

**ERIK KORMOS:**

## **Man's divine image and taxpaying according to the ethics of Jesus**

*“Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's;  
and unto God the things that are God's.”*

*(Matt 22, 21)*

### **Foreword**

This paper is the written form of the presentation presented in 25<sup>th</sup> International Biblical Conference (August 2013) in Szeged at Gál Ferenc Roman Catholic College. This was the first time when I had publically spoken about the MEMO-Exegesis as a new hermeneutical paradigm respected the roll of hapax legomena (words that occurs only ones in writing) in New Testament which is result of my PhD research.

First of all I would like to make something clear; there will be a very new method of exegesis that I am going to share with you. There are so many ways to reach this text and topic. I am finishing my PhD and hopefully my studies will be finished next year. During the last three years I have been researching the problem of hapax legomena in the New Testament. Having examined and tested the New Testament's text I have created this new method: *Method of Emphasis Modelling Exegesis*, which in short form, as an acronym can also be used as: *MEMO-Exegesis*<sup>®</sup>.<sup>1</sup> If somebody would like to use it in German, its translation is: „*Exegetische Methode der Nachdruck Modellation.*” My desire is that it will be used widely in theology when the problem of hapax legomena is being studied. In that case one should not use this technical term in the translated form: the acronym is quite enough.

### **What is MEMO-Exegesis<sup>®</sup>?**

In the 20<sup>th</sup> century there was a paradigm shift in theology, linguistics and in other human arts as well. Between the 17<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century there was the high and low critical era of theology. According to these critical methods even if they were positive or negative in their goals, they created a problem: the philological or textual analysis of the New Testament stayed at the level of 19<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>2</sup> During this period Linguists claim that Koine was grammatically

---

<sup>1</sup> This is the first time when I have named this method publically. During the last three years I have researched the problem of hapax legomena in New Testament. The title of my Ph Dissertation is: Paradigms for the exegetical use of hapax legomena in the New Testament. Lecturer: Dr. habil Peter Balla.

<sup>2</sup> William Baird: *History of New Testament Research*. Vol.1. Fortress Press, Minneapolis 1992, 6-25; 25-29; 93-101; 101-107.

worse than classical Greek. This statement is out of date,<sup>3</sup> although it is influencing the theological thinking nowadays.<sup>4</sup>

From the second half of the 20th century there was a fundamental change among Linguists due to a revolution in communication.<sup>5</sup> In consequence of this, linguists as scientists were divided into two different directions: 1) universal- and 2) pragma-linguists.<sup>6</sup> The Universal-Linguists use methods from before the 20<sup>th</sup> century, whereas the Pragma-Linguists ride on new methods<sup>7</sup> influenced by communication theories.

American Linguist GEORGE KINGSLEY ZIPF showed the text we examine,<sup>8</sup> independently of its language or age, if it is a certain corpus, would comprise 30-35% of hapax legomena. CLAUDE SHANNON and WARREN WEAVER pointed out<sup>9</sup> the importance of hapax legomena: the less a message we use, (for example a word occurred only once in a certain text) the stronger its communication emphasis is. Reasoned by this accomplishment the Linguists separated the study of language into two areas, written and spoken; however, there are connections between these separated fields, but these are not equal. According to this 'communication theory' the hapax legomena are language typologies<sup>10</sup> coming from the *spoken* language and can be found as *written patterns* in texts that we inherited.

CLAUDE SHANNON also showed that complex expressions of more than one syllable (e.g. ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος the longest expression in the New Testament from 1 Pet 4,15)<sup>11</sup> are also hapax legomena. These expressions as certain patterns play the same roll in interpretation like the simple word hapax legomena (e.g. ἄρκος from Rev 13,2).

---

<sup>3</sup> C.F.D. Moule: *An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek*. Cambridge University Press, 1971. v-vi.

<sup>4</sup> Stanley E. Porter: The Greek Language of the New Testament. In: Stanley E. Porter (ed.): *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament*. Brill Academic Publishers, Inc. Boston-Leiden, 2000. 99-131.

<sup>5</sup> Eric P. Hamp (ed.): *Janua Linguarum*. Mouton. The Hague, Paris, 1973. 9-12.

