

MATTHEW:
JEWISH CHRISTIAN OR GENTILE CHRISTIAN?

Michael Pettem
Department of Religious Studies
McGill University, Montreal

September, 1989

A thesis submitted to the
Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Copyright © Michael Pettem, 1989

ABSTRACT

This dissertation addresses the problem of whether the Gospel of Matthew reflects a Jewish Christian or gentile Christian stance within the early church. A study of the principal theories of the evolution of the early church provides the background against which the terms "Jewish Christian" and "gentile Christian" may be understood. The dissertation examines the bases on which Matthew has been classified as either Jewish Christian or gentile Christian. This previous work on Matthew is found to be unsatisfactory because of the lack of adequate criteria for classifying Matthew. A study of Acts and the letters of Paul reveals that the practice or rejection of Jewish dietary purity was a cause of division in the early church, and thus constitutes a suitable criterion for distinguishing between Jewish and gentile Christianity. Examination of Mt 15:1-20 shows that Matthew does not accept Jewish dietary purity as a part of God's will. Matthew thus reflects a gentile Christian position.

RESUME

Cette thèse essaie de voir si l'évangile de Matthieu reflète une position judéo-chrétienne ou une position pagano-chrétienne dans l'église primitive. Une étude des principales théories de l'évolution de l'église primitive fournit le contexte dans lequel les locutions "judéo-chrétienne" et "pagano-chrétienne" doivent être comprises. Cette thèse part de l'étude des principaux arguments qui ont permis de classer Matthieu comme judéo-chrétien ou pagano-chrétien. Ces arguments ne sont pas jugés satisfaisants à cause du manque d'un critère de classification adéquat. Une étude du livre des Actes et des lettres de Paul montre que la pratique ou le rejet de la pureté diététique juive a été une cause de rupture dans l'église primitive et constitue donc un critère valable de distinction entre le judéo et le pagano-christianisme. Selon Mt 15,1-20 le respect de la pureté diététique juive s'oppose à la volonté de Dieu. Matthieu refléterait donc une position pagano-chrétienne.

PREFACE

Quite some time ago, Dr Frederik Wisse suggested that I examine the possibility that Matthew might be gentile Christian. I initially declined. The background research would probably be long and dull (the first part was true!), and, besides, everyone knows that Matthew is Jewish Christian. But many of the things that "everyone knows" in fact rest on a very thin basis, or on no basis at all. The question began to draw me with a strange fascination. What was this Jewish Christianity which has so seized the scholarly imagination, and does Matthew in fact fit into it?

To understand what Jewish Christianity was, it is necessary to situate it in the development of the early church. My research in this area was spurred on by lively discussions with many friends and scholars, and most particularly with Pierre Bellemare, Frederik Wisse and Thomas Wright (formerly of McGill, and now of Oxford). This led to the various schemata of early church evolution summarized in chapter one of this dissertation. These ideas were first presented as a paper at the conference of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies in Winnipeg in 1986.

Does Matthew fit into Jewish Christianity? I believe

that this dissertation shows that it does not. Some readers may come to a different conclusion on the evidence. It is important, however, to see that this conclusion, and the manner in which it is argued, fit into the recent development of the study of religions.

In recent years, first century Judaism and Jewish Christianity have been given serious and positive study by scholars. This is a great change from the practice during the first period reviewed in the appendix to this dissertation. Some scholars may thus be dismayed to see the Jewish Christian character of Matthew denied. I believe that, contrary to what such scholars might feel, in coming to such a conclusion this dissertation advances the newer, more positive appreciation of first century Judaism and Jewish Christianity. This it does by showing first century Judaism, Jewish Christianity and gentile Christianity the respect they deserve by allowing them to be what they were. This dissertation deliberately tries to avoid imposing modern ideas on them and rather strives to allow the first century documents to show us what religious people of the first century considered important enough issues to divide on. They are thus allowed to define their beliefs themselves.

The dissertation itself has been organized in such a way as to focus on the thesis being defended, while not neglecting necessary background information. Sources quoted or alluded to are identified immediately in parentheses, as briefly as possible. Full bibliographical information may

be found at the end of the dissertation. End notes almost always contain some form of further discussion or examples, and not mere documentation. This system, which has been approved by the Modern Language Association of America and is now very generally used, is intended to simplify reading of the text. The schemata outlined in chapter one are essential to the defence of the thesis, but are not fully developed or defended there. Fuller discussion is included in an appendix. Chapters four, five and six include a number of excurses. The object of moving so much to appendix, excurses and notes is to clarify the presentation and defence of the thesis itself.

In the actual research and arguments of this dissertation I have been assisted and encouraged by many people. I would particularly like to thank Dr Wisse for his initial suggestion and help at all the subsequent stages. Special thanks are also due to Robert MacKenzie, for his many helpful suggestions, and to Dr Robert Culley who has always insisted on clarity and conciseness in scholarly work (the length of this dissertation is not his fault!). Dr Edward Furcha was most kind in helping me as I struggled with obscure passages in F.C. Baur.

A great debt of gratitude is also owed to several institutions and their staff. Four libraries provided most of the material needed for this research, and each is blessed with an outstanding staff of excellent people: la Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Théologie de la Compagnie de Jésus in Montreal; the Library of the Faculty of Religious

Studies at McGill University; the former Bibliothèque de philosophie-théologie de l'Université de Montréal, now integrated into the new Bibliothèque des lettres et des sciences humaines; and the Library of St Paul University in Ottawa. I also wish to thank the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for a two year doctoral fellowship; and the Department of Veterans' Affairs for its much appreciated financial assistance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PREFACE.....	1
0	INTRODUCTION.....	1
0.1	The Thesis.....	1
0.2	Story and History.....	11
0.3	The Two Source Hypothesis.....	19
0.4	Mary Douglas.....	21
0.5	Jewish Dietary Purity.....	22
1	SCHEMATA OF EARLY CHURCH DEVELOPMENT.....	26
1.1	Introduction.....	26
1.2	F.C. Baur's Schema.....	26
1.3	Albrecht Ritschl's Schema.....	30
1.4	The Early Consensus Schema.....	35
1.5	Jean Daniélou's Schema.....	36
1.6	R.E. Brown's Schema.....	42
2	MATTHEW AS JEWISH CHRISTIAN.....	47
2.1	Introduction.....	47
2.2	F.C. Baur.....	49
2.3	Ernest Renan.....	66
2.4	H.J. Schoeps.....	69
3	MATTHEW AS GENTILE CHRISTIAN.....	79
3.1	Introduction.....	79
3.2	Edouard Reuss.....	81
3.3	C. von Weizsacker.....	85
3.4	Poul Nepper-Christensen.....	89
3.5	Georg Strecker.....	98
3.6	Conclusion.....	110
4	JEWISH DIETARY PURITY AS CRITERION.....	112
4.1	Introduction.....	112

