideration of the identity of its author because scholars have insisted that the measure of its authenticity rests upon apostolic authorship (Perrin 6). For this reason an examination of Johannine authorship will help establish the credibility of his relative perspective of the eternal Word (1:1), Jesus, the Word-made-flesh (1:14), the Life and Light of the world (1:9).

From the time of the early Church fathers, the authorship of John has been ascribed to John, the Apostle, who was also "the Apostle whom Jesus loved" (13:23; 19:26; 20:2). External evidence supports this traditional view of John's authorship. Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons [circa 140-220] testified that at the end of the second century, Johannine authorship of the fourth Gospel was a widely received tradition. Eusebius in Ecclesiastical History (v. 20) recorded a letter written by Irenaeus to Florinus, a Roman presbyter, in which he recalls their boyhood days when they sat in the presence of the famous Christian teacher Polycarp and heard him tell of his conversations with "John and the rest who had seen the Lord" and how he would relate

their works. Irenaeus writes that Polycarp considered John's account of the Lord Jesus's teachings and works to be an "eyewitness of the life of the Word" (Wright 653). Moreover, Irenaeus in Against Heresies (III,I,i) wrote that the John who was the disciple of the Lord and had leaned upon the breast of Jesus "'did himself publish a Gospel during his residence at Ephesus in Asia'" (Wright 653).

Merrill F. Unger points out that other early Church fathers such as Clement of Alexandria [circa 200], Tertullian [circa 220], and Origen [circa 250] all agreed on the Johannine authorship of the fourth Gospel. Unger writes that "even Porphyry and Julian the Apostate would have denied John's authorship had there been any grounds for doing so because "to deny the authenticity of the Gospel which so signally emphasizes the deity of Christ" would have justified their theological argument that Christ was not God (543).

In the nineteenth century, Bible scholars skilled in the methods of literary criticism examined the fourth Gospel for internal evidence of Johannine authorship (Smart 12). These scholars objected to ascribing John the Apostle as the author of John because "the order of events and the content are so different from those of the synoptics that both cannot preserve direct apostolic witness" (Davis 379). Also these nineteenth-century scholars argued that the Gospel



"presupposes the rise of the Gnostic movement which it both reflects and combats" and that such a date would indicate that "John must belong to a period when the Apostles could no longer be alive" (379). Next, these higher critics claimed that "many details to which the conservative [traditional] scholars point as supporting the apostolic authorship are dubious" such as the author's knowledge in matters Judaica (Davis 379-80). Finally, these critical scholars object to a Johannine authorship on the grounds that John refers to himself as a disciple in the last chapter, often identified as posthumously added (380).

After reviewing objections from higher critics to John's authorship of the last Gospel, Davis arrives at a two-fold conclusion: first, the Gospel of John has an apostolic connection or a Palestinian root whether it be John the Apostle, Andrew the Apostle,<sup>2</sup> or some other apostle. The second part of Davis's conclusion is that the Gospel of John "as it stands points to an extra Palestinian milieu: it looks to the far horizons of the higher-paganism of the Graeco-Roman world: the Gospel has a Hellenistic spread" (381).

Donald Guthrie (222-24), W. A. Smart (13-23), and William Barclay (John and Acts 16, 55, 107) represent modern biblical scholars that disagree with the objections of the nineteenth-century higher critics who discount John

the Apostle's authorship of the Gospel bearing his name. Barclay answers higher critics' argument that John the Apostle could not have been the author of John because he lacked the intellectual ability nor could the Apostle John have referred to himself as the "disciple whom Jesus loved" as did the writer of the Gospel. He writes that it seemed to him that "in the end there is no better candidate for the authorship of the fourth Gospel than John the Apostle" (107). He argues that no one is qualified to judge John's intellectual ability nor personal quality with any degree of certainty. As for John's reference to himself as "the disciple whom Jesus loved," Barclay states "that he called himself the disciple whom Jesus loved could be the outcome of astonished humility rather than of pride" (107). Barclay agrees with R. H. Lightfoot that the traditional ascription of Johannine authorship to the fourth Gospel is possible (107). This study accepts the traditional authorship of John.

Following the brief tracing of the issues of Johannine authorship, the qualifications of John to write authoritatively concerning the life and teaching of Jesus and the cataloguing of his rhetorical strategies used to appeal to his audience will conclude this section.

John was the son of Zebedee (Matt. 4:21) and Salome (Matt. 27:56; Mark 15:40). Salome seems to have been a

sister of Jesus's mother, Mary (John 19:35). In this case, John would have been Jesus's cousin and may have known Him from childhood.

If John were the cousin of Jesus, then he was also a cousin of John the Baptist (Luke 1:36). According to John 1:35, he was John the Baptist's disciple and became one of Jesus's first five disciples (John 1:35-51). After leaving the Jordan river area where John the Baptist was baptizing, John returned with Jesus to Galilee and was present at the wedding at Cana where Jesus performed His first miracle (John 2:1-9). While it seems clear that John returned to his prosperous fishing business for about a year, Jesus again called him. Thereafter he was with Jesus continuously and was a witness to all that Jesus said and did.

Since John's brother, James, who was martyred by Herod in AD 44, is always mentioned first by all the Gospel writers, most scholars are of the opinion that John was the younger brother. Jesus nicknamed them both the "sons of thunder" (Mark 3:17), which seems to imply that he and his brother James had vehement violent tempers (Mark 9:38; Luke 9:54).

John was one of the three disciples who was closest to Jesus. On five occasions, he refers to himself as the disciple "whom Jesus loved" (John 13:23; 19:26; 20:2; 21:7,20). John was also given the responsibility of sonship

to Jesus's own mother, Mary, as He was dying on the cross. John writes that "from that hour that disciple [referring to himself] took her into his own home" (John 19:27). Furthermore, after Jesus's crucifixion John and Peter became the recognized leaders of the Apostles (John 20:2; Acts 3:1,11; 4:13; 8:14). The preceding evidence concerning the Apostle John has been compiled from the Gospels and Acts. In addition, tradition sheds more light on his whereabouts and activities. Traditionalists believe that for a number of years, John lived chiefly in Jerusalem but that later he went to Ephesus where he wrote his Gospel, the three Epistles, and Revelation (Halley 528). He was perhaps one of the leading members of a group of disciples and Bishops in Ephesus (Manson 107).

On the basis of information generated by a brief review of the authorship of John's Gospel, several important features relevant to audience appeal become apparent and provide the basis for further examination of John's Gospel. This tagmemic analysis of John will illuminate characteristics that allowed him to achieve identification with a universal audience though he first appeals to the church at Ephesus and those of Asia. First, John the author of this Gospel, intimately acquainted with Jesus from his boyhood until His death, was an eyewitness of all the major events in His public and private ministries. Moreover, John,

Peter, and James were members of an inner circle of Jesus's most trusted disciples. Jesus chose them to be with Him at two of the most important times of His ministry: He selected them to witness His glory in the Mount of Transfiguration,<sup>3</sup> and He chose these three to watch and pray with Him in the Garden of Gethsemane on the night of His betrayal and arrest.<sup>4</sup>

John not only witnessed all the major events in the public life of Jesus, but in all probability, he also witnessed the birth of the Church on the day of Pentecost when 120 people were filled with the Holy Spirit (Acts 1-2). Finally, Jesus chose John to assume His responsibility to His mother. John's personal knowledge of the birth and infancy of the Church, the aesthetic distance of his great age with its ensuing spiritual maturity eminently qualified him to write the Gospel which bears his name.

John wrote a Gospel, as did Matthew, Mark, and Luke, which unveils the imprint of his particular character and authority. Although Bible scholarship has long been aware that the rhetorical style utilized by John indicates that he was influenced by the Jewish Scriptures, it is also aware that he was influenced greatly by Hellenistic writers, especially Plato, Philo, and Thucydides (Dodd 73; Smart 33-36). Despite the extent of Greek influence on John's style, no conclusive proof is available concerning John's being

consciously aware of Aristotle's Rhetoric or Logic.

Nonetheless, his Gospel has demonstratable proof that he employed Aristotelean rhetorical principles. However, his rhetorical use of ethos goes beyond simple identification of credibility because he employs all of Aristotle's ethical proofs. He begins with Aristotle's first ethical proof which the philosopher calls "the ethos of the speaker" (Rhetoric 1.2). James Kinneavy interprets this Aristotelean ethical proof as residing in the speaker who has "a practical knowledge about the reality at issue" (Kinneavy 238). John's philosophical, theological interpretation of the public and private ministry of Jesus affirms that he personally witnessed Jesus's deeds which confirmed His Godhead.

John's passionate evangelistic concern that his audience believe on Christ's name in order to gain eternal life and escape death (John 3:16) indicates amply that John used Aristotle's second ethical proof (Rhetoric 2.1; 2.2-11) which Kinneavy interprets as bearing evidence that the writer has "the good of his audience at heart" (238-39). Furthermore, by carefully documenting "these signs" of Jesus "which are written that ye might believe" (John 20:31), John employs the principle of Aristotle's third ethical proof (Rhetoric 2.1), which Kinneavy extends to mean proof that the writer "portrays himself as a person who would not

deceive the audience in matters at hand" (239).

John understands that he is not only addressing Ephesians and Asians who need credible witnesses of Jesus's divinity before they can believe but he is also adapting his material for the "higher pagans" or Hellenistic thinkers whose philosophical minds require such proofs; therefore, he carefully interprets and structures his Gospel for the world (Richardson 16) by addressing in his Gospel four basic issues found in a number of religions. The Evangelist deals with "the nature of the founder of the [Christian] religious movement" and the "nature and source of evil" in the Christian faith; moreover, he deals with the "relationship of faith to to experience," and "the relationship of the present and future of salvation" (Kysar Maverick Gospel 116). John's careful, philosophical argument, couched in the style and language which his audience understands, that Jesus is eternal God who procured eternal life for all men who believe on His name argues eloquently that he consciously strove to convince his audience of the integrity of his motivation. Along with the other Evangelists, John, having displayed the cultural expectation of his audience, skillfully solidifies his identification with them. His use of the three ethical proofs assures initial identification with a general, heterogeneous, ever-growing audience because the ethical qualities demonstrated are universally admired.

Once initial identification has been achieved through ethical proofs, John adjusts his Gospel for his pre-determined audiences. For each segment of his audience, he uses pathetic appeal. Though the specific application of rhetorical principles of pathetic appeal is patterned to strike a sympathetic chord in a particular group, when the overtones of these three chords resound in a harmonious context, the vibrations from their sympathetic harmonies increase the energies of pathetic appeal that extend beyond the particular entities in the audience and deliver John's Gospel to the world.

Before demonstrating that John achieved a relative perspective in the way that a universal audience viewed the life and teaching of Jesus by applying the tagmemic theory in an overall effort to account for the differences in the four Gospels and to determine the purposes these differences serve the Gospel as a whole, it is expedient to indicate the manner that John utilized pathetic argument. John wrote to three factions of his immediate audience which merged to make up his universal audience.