<sup>6</sup> Bernard Quemda: Lexicology and Lexicography. In: Thomas A. Sebeok (ed.): *Current Trends in Linguistics. Linguistics in Western Europe*. (Vol. 9). Mouton, The Hague – Paris, 1972. 402-442.

<sup>7</sup> Stefan Ullmann: Semantics. In: Thomas A. Sebeok (ed.): *im*, 378 and f.

<sup>8</sup> David Crystal: *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1978. 115-116.

<sup>9</sup> Józsefné, Csernoch: *Irodalmi művek szókészletének statisztikai elemzése és matematikai modellezése*. (PhD) Debreceni Egyetem Természettudományi Kar Debrecen, (sine pub.) 2005. 5.

<sup>10</sup> Hadumod Bussmann (ford. Gregory P. Trauth – Kerstin Kazzazi): *Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics*. Routledge Reference, London – New York, 1996. 267.

<sup>11</sup> This is my view: I collected the longest words from the New Testament, and tested them. The 15 letters was the bar where the words are hapax legomena, dis or tris legomena. So, the word 16 or 17 letters are hapax legomena, and complex expressions.

Russian mathematician ANDREY ANDREYEVICH MARKOV also made researches into communication theory.<sup>12</sup> Later the Linguists use his method to show the importance of grammatical variants of hapax legomena.<sup>13</sup> These words (e.g. κορβᾶν, κορβανῶς, στίγμα, στίγμή, Ἰουδαῖζω, Ἰουδαϊκός, Ἰουδαϊκῶς) in lexicalized form also play the same role.<sup>14</sup> Using the reasons of these Pragma-Linguists' researches I have found 1711 hapax legomena in the New Testament which is 31% of the whole vocabulary.<sup>15</sup> This means that we have 1711 words which cannot be neglected in the interpretation.<sup>16</sup>

The MEMO-Exegesis<sup>®</sup> 1) make this neglected field significant using the researches of Pragma-Linguists 2) synchronise them with contemporary theology, 3) and build on the conservative textual-analysis of the New Testament.<sup>17</sup>

### **How can MEMO-Exegesis<sup>®</sup> be used?**

This far I have drafted the linguistic rules which are important to understand the MEMO-Exegesis I would like to make an exegesis of Mathew 22, 15-22. It is necessary to clarify how this method can be used, if we want to examine a shorter text from the whole New Testament.

The most important result of the Pragma-Linguists is that if we want to know the exact meaning of hapax legomena, we need to take a journey outside the context and take the so-called *referential meaning*<sup>18</sup> of a certain word into consideration. According to this referential connection, we can speak about at least *four* paradigms besides the context.

### **1. Intertextual reference as inner biblical meaning**

---

<sup>12</sup> Rens Bod – Jennifer Hay – Stefanie Jannedy: *Probabilistic Linguistic*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, USA, 2003. 39-93; 177-229.

<sup>13</sup> D. J. Bartholomew: Probability, Statistics and Theology. In: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*. Willey Blackwell and Royal Statistical Society, USA. 1988. 157, 4. §.

<sup>14</sup> There is some special technical terms used by Linguists after Markov: E.g. *item-and-arrangement grammar*, *item-and-process grammar*, *word-and-paradigm model*. These show us that the definition of grammar has changed. The most important is the *basic element of words*, which is named "token". The meaning of tokens is a pragma-linguistical question. See at: Hadumod Bussmann (ford. Gregory P. Trauth – Kerstin Kazzazi): *Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics*. Routledge Reference, London – New York, 1996. 315.

<sup>15</sup> This is the goal of my research. In my PhD, there is a chart form  $\alpha$ - $\omega$  containing all the New Testament hapax legomena. Later, hopefully, it will be published.

<sup>16</sup> Hellen Mardaga: Hapax Legomena: A Neglected Field in Biblical Studies. In: *SAGE Journals*, USA, Washington, 2012/06.

<sup>17</sup> I am Seventh-day Adventist theologian (BA) with an MA degree issued by the Sárospataki Reformed (Calvinist) Theological Academy. These influenced me to be a conservative and protestant theologian. Now, I study at Károli Gáspár Reformed (Calvinist) University as a PhD student.

<sup>18</sup> Stéphane Girard named the "extra meaning" as referential meaning, because a word can refer to something. This reference can be changed the meaning according to dictionaries. See at: *Popular Music Journal*. Cambridge University Press, 2011. (Vol. 30) No. 1.105–125.