TABLE OF CONTENTS

4.2	Galatians.....	115
4.3	Acts.....	123
4.4	Implications for Brown's and Daniélou's Schemata.	129
4.5	Conclusion: Matthew and Jewish Dietary Purity....	135
4.6	Excursus 1: Jewish Dietary Purity in Jewish Sources.....	141
4.7	Excursus 2: Jewish Dietary Purity in Gentile Sources.....	145
4.8	Excursus 3: Romans and I Corinthians.....	148
5	MT 15:1-20: JEWISH DIETARY PURITY REJECTED... ..	153
5.1	Introduction.....	153
5.2	Mt 15:1-2.....	155
5.3	Mt 15:3-9.....	159
5.3.1	General.....	159
5.3.2	The " <u>Korban</u> " Section.....	164
5.3.3	Mt 15:3-9 as a Redaction of Mk 7:6-13.....	174
5	Mt 15:10-20.....	181
5.4.1	General.....	181
5.4.2	The Parable (Mt 15:11, parallel Mk 7:15).....	182
5.4.3	Plants to Be Uprooted and Blind Guides (Mt 15:12-14).....	191
5.4.4	The Commentary (Mt 15:15-20).....	203
5.5	Conclusion.....	217
5.6	Excursus 4: Usage of the Word " <u>Koinos</u> ".....	220
6	CONCLUSION.....	224
6.1	Jewish Christianity and Gentile Christianity.....	224
6.2	Matthew: Jewish Christian or Gentile Christian?... ..	229
6.3	Excursus 5: Supplementary Conclusions on Early Church Evolution.....	234

TABLE OF CONTENTS

7	APPENDIX: SURVEY OF RESEARCH INTO THE RISE OF THE EARLY CATHOLIC CHURCH.....	237
7.1	The First Period: From Baur and Ritschl to a Consensus Position.....	237
7.1.1	F.C. Baur.....	237
7.1.2	Albrecht Ritschl.....	242
7.1.3	Edouard Reuss.....	247
7.1.4	Ernest Renan.....	251
7.1.5	Carl von Weizsäcker.....	255
7.1.6	J.B. Lightfoot.....	262
7.1.7	F.J.A. Hort.....	270
7.1.8	Adolf Harnack.....	273
7.1.9	Trends in Research Reviewed to this Point (Baur-Harnack).....	280
7.2	The Second Period: A New Appreciation of Judaism.....	287
7.2.1	H.J. Schoeps.....	289
7.2.2	Jean Daniélou.....	297
7.2.3	Marcel Simon.....	303
7.2.4	R.E. Brown.....	312
7.2.5	Observations on the Second Period Surveyed.....	317
7.3	Summary of Positions on Jewish Law.....	323
	NOTES.....	326
	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	371

The Thesis

"Yet nevertheless of all those who had been with the Lord only Matthew and John have left us their recollections, and tradition says that they took to writing perforce. Matthew had first preached to Hebrews, and when he was on the point of going to others he transmitted in writing in his native language the Gospel according to himself, and thus supplied by writing the lack of his own presence to those from whom he was sent..." (Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History III. xxiv. 6). "Matthew collected the oracles in the Hebrew language, and each interpreted them as best he could" (Papias, according to Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History III. xxxix. 16). Biblical critics no longer believe that the Gospel of Matthew was written by the apostle Matthew, and the idea that it was originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic has been discredited. Thus on these points, as is generally the case in scholarly research, Church traditions about the origins of ancient writings are no longer considered decisive. Nevertheless, a majority of scholars continues to see these and other early Church reports¹ as confirmation of the Jewish Christian character

of Matthew. Voices are being raised with increasing frequency, however, to oppose the idea that the Gospel of Matthew is to be situated in a Jewish Christian environment.

The question of whether Matthew is Jewish Christian or gentile Christian has major repercussions. If Matthew reflects a Jewish Christian position, then, since Matthew quickly became the most influential gospel (insofar as can be judged from extant documents²), this implies that Jewish Christianity greatly influenced the early church. On the other hand, if Matthew reflects a gentile Christian position, then the most important gospel for early Christianity was not Jewish Christian. This in turn might imply a correspondingly smaller role for Jewish Christianity in the development of the early church. Furthermore, if Matthew is judged to be gentile Christian, then the source material for Jewish Christianity is greatly reduced.³ Reading Matthew against the background of gentile Christianity would also significantly change the interpretation of this Gospel itself. No matter what critical method has been brought to bear on Matthew, the results have been influenced by the presupposition that Matthew reflects a Jewish Christian position. For instance, Matthew's understanding of law has been considered of importance in this Gospel. A major change is effected if it is asserted that Matthew brings no Jewish Christian presuppositions or understanding to his appreciation of law. Thus, if Matthew is in fact gentile Christian, both the

interpretation of Matthew and the dominant views of early church history may have to be significantly altered.

The first task of this dissertation is to establish what is meant by "Jewish Christian" and "gentile Christian," and what is at stake in making such a distinction in early Christianity. The precise meanings given to these terms have always been intimately linked to the various ways of conceptualizing the movement of Christianity from being a small group of followers of Jesus within Judaism to being a catholic church independent of Judaism. The most influential modern work on this problem has been that of F.C. Baur; most theories developed since his time have either been an extension of his thought, or a reaction against it. Starting thus with the seminal work of F.C. Baur, this dissertation outlines what are argued to be the five dominant ways in which the development of the early church has been schematized. (The argument is developed and defended in more detail in an appendix.) These schemata function as a very precise definition of the meanings of "Jewish Christian" and "gentile Christian" in the most reflective work in the area, and outline the possible backgrounds against which Matthew is to be classified.