John writes to Christian Jews of the Diaspora whose roots have been transplanted in Asia Minor and whose emotional, intellectual, and spiritual ties to temple worship in Jerusalem have been greatly diminished in intensity. In the early days of the Church in Asia Minor,



Christian Jews maintained a relationship with their Jewish heritage "while at the same time adhering to their new Christian beliefs. But very soon Christians stood independent of Judaism" so that by the time the Temple was destroyed in Jerusalem in AD 70, most Christian communities were free from Judaism. Kysar argues, however, that the Church in Asia Minor was "slow in coming out of the womb of Judaism. It had lived peacefully there amid the Jewish adherents for years longer than other Christian communities," so that "in comparison with other Christian communities it was slow in developing" (112). When this element of the Johannine audience found itself cast out from the synagogue, it was seriously traumatized by its social dislocation. This social dislocation "affected the identity of the Christians in that community so much that they suffered from an identity crisis (Kysar 113).

Kysar concludes that John, recognizing the Christian community's identity crisis, adapts and adjusts his material, draws upon his own memories of Jesus's life and teaching, and writes a spiritual Gospel which will provide a new spiritual and social identity for Christian Jews in Asia Minor and in the world (113-16). John, with fatherly compassion, emotionally identifies with this segment of his audience. John's Gospel helped these Christian Jews attain an identity with the universal Church.

C. H. Dodd identifies another entity of John's audience. He argues that John intellectually and emotionally identifies with the "higher paganism" of the Hellenistic world and attempts in his Gospel to commend the Christian faith to them (11). Hellenistic thinkers in the first century AD had moved away from the religious concepts based on agrarian mythology, even as Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle had done. These "higher pagans" had fused together Platonism and Stoicism to provide "an organon for thinkers of various tendencies who sought a philosophical justification for religion" (Dodd 11). The extensive literature which was generated by them was current in antiquity under the name Hermes Trismegistus, a sage of ancient Egypt who, after his death, was deified as the Egyptian god of wisdom, Thoth or Hermes (Dodd 11).

Another part of John's audience, and the final part of his pre-designated audience that relies on pathos, was the Hellenistic Jew. Dodd argues that we may take for granted "that the fourth Evangelist expected to find readers among open-minded Jews who participated in the intellectual life of Hellenism" (54). Philo of Alexandria is presented as an example of these Hellenistic Jews. Philo, especially influenced by Platonism and Stoicism in the Hermetica, interpreted the Old Testament Scriptures in terms of Greek philosophy (54). Dodd contends that elements in Philo's neo-

Platonistic approach to interpreting God have entered into the background of John's Gospel (73). John emotionally identifies with the Hellenistic thinker (whether he be Jew, Roman, Greek, or Asian) who sought to believe in and to know the eternal Word as God. R. H. Lightfoot writes of John "that in no book of the New Testament has the fusion of the two chief and very different elements in Christianity, the Jewish and the Greek, been achieved with surer touch or with greater thoroughness than in St. John's Gospel" (51).

The Evangelist's portrayal of Jesus evokes sympathy in his audience because John shows Jesus to be that pre-existent God, the eternal Word of whom Moses wrote in his Genesis account of creation (1:1); yet, unlike the Mosiac image of God who speaks light, time, and earth into existence, John presents Jesus as a God of such love and compassion for men that He became flesh and died for the sin of man.

The Evangelist also evokes sympathy in his Hellenistic audience by presenting Jesus as the eternal Word who left His heavenly glory to become Word-made-flesh. A representative view of the Hellenistic Jew comes from Philo. The Philonic concept of Logos, the Word, signified "the way man must tread to the knowledge of God"; yet Philo's Logos is "never personal, except in a fluctuating series of metaphors" (Dodd 72-73). The Evangelist emotionally appeals

to this audience and evokes their sympathy for Jesus because he presents the Word who personally lived and died as a man. Dodd maintains that "The Logos of Philo is not the object of faith and love" but that "the incarnate Logos [Word] of the Fourth Gospel is both lover and beloved. . . ." Moreover, Dodd points out, "to love Him and to have faith in Him is of the essence of that knowledge of God which is eternal life" (Dodd 73).

Essentially John is addressing the most non-Judaistic of all the Gospel audiences and emotionally appeals to its preference for idealistically oriented values couched in terms of philosophical discourse. John, perhaps more than any of the other Evangelists, employs audience-based emotional appeal which can be viewed as an extension of Aristotelean pathos. John's addition of pathetic appeal of Jesus as God who became flesh to live and die for man's sin changes the perspective of the super-hero sufficiently to establish Him as the relative entity in these Gospels as opposed to the static of Matthew's and the dynamic of Mark's and Luke's.

John, along with the other three Evangelists, also employs a type of logical argumentation. Like theirs, his rhetorical logic resembles the Aristotelean logical argument (Rhetoric 2.21-24) which Kinneavy interprets as being "an appearance of rationality used to persuade" (245).

John, despite the fact that his Gospel indicates that he was influenced by Greek philosophy, yet argues from the reasonableness of faith which is founded on the traditional values inherent in the Old Testament Scriptures. He, like Mark and Moses, makes no attempt to prove the existence of the Word (1:1) which introduces his Gospel.

Finally, the philosophical and theological emphasis of the Prologue (1:1-18) to John, with its appropriate terminology, in no way diminishes its dependence upon faith as the key to knowing philosophical and theological truth through Jesus Christ. John is just as zealous as the other Evangelists in writing to persuade men to embrace a new religious faith which rests not nearly so much on an intellectual comprehension of its basic premises as it does upon a willingness to believe the public and private witnesses of Jesus that He and the Father are one (14:11) and that no man can know the Father except through the Son (14:6).

Having observed that Aristotelean rhetoric has provided a way to ascertain the ethos, pathos, and logos of John's appeal to his audience, a tagmemic analysis will provide a practical procedure to establish the sense of audience in his Gospel. In addition, using the same tagmemic procedure to ascertain a sense of audience, John will be examined to determine features that contribute to the relative

perspective. Evidence of a relative, universal manner in which the audience views Jesus's Messiah-kingship also includes degrees of variation and distribution of this perspective.

The first phase of this analysis will focus on John's particular treatment of the Word-made-flesh. Like Mark, John does not find it necessary to prepare his audience to receive the "good new" of Jesus Christ by including accounts of His birth and infancy, nor does he find a genealogy to be a necessary support for Jesus's authority as the Word-made-flesh. Immediately, John sets the pattern for his approach to his Gospel by first introducing Jesus not as the Word-made-flesh but as the preexisting Word. Without fanfare, John presents his hypothesis: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God" (1:1). In this opening John equates the physical through reification to the symbolic. As A. Plummer has pointed out, the meaning of John's "in the beginning" parallels the first verse of Genesis, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," because Genesis 1:1 refers to an act done in the beginning while John refers to a divine Being who existed in the beginning "and therefore prior to all beginning" (60). John echoes, restates, and augments the opening of the Old Testament in his prologue to the final Gospel which will appeal to a universal rather than a specific audience.

Matthew begins his Gospel with the promise of the Messiah-king given to Abraham; Mark begins his Gospel with the historical beginning of the public ministry of Jesus Christ, the Son of God (1:1); Luke begins his Gospel with an introduction to Jesus Christ, the Son of Adam who was the Son of God; but John begins his Gospel with the Son of God who is the eternal Word or Revelation of God who existed before time began (Plummer 60).

A. M. Hunter argues that John's opening statement "begins a new Genesis story: this one is to be about him who is the revealer of God" (16). Hunter further points out that to a Jewish mind, John's portrayal of Jesus as eternal Word "meant the first creative power of God in action" (16), but to a Greek mind, the Word [Logos which the King James scholars translated Word] meant "the Rational Principle permeating all reality" (16). While Hunter concludes that perhaps he [John] meant both (16), the multidimensional possibilities of the reification of God through the Word are limitless since Word and referent exist in all languages and since Word and symbol allow for idiosyncratic interpretations. When the relative perspective is considered, then the Word or symbol for God becomes unique for each member of the audience, thus the universality of John's Gospel is apparent from the opening verse.

Thus, John begins his perspective of Jesus as the

Christ where Mark and Luke end. He makes no more attempt to support his declaration that Jesus is not only the Son of God but He is also God than Mark makes to prove that Jesus is the Christ [Matthew's static perspective], the Son of God [Mark's and Luke's dynamic perspective]. John presumes that his audience will accept his simple, subtle, but sublime statement that while Jesus is indeed the Word-made-flesh (1:14), He is more than the Son of God incarnate--He is God, and as such He is not only the Word that reveals God but He is also the Word that spoke the worlds into existence (1:3).

John immediately establishes his relative perspective that Jesus is God and that as God He is Creator, Life, and Light of men (1:3,4). Without any semblance of a theological or philosophical argument, John further clarifies Jesus's Godhead by explaining who He was (1:1-13) and who He became (1:14-18). He was and is the eternal One who existed before time and matter: "In the beginning was the Word" (1:1). He is a divine Personality distinct from the Father because as the pre-incarnate Christ "He was with God [the Father]" (1:1). As the Word, in the beginning He created the universe (1:3), He became the physical, mental, and spiritual source of the life and light of men (1:4), and He became the revealer of God to a sinful world (1:5). In a sense Jesus is the reification of God. Moreover, John tells that He was rejected by "his own" people, Israel, (1:10), but that "as



many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name" (1:12).

John further explicates the eternal Word by explaining who He became (1:14-18). The Word, or eternal Creator-God, was reified through man and flesh (1:14). He continues by declaring that those who saw this Word-made-flesh were able to see the invisible God in His only Son, who reified God and "introduced a new era of grace and truth" (Unger 546). Not only is the Son God but He is also a symbol of God. At once referent and symbol He is Son and God.

Thus John has introduced to his universal audience the Word who is not only God's Son but who is also God Himself. This Word, as Son, the only revealer of God's divine nature, loves all men so much that He condescended to become flesh and to present Himself first to His people Israel as their Savior (1:11) and then to "as many as would receive him" as theirs (1:12). The Evangelist presents a God who has the power to create worlds, but at the same time He chose to humble Himself in the flesh so that He might provide eternal life for every man in the world who would believe or confess "Thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God" (6:69).

Having established his relative perspective of Jesus, a view that echoes and augments Matthew's static perspective and Mark's and Luke's dynamic perspectives, John definitely equates Jesus and God. He continues his portrayal of Him

by the use not of the rhetorical phrases and allusions of Matthew, Mark, and Luke but by the use of complete syntactical units and metaphors which declare His Godhead and mission on earth as the Word-made-flesh. He refortifies this relative perspective of Jesus by the rhetorical use of terms and titles, selection and arrangement, and form. Using this rhetorical method, John adds new dimensions to his relative identification which introduces variations that extend his initial concept of Him.