When the hapax legomena in the New Testament are compared to the text of Septuagint, we can speak about an *inner* biblical reference. According to Pragma-Linguists, this is the intertextual reference.<sup>19</sup> This does not mean that there is equality between the LXX and NT text. Somehow, when a word is a hapax legomenon in the New Testament, but not in the LXX, this inner biblical reference is very strong. So, because of this reason, I called these words and expressions intertextual hapax legomena. In our context we can find two intertextual hapax legomena: παγιδεύω (Mt 22,15); νόμισμα (Mt 22,19). In order to separate words from each other I use *codes*. This *code* contains the most important character of hapax legomena. So the words mentioned are IntHpMt 22,15 παγιδεύω and IntHpMt 22,19 νόμισμα.<sup>20</sup> Otherwise we can find 1129 intertextual hapax legomena in the *whole* New Testament.<sup>21</sup>

## 2. Hypertextual reference for cultural and psychological meaning

When hapax legomena refer to outside information and at the same time to the lexical meaning, they have hypertextual meaning, too.<sup>22</sup> Their code is HypHp. Unfortunately this kind of word cannot be found in our text, but in the New Testament there are 583 HypHps.<sup>23</sup> In this case we need to mention that when there is a difference between an LXX and an MS text quoted in the New Testament, this hypertextual reference can be a solution to solve the interpretation problem by building a bridge using the pragma-linguistical reference. Usually, these extra meanings came from a cultural relation or extract a feeling or expression when they were used. For example, as a psychological expression, they can refer to a picture, like Walter Ong said: “*I see that you are saying...*”<sup>24</sup>

## 3. Paratextual reference<sup>25</sup> to use mia-graphe legomena

---

<sup>19</sup> Graham Allen: *Intertextuality. The New Critical Idiom*. Rotledge, Taylor & Francis Group. London and New York, 2000. 17; 19; 33; 39; 200; 203.

<sup>20</sup> To clarify my codes: First part means the referential character: “Int” means; intertextual. Second part “Hp” means hapax legomenon. Third “Mt” means how can it be found. Altogether: IntHpMt.

<sup>21</sup> In my dissertation I separated the hapax legomena that occur in Septuagint as well, and they are not hap. leg there. These words are 1129. See my above-mentioned chart, hopefully to be published later.

<sup>22</sup>The Dept of the Hole: Intertextuality and Tom Wait’s „Way Down In The Hole”. In: *Pro Quest on-line database, 2010/summer*. 461-485.

<sup>23</sup> In my above-mentioned chart, the sum of hapax legomena is 1711. If we add the intertextual and hypertextual hapax legomena, that will make 1711. (1128+583)

<sup>24</sup> Walter J. Ong: *Szóbeliség és írásbeliség*. AKTI – Gondolat, Budapest, 2010. 5- 70.

<sup>25</sup> Graham Allen: *ibid*, 103-107.

If we examine a shorter text, some words occur only once inside, but there are more example outside. These are not hapax legomena, Eta Linnemann calls them mia-graphe, because of their occurrence.<sup>26</sup> The PrMaMt 22, 16 Ἡρωδιανοί occurs only once in Mathew and very seldom in NT (Mt 22, 16; Mk 3, 6; 12, 13). So, using the MEMO-Exegesis we need to lay the same emphasis on these words as if they were hapax legomena. The paratextual reference means that this is comparable outside the Gospel. The mia-graphes are like the *motto* in this paper: they *summarise*<sup>27</sup> what we really want to tell.<sup>28</sup>

#### **4. Contextual reference to use mia-graphe legomena**

In some cases we find words in the shorter text, which occur only ones, but outside the Gospel (or, generally, outside in another document) more. In our context these are the following: CnMaMt 22,16 ἀληθής; CnMaMk 12,14 κήσος; CnMaMt 22,18 ποιηρία. The pragma-linguistical usage of “context” is different from the theological usage:<sup>29</sup> the technical term of “contextuality” means the group of people to whom the text was written and the specific vocabulary that they use.

#### **The use of MEMO-Exegesis®**

This method is very simple and at the same time very complicated depending on the user’s skill. The draft of this kind of exegesis is as follows:

*First step:* Using concordance or a computer we need to collect hapax and mia-graphe legomena in a certain text. These will be the most important expressions in this kind of exegesis if we concentrate on their rare occurrence. In the case of mia-graphes the more rarely they occur the more emphasis will be used.