Having sketched the importance and meaning of the distinction between "Jewish Christian" and "gentile Christian" in critical studies, the dissertation then turns to the thorny problem of finding a method for classifying Matthew in terms of these options. Both the traditional arguments in favour of Matthew as Jewish Christian and the

more recent attempts to see Matthew as gentile Christian have tended to founder at this point. The most carefully reasoned arguments found in the literature start from a particular understanding of first century Judaism, move to a conception of Jewish Christianity, and then judge Matthew by its overall level of correspondence to this model of Jewish Christianity. Most writers, however, employ one or another variation of a much less satisfactory method. They start by isolating what they consider to be Jewish or Jewish Christian elements in the Gospel of Matthew. The Gospel is then classified as Jewish Christian or gentile Christian on the basis of the number of these Jewish elements present in the work as a whole, or at a given redactional level.

These methods of classifying Matthew are deeply flawed. The first approach demands a sound and comprehensive understanding of first century Judaism. But almost twenty centuries later, such a comprehensive understanding is an elusive goal. A glance at nineteenth century work shows how erroneous was their understanding of first century Judaism; will another century judge our view to be fully accurate? The second approach, which is the dominant one, is even weaker at the level of method. It tends to assume it can isolate Jewish elements in Matthew without even developing a carefully researched model of first century Judaism. But the further, more obvious weakness of this popular method is inherent in its tally sheet approach. How does the critic decide whether the number of Jewish elements compared to

gentile elements is sufficient to declare Matthew Jewish Christian? The decision concerning the quantity and proportion of Jewish elements which must be present to classify a work as Jewish Christian has remained essentially subjective and unverifiable. Such approaches, so weak at the level of method, can neither give the traditional view truly solid support, nor hope to displace the weight of tradition and suggest a new conclusion.

This dissertation proposes a more appropriate method for classifying Matthew which avoids both the weaknesses outlined here. This is accomplished by starting where F.C. Baur and his successors began in distinguishing between Jewish Christianity and gentile Christianity: the letters of Paul and the book of Acts. These texts show the points of division between Jew and gentile in the early church. This dissertation examines these sources to determine critical points characterizing these divisions. The new, but patently obvious, point made here, is that any early Christian document should be classified as Jewish Christian or gentile Christian not on the basis of anachronistic modern considerations, but rather on the basis of its stand on the critical issues which characterized the real, historical divisions in early Christianity.

The sharpest issue causing separation between Jews and gentiles in the letters of Paul and the Acts of the Apostles which is also explicitly discussed in the Gospel of Matthew concerns Jewish dietary purity. Further points of conflict mentioned in the first century literature are circumcision

and Sabbath observance. There may have been other issues dividing Jewish Christianity from gentile Christianity. It is, however, a fundamental choice of this dissertation to accept only documentary evidence. The burden of proof lies on those who would argue, in the absence of a solid documentary basis, that there were other important issues dividing Jews and gentiles in the very early church. It remains only to outline why this dissertation focuses exclusively on Jewish dietary purity, and does not consider circumcision or Sabbath observance in classifying the Gospel of Matthew.

The issue of circumcision is not raised in this dissertation because it is not raised in the Gospel of Matthew. This very absence tends to support the thesis that Matthew is gentile Christian. According to Luke, the dispute which led to the Apostolic Conference was occasioned by the fact that some of those "from Judea" were teaching that the gentile Christians must be circumcised (Acts 15:1). Paul agrees with Luke that this was an issue at the conference (Gal 2:3ff). The problem arose again in Paul's congregations, and was important enough for Paul to be very concerned about it (see Phil 3:2-11), and to refer frequently to it (e.g. Rom 4:1-12). Given that this was "no small dispute" (Acts 15:2), it is hard to imagine how Matthew could omit circumcision as a rite of entrance into Christianity from the Great Commission (Mt 28:18ff) if Matthew were in fact Jewish Christian. It is difficult to

argue that the complete absence of reference to circumcision in the Gospel of Matthew means that this practice was assumed by Matthew. Nevertheless, even though the absence of reference to circumcision speaks strongly in favour of the gentile Christian character of Matthew, circumcision is not discussed in this dissertation so that the thesis of this dissertation may be firmly established on documentary evidence, and not on arguments from silence.

The issue of Sabbath observance is also not raised in this dissertation. Unlike circumcision, this is an issue in the Gospel of Matthew. Matthew even stresses it by adding "nor on the Sabbath" (Mt 24:20) to Mark's exhortation to pray that the flight should not be in winter. To flee at any time is a dangerous undertaking. To be forced to flee in winter is doubly dangerous. But why add "on the Sabbath"? Flight on the Sabbath would add insult in injury, but it should not actually prevent it, since flight or fight on the Sabbath when necessary had been the general policy for Jews at least since the disaster of the Maccabean period. The Sabbath pericopae of Mt 12:1-14 also have several interesting redactional additions beyond their Marcan sources. But what is important for this study is the character of these pericopae. The Gospel of Mark is generally viewed as reflecting a gentile Christian position, including a gentile Christian view of the Sabbath. Matthew takes these Marcan Sabbath pericopae and, far from rejecting them, includes them in his Gospel. Matthew even goes so far as to make certain changes which strengthen the points

made in the pericopae (for example, David's men also eat the show-bread, Mt 12:44). Since the points being made by Mark in these Sabbath pericopae were acceptable in gentile Christian circles, then the points being made in these Sabbath pericopae in Matthew must also have been acceptable in gentile Christian circles. Thus a case could certainly be made that Matthew's view of the Sabbath falls well within the limits of gentile Christianity. Nevertheless such an argument has not been advanced in this dissertation because the issue does not divide Jewish Christianity and gentile Christianity in a sufficiently clear way. Gentile Christianity has hesitated concerning Sabbath observance since it is included in the Decalogue.⁴ Few have been inclined to follow the opinion that the Sabbath is only a shadow of things to come, for which no one should be criticized (Col 2:16-17, cf. Rom 14:5, 6). Some non-Jewish Christian groups, both ancient and modern, have observed the Sabbath. The majority tradition has been something of a compromise: the Sabbath has been replaced by a Sabbath-like Lord's Day observance. These hesitations in the gentile Christian position make it less decisive in questions of classifying literature; nevertheless, if the question were to be pressed, there does not seem to be evidence that Matthew understood the Sabbath in any way beyond the bounds of gentile Christianity.