Another feature of John's Gospel is that he extends the static and dynamic perspectives to a relative one by equating the kingdom of heaven and the kingdom of God and the kingdom of the Word. Because God is reified through the Word and the Word is a symbol of God and the Word-made-flesh is the Son of God, the extension of the place is physical, mental, and spiritual. These provinces of the kingdom are evident in John's Gospel.

While Matthew uses the phrase "the kingdom of heaven" in his static perspective of Jesus as the Messiah-king of that kingdom, and while Mark and Luke both use the phrase "the kingdom of God" in their dynamic perspectives of Jesus as the Son of God, Ruler of God's kingdom, John uses the syntactical unit "I am" in the mouth of the Word-made-flesh to identify and define the physical, mental, and spiritual provinces of His kingdom. These three provinces are

realized in two rhetorical strategies that John uses to interpret Jesus's kingdom for a universal audience. His tripartite kingdom can be seen in His associating Himself (the tenor of an explicit metaphor) with three vehicles for Himself when Jesus declares that He is "the way" (physical, i.e. road), "the truth" (mental, i.e. alembication of symbol and meaning) and "the life" (spiritual, i.e. metaphysical source of being).

These "I am" declarations re-affirm that His "kingdom is not of this world" (18:36), which is evident from the interdependence of tenor and vehicle and from the cyclical movement from physical to mental to spiritual to physical, ad infinitum. Since His divine power to rule is not a physical heritage from the known world, His seat of power rests on God. John mentions the kingdom a total of five times in his Gospel compared to Matthew's fifty-one, Mark's twelve, and Luke's forty-one. Of these five, only twice does John write of kingdom as "the kingdom of God." In John 3:3, John quotes Jesus as saying "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." In 3:5 John quotes Jesus as declaring, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God." Clearly, John presents Jesus defining the qualifying prerequisites of citizenship in that kingdom.

Three times John's Jesus refers to this kingdom of God as "my kingdom." John writes that Jesus, before the Roman magistrate, Pilate, said to him, "My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence" (18:36). Jesus identifies this kingdom of God about which He has spoken earlier to Nicodemus (John 3:3,5) as being "my kingdom" while at the same time assuring him that this kingdom was not of this world. In addition to Jesus's ascribing God's kingdom as being "my kingdom," John records that Jesus announced His own preexistence when He said to the Jews, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was I am" (8:58) and to His Father, "O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory that I had with thee before the world was" (17:5). John also writes that Jesus, on the same occasion, spoke these words to His Father: "Father, I will that they also, whom thou has given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me: for thou lovest me before the foundation of the world" (17:24).

Thus, not only does John present Jesus as the Word-made-flesh, or Christ incarnate, but John, the son of thunder, opens his Gospel with a thunder-bolt statement: Jesus is the eternal God. Moreover, early in his Gospel

John presents Jesus defining for Nicodemus the prerequisites of citizenship in the kingdom of God. Finally, at Jesus's trial before the magistrate of the Roman Empire three times in one sentence Jesus referred to this kingdom of God as being "my kingdom" (18:36). These instances demonstrate that John intends to equate the Father's kingdom with the Son's kingdom as one and the same. When the Father's and the Son's kingdoms are merged, the physical and mental kingdoms have become the spiritual kingdom.

In order to re-fortify his relative perspective of Jesus as pre-existing Word who has come to the world in flesh so that those who believe on His name might become citizens of His kingdom, John employs Jesus's "I am" statements, coupled to explicit metaphors, to delineate the boundaries of Jesus's sovereignty in His eternal kingdom. John's Jesus begins His "I am" self-identifications by declaring to the Samaritan woman at the well that "I that speak to thee am He [the Christ]" (4:26) and that He could give her "living water" [eternal salvation] to drink (4:14). Thus, He claims for Himself the prerogatives of God.

In John 8:12, Jesus publicly declared "I am the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness but shall have the light of life." In John 9:5, He emphasizes His role as light in the world: "As long as I am in the world, I am the light of the world." Jesus is more

than the Word, or reifier of God in the world: in the mental province of His kingdom He illuminates the understanding of men through the Holy Spirit (Tenney 487). John's audience would have responded favorably to Jesus claim: "I am the light of the world" because it reifies the light of wisdom and knowledge through the Deliverer.

John writes that Jesus, with reference as to whom might enter the kingdom of God, said "I am the door [physical province]: by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out, and find pasture" (John 10:9). Jesus also adds "I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for his sheep" (10:11). As Hunter points out, when Jesus said, "I am the door," He is emphasizing that "it is by this door alone that men enter the fold--the new Israel of which the disciples form the nucleus" (102). The restrictiveness of Jesus's claim to be the only way to come to God, the Father, may have been difficult for the audience to accept until John records Jesus's proclaiming, "I am the good shepherd" [emphasis added] who cares so much for His sheep that He lays down His life for them. John's rhetorical delivery would evoke an emotional response from Greeks, Jews, and Asians whose gods were too cold and unresponsive to demonstrate love and care.

Jesus claimed even greater divine powers than those of the physical and mental ones. To Martha whose brother had

died, He defined the greater divine power, His spiritual province, of His kingdom when He said, "I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in me though he were dead, yet shall he live" (John 11:25). Furthermore, He added "And whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die" (John 11:26). Hunter contends that the Jewish religion had those who believed in the resurrection of the dead at the final judgment of God, as did Martha (11:24), and Christ's words startle" when "He does not deny the traditional doctrine." He maintains that Jesus "in his own person, is the victory over death" and "is eternal life." In Jesus "what was a future hope has become a present reality " (115).

One of the great preoccupations of John's audience involves the problem of death.<sup>5</sup> John presents Jesus as the God/man who has overcome death in this present world with the gift of eternal life. John's audience would have intellectually and spiritually responded to his multidimensional perspective of Jesus.

In addition to being the Resurrection and the Life, Jesus declares "I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh to the Father, but by me" (14:6). The philosophers and sages of the Hellenistic world had searched for truth by studying all the known sciences: cosmology, metaphysics, and astronomy, and axiology, ethics, epistemology,

and even astrology and the occult arts of divination; but they could never decide on what constitutes truth. Plummer states that in "I am, the way, the truth, and the life," that Jesus is ranking His divine offices according their importance. Plummer argues that "Christ shows that for him, and therefore for us, it is more important to know the way . . ." than to know the truth and the life (275).

Finally, Jesus makes His last "I am" proclamation to His disciples in His farewell address to them at the Last Supper. He said "I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman" (15:1). His declaration begins a parabolic description, couched in the language of vinegrowers, of that "living union between himself and his disciples on which rests the future of the new fellowship he is founding" (Hunter 148). He is the only way to have fellowship or communion with the Father. Furthermore, in John 15:2,3, Jesus tells His disciples that if they as the branches of the true vine, do not bear fruit, the Father/Husbandman will prune or purge them with the "Word which I have spoken to you" (15:3).<sup>6</sup> John's audience that had so longed for fellowship with the gods and the god/men heroes now had the opportunity for Atonement when they were joined to the one God through Jesus, the Son. Additionally, because Atonement provides cleansing by His Word, they too could reify the Word and bear the fruit of heavenly fellowship. At the



moment of Atonement change takes place; the change of Atonement joins the physical to the spiritual through the Word, and allows the audience to be united with God. John's audience recognized that the "fruit of the vine" to which Jesus referred symbolized the wine of communion with God and men; moreover, they understood that this wine of communion was made possible by the act of Atonement, Jesus's death on the cross.

John's Gospel sets in motion energy when once received by the audience can then be delivered to an ever-increasing audience because when the audience acts and begins to deliver John's Gospel, the role of the audience changes from receiver to presenter, from passive to active. After the audience receives the Word and delivers the Word to others, the spiraling audience increases in altitude and amplitude because the audience has moved from stasis through change to multidimensional.

John wrote to an audience who understood that the metaphysical implications of the syntactical unit "I am" and the metaphorical definitions of the provinces of Jesus's kingdom were not those of just the Messiah-king, the Son of Man, nor even of the Son of God--John presented Jesus as God describing a kingdom that wedded God and heaven to man and earth. Using these syntactical units with metaphors or symbols that the Hellenistic, Jewish, and Asian audience

understood, John has viewed the super-hero Jesus as "an abstract multidimensional system" (Fig. 1, 6-6). Moreover, by presenting Jesus defining His provinces of sovereignty John has shown that all these aspects of the kingdom of God merge and met in the Word who is co-equal with God and who is God. He and His kingdom are eternal.

Although John's relative perspective of the Gospel of Jesus Christ views Him and His kingdom as "an abstract multidimensional physical system" (Fig. 1, 6-7) or order, John achieves this variation of the relative view by using rhetorical titles and terms to expand his definition of the Word-made-flesh.

The first title that John ascribes to Jesus which enlightens the audience as to one of the aspects of His ministry is that of teacher of the divine plan of salvation; thus John defines an important function of Jesus, the Word, in His spiritual province. Of the three synoptic Gospel writers, Matthew and Luke use the title teacher in reference to Jesus only once each. While Mark does not use the title, he refers to the act of Jesus's teaching four times. John, however, explicitly names Jesus teacher by having Nicodemus refer to Jesus as a teacher "come from God." John records that Nicodemus, coming secretly during the night to meet with Jesus said to Him: "Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God [emphasis added]: for no man can do

these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him" (3:2).

John's Jesus as a "teacher come from God" uses the language of teaching. Only John relates that Jesus established a pattern of double adverbs to preface His teaching sessions. Frequently, He used "verily, verily" [truly, truly] coupled with the syntactical unit "I say unto you" to introduce a spiritual or theological statement. John especially emphasized Jesus's role as teacher in His private ministry of revealing the Word to His disciples in Chapters 13-17. Significant also in John's portrayal of Jesus as teacher is that John indicated Jesus's approach to teaching and witnessing of Himself through His use of the nominative pronoun "I." Much in the same style of Socrates and Diogenes, His teaching approach was direct and personal. John's audience would have understood, appreciated, and admired John's presentation of Jesus as divine teacher.

The next title with which John describes Jesus's ministry is that of prophet. John relates the account of Jesus asking the Samaritan woman for a drink of water. The woman, being amazed that a Jew would ask a woman who was a Samaritan for a drink, inquired of Him why He did so. He answered that if she knew "the gift of God, and who it is that saith to thee, Give me to drink; thou wouldst have asked of him, and he would have given thee living water"

(4:10). When Jesus had explained to her that the water He had to offer her would become "a well of living water springing up into everlasting life"(4:14), the woman asked that He might give it to her. Jesus then instructed her to go call her husband; she responded that she had no husband. He replied that this was indeed the truth, "for thou hast had five husbands; and he whom thou now hast is not thy husband" (4:18). The woman recognized His prophetic credentials; she said, "Sir, I perceive that thou art a prophet" (4:19). Later, when the woman invited the men of her village to come and see Jesus, she said "come and see a man which told me all the things that ever I did: is this not the Christ?" (4:29).

