

---

The question of the formal structure of religious authority is one question, the question of its material content, another. Thus, whether *X* is *an* authority, or rather the explicit primal ontic *source* of authority—this being a question about *X*'s place in the formal structure of religious authority—*X* may represent either the gift and demand of unconditional love, or the gift and demand of conditional love.

If Marxsen is right, what is distinctive of Jesus' own kerygma as well as both the Jesus-kerygma and the Christ-kerygma of the early church and the Christ-kerygma of Paul is representation of the gift and demand of unconditional love. By contrast, what is distinctive of both John the Baptist's pre-Christian message of repentance and the Christian (but not "Christian") message of the Gospel of Matthew is representation of the gift and demand of conditional love.

Thus Christ, for Matthew, is a "second Moses," but only in something like the same sense in which Christ, for Paul, is a "second Adam." That is, Christ for Matthew, as much as for Paul, is not simply *an* authority, not even *the* authority, but, rather, the explicit primal ontic *source* of authority. And yet, whereas Christ, for Paul the Christian, re-presents the gift and demand of unconditional love, together with the self-understanding/understanding of existence corresponding thereto, Christ, for Matthew, very much as the law for Paul the Pharisee, re-presents the gift and demand of conditional love only, together with the self-understanding/understanding of existence corresponding to it.

15 September 1999; rev. 10 December 2008