Having established that its stance on Jewish dietary purity is the appropriate test of whether the Gospel of

Matthew is Jewish Christian or gentile Christian, the dissertation then focuses on this issue. It will be argued, on the basis of Mt 15:1-20, that Matthew's rejection of Jewish dietary purity is complete and unambiguous. This position puts Matthew clearly on the side of gentile Christianity in terms of the unequivocal lines drawn by the authentic, first century source literature.

The conclusion that the Gospel of Matthew is gentile Christian means that it expresses a gentile Christian perspective and assumes a gentile Christian understanding on the part of its readership. It is a conclusion about the practice and point of view expressed in the Gospel, and not a conclusion about the ethnic background of the author. While the nature of this conclusion makes it likely that the author was himself gentile, it does not rule out the possibility that he (or she) could have been ethnically Jewish. Paul, it should be recalled, was ethnically Jewish, but his views are classified as gentile Christian by the majority of critics. Whatever the ethnic background of its author, the position expressed in the Gospel of Matthew is that of gentile Christianity.⁵

It should be noted that the aspects of the Mosaic Law which later tradition has often considered "moral" are not discussed at all in this dissertation. Paul and Luke seem to assume that these will be observed by all Christians. The greater righteousness called for by Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount might be a worthy area for investigation, but would require a fundamentally different approach. Besides,

it is quite probable that Jewish Christianity was fully at one with gentile Christianity in believing that Jesus has called all his followers to a higher, stricter morality.

A brief outline of the five chapters may serve as a succinct statement of the argument of this thesis. The most important schemata which have been developed to represent the early development of the early Christian church are presented briefly in chapter one (an appendix provides more detail). In chapter two, representative arguments in favour of Matthew as Jewish Christian against the background of various schemata are presented and critiqued. The third chapter presents representative arguments for Matthew as gentile Christian against the background of the appropriate schemata. These are found to be somewhat more carefully thought out than the arguments presented in the preceding chapter, but still unsatisfactory. Arguments on both sides present lists of Jewish and gentile characteristics, but fail to present a sound method for weighing these characteristics and judging where Matthew should be situated. Chapter four develops this method. On the basis of the New Testament texts which were used to create the various schemata, it is argued that incidents in the early church show that there was in practice a sharp division between Jewish practice and gentile practice within the early Christian church, creating positions which may legitimately be called Jewish Christianity and gentile Christianity. One of the sharpest points of conflict

between these two is over the issue of Jewish dietary purity. According to the documents, Jewish Christianity characteristically practiced Jewish dietary purity, while gentile Christianity characteristically either rejected Jewish dietary purity completely, or practiced it only in the very restricted way outlined in the Apostolic Decree. Chapter five studies the position of the Gospel according to Matthew on Jewish dietary purity. On the basis of Mt 15:1-20, it is concluded that Matthew totally rejects the belief that the practice of Jewish dietary purity forms any part of God's will for the Christian church. As such, it is concluded that the Gospel of Matthew does not reflect a Jewish Christian point of view, but rather a gentile Christian one.

0.2

Story and History

This thesis juxtaposes two worlds. The first is the world of the history of the early Christian church as it can be inferred from the writings of Luke and Paul. The second is the literary world of the Gospel of Matthew. These two worlds have many points of contact, one of which- Jewish dietary purity- serves as the standard of comparison in the present study. This standard allows us to determine whether the literary world of the Gospel of Matthew is a product of and destined for Jewish Christianity or gentile Christianity.

Narrative criticism has rendered a valuable service to Biblical studies by establishing the existence and

importance of the literary world of the story. The real author, that is the actual historical person who wrote the story, and the real reader stand outside this world. But the literary world has, for its loss of the real author and reader, no shortage of inhabitants. This area of study is still in a state of flux, and the identification of the inhabitants of this world and their names vary from author to author.⁶ Since J.D. Kingsbury has been one of the first to make explicit use of this approach in Matthean studies, his terminology may be briefly outlined as illustrative. At the authorial level are the "implied author," who is the literary version of Matthew, which the reader comes to know by reading the Gospel; and the "narrator," which is the "voice" heard telling the story within the gospel (Story 30). There are many works of literature in which the narrator does not agree with, or present the same point of view as the implied author.⁷ In the case of Matthew, however, Kingsbury concedes that the narrator is in complete accord with the implied author, so that this distinction is rarely important in the study of the Gospel of Matthew (Story 30). At the "reader" level Kingsbury distinguishes two characters. The "implied reader" is "an imaginary person who is to be envisaged, in perusing Matthew's story, as responding to the text at every point with whatever emotion, understanding, or knowledge the text ideally calls for." (Story 36). The "narratee" is the literary person addressed by the narrator. As is the case for implied author and narrator, the difference between implied reader

and narratee is not significant for Matthew (Story 36).

The challenge the narrative approach presents for this dissertation is to relate the narrative world of the Gospel of Matthew to the real world of the first century Christian church, with its various Jewish Christian and gentile Christian options. This problem has been further compounded in a recent article by Kingsbury. In this article he argues that nineteenth century and early twentieth century researchers read the gospels in such a way as to identify primarily with the real-life contemporary of Jesus (thus seeking information on the historical Jesus), while the redaction critic primarily identifies with the real-life contemporary of the real author (thus seeking information about the Matthean church) (Reader passim). He argues that to understand the story, the primary identification of the reader should be with the implied reader. This approach he calls the "narrative-critical model of readership" (Reader 455). He particularly criticizes the redaction-critical approach for assuming that the events narrated in the story are "transparent." By "transparent" he means that events in the story normally have direct relevance for the Matthean church and can be used to understand the Matthean community, even to the point that one sometimes assumes a one-to-one correspondence between events or characters in the story and events or characters in the Matthean community (Reader, especially 445-446). In this abusive use of redaction criticism, the story (which is, after all, situated in the

time of Jesus) almost becomes a riddle about the history of the evangelist's community. No such assumption is made in this dissertation. The two worlds are respected: a story about Jesus remains a story about Jesus, with no comprehensive history of Matthew's community hidden in it. What is assumed here is not that the Gospel reflects particular events in Matthew's community, but rather that in Matthew's redaction of his source material he is influenced by his own religious presuppositions, and those of his environment. Thus, redaction criticism is used not to construct a history of Matthew's community, but rather to find his position on Jewish dietary purity by examining his redaction of a Marcan passage which deals with this practice.