The Greek mystery religions and the Hellenistic world's preoccupation with and admiration of prophetic foretelling the future was a part of the cultural expectation of John's heterogeneous audience. The story of Jesus' perfected knowledge of the past, present, and future appealed to John's pre-selected audience and to the universal audience they represent.<sup>7</sup>

John also presents Jesus ministering another aspect of prophetic role, that of healer of the blind. The most illuminating application of the title of prophet was made after Jesus healed a man born blind. The Pharisees who were enraged that He would break the Jewish Sabbath to heal a

man, asked the newly healed one, "What sayest thou of him, that he hath opened thine eyes?" (9:17). The man answered them, "He is a prophet" (9:17). The Pharisees, still upset, sought to find an explanation for the contradiction of Jesus's power to heal the blind (no other prophet in Israel's history had ever done so) and to reconcile why He broke Moses's Law of the Sabbath to accomplish this healing. They reasoned that "since the world began was it not heard that any man opened the eyes of one that was born blind. If this man were not of God, he could do nothing" (9:32-33). John rhetorically adapted and adjusted his material to emphasize Jesus's title of prophet and His prophetic works to appeal to an audience which was intellectually conditioned to respect and admire prophetic qualities in holy men. John's presenting Jesus in the title and work of prophet is but another of John's extensions of Jesus's divine qualifications to reveal God to the minds of men. The last title ascribed to Jesus by John's Gospel describes his physical province. John presents Jesus as King. John has preserved fifteen occasions that Jesus was referred to as "King of Israel" as compared to Matthew's and Mark's six each and Luke's five. The first occasion John records is Nathaniel's being amazed that Jesus had foreknowledge of his existence and character even before they had met. Nathaniel said to Jesus, "Rabbi, Thou art the Son of God; the King of

Israel" (1:49). On the occasion of Jesus's miraculously feeding the five thousand, John writes that Jesus perceived that the men who witnessed this miracle were going to force Him to become King (6:15). When Jesus rode into Jerusalem on an unbroken ass colt, He came as a king to be received by His people. They lined His path with palm branches and pieces of clothing and cried "Hosanna: Blessed is the King of Israel that cometh in the name of the Lord" (12:13). John's Gospel, by presenting Jesus in the role and title of king, extends its universal audience's perspective of His mission on earth.<sup>8</sup>

John writes that one week later Jesus was taken before Pilate to be judged. To Pilate's questions, Jesus clarifies what kind of king He is by answering him in this manner: "Thou sayest that I am a king" (18:36), meaning that Pilate's concept of His mission on earth was in the conceptual framework of earthly kingship. Jesus then outlines the kind of ruler He had come to be: "to this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth" (18:36). Neither the Jewish multitude, the Jewish religious leaders, nor Pilate understood that Jesus's kingship was not ceded by any earthly power: He was a king whose mission was to reveal God the Father to men. Their mistaken concept of His kingship caused the Roman soldiers to mock Him with a crown of thorns, a purple

robe, and cries of "Hail, King of the Jews" (19:3). Jesus's kingship also caused Him to be crucified on a cross with the inscription written at the top: "JESUS OF NAZARETH THE KING OF THE JEWS" (19:19).

John, in ascribing Jesus with the title and work of a king, provides yet another dimension of His kingship: kings sometime suffer for their people. This concept of kingship comes from ancient Greeks who practiced annual regicide in order to purge the community of their sins would be understood and appreciated by John's audience. John presents a King who was rejected by His own people yet was willing to die for their, and all men's, sin.

Further indication of his consciousness of his non-Jewish audience is John's interpretation of Jewish terms for his Gentile audience. He interprets such Jewish terms as "Rabbi" (teacher) (1:37-38), "Messiah" (Christ) (1:41), and "Cephas" (a stone) (1:42). Also John avoids confusing his audience by referring generally to all Jewish religious factions (Pharisees, Sadducees, and Scribes) as "Jews" and "rulers of the Jews" (5:1; 3:2; 8:52; 10:33; 11:36; 19:31). John also explains Jewish places such as Bethesda (5:1-2) and customs such as Jews not speaking to Samaritans and Jews not permitting the body of a Jew to hang on a cross during the Sabbath (4: 9; 19:31) for his non-Jewish, universal audience.

These preceding titles and terms John has utilized to describe the spiritual, mental, and physical systems of Jesus's ministry on earth. They reveal that John's rhetorical aim was to convey to his audience that Jesus, though He was God, had the practical outreach of Teacher, Prophet, and King in that He did dispel sin with salvation, mental darkness with illuminating understanding, and anarchy with authority. Thus, the Evangelist's skillful implementation of titles and terms has enriched his relative perspective of Jesus by providing variations of the Word's ministry in terms of the services He offers to all men.

Additionally, John has selected and arranged his material for his audience to depict the relative perspective of Jesus, the Word, as an abstract religious system. By selecting from his available material from Mark and Luke's Gospels<sup>9</sup> and by selecting from his own memory the actions and teaching of Jesus, John arranged his spiritual Gospel as an application of what the Word has revealed so that men might know how to believe on Jesus's name and receive eternal life. He has selected and arranged Gospel material which address major questions found in several of the world's religions.

In the prologue of his Gospel, John addresses the first question concerning identification of a universal religion: what is its founder's nature<sup>10</sup> (Kysar 116)? In John's prologue (1:1-18), he dares to identify the founder of this



religion as "the giver of grace and truth" and not "the law" which Moses gave (1:17). John records what the founder of the Christian religion claims for Himself in the great "I am" statements. These statements, dealt with earlier, leave no doubt that Jesus asserts for His preexistent deity and claims divine attributes which heretofore had only been ascribed to the God of Israel. Moreover, in these public assertions of His divinity, Jesus made clear that He, being co-equal with the Father, is the only door to eternal life, intellectual truth, and physical order.

Paradoxically, the founder of this universal religion is also the Son of Man. As the Son of Man, He celebrates life and mingles with men on social occasions such as the marriage at Cana (2:1-10). Also, as the Son of Man, He is the defender of the weak, championing even the rights of the disgraced woman taken in adultery (8:3-11). As the servant of men, He humbles Himself to wash His disciples' feet (13:1-10). Moreover, He is the consoler of men, comforting those who fear death (14:1-3); He is the model sufferer, loving those who betrayed and maltreated Him (18:1-11); He is the conqueror of death (20:1-31); and He is the restorer of the penitent (21:1-17).

John also gives Jesus, the eternal Word, another distinctive identification: "the Lamb of God." Jesus's forerunner, John the Baptist, on two occasions declared,

"Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world" (1:29,36). From the beginning of John's Gospel, he has depicted Jesus as the sacrificial lamb required by Moses's Law to take away the sin of the world, thus varying and extending his relative perspective of Jesus as the eternal Word. Indications that Jesus will be offered up as the ultimate Paschal Lamb are interwoven through out John's Gospel. On ten occasions John records the Jews' threats and efforts to kill Him, thus intensifying the audience's emotional response to Jesus's ensuing crucifixion. John's Jesus, despite being badly treated and rejected by Jews, illustrates love and compassion for the perpetrators of His suffering. No other Gospel writer so distinguishes Him as being a God of love as does John, "the disciple whom Jesus loved." Jesus wept to see Mary and Martha grieve over the death of their brother, Lazarus, because He loved them (11:35).

The most distinctive feature of the nature of Jesus as the founder of a universal religion rests in His declaration that love is the identifying characteristic of His followers (13:34-35; 14:15). John's Jesus commanded those who believed on Him to love one another even as He had loved them (15:13). His disciples had only to keep His commandments and abide in His love (15:10). John's audience would recognize uniqueness of love as a distinguishing religious

characteristic. No other universal religion had a founder whose nature is predicated on love.

The second universal religious question John addresses in his Gospel focuses on the nature and source of evil. John utilizes a philosophical and rhetorical device, dualism or antithesis, to treat this issue. He equivocates light with the life created by God; its antithesis, darkness, is sin, a destructive force (1:5). In John 8:23, Jesus juxtaposes "those who are from beneath," meaning the unbelieving Jews who are evil, with "I am from above," meaning that He is God and is good. John antithetically pairs eternal life with death (3:36), truth with falsehood (8:44 f.), heaven with earth (3:31), God with Satan (13:27), and Israel with the Jews (sometimes with the world) (1:19, 47; 17:14). John's Gospel leaves no doubt that Satan and darkness, falsehood and "from below," death and flesh epitomize all evil. On the other hand, John ascribes the goodness of God, as truth, light, spirit, and life. Philosophically and theologically, John delineates the boundaries of good and evil for his universal audience by using this dualistic, antithetical rhetorical pattern.

John treats for his universal audience the third question of the relationship of faith to experience. He uses the verb "to believe" almost one hundred times (exactly ninety-eight) and refers to at least three different

objects of faith. Initially, John deals with the first object of faith, "a personal allegiance to Jesus, a personal relationship with him" (Kysar 80). As an example, the many Samaritans at Sychar "believed on Jesus" because of what the woman at the well told them about Him (4:39). The second object of faith not seen in the Person, Jesus, but in the statements He makes extends a faith in His Person. After Jesus had arisen from the dead, John records that "his disciples remembered that he had said this unto them; and they believed the scripture and the word which Jesus had said" (2:22).

Finally, John writes of faith in the statements about Jesus. He admonishes his audience "to believe that Jesus is the revealer, the Messiah, the Father's Son (e.g., 11:27). This use of the word 'believe' has shifted the meaning of faith from a personal relationship to an intellectual acceptance" which involves confessing a creed about Jesus. John divides the three objects of faith into two different kinds. One embraces a personal, intimate relationship and allegiance to Jesus (Kysar 80). The other rests on "an understanding of faith as an acceptance of a creed, or at least of creedal assertions about Christ" (Kysar 80). The first kind of faith which John presents solidifies the believer's personal relationship with Jesus, the Christ; the second kind of faith is an intellectual act of the will

which cements the believer into the body of the Church, thus defends him from the world. John's universal audience had need of both kinds of faith. In depicting both kinds of faith, John "never uses the noun, faith or belief, but always and only the verb, to believe. . . ." (Kysar 81). John presents faith in Jesus not as something one has, rather as something one does. Johannine faith in Christ is love in action; consequently, the faith John presents to his heterogeneous audience is one grounded on experience.