*Second step:* They need to be categorised by their reference: Intertextual (IntHp); Hypertextual (HypHp); Paratextual mia-graphe (PrMa) and Contextual mia-graphe (CnMa). These are *the elements of Emphasis Modelling Exegesis*.

---

<sup>26</sup> The Quantitative Structure of the vocabulary of the New Testament. In: Eta Linnemann: *Biblical Criticism on Trial. How Scientific is the „Scientific Theology“?* Kregel Publications, Kregel Inc. P.O. Box 2607, Grand Rapids MI 49501, 1990. 164-176.

<sup>27</sup> Christopher D. Morris: Hermeneutic Delusion in Mark Twain and Charles Dudley Warner’s *The Gilded Age*. In: *Pro Quest on-line database*, 2011. (Vol. 10). 242-243.

<sup>28</sup> Graham Allen: *Intertextuality. The New Critical Idiom*. Rotledge, Thaylor & Francis Group. London and New York, 2000. 103.

<sup>29</sup> J. Andrew Kirk: The Confusion of Epistemology in The West and Christian Mission. In: *Tyndale Bulletin*. Tyndale House, Cambridge, 2004. (Vol. 55). No. 1. 131-156.

*Third step:* Let us make the expressions order from 15 to 22 verses: in that case it does not matter which a hapax is and which a mia-graphe legomenon is.

*Fourth step:* Search for the *extra meaning* of these words; sometimes it is what Linguists call “associative meaning” because of their reference. Usually this meaning is not found in dictionaries, but commentators often use them. It is a picture or a scene, where hapax legomenon comes from. They are also catch-words or technical terms.<sup>30</sup>

*Fifth step:* Search for that which is the most frequent word in the whole text: the Shannon-Weaver law say: “The *real* topic of the text that the writer shared with us can be expressed by hapax legomena and the statistically most frequent *word, or expression.*”<sup>31</sup> But in the case of a short text it would be neglected if we know the historical background.

### **MEMO-Exegesis of Mt 22, 15-22**

In this context we can find six *elements* for *Emphasis Modelling Exegesis*, which are here ordered by the *third* step:

- 1) IntHpMt 22,15 παγιδεύω
- 2) PrMaMt 22,16 Ἡρωδιανοί
- 3) CnMaMt 22,16 ἀληθής
- 4) CnMaMt 22,18 πονηρία
- 5) IntHpMt 22,19 νόμισμα
- 6) PrMaMt 22,20 εἰκῶν

If we follow the 5 steps of MEMO-Exegesis above, the next is the 4<sup>th</sup> step: to make a research for the extra meaning of these words.

The IntHpMt 22, 15 παγιδεύω is an unknown word in Greek,<sup>32</sup> possibly a tropos.<sup>33</sup> Usually it means a trap which was built for animals. Here there are some people who came from the

---

<sup>30</sup> According to these categories I separated hapax legomena not only by their references: 1) Omitted words that occurred ones; 2) Oral information in written form; 3) Hypertextual catch words came from Septuagint; 4) Intensive metonymies; 5) Technical terms; 6) Complex expressions. See: later in my PhD.

<sup>31</sup> Józsefné, Csernoch: *ibid. lim.*

<sup>32</sup> *Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament.* New York, Harper & Brothers Francklin Square, 1887. 742.

<sup>33</sup> The „tropos” (τρόπος) and the “metonymy” are very same, but there is a difference between these technical terms: The metonymy is a sentence or a fragment of a sentence which has certain figurative meaning. E.g. “The life is like a Rat Race”. The “tropos” can be a word with very same certainness. E.g. see the underlined words in these sentences: “Buy one get one free! Doughnut miss it!” instead of “Buy one get one free! Do not miss is!” In

party of Herodias (PrMaMt 22, 16 Ἡρωδῖαινοί) who want to harm Jesus. Their aim was, to tell Him an enigma, which is more than a dilemma: If it had been a dilemma, it would have had a solution. It is not enough to take up a dictionary because of two reasons: 1) This is not enough to use the information about the meaning of this word; 2) a *tropos* is more than a simple translatable expression: we can find a certain *picture*, as *extra (associative) information*, that makes emphasis to the real meaning of the hapax legomenon; that was a *trap*. In addition this is realized by words (ἐν λόγῳ).