This dissertation makes the link between the world of the story and the world of the first century church by asserting an identity of opinion between the implied author and the real author on the question of Jewish dietary purity. To do this it is useful first to see how the normative point of view is transmitted within the literary world of Matthew gospel. Kingsbury asserts an identity of viewpoint between the narrator and the implied author in Matthew (Story 30). He identifies "point of view" as a major way in which the narrator presents the story in Matthew:

Characteristic of a gospel-story such as that of Matthew is that the many conflicting evaluative points of view expressed by the various characters can

fundamentally be reduced to two, the "true" and the "untrue." The measuring rod for distinguishing truth from untruth is, as Matt. 16:23 indicates, "thinking the things of God" (as opposed to "thinking the things of men"). Within the world of the Matthean story, therefore, it is God's evaluative point of view which Matthew the implied author has made normative. What this means, in turn, is that the evaluative point of view which Matthew ascribes to himself as narrator or to any given character is to be judged true or false on the basis of whether it aligns itself with, or contravenes, the evaluative point of view of God. Because Matthew as implied author reliably places his voice as narrator in the service of the evaluative point of view which he has made normative- that is, God's evaluative point of view, and because Jesus is the supreme agent of God, it is plain that the reader is to regard the evaluative points of view of both Matthew as narrator and Jesus as being in complete alignment with the evaluative point of view of God. Accordingly, there is only one true way in which to view things in Matthew- namely, the way established by God, and this is the way in which both Matthew as narrator and Jesus also view things. (Story 33)

This dissertation holds with Kingsbury that Jesus' evaluative point of view on Jewish dietary purity is the same as that of the narrator of Matthew, and therefore the

same as that of the implied author of Matthew. This dissertation takes one further step. It is an undisputed tradition- accepted by the Christian tradition, by Christian scholars, non-Christian scholars, and even anti-Christian scholars- that the real author of the Gospel according to Matthew was a Christian, identifying himself as a follower of Jesus.⁸ The step between the world of the story and the world of the early Christian church is thus the assumption, here made explicit, that the real author of the Gospel according to Matthew would himself accept as correct the evaluative point of view which is presented by Jesus and the narrator and God. Thus if in the story by Matthew, God as understood by Jesus and the narrator rejects Jewish dietary purity, then the conclusion follows that the real author of the Gospel of Matthew also rejects Jewish dietary purity.

Redaction criticism, as used in this dissertation, bolsters the conclusion just derived. Since we possess Matthew's main source in the Gospel of Mark (see the following section on the Two Source hypothesis), we can to some extent peek over the shoulder of the real author in the process of composition. Comparing Matthew's writing with Mark's, as is done in chapter five of this dissertation, gives the critic a vantage point outside the world of the story. Redaktionsgeschichte thus shows how the real author has changed Mark's story to create his own story. This method shows from a reference point outside the literary world of the Matthean story that the real author rejects Jewish dietary purity.

On the readers' side of the literary world, this thesis claims that the implied reader of the Gospel of Matthew rejects Jewish dietary purity. The basis for this claim is developed in chapter five. There it is argued that Mt 15:1-20 does not present an attack on Jewish dietary purity structured in such a way as to convince an opponent. On the contrary, it will be shown that the argument of Mt 15:1-20 is structured in a way which is coherent and convincing only to a reader who already accepts the premise that God is concerned exclusively with moral and not with ritual purity. That the discussion is so ordered shows that Matthew has produced a literary world in which the implied reader shares his rejection of Jewish dietary purity.

On the authorial side, this thesis extends its claim of the rejection of Jewish dietary purity from the implied author to the real author. A similar extension appears warranted on the readers' side. The implied reader of the Gospel of Matthew rejects Jewish dietary purity. Yet, there is no evidence of hesitancy in accepting this Gospel in the early Christian community. In fact, as Massaux has shown, according to the available records Matthew quickly became the most used gospel. And it became the most copied gospel without there being evidence that its views on Jewish dietary purity were seen as novel or problematic. On this basis, there seems to be no reason to deny that not only the implied reader, but also the early real readers of the Gospel of Matthew shared its rejection of Jewish dietary

purity.

On the basis of this identity of viewpoint between narrator, implied author, and real author on the one hand, and narratee, implied reader, and first real readers on the other, this dissertation proposes that the bridge between story and history is sound. History, as evidenced by the letters of Paul and the Acts of the Apostles, provides the criteria for distinguishing between Jewish Christian and gentile Christian positions. The correspondence of views argued for in this section shows why the comments made on Jewish dietary purity in a story may be legitimately accepted as corresponding to those of the real author of the story and, in all probability, most if not all of its early readership. Following these arguments, it is sound, in this specific case, to go from positions adopted within the narrative world of the Gospel of Matthew to conclusions about the position of the literary work, its author, and most of its early readers, with regard to Jewish Christianity and gentile Christianity.

Since this dissertation argues that both the literary work and its author express a point of view which falls within the domain of gentile Christianity, it will generally follow the normal procedure of using the name "Matthew" to refer both to the literary work and to its author. The context will normally make clear which is meant. It would be crucial to designate the Gospel and its real author by different terms if it were not the case that the real author, implied author and narrator all espoused the same

views on the issues which are critical to this dissertation. It might also be important to have different terms for the author and his work if the author were Jewish Christian but wrote for a gentile Christian intended reader. But given the contention of the preceding paragraph, the somewhat looser usage of "Matthew" for both the Gospel and its author should rarely cause confusion.