A universal religion always addresses a fourth question concerning the salvific relationship of the present and the promised future. John selects and arranges his Gospel message to emphasize a present salvation. For example, Jesus promised the present "living waters" of salvation to the Samaritan woman at the well (4:10-14). Also, He promised that whoever believed on Him "should not perish but have eternal life" now and in the future (3:15). On another occasion He said "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me has [now] eternal life" (6:47). Furthermore, John records that Jesus promised "Whoso eateth my flesh [Word], and drinketh my blood [partakes in the fellowship of His Atonement], hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day" (6:54). John presents an eternal salvation which begins at the moment a person believes on His name. In His salvific plan [according to

John], eternity is now (Kysar 109).

A study of the thematic content of John's Gospel has demonstrated that he selected and arranged his material for a universal audience by addressing the four questions which concern all universal religions. The answers to these four questions reveal that the Christian religion as an abstract system of faith within the larger context of universal religions known by John's audience has unique features. First, its God/man founder loved mankind so much that He died to atone for their sin so that man's prelapsarian relationship with God might be restored. Second, the founder of Christianity, though rejected by His own people, overcame Satan and evil by His death, thus provided victory over death for all His followers. Third, faith in Christ, not merely a religious possession nor a state of being, becomes a state of action. Fourth, the founder of the Christian religion provides a salvation which opens the door to eternity now. John's selection and arrangement of Gospel material has made his relative perspective of Jesus as eternal Word the most effective of all the Gospels because his Gospel is a spiritual interpretation of the synoptic Gospel writers' ethical, political, and intellectual Gospels.

John also chose a form superbly suited for his portrayal of Jesus to a universal audience. In his prologue

and testimony (1:1-51), he deliberately echoes Genesis 1:1-2 (MacKensie 211). The Word in the beginning commences a new spiritual kingdom, a new Israel (1:1-5). John presents the the testimony of John the Baptist and Jesus's disciples "to bear witness" to Jesus as the light or revealer of God. Andrew bore witness of this light, Jesus (1:41), and so did Nathaniel (1:49).

After John's prologue and testimony, he presents Jesus's public ministry (2:1-12:50) which spans a period of three Passover celebrations, or three years. The first act of His public ministry starts at the first of these three Passover celebrations in Jerusalem when Jesus cleansed the Temple of the commercial element (2:13-17). After Jesus's official inaugural act of cleaning the Temple, He makes most of His "I am" declarations of divinity. Perrin (231) and other scholars such as Dodd (400) argue that this section contains the "book of signs" because of the framework of seven miracle stories or "signs" which John included so that his audience might "believe" that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. Also called the "book of signs," Jesus's doctrinal (theological) discourses followed these miracles. During the whole of Jesus's public ministry, He, as the Word, makes known the will of the Father to men by signs and discourses.

In the second half of Jesus's ministry, John records

Jesus's private ministry. In this part of his Gospel Jesus unveils His glory before the community of believers (13:1-20:31). In this part of John's Gospel, he records that Jesus celebrated the Last Supper (13:1-38) at the time the paschal lambs were being killed and prepared for eating by all faithful Jews. He also records that Jesus was arrested that night (18:1-19:16), crucified the next day (19:17-42), and appeared to His disciples (20:1-3). In the last chapter of Jesus's private revelation to His disciples, John relates the story of how Jesus forgave and restored penitent Peter and how Jesus charged Peter to care for the sheep of the new Israel.

Thus, the form of John's Gospel is structured on the three years of Jesus's public and private ministries and falls within the space of three annual Passover celebrations. His ministry closes with His threefold charge to Peter to care for lambs and sheep of the new Israel. The final step away from the static ethnicity of the Jewish audience to the dynamism of the Roman and Greek audience has been made. John's Gospel presents a Gospel for the whole world.

In summary, a tagmemic analysis of John has demonstrated that this Gospel writer has adjusted his material to fulfill the expectations of a universal audience. As the final, integral part of the whole Gospel, John provides



a universal perspective of Jesus through his relative presentation. The relative perspective revealed through tagmemic analysis of John completes the advance of the static range and variation found in Matthew and the dynamic range and distribution found in Mark and Luke, making it possible, through this critical apparatus, for readers to view the Gospels as an array and process instead of linear narrative.

In an examination of John's referential use of rhetorical strategies such as syntactical units and metaphors, titles and terms, selection and arrangement, and form, this analysis has chartered an extension of John's initial identification of Jesus as the eternal Word which indicates a perceptible movement of change within his relative perspective of Jesus. The range and variation of his relative perspective of Jesus's life and teaching is essential to John's appeal to his heterogeneous, universal audience.

Through John's relative perspective, his identification of Jesus as the preexistent Word who became flesh extends the range and variation of his perspective of Him to provide insight into not only His eternal Godhead, but also into His role as Teacher, Prophet, and King. John's Gospel cuts the last tie to Judaism and opens the door to the Door of the sheepfold of the new Israel for the whole world. John makes clear that the sheep of the new Israel have found "the way,

the truth, and the life" (14:6). Not only does John open this door, but his Gospel presents the Church, the new Israel, where believers share the bread and wine of fellowship with the eternal Word and with each other. John brings his universal audience to God's "banqueting house" where "His banner over us is love" (Cant. 2:4).

## Notes

1

See Chapter II, Note 2.

2

Davis believes that in all probability, either Andrew or some other apostle wrote the Gospel According to John.

3

Please see Chapter III, Note 5.

4

Please see Chapter III, Note 6.

5

Plato's [circa 427-347 BC] Phaedo and Apology disclose the preoccupation Greeks had with the question of death. Lucretius [circa 96-55 BC], in his De Rerum Natura, influenced by Demosthenes and Epicurus, also shows evidence of the fear and wonder which accompanied an examination of the issues of death.

Also, Rudolph Bultmann and those thinkers who adhere to his teaching on the Gnostic influence especially in John's Gospel argue that John interprets Jesus's teaching on death and life, knowledge and salvation, and light and darkness in the context of Gnostic thought which, they contend, permeated Christian theology at the turn of the first century. Spivey and Smith (42-45) summarize Gnostic

clearly and intentionally portray the involvement of Jesus in this life and this world, are unprecedented in Gnostic literature" (45).

Robert Grant (206) maintains that the Gnostic thinkers adapted John's Jesus's teaching (especially His ethical dualism) for their own purposes. He argues that "This dualism, however, is characteristic of Jewish thought as found, for example, at Qumran, and the presence of this dualism is not necessarily an indication of Gnostic thought." He adds that "A real Gnostic would find it difficult to say that God loved the world (John 3:16)" (206). Kee, Young, and Froehlich agree with Grant that John's doctrine on death and eschatological dualism is much closer to that of the Qumran sect than to the Hellenistic thought, "especially Gnostic thought in some of its varieties. There is no question but that the discovery of the Qumran Scrolls has strengthened the case for the strong Jewish influence on John's thought" (348). Finally, W. D. Davis contends that hermetic literature was the major intellectual, philosophical influence on John's doctrinal thought (396-408). Both the argument for Gnostic influence and for hermetic influence indicate that John did indeed adapt his Gospel material for a heterogeneous, universal audience.

<sup>6</sup>  
Jesus's obviously refers to grapes when He speaks about "fruit" in John 15:3. Grapes symbolize the wine of

communion with God and men.

7

In the context here, the prophet is not necessarily a foreteller of the future but rather speaks that perfected knowledge of God which expands his vision from discerning the past to understanding the present and finally to foreseeing the future. A. Lamorte and G. F. Hawthorne define the word "prophet" as "one who speaks before in the sense of proclaiming, or the one who speaks for, i.e., in the name of God." These writers emphasize, however, that the definition "best adapted to characterize the prophetic mission" would be: "he who witnesses or testifies" to the Word of God (Evangelical Dictionary 886).

8

John's Gospel presents Jesus, at the Feast of Tabernacles, fulfilling Zechariah's messianic prophecy: "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; Shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold thy King cometh unto thee: he is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the fold of an ass" (9:9). It was the custom of oriental monarchs to ride to their coronations on a mule or an ass as a public confession of humility. For example, Solomon, when he was crowned, rode to his coronation on his father's (King David) mule (1 Kings 1:33, 38-40). On the other hand, his brother, Adonijah, who had tried a few days earlier to usurp the Davidic throne, had ridden pridefully

to his self-appointed coronation in a chariot drawn by horses. Horses were status symbols in Old and New Testament times. John portrays Jesus in the true trappings of His kingship: despite the glorious adulation with which He is received as King, He is lowly in demeanor.

9

Kysar argues that John makes no claim of being linked with other forms of early Christianity and there is no good evidence that this is indeed the case (112). On the other hand, Colwell and Titus disagree, arguing instead that John used Mark and Luke as his sources (24-30). Russell also maintains that John was familiar with the Gospels of Mark and Luke and built on their foundations a Gospel adequate for the needs of a missionary Church (17). Tasker contends that John was familiar with all three synoptic Gospels, but in order to bring out their fundamental theological meaning, he wrote indirectly of them in His Gospel (85).

10

The idea and outline of the four universal questions found in many of the world's major religions is taken from Robert Kysar's The Maverick Gospel (116-18).

## CHAPTER V

### AUDIENCE UNITY IN THE GOSPELS

Because its excellent literary structure and style present its meaning with great lucidity (R. M. Frye 263), the King James Version of the Bible, since its appearance, has continued to "capture the minds of its readers and to enter into the written language" (Maier and Tollers 253). Even so, biblical and literary scholars continue to analyze this version in order to understand better its meaning, structure, and style. A major concern of biblical investigation in the King James Version centers on the differences among the four Gospels. Though New Testament scholars generally agree on the purpose of the Gospels, they are divided in agreement among offered explanations for their differences.

This study has searched for an explanation of the differences among the Gospels by considering a gradual geographical, conceptual, and spiritual expansion of each Evangelist's speaking Christ's words to an ever-widening audience, from its original Jewish homogeneity to its present heterogeneous universality. Since the tagmemic theory, originally designed as a linguistic device by

Kenneth Pike and later adapted as an intentional heuristic by Young, Becker, and Pike, seemed especially useful in examining the subject of the super-hero, Jesus, in the four Gospels, its three perspectives, static, dynamic, and relative, have been applied to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. From this tagmemic intentional heuristic, a guide or pattern for discourse analysis was designed. This instrument, a tagmemic deconstruction matrix, served as the pattern for this analysis. The purpose of the analysis has been to determine the particulars in each Gospel that would appeal to a homogeneous audience and the adjustments and adaptations made in the Gospels for their ever-increasing audiences.

In adapting the nine-cell tagmemic heuristic into an instrument productive for a rhetorical analysis of the selections and adjustments made in the Gospels for audience, they have been examined as a literary whole which focuses upon a single subject--the super-hero, Jesus Christ. This procedure included three questions to be asked concerning the Gospel's subject: (1) In what role does each Evangelist see the super-hero, Jesus, and expect his audience to see Him? (2) How does each Gospel's referential framework and rhetorical devices vary from each other in the portrayal of Jesus? (3) Why are these changes significant? The answers to these questions have identified rhetorical features which



have explained differences among the Gospels and determined the rhetorical effects of these differences.