This expression has *intertextual references* to the Septuagint and they very strongly influence the NT meaning, because there are *only* two occurrences there:

In 1 Samuel 28:9 it has very similar meaning: “...wherefore then layest thou a snare for my life, to cause me to die?”<sup>34</sup> And also in Ecclesiastes 9:12: “as the fishes that are taken in an evil net, and as the birds that are caught in the snare; so are the sons of men snared in an evil time...”<sup>35</sup> These references are significant, because there is a connection with Massoretic text: We cannot find a Hebrew word in MS 1 Sam 28,9 for *trap*, instead we can find the שָׁנָה in hitpael participle form (שָׁנָהּ) which is a *passive statement without instrument*: “Being in the statement of catch”. Very similar in Ecc 9:12 we can find at least two words (e.g. פָּה and הַמְצוּרָה), but only once was translated to παγιδεύω. This is a so-called septuagintism, when the Greek text influenced the NT, but there is a subjective connection between the Greek and Hebrew that we are able to demonstrate.

The PrMaMt 22, 16 Ἡρωδῖαινοί is a special expression; actually a technical term to express the certainness of a Jewish political and religious party.<sup>36</sup> It is not enough to say that this was a group of people who respected Herodias. They have a political character; hypocrisy. So, by this character they wanted to harm Jesus: “*Master, we know that thou art true...*” (CnMiaMt 22, 16 ἀληθής).

---

this example the certain word (doughnut) have an associative meaning as certainness. See: István, Szathmári (ed.): *Alakzatlexikon. A retorikai és stilisztikai alakzatok kézikönyve*. Tinta Könyvkiadó, Bp. 2008. 587.

<sup>34</sup> Quoted from The King James Version of the Bible.

<sup>35</sup> KJV Bible.

<sup>36</sup> There is a certain field within the pragma-linguistic, the socio-linguistic. This science is searching for the special usage of languages within smaller groups. Usually the hapax legomena, or other terminuses became a certain expression within the group. More information about this science see at: Atsuhiko Ashano: Community – Identity Construction in Galatians. Exegetical, Social-Antropological and Socio-Historical Studies. In: Mark Goodarce (ed.): *Journal for the Study of New Testament Supplement Series*. T&T Clark International, England, London – USA, New York, 2005. (Vol. 285).

There were two categories of “true people” in Israel. For example Noah was “צַדִּיק”, but Job was “רָשָׁע”. The New Testament writers used to express this with: δίκαιος which is almost the translation of “צַדִּיק”. Jesus was a member of Israel and He was צַדִּיק/δίκαιος according to Israel’s covenant theology. The members of Herodias party did not say that Jesus had been a צַדִּיק/δίκαιος, they said instead that He had been רָשָׁע/ἀληθινός like Job. This was a *temptation*, παγιδεύω ἐν λόγῳ, special kind of trap made from words: actually a “pitfall”. The possibility of this *hypertextual* allusion can be shown: The CnMaMt 22,16 ἀληθής means the “truth of God” in New Testament who was Christ, as Son of God, but the δίκαιος has another meaning referring to covenant theology: justification by work obeying the Torah and the oral law of Israel.

Finally there are two tropes which make the allusions stronger in this context. The IntHpMt 22, 19 νόμισμα means a very special kind of Coin, which was used for paying tax to Cesar. There are so many other kinds of moneys in the New Testament, but this was issued by Caesar Tiberius, made from silver, with an inscription on it: “TIBERIUS DIVI AUGUSTI FILIUS AUGUSTUS”<sup>37</sup>. This was not just a coin to pay tax with it, but also symbolised the power of Caesar.

In our context there are two kinds of coins: IntHpMt 22, 19 νόμισμα and δηνάριον. When Jesus asks them to show a coin, according to Mathew, this was a IntHpMt 22, 19 νόμισμα. To reply Him they show a δηνάριον which puts *emphasis* on the main message of this teaching that Jesus taught for us.

According to the Decalogue, it was forbidden to make an image of man to present him as he had been god. When Jesus asked them to show a IntHpMt 22, 19 νόμισμα, which was itself a so-called “question-in-picture”. And Jesus asked: Whose is the picture (PrMaMt 22, 20 εἰκὼν)? The members of Herodias party knew that who was stamped on the coin, so they *avoided* the showing a νόμισμα, instead Jesus was given a δηνάριον as a common coin.