0.3 The Two Source Hypothesis

The Two Source hypothesis of synoptic relationships will be used in this dissertation. A number of theories have been proposed in opposition to the Two Source hypothesis, and in recent years the strongest opposition has come from the new form of the Griesbach hypothesis as proposed by W. Farmer and those who have followed him.⁹ The majority of New Testament scholars have not been won over to any of these, and feel that the Two Source hypothesis best accounts for the observed relationships. Since it has been approved by the majority of New Testament scholars, and in particular by the majority of scholars working on Matthew,¹⁰ it is not necessary to question it here.

The adoption of the Two Source hypothesis is particularly helpful in the analysis of Mt 15:1-20. A straightforward reading of this section without reference to any sources clearly indicates that Matthew rejects the concept of Jewish dietary purity. A number of important commentators have, nevertheless, argued that the true meaning of this section is quite different from its apparent

meaning. On the basis of the Two Source hypothesis, this dissertation will show in great detail how the Matthean text is related to its Marcan source, and thus place the affirmation that Matthew rejects Jewish dietary purity on an even firmer foundation.

Just as the Two Source hypothesis helps in the analysis of Mt 15:1-20, so the hypothesis helps in certifying this pericope's place in the gospel. Since Mt 15:1-20 plays a key role in arguing the thesis that Matthew is gentile Christian, the conclusions based on this pericope must be applicable to the Gospel of Matthew as a whole. According to the Two Source hypothesis, Matthew uses Mark as his main narrative source and usually follows the Marcan order, adding material held in common with Luke ("Q") and his unique material at various points in the Marcan framework. Mt 15:1-20 is parallel to a Marcan section, and is found in the same context in both Matthew and Mark. In both gospels the section is preceded by the Feeding of the Five Thousand, the Walking on the Water, and healings at Gennesaret; and in both gospels the section is followed by the Healing of a Woman, other healings, and the Feeding of the Four Thousand. Within Mt 15:1-20, we find Matthean redactional characteristics common to the Matthean redaction of other sections of Mark. Given the Two Source hypothesis and these observations, we may reasonably conclude that Mt 15:1-20 is not a foreign body in the text of Matthew, but was redacted by the same person (or persons) who is responsible for the

gospel as a whole.¹¹ The line of reasoning followed here also renders unlikely any extensive re-editing of Matthew.¹²

Even though the Two Source hypothesis is assumed in this dissertation, any use of it is also a test of the theory. If the arguments of this dissertation based on the Two Source hypothesis are judged sound, then the theory is strengthened. On the other hand, the Two Source hypothesis is weakened if the arguments here which move from Mark (as source) to Matthew are not judged tenable.

0.4

Mary Douglas

In a dissertation which uses Jewish dietary purity as the critical measuring stick, it would be impossible not to recognize the importance of the work of Mary Douglas on purity. She has ably demonstrated the role of purity in tracing the cosmic and social order in which a society moves. Since dietary purity was (and is) so significant in Judaism, the gentile Christian rejection of Jewish dietary purity implies a very different understanding of the cosmic and social order. Douglas's insight is both confirmed and put to use in this dissertation. Every page of chapters one to four shows how correct she is in stressing the importance of purity. In those chapters we see how something as potentially trivial as what one eats and whom one eats it with, became the battleground that divided the nascent church. Clearly what is at issue here is not personal dietary idiosyncrasies, but a clash of worlds within a community. It would be fascinating to pursue the problem of

exactly what world view corresponds to each side of this battle, but that would go far beyond the the question at hand. Rather, this dissertation, which has confirmed Douglas's view on the crucial importance of purity and identified Jewish dietary purity as a touchstone for the division between Jewish Christianity and gentile Christianity, poses the question: Where does Matthew stand on Jewish dietary purity?

0.5 Jewish Dietary Purity

This dissertation focuses on Jewish dietary purity as the appropriate test for determining whether Matthew is Jewish Christian or gentile Christian. It is useful at this point to give a preliminary indication of what is meant by this term, and to explain why it has been chosen.

The term "Jewish dietary purity" is used in this dissertation to refer to all practices related to eating which are characteristic of first century Judaism. This includes production and harvesting (or slaughter), preparation, serving, consumption and such ceremonies which may have accompanied each of these. It is meant to include the determination of what food is suitable for consumption, what restrictions exist pertaining to the people who are suitable to perform the various steps in production and the various ceremonial functions, and what people are suitable companions for eating. Pagan sources give some limited evidence for first century Jewish dietary purity practices (see chapter four, excursus 1). More evidence comes from

the assumption of significant continuity from Biblical dietary purity, and some continuity in the direction of Mishnaic purity laws. It should be stressed, however, that first century Jewish dietary practice was almost certainly varied, and our direct sources for it are quite limited. It is not our purpose to contribute to the study of first century Jewish dietary purity. Our purpose is rather to determine where early Jewish Christianity and gentile Christianity each stood on the question of Jewish dietary purity, and then to apply this result to the Gospel of Matthew.

Why has the particular designation "Jewish dietary purity" been chosen? The term "Jewish" is used because, while it may be that other dietary practices figure in New Testament controversies (ascetic or other practices may be referred to in Rom 14), it is the dietary practices characteristic of Judaism which are of interest in this dissertation. The term "dietary" is used in a general sense, to indicate all things associated with eating. The term "purity" is chosen because it is the term generally applied to the code of Levitical laws which lies behind much of the pertinent New Testament controversy material, and is the general term commonly used to describe the set of concepts behind the term "koinos" as used in appropriate passages in the New Testament (see excursus on "koinos" in chapter five). One of the passages of great importance to our study is Gal 2, where the issue of Jewish Christians and gentile Christians eating together is discussed. This text

does not explicitly state that Jewish eating with gentiles causes impurity. But the context of Gal 2, where the applicability of distinctive Jewish law to gentile Christians is the subject, and where commensality is the test case, makes it almost certain that concern for purity is at issue here. It appears very likely that it was the presence of gentiles which was conceived of as the source of impurity, although the possibility cannot be ruled out that it was the presence of non-kosher food which was the source of impurity.