An application of the tagmemic deconstruction matrix revealed that the difference in the Gospels is conscious rhetorical strategies of the Gospel writers. First, each Gospel was examined for its particular perspective or identification of Jesus either through the presence or absence of the birth/infancy stories, genealogies, or prologues. Next, each Gospel's phrases and allusions (in John, his syntactical units and explicit metaphors), titles and terms, selection and arrangement, and form were deconstructed to find the range and distribution of its perspective of Jesus as super-hero.

This tagmemic analysis as a whole helps the reader discover why the canonical fathers placed Matthew first. Since Matthew, the most Jewish of all the Gospels, links and binds the Old Testament to the Gospels; and the Gospels, to the remainder of the New Testament, his Gospel is the first integral part, the seminal account of Jesus Christ upon which the other Gospels and the other New Testament books logically rest. Matthew controls the first aspect of knowing a subject (stasis) through his primary emphasis on the identity of Jesus as the Messiah-king while, at the same time, he plants an underlying movement toward presenting Him as the universal Savior. Even though this Gospel focuses

primarily on static features, it contains within it the energy that gyrates into an ever-increasing spiral that will encompass a universal audience. In this manner, Matthew maintains cohesiveness as well as anticipates the spiraling audience for the four Gospels. This examination of Matthew's Gospel for rhetorical features indicates its particular perspective and reveals that the particle aspect (stasis) dominates.

Because Matthew wrote to convince a Jewish audience that Jesus had come as their Messiah-king in fulfillment of prophecy, he adapted the available Gospel materials to serve his audience's need in their controversy with Jewish religious authorities. For this reason he carefully portrays Jesus as the Messiah-king according to the Law of Moses and the writings of the prophets. Matthew establishes identification of Jesus as the Messiah promised by Old Testament prophets in his accounts of Jesus's birth, infancy, and genealogy. He sees (and expects his audience to see) Jesus in the role of the messianic heir to the throne of David. Thus Matthew, in adapting and adjusting his material for his audience, achieves a static perspective of Jesus. Matthew's Jesus is the Messiah-king.

By his use of phrases and allusions, titles and terms, selection and arrangement, and form, Matthew adds a slightly different dimension to his portrait of Jesus. He expands

adroitly his static perspective of Jesus by utilizing dialogue to ascribe to Jesus the title of Son of God. In Matthew's account, God pronounces that Jesus is "the Son of God" at His baptism; Satan taunts Jesus with "If thou be the Son of God" at His temptation in the wilderness, and Peter, the most Jewish of all the disciples, confessed, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Inherent in these three ascriptions of "Son of God" to Jesus are allusions to His Godhead and the divine prerogatives which accompany deity. In this skillful, rhetorical manner, Matthew not only manages to present indirectly an abhorrent idea to monotheistic Jews but he also, by using the title "the Son of God," initiates movement toward change which constitutes an extension of the original idea of His Messiah-kingship and move his static presentation of Jesus toward the dynamic.

Matthew continues to inch his static perspective of Jesus, the Messiah-king, toward a dynamic perspective, yet he fully develops the static perspective. By repeating the phrase "the kingdom of heaven" in his accounts of Jesus's teaching, he emphasizes the kingship of Jesus. Also, by selecting the details of Jesus's temptation pericope and rearranging their Marcan order, Matthew presents a Messiah who passed the physical test of obedience where Adam failed (contrast), the temporal test of obedience where Moses

failed (variation), and the spiritual test of obedience where Adam and the whole human race have failed (distribution).

The first Evangelist uses the pattern or form of the Pentateuch in presenting the new law of the heart, Christ's Sermon on the Mount. Matthew chose the form most familiar and acceptable to his Jewish audience. While the Pentateuchal form constitutes stasis by recalling Moses's five books of the Law, it inches toward the dynamic (wave) perspective because Jesus said that He had not come to destroy the Law but to fulfill it (Matt. 5:17).

By using rhetorical devices (phrases and allusions, titles and terms, selection and arrangement, and form), Matthew fully develops his static perspective of Jesus as Messiah-king by extending stasis through contrast, variation, and distribution of particle. In this way his Gospel ranges from the Mosaic Law to the preaching of the Sermon on the Mount. Though some movement occurs, the principal perspective does not go beyond stasis.

Matthew continues to consider his audience through distribution by broadening their view of Jesus as Messiah-king. In his Crucifixion pericope, he selects a group of supernatural events that further extend the range of variation of his static view of Jesus. He adapts his material to demonstrate the supernatural happenings which accompanied

Jesus's death. His inclusion of the stories of Pilate's wife's prophetic dream, of the earthquake and the appearance of resurrected saints at the moment of Jesus's death, and of the earthquake that rolled the stone from Jesus's tomb indicates that Matthew intended for his audience to set Jesus apart and to see Him as being more than an earthly king.

After having established the particle aspect of his static perspective of Jesus as Messiah-king and after having extended the range of variation of this perspective to include Jesus as the Son of God by using rhetorical phrases and allusions, terms and titles, selection and arrangement, and form, Matthew concludes his Gospel with Jesus's great commission pericope. Matthew alone records that Jesus prefaced this commission with an unequivocal declaration of His Godhead: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth" (28:18). Matthew writes that Jesus then charged His disciples to "go ye therefore and teach all nations, Baptizing them in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost" (28:19).

The Evangelist had adapted his material so that his audience could understand that Jesus was the Messiah-king and that He had been sent to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel," and that He was more than Messiah: He is the Son of God. This tagmemic analysis of Matthew has clarified how

the Evangelist has rhetorically enlarged his audience's exclusive, ethnic perception of Jesus toward a dynamic one without ever leaving the static boundaries of Jesus as David's Son, the Messiah-king of Israel.

Though both Mark and Luke identify Jesus as the Messiah-king in the beginning of their Gospels as did Matthew, they establish a different perspective of Him than does Matthew's static perspective. Through their choices of introductory materials and titles, they have each established their changing perspective of Jesus. Mark, writing to Romans, emphatically identifies in 1:1 Jesus as the Christ and also as the Son of God. He immediately supports his declaration with a battery of powerful examples of the Son of God's mighty works. Luke, writing to a Greek audience, approaches the subject of Jesus, the super-hero, from an historical point of view. He identifies Jesus as the Son of God, conceived by the Holy Spirit as well as the Son of Adam, conceived in the womb of the Virgin Mary. Luke provides the stories of witnesses to further his dynamic identification of Jesus.

Having established their dynamic perspectives of Jesus as the Son of God, views that echo and augment Matthew's static perspective, they also strengthen their portrayals of Him by the use of rhetorical devices, thus adding new dimensions to their dynamic identification which introduces

variations that extend their initial concept of Him. Both employ the phrase "the kingdom of God" in order to avoid using the Aramaic idiom that translates "the kingdom of heaven" since they are writing to audiences who were not accustomed to Jewish religious phraseology.

Mark's early use of the phrase "the kingdom of God" is important background for his portrayal of the Son of God who has come to establish God's kingdom on earth through His mighty works, thus vanquishing Satan's cosmic forces of evil. Mark's choice of phraseology and arrangement of materials for his Roman audience emphasize Jesus's authoritative teaching, His healing miracles, especially His exorcism miracles. On the other hand, Luke, writing to a Greek audience who understood the intellectual quest for human moral perfection, employs the phrase "the kingdom of God," but he stresses Jesus not only as the Son of God of that kingdom but also as the Son of Adam. Moreover, Luke uses the phrase rhetorically to introduce Jesus's Sermon on the Mount, which he adapts and adjusts in such a manner that his interpretation reflects a humanitarian emphasis that demonstrates Jesus's compassionate concern for the poor, hungry, sad, and hated. Luke employs the phrase "the kingdom of God" as the context for the perfected Son of Adam who is King of the Kingdom of God. Rhetorically embedded within their changing perspectives of Jesus as Son of God lie perception

of change and variation which enhance their audiences' comprehension of Him. Mark's rhetorical development of "the-kingdom-of-God" phrase presents a militant, commanding, active Servant of God while Luke presents a royal, compassionate, sensitive, humane Son of Man.

Furthermore, both Mark and Luke adjust and adapt their material to emphasize their particular dynamic perspectives of Jesus in yet another rhetorical manner, the utilization of appropriate terminology. Mark accelerates his account of Jesus's mighty acts through his use of conjunctions and adverbial links. The anaphoric strategy of beginning sentences with coordinating conjunctions and the adverbial links which heighten the sense of urgency allow him to extend, thus vary, the range of his dynamic perspective of Jesus as the Son of God and the Son of Man (a title he also uses frequently) and to present a divine Person of action, with forthrightness, authority, and power, all admirable traits in a Roman culture. At the same time, adjusting his Gospel for a Roman audience who thought of Jesus's death on the cross as scandalous, Mark repeatedly records that Jesus uses the title the Son of Man as a surrogate for the pronoun "I" to focus on His humanity and thus prepare his audience for the ignominious death of the suffering Servant of God.

Luke, on the other hand, uses the terminology of prophecy which is appropriate to his portrayal of Jesus as



the Son of Adam and also as the Son of Man. Luke's use of prophetic terminology and the title, the Son of Man, are rhetorical strategies which he employs to draw upon the expectation of a Greek audience who would insist that a prophet display knowledge perfected. Both Luke and Mark skillfully employ titles and terms to interpret for their respective audiences the internally changing perspectives of their initial, dynamic perspectives of Jesus. Mark's treatment of Jesus as suffering Servant and Luke's portrayal of Jesus as Prophet extend their dynamic perspectives that Jesus is more than the Jewish Messiah and more than the Son of God.

Both Evangelists also have rhetorically selected and arranged their material to extend their dynamic perspectives of Jesus. Mark's brief account of Jesus's temptation in the wilderness enhances his depiction of Jesus as the busy, obedient Servant of God. Luke's arrangement of Jesus's temptation portrays Jesus as the ultimate Prophet who overcomes Satan in the wilderness with the Word of God whereas His first father, Adam, failed in the Garden of Eden.

Mark and Luke have also structured their Gospels according to forms most appropriate for communicating their perspectives of Jesus to their Roman and Greek audiences. Mark, using the dramatic principles of character reversal,

has chosen an effective form for presenting the powerful ministry of the Son of God, the suffering of His servitude, and the triumph of His resurrection. Luke has chosen a classical Greek form which is superbly suited for his portrayal of Jesus as the ideal Man and ultimate Prophet to a Greek audience. Luke's threefold presentation of Jesus begins with the twofold witness of His messiahship in the Temple, peaks with his main division where Jesus gathers witnesses to the Word in His Galilean ministry, and concludes with the true Israel, the Church, who will be those witnesses who will perpetuate His work.