There was a most serious opened question produced indirectly by this situation: Were you for the Cesar, or for God? The PrMaMt 22, 20 εἰκὼν also a typical septuagintism and intertextual allusion. In the Genesis the man created by God as divine image, but by the MS text this is like the “shadow” מִלְּצֶלֶם. In the Septuagint it was translated to εἰκὼν. In the New Testament the

---

<sup>37</sup> Horst Balz – Gerhard Schneider (ed.): *Exegetical Dictionary of The New Testament*. William B. Eerdmans Publishing. Company Grand Rapids. USA. Michigan. 1982. See at the mentioned word.

most typical use of this word is in Col 1, 13 (ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ), when Jesus is showed to us also as divine image. So this is a word-typology as the second Adam is a name- or character-typology in 1 Cor 15, 45 and Rom 5, 14.

The question of Jesus was the certainness that caused by this typical and serious situation. (???) This is that the authors of Gospels made us suspect by using of εἰκὼν: we are the εἰκὼν of God and Jesus also was “*as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.*” (Phil 2,8). The Caesar and his money is not the part of God’s εἰκὼν, the taxpaying is the matter of man, by human laws.

Using the method of MEMO-Exegesis, we can call these words as *elements of Emphasis Modelling Exegesis*, and these are enough to show the most important message of a certain context. Above all, we have possibility to make reconstruction of a situation using the *figurative meanings* of these words and to show the *ethical* teaching as an important teaching of the Gospels.

### **The ethical consequence of Mt 22, 15-22 by MEMO-Exegesis**

The last question is that: what is the reason that makes the use of MEMO-Exegesis worthy? Sometimes there is no method by which we can use key words in exegesis. Usually we determine by the practical method: the more a word occurs in a certain text, the more we respect them. On the other hand, theologians decide by their denominational hermeneutic perspective, influenced by dogmatics, instead of ethics. Applying the MEMO-Exegesis, we can have *philological* tools in our hands and the usage of key words, as *assorted* elements, which open us a new perspective of exegesis, independently of whatever denomination we came from.

The associative (or in other words figurative) meanings of these words make emphasis into the ethical understanding of New Testament. Jesus disputed with Pharisees, because they knew both, the covenant and the ethical understanding of the Torah.<sup>38</sup> This teaching of Mt 22 as a certain part of the Gospels was a dispute which has some consequences:

---

<sup>38</sup> This aspect is not new. After World War II in protestant theology there was a changing of paradigm. The Christians and Jew’s have been closed since. See at: Ch. T. Vriezen: *An Outline of Old Testament Theology*. Charels T. Brandford Company, Newton Centre, Mass. 02159, 1966. Foreword and also first chapter.

The members of Herodias party were not the same as the Pharisees. Mathew wanted to emphasise this difference using the word PrMaMt 22, 16 Ἡρωδῖαινοι. This means that, the Pharisees *commonly* were not against Jesus, but there was a party which opposed Him.

We don't know who gave the coin for Jesus, but possibly the party of the Pharisees who were Herodians politically. Jesus and they understand the problem of "images". Using two words to describe this situation (IntHpMt 22, 19 νόμισμα and δηνάριον that "catch words") is characterized the seriousness of the situation. By this reason these words are technical terms in that certain context within the Gospel of Mathew.

Jesus in this situation could declare the ethical understanding of Torah, possibly to demonstrate the Alexandrian thinking instead of making that for a trap (IntHpMt 22, 15 παγιδεύω) by the mystical meaning of letters. The last sentence of our context helps us understand this: "*When they had heard these words, they marveled, and left him, and went their way*".

The using of these words in this situation strengthens the ethical consequence: The money is just a tool for paying tax or any other things, but it would never be aim to reach the status quo by possession of money. This was the real problem among the people in Jesus age, like now.

This problem was serious enough, because the Man was created as divine image. So there was another image which was real temptation, the PrMaMt 22, 20 εἰκῶν.

It is not enough to say that; we have free will to decide which image we can choose, so we need the most important and the highest one: Jesus. And we must follow Him by the traditional teaching of "Imitatio Christi".

The example of Mt 22 is a certain context which shows us how it can be done.