The term "ritual" is generally avoided in this dissertation. This is because the term "ritual" tends to have pejorative connotations in our society, and because there is a tendency to make a distinction between "ritual purity" and "moral purity." In the wake of Douglas's work, purity is seen to be its own category with its own logic, and not intrinsically related to either morality or cleanliness. This is certainly the case for Jewish dietary purity. Spotlessly clean hands could be impure for reasons having nothing to do with hygiene, or conversely, impure hands are made pure by pouring water over them, even if contaminated with an unclean substance which is not water soluble. More significantly for our study, morality in our society is usually linked with intent. But a person can become impure without the intent to commit an act leading to impurity. Since a person may become impure by accident, or even without realizing it, impurity would thus not

necessarily be linked with any form of immorality. In many cases the distinction between moral purity and ritual purity may be in the eye of the beholder. It is far from certain that different societies would draw this line in the same places. In this study, the "beholder" who counts the most is Matthew. Matthew does seem to make a distinction which at least approximates the traditional division between what some modern scholarship has called "moral purity" and "ritual purity." In fact, this point seems to be quite important to him in Mt 15:1-20. The derogatory connotations of the term "ritual" are quite in place in catching the tone of this pericope, which is very sharp in its attack on Jewish dietary purity. Since exegesis of this text is pivotal to the defense of the thesis, when this distinction is deemed appropriate and suggested by the Matthean (or other) text, this dissertation will use the terms "moral" and "ritual" purity. Outside the exegetical sections, these terms will be used sparingly, with the constant intention to reflect as far as possible the intentions of the authors whose texts are exegeted and as little as possible the polemics of later ages.

1 SCHEMATA OF EARLY CHURCH DEVELOPMENT

1.1 Introduction

The terms "Jewish Christian" and "gentile Christian" have been used to describe tendencies, groups and other phenomena postulated to have existed in early Christianity according to various theories of the evolution of the early Christian church.¹ This chapter will review five of the most influential and representative theories of the development of the early Christian church, paying particular attention to which groups or tendencies have been labeled "Jewish Christian," and which "gentile Christian." The attitude of each group or tendency toward the Jewish law will be stressed, in line with the importance this theme will have in the following chapters for the discussion of the Gospel of Matthew. This chapter presents only the background necessary to argue the question of the appropriate designation for Matthew; a more detailed outline of the development of theories of early church evolution is to be found in the appendix.

1.2 F.C. Baur's Schema

F.C. Baur's goal in tracing the early history of Christianity is to understand the development of mankind's

religious consciousness.² The motor which moves the process of development forward is the dialectical clash of thesis and antithesis giving rise to a synthesis. In the early history of Christianity, the thesis is Jewish Christianity, which is particularistic: it is oriented toward one nation, and expresses itself in the forms of Jewish cult. These forms characteristically include circumcision, obedience to the Mosaic Law, and certain regulations respecting relations with gentiles. The antithesis might be called Hellenistic Christianity, Paulinism, or (due to the element which quickly predominated) gentile Christianity. This Christianity is universalizing, tending to include all nations and expressing itself in forms not limited by Jewish tradition. It would not see any further need for circumcision, or obedience to the Mosaic Law, or countenance any discrimination in relations between Jewish and gentile Christians. The synthesis, early catholic Christianity, maintains the universalizing aspect of gentile Christianity and the historical roots and ecclesiastical structure of Jewish Christianity, while tempering the stress on faith versus works of the former and rejecting the Jewish exclusiveness of the latter.

Baur is able to trace an outline of the development of the early church consistent with his theory, following the account of the book of Acts. The earliest Christian community in Jerusalem was made up of both Hebrew and Hellenist Jews. The Hebrews continued, as Christians, to

identify with the Jewish nation and culture, and to observe the Jewish law. The Hellenists had a more universalist view of religion. Their new perspective was first clearly expressed by Stephen, whose challenge to Judaism necessitated the flight of the Hellenists from Jerusalem. In their new surroundings, the Hellenists' universalizing principle found expression in their preaching of the Gospel to gentiles. Their movement came to flower in the thought and career of Paul, who preached Christianity as a universal religion, not bound by the particularism of the Mosaic Law.

The two views of the shape of the Christian religion in general, and particularly its relation to the Jewish law, clashed in Antioch. This confrontation and the subsequent meeting in Jerusalem led to the recognition and theoretical acceptance of each group by the other. The Jewish Christian party, led by James, Peter and John, was to preach to Jews a gospel including full observance of the Jewish law, while the gentile Christian party, spearheaded by Paul, was to preach to the gentiles a gospel not including observance of the Jewish law. Paul travelled west preaching this gentile Christianity. Jewish, law-observant Christianity spread throughout the Empire, and most especially to Rome, by the natural medium of the Jewish diaspora. Although the two parties in theory accepted each other, in practice they came into very sharp conflict. This was particularly the case when, as in Galatia, members of the Jewish Christian party were at least partly successful in convincing gentiles that they must obey the whole Jewish law.

The synthesis of these two ideas of Christianity was worked out in the period following Paul's death. It was brought about by the realization that the two parties really belonged together. The Jewish Christian party had originally insisted on the absolute necessity of circumcision for salvation. As the number of gentiles entering the church became overwhelming, the Jewish Christians abandoned this position, and in a move toward Christian universalism, replaced circumcision with baptism (this is even the case in the Pseudo-Clementine literature). Only a small group of Jewish Christians rejected this accommodation. The next step in this process was marked by the Apostolic Decree, which is dated quite late by Baur. With the promulgation of this decree (a sort of minimum of law) and the substitution of baptism for circumcision, free association between Jewish and gentile Christians became possible. The fellowship thus created brought together the two parties, leaving out only certain backwater movements such as Ebionism. The final, early synthesis included elements from Jewish Christianity, such as the formal ecclesiastical structure including the office of bishop. However, in this synthesis, the principle of universalism had won the day. Ritual purity laws, and any other aspects of the Jewish law which were not part of the developing human religious consciousness, but were rather only part of Judaism, were progressively eliminated.

Baur studied the early history of Christianity to understand the development of mankind's religious consciousness. Ritschl's orientation was very different: what lies at the heart of his study of the history of the early Christian Church is the question of its understanding of mankind's reconciliation to God.³ This being the case, it is not surprising that the problem of how Christianity related to the law is of great importance for Ritschl.