Through their dynamic perspectives, both Evangelists have extended the range of the Son of God to provide insight into His suffering servitude and His ideal manhood (contrast), His function as the ultimate Prophet and Word-made-flesh (variation), and His mighty cosmic power (distribution). Finally, this tagmemic analysis revealed that by adapting source material for Roman and Greek audiences they have directed the Gospel of Jesus Christ toward a more universal appeal and have instructed a spiraling expectation of the super-hero's function.

While the Evangelist John acknowledges Jesus to be the Messiah-king, the Son of Man, and the Son of God, he primarily emphasizes Jesus as the eternal Word of God who became flesh so that all man who believe Him to be the Christ

might have eternal life. In this manner, John completes the synoptic Gospels and delivers the Gospel of Jesus Christ to the world. In his delivery of the Gospel, he reconciles the differences that exist among the other three Gospels and explains them theologically. Moreover, John's spiritual interpretation of Jesus provides the thought and symbolism which represents the universal religious quest.

John presents Jesus's public ministry where He witnesses to His Godhead and His private ministry where He teaches this truth to His disciples. Together, both public and private ministries provide the procedural concepts of belief necessary for the universal religion, Christianity. When John links together Jesus's public and private ministries, he proffers a spiritual interpretation of the life and teaching of Jesus which allows the super-hero to be viewed from a universal vantage. In writing to reflect a variety of features for this heterogeneous audience, John presents the relative perspective of Jesus.

In recording all the signs or works that Jesus did so that his audience might believe on Him, thereby gaining eternal life (20:30, 31), John immediately establishes a relative perspective of Jesus. In his prologue, John identifies Jesus not only as the Word-made-flesh but also as the eternal Word, who was with God in the beginning and who created the worlds. Having established his relative

perspective of Jesus, John's augmentation recalls and extends Matthew's static perspective and Mark's and Luke's dynamic perspectives. He equates God and Jesus.

John re-fortifies and expands his relative view of Jesus, the eternal Word (an abstract multidimensional system of belief) by way of contrast to a multidimensional physical system that also includes the mental aspect (variation). He achieves this variation by equating Matthew's kingdom of heaven and Mark's and Luke's kingdom of God with the kingdom of the Word, which is His kingdom. Because God is reified through the Word and the Word is a symbol of God and the Word-made-flesh is the Son of God, the extension of the place is physical, mental, and spiritual. These provinces are evident in John's Gospel. When John's Jesus merges the Father's kingdom with His kingdom, the physical and mental kingdoms become the spiritual kingdom (distribution).

Using the syntactical units, "I am," coupled with explicit metaphors such as "Door," "Light," "Bread," and "Truth," John defines the boundaries of the Word's physical, mental, and spiritual provinces of His kingdom so that those who believe on His name might become citizens there. His "I am the true vine" (John 15:1-8) presents the cleansing which the Atonement requires and provides for those who become branches or citizens in His kingdom. As branches of the true vine, John's audience could reify the Word and bear

the fruit of heavenly fellowship.

For his universal audience, John develops his relative perspective of Jesus, the Word of God, through the use of titles and terms and defines the physical, mental, and spiritual dimensions of His role as the Word-made-flesh. The titles which John ascribes to Jesus, Teacher, Prophet, define an important function of Jesus, the Word, in His kingdom. The Evangelist also interprets Jewish terms for his non-Jewish audience and explains places and customs.

Additionally, John has selected and arranged his material for his audience to depict the relative perspective of the Word as an abstract religious system. In His spiritual Gospel, he has theologically applied the revelation of the Word so that men might believe on Jesus's name and receive eternal life. His selection and arrangement of Gospel material addresses these major questions found in several of the world's major religions: What is the founder's nature? What is the nature and source of evil? What is the relationship of faith to experience? What is the salvific relationship of the present to the promised future?

John's answers to these four questions for his universal audience reveal uniqueness of the Christian religion which constitute an abstract system of faith within the larger context of universal religions known by John's

audience. Its God/man founder is a God who loves so much that He gave His own life to redeem all man from sin. Second, He also overcame Satan and evil by His own death and provided victory over death for His followers. Third, faith in Christ is not a possession nor a state of being, rather it is a process of action. And fourth, the founder of Christianity provides a salvation that at the moment of belief opens the door to eternity. Thus, John's selection and arrangement of Gospel material has provided a theological, spiritual interpretation of the synoptic writers' ethical, political, and intellectual Gospels.

John's implementation of form furthers his portrayal of Jesus to a multidimensional audience. Structured on the three years of Jesus's public ministry, it falls within the space of three annual Passover celebrations. Opening his account of the Word in the same manner as Moses begins with the Genesis account of the creation of the earth, John begins with the Word's setting up the new Israel by His public and private revelation of His three-dimensional kingdom. John's Gospel closes with Jesus's threefold charge to Peter to care for the lambs and sheep of the new Israel, the Church. Thus, this tagmemic analysis of John's Gospel reaches the final step of the path that began with the static ethnicity of the Jewish audience and journeyed through to the dynamism of the Roman and Greek audiences. The relative perspective

of John's Gospel contains the rhetorical explanation of strategies used by the fourth Evangelist to structure a Gospel for the world.

An application of a tagmemic deconstruction matrix allows the discovery of a sense of audience in the four Gospels by identifying and reconciling differences. In other words, it unveils the Evangelists' rhetorical strategies of audience appeal. While all four Gospel writers did indeed "manipulate their materials to express their theological viewpoints" (Guthrie 13), their Gospels do consist of the personal words and addresses of Jesus to His audiences as remembered by many eyewitnesses and interpreted by each Evangelist. Even so, that which is common among the Gospels is sufficient for their audiences "to regard the particular interpretation of each as a variation within a basic unity" (Guthrie 108).

This analysis has also disclosed that even though none of these Gospel writers were men of letters, their elegant simplicity employs rhetorical devices and demonstrates rhetorical principles of audience appeal which still characterizes them, even in translation, as literary masterpieces. Through the tagmemic deconstruction matrix, the person of the writer almost mysteriously appears to earnestly present his perspective of the most controversial super-hero of all ages, Jesus Christ. With rhetorical deftness, each

identifies the role in which Jesus will be cast, each enlarges his particular identification of Jesus by rhetorically varying the range of His Person and work, and each moves toward a fuller comprehension of Jesus by distributing the super-hero, Jesus, to an ever-widening context of audience appeal.

A tagmemic examination of the four Gospels has also revealed more clearly four different strata of Christian theology. As the tagmemic probe has moved from a particle static perception of knowing the subject of the four Gospels through variation and distribution of stasis to a double dynamic perception to a relative perception of Him, an ethical interpretation of Jesus as the Messiah-king of the kingdom of heaven comes into sharp focus in Matthew. Moreover, the political ramifications of the mighty Son of God's cosmic conflict with Satan, sin, and death becomes clearer in Mark. Also, the philosophical quest for human, moral perfection in the use of the Word broadens the concept of the kingdom of God in Luke. Finally, the theological interpretation of Christ as God in the kingdom of God which is also His kingdom, along with the answers to the four questions basic to universal religions in John complete the four indispensable stratas of theological understanding. In reality, each perspective of the four Gospels themselves, with their four portrayals of Jesus, the super-hero,



delineates and defines the boundaries of the three provinces of Christ's kingdom.

Matthew's Gospel delineates the boundaries of Christian ethics. In reality, the tagmemic analysis of Matthew has revealed that Matthew adjusted and adapted his Gospel material for the purpose of convincing Jewish Christians and their Jewish opponents that Jesus was the legal (according to the Law of Moses) Messiah-king who was a prophet greater than Jonah and who had also come not to destroy the Law of Moses but to fulfill it (Matt. 5:17). Matthew put Jesus's new ethical teaching into the context of Moses's old ethical law and proclaimed that He was fulfilled Moses's law in so doing. Since Matthew's audience understood the legal aspects of Moses's Law, Matthew made the ethical teaching of Jesus easier to grasp mentally and embedded the spiritual by couching the ethics of Jesus's Sermon on the Mount, the cornerstone of the new ethics of the new Israel, in the language of Moses's Law. This referential use of rhetorical devices in order to appeal to his Jewish audience has appealed to a greater audience because it has effectively defined the history of Christian ethics. Matthew's ethical interpretation of the kingdom of heaven not only established a static perspective of Jesus which links the Gospels to the Old Testament but it also contained the seed of change which effected a cohesive movement to an ever-widening audience

in all the Gospels.

Mark's Gospel draws the political boundaries of Christ's kingdom on earth to meet the politico/cultural expectations of his Roman audience. His portrayal of Jesus as the mighty Son of God who came to conquer Satan, sin, and death comforted and inspired Roman Christians who were suffering grievous persecution to a broader faith in a God who would and could interject Himself into the political affairs of the world and who would and could establish a government of righteousness.

In addition, Mark's depiction of Jesus as the Son of God, the suffering, obedient Servant who "came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many" (10:45) served as a political and social example as well as a spiritual one for the Romans; in context of the four Gospels, for the world. Certainly, Mark's perspective of Jesus in the paradoxical roles of mighty Son of God and humble Servant of God has deepened an audience's respect, understanding, and admiration for a God, who though omnipotent, humbles Himself to suffer for the sin of His creation, man. Mark's Roman witness of his Gospel establishes the new politics for the kingdom of God.

In Luke's Gospel, this tagmemic deconstruction matrix has proven effective in uncovering the intellectual, philosophical boundaries of the kingdom of God. Luke's

portrayal of Jesus as the Son of Adam who was also the ultimate Prophet reflects the Greeks' intellectual, philosophical quest for ideal human perfection. This idealistic search for human perfection also entailed perfected knowledge of the past, present, and future. Luke's presentation of Jesus as the compassionate Son of Man whose love and mercy knows no racial nor creedal limitations satisfied the humanitarian concern for the Greeks of his day and for their intellectual and philosophical heirs.

The Lucan dynamic perspective of Jesus sheds theological light on the function of the ideal Man and ultimate Prophet in the Word of God. Jesus's death on the cross, the result of His obedience to God's Word, atoned for the first Adam's lack of obedience to God's Word and also his heirs' lack of obedience. Luke's presentation of the Son of God who was willing to become Adam's Son unites his past and present audiences' comprehension of the thoroughness of God's love and concern for the needs of the whole man. Luke's Gospel establishes the new humanitarian philosophy as the standard of moral excellence for the kingdom of God.

John, on the basis of the three witnesses in Matthew, Mark, and Luke, writes his spiritual Gospel to the world. He presents the mystical deity of God reified in Jesus and then explains how those who believe in His name are spiritually reborn. Furthermore, John, through the arrangement

and adjustment of his Gospel material explains that in the Atonement of Christ, those who participate in His kingdom through believing His name bear the fruit of the vine (which is communion with God) because they are attached to the "true vine" which is Jesus Christ.

John's presentation of Jesus as teacher of Atonement is an essential aspect of Christian theology. John's perspective of Jesus as the eternal God--reified in the Word-made-flesh, who in turn is reified in all those who partake in His Atonement--remains the most essential characteristic of Christian theology because it gives birth to the Church, the new Israel. The Word-made-flesh binds the followers of Christ together in the fellowship and love which are inherent in Atonement. By having interweaved the perspectives of the synoptic Gospels into his universal one, John has unified the Gospels and widened their appeal to audience.

## Works Cited

- Baird, Arthur J. Audience and the Historical Jesus.  
Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969.
- Barclay, William. Introduction to John and the Acts of the Apostles. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976.
- . The Men, the Meaning, the Message of the New Testament Books. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976.
- Bloomfield, Leonard. Language. New York: Holt, 1933.
- Brandon, S. G. F. The Trial of Jesus of Nazareth. London:  
B. T. Batsford, 1968.
- Bromiley, G. W. "Church." Zondervan Pictorial Bible Dictionary. Ed. Merrill C. Tenney. 1963. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1967.
- Brooke, Tucker. "The Early Stuarts and the Commonwealth."  
A Literary History of England. Ed. Albert C. Baugh.  
2nd ed. New York: Appleton, 1967.
- Brownrigg, Ronald. Who's Who in the New Testament.  
Vol. 2 of Who's Who in the Bible. New York: Bonanza,  
1980.
- Bruce, F. F. The New Testament Documents: Are they Reliable? 1943. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.
- Bundy, W. E. Jesus and the First Three Gospels.  
Cambridge: Harvard P, 1955.

- Burke, Kenneth. Rhetoric of Motive. New York: Prentice, 1950.
- Burkill, T. A. New Light on the Earliest Gospel: Seven Markan Studies. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1972.
- Bywater, Ingram, trans. On Poetics. By Aristotle. Vol. 2 in Great Books of the Western World. Ed. Robert Maynard Hutchins. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1952.
- Colwell, Ernest Cadman, and Eric Lane Titus. The Gospel of the Spirit: A Study of the Fourth Gospel. New York: Harpers, 1953.
- Cooper, Lane, trans. The Rhetoric of Aristotle. By Aristotle. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice, 1932.
- Davis, W. D. Invitation to the New Testament. Garden City: Doubleday, 1966.
- DeVries, Carl E. "Saul." The Zondervan Pictorial Bible Dictionary. Ed. Merrill C. Tenney. 1963. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1967.
- Dodd, C. H. The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. Cambridge: UP, 1960.
- Farrar, F. W. The Gospel According to Luke; With Maps, Notes and Introduction. Cambridge: University P, 1921.
- Fowler, Arthur B. "Jehovah." The Zondervan Pictorial Bible Dictionary. Ed. Merrill C. Tenney. 1963.

Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1967.

Freeman, James. M. Manners and Customs of the Bible.

Plainfield, NJ: Logos, 1972.

Frye, Northrop. The Great Code: The Bible and Literature.

New York: Harcourt, 1981.

Frye, Roland M. "The Bible in English." In The Bible in Its Literary Milieu: Contemporary Essays. Eds.

John Maier and Vincent Tollers. Grand Rapids:

Eerdmans, 1979.

Gorrell, Robert M., Patricia Bizzell, and Bruce Hertsberg.

Abstract of "The Writer Is Always a Fiction." By

Walter J. Ong, S. J. Bedford Bibliography. Boston:

St. Martin's, 1983.

Grant, Robert M. A Historical Introduction to the New Testament. New York: Harpers, 1963.

Gruenler, R. G. "Son of Man." Evangelical Dictionary of Theology. Ed. Walter A. Elwell. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984.

Guthrie, Donald. The Gospel and Acts: New Testament Introduction. London: Tyndale, 1965.

---. "The Historical and Literary Criticism of the New Testament." In Biblical Criticism: Historical, Literary, and Textual. By R. K. Harrison, B. K. Waltke, D. Guthrie, and G. D. Fee. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978.

- Halley, Henry H. Halley's Bible Handbook: An Abbreviated Bible Commentary. 1927. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1965.
- Hendriksen, William. New Testament Commentary: Exposition of the Gospel According to Matthew. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1973.
- Hertzberg, Arthur, ed. "Introduction." Judaism. In Great Religions of Modern Man. Ed. Richard A. Gard. New York: Braziller, 1962.
- Hertzog, John Joseph. "An Investigation of J. Arthur Baird's Program of Audience Criticism: The Analysis of Audience as a Critical Approach to the Synoptic Sayings of Jesus." Diss. The Hartford Seminary Foundation, 1972.
- Hiebert, D. Esmond. Mark: A Portrait of a Servant. Chicago: Moody, 1974.
- Hunter, A. M. The Gospel According to John. Cambridge: University P, 1965.
- Jeremias, Joachim. The Central Message of the New Testament. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981.
- Kingsbury, Jack Dean. Jesus Christ in Matthew, Mark, and Luke. In Proclamation Commentaries: New Testament Witnesses for Preaching. Ed. Gerhard Krodel. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981.
- Kinneavy, James L. A Theory of Discourse. 1971.



New York: Norton, 1980.

Kysar, Robert. John, the Maverick Gospel. Atlanta: Knox, 1961.

Langellier, Kristin M. "The Audience of Literature: A Phenomenological Poetic and Rhetoric." Diss. Southern IL U at Carbondale, 1980.

Liefeld, W. L. "The Theology of Luke." In Evangelical Dictionary of Theology. Ed. Walter A. Elwell. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984.

Lightfoot, R. H. St. John's Gospel: A Commentary. Ed. C. F. Evans. Oxford: Clarendon, 1956.

Love, Julian Price. The Gospel and the Gospels. New York: Abingdon, 1953.

Mackensie, John L. The New Testament Without Allusion. New York: Crossroads, 1982

Maier, John and Vincent Tollers. Preface. "The Bible in English." By Roland M. Frye. In The Bible in Its Literary Milieu: Contemporary Essays. Eds. John Maier and Vincent Tollers. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979.

Major, H. D. A. "Incidents in the Life of Jesus." In The Mission and Message of Jesus. By H. D. A. Major, T. W. Manson, and C. J. Wright. New York: Dutton, 1946.

Manson, T. W. "The Sayings of Jesus." In The Mission and Message of Jesus. By H. D. A. Major, T. W. Manson, and C. J. Wright. New York: Dutton, 1946.

- . Studies in the Gospels and Epistles. Ed. Matthew Black. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962.
- Murrin, Michael. The Veil of Allegory: Some Notes Toward a Theory of Allegorical Rhetoric in the English Renaissance. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1969.
- Nickle, Keith Fullerton. The Synoptic Gospels: Conflict and Consensus. Atlanta: Knox, 1980.
- O'Hara, W. J. trans. The Historical Jesus in the Gospel of John. By Franz Mussner. London: Burns and Oates, 1976.
- Ong, Walter J., S. J. "The Writer Is Always a Fiction." PMLA 90 (1975): 9-21.
- Osborne, Grant R. "Theology of Mark." Evangelical Dictionary of Theology. Ed. Walter A. Elwell. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984.
- . "The Theology of Mark." In Evangelical Dictionary of Theology. Ed. Walter A. Elwell. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984.
- Perrin, Norman. The New Testament: An Introduction; Proclamation and Parenthesis, Myth and History. New York: Harcourt, 1974.
- Pike, Kenneth L. "Beyond the Sentence." CCC 15 (1964): 129-35.
- . Kenneth L. Linguistics Concepts: An Introduction to Tagmemics. Lincoln: U Nebraska P, 1982.

- Plummer, A. The Gospel of John; with Maps, Notes and Introduction. From The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. Cambridge: UP, 1923.
- Rhein, Francis Bayard. An Analytical Approach to the New Testament. Woodbury, NY: Barron's, 1966.
- Roberts, W. Rhys, trans. Rhetoric. By Aristotle. In Great Books of the Western World. Ed. Robert Maynard Hutchins. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1952.
- Robertson, A. T. The Christ of the Logia. New York: George H. Doran, 1924.
- Rosenstock-Huessy, Eugen. The Fruit of the Lips or Why Four Gospels. Pittsburg: Pickwick, 1978.
- Scott, Ernest F. The Purpose of the Gospels. New York: Scribner's, 1949.
- Smart, W. A. The Spiritual Gospel. New York: Abington, 1945.
- Spivey, Robert A. and D. Moody Smith, Jr. Anatomy of the New Testament: A Guide to Its Structure and Meaning. 2nd ed. New York: Macmillan, 1974.
- Strachan, Richard. "The Gospel in the New Testament." In Vol. 8 of The Interpreter's Bible. New York: Abington, 1951-57.
- Strong, James. Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible. 1894. Nashville: Crusade Bible Publishers,

n.d.

Tasker, R. V. G. The Nature and Purpose of the Gospels.

2nd ed. London: S. C. M. Press, 1945.

Taylor, Vincent. The Gospels According to St. Mark, the Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indexes.

New York: St. Martin's, 1966.

Tenney, Merrill C. "Meribah." In Zondervan Pictorial Bible Dictionary. Merrill C. Tenney. 1963. Grand Rapids: 1967.

Thompson, Charles Frank. The Thompson Chain Reference Bible. New International Version. Indianapolis:

Kirkbride Bible, 1983.

Thompson, Leonard. Introducing Biblical Literature: A More Fantastic Country. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice, 1978.

Tinsley, E. J. The Gospel According to Luke. Cambridge: UP, 1965.

Unger, Merrill F. Unger's Bible Handbook. Chicago:

Moody, 1967.

Vermes, Geza. Jesus the Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospels. New York: Macmillan, 1973.

Vine, W. E. Expository Dictionary of the New Testament; with Their Precise Meanings for English Readers. 1940.

Old Tappan, NJ: Revell, 1966.

Wallis, Ethel E. "Contrastive Plot Structures of the Four Gospels." Notes on Translation 40 (1971): 3-16.

---. "Four Gospels, Four Discourse Genres." Notes on Translation 94 (1983): 3-16.

Wilder, Amos Niven. The Language of the Gospels: Early Christian Rhetoric. New York: Harpers, 1964.

Wright, C. J. "Jesus: The Revelation of God." In The Mission and Message of Jesus. By H. D. A. Major, T. W. Manson, and C. J. Wright. New York: Dutton, 1946.

Young, Richard, Alton L. Becker, and Kenneth L. Pike. Rhetoric: Discovery and Change. New York: Harcourt, 1970.

---. "Invention: A Topological Survey." In Teaching Composition: 10 Bibliographic Essays. Ed. Gary Tate. Ft. Worth: Texas Christian UP, 1976.

---. "Methodizing Nature: The Tagmemic Discovery Procedure." In Rhetoric and Change. Eds. William E. Tanner and J. Dean Bishop. Mesquite: Ide House, 1982.