In sharp contrast to Baur, Ritschl does not see the early catholic church as a synthesis of Jewish Christianity and gentile Christianity, but rather as a development of gentile Christianity which had finally separated itself from its Jewish roots. This separation was brought about both by external factors such as culture and politics, and by internal factors such as the inordinate demands made by the Jewish Christians on gentile Christians in the Apostolic Decree. Catholic Christianity was not a triumph of "Paulinism" either, since Ritschl by no means ascribes as much significance to Paul as does Baur. The catholic church misunderstood Paul as much as it did Peter, and neither had an overwhelming influence on it.

The divorce of the catholic church from its Jewish roots meant that it lost its context for interpreting the Old Testament presuppositions on which it was built. This led to a drift into a new type of legalism, a legalism which was distinctly Christian, and not Pauline or Jewish Christian. It should be noted that from Ritschl's

Protestant point of view, this loss was by no means religiously neutral, but was a real disaster for humanity, a disaster only to be reversed at the time of the Reformation.

Let us review the history of the early Christian church, and especially its struggles about the Mosaic Law, as viewed by Ritschl.

The Apostles at first followed Jesus' example in going only to Israel, believing perhaps that all Israel must be saved before the entry of the gentiles. Peter's conversion of the Roman centurion Cornelius does not really represent an exception, because Cornelius was added to the church as a proselyte. The initial attitude of the Christian Church toward the law was set by Jesus himself. He distinguished between two types of laws: those laws which pertain to man's highest end and are therefore permanently and universally binding; and those laws which exist for the sake of men, and are therefore adiaphora. As long as Christendom was contained within Israel, the Apostles could not distinguish between the national facets and the religious facets of the law.

The mission to the gentiles started in Antioch independently of the Apostles. It appears that in this city, gentiles were baptized without being asked to observe the Mosaic Law, but some time thereafter former Pharisees from Jerusalem demanded that they be circumcised and obey the whole law. This demand, Ritschl notes, is an indication of true Jewish Christianity. The original Apostles did not

support this demand and found themselves in the position of having to oppose and yet conciliate this group. At the meeting held in Jerusalem, attended by Paul and Barnabas as delegates from Antioch, the solution adopted was the Apostolic Decree. The decree is pivotal for Ritschl's understanding of this period. It in effect gave proselyte status to the new converts, thus preserving the priority of the Jews, while still allowing for full recognition of the gentiles as brothers and sisters. Gentile Christians, however, still remained ritually unclean, and thus full table fellowship was not established within the Christian Church itself. Ritschl is highly critical of this attempt at a solution:

"In dem Dekrete ist eine Norm des mosaischen Gesetzes direkt auf die Verhältnisse der christlichen Gemeinde angewendet. Muss man dies nicht so verstehen, dass eigentlich das ganze mosaische Gesetz im Christenthume gilt, jedoch aus äusseren Gründen nur ein Minimum davon bei den Heidenchristen durchgesetzt wird?" (Entstehung 131)

The fact is, even James and Peter saw the converted Jews as the true people of the old covenant, and as the core of the new covenant- as can be seen even from the letters attributed to them (which Ritschl accepts as genuine).

The Apostolic Decree made sense in Palestine, where most Christians were Jewish. In the Diaspora, however, where most Christians were gentile, full communion between Jewish and gentile Christians was more important than full

communion between Jewish Christians in the Diaspora and their co-religionists in Palestine. It quickly followed that this full communion was established in the Diaspora on gentile terms, that is to say, without observance of the Mosaic Law. This practice represents Paul's position. While this was not a formal breach of the Decree, it was certainly less than full observance of the law by all Jews, which is of course what James had wanted.

Peter was sympathetic to Paul's position, and when he came down to Antioch he ate with the gentile Christians without concerning himself about their ritual uncleanness. When representatives came from Jerusalem to recall Peter to James's understanding of the Decree, Peter withdrew from such fellowship. Ritschl cannot find indisputable evidence that Peter returned to his position of ignoring questions of ritual purity and to full communion with gentile Christians, but he clearly suspects that Peter did eventually return to that Pauline position. This question is secondary. What is central is that Paul, Peter and even James were in complete agreement that faith in Christ is the condition for admission to the new covenant.

At this point there were essentially two groups within Christianity. The first group recognized faith in Christ as the only condition for full Christianity. Within this group we find the Pauline tendency which, while accepting the Apostolic Decree, did not require any further observance of the Mosaic ritual law from anyone; and the tendency of

James, which expected the gentiles to observe the Apostolic Decree and ethnic Jews to observe the whole law. The second major group within Christianity at this time comprised the Jewish Christians in the strict sense of the term, which Ritschl often calls the "strenge (as opposed to milde) Judenchristen". They did not recognize any form of Christianity except that which was based on the Jewish people. Gentiles might therefore become Christians only through circumcision and obedience to the whole Law of Moses. This group of course did not recognize the apostleship of Paul, and are the people Paul refers to as demanding the circumcision of Titus, and were responsible for the opposition to Paul's work in Galatia. With the passage of time, those who held James's position became the Nazarenes, while the extreme Jewish Christians became the Pharisaic and Essene Ebionites.

The reason for the split between what became mainstream Christianity and "strict" Jewish Christianity is self-evident. "Moderate" Jewish Christianity (the position represented by James), despite the general observance of the Apostolic Decree, still could not accept full communion with the gentile Christians. Its influence on gentile Christianity came to an end in the aftermath of the Bar-Cochba revolt (if not earlier), when Jewish Christians (and, of course, non-Christian Jews) were banished from Jerusalem, and gentile Christians replaced them there. The positions of Paul and Peter did influence general Christianity, but not to a great extent. The true development of Christianity

went with the current of the increasing gentile majority. It grew in response to factors in the gentile world (such as Gnosticism and Montanism) toward a new type of legalism, a "Christian nomism" as Ritschl calls it, with no relation to Jewish Christianity, and no real appreciation of the Jewish law.

1.4 The Early Consensus Schema

In the latter part of the nineteenth and early twentieth century, most researchers rallied to a schema which is an amalgam of the two we have been examining. They adopted an analysis similar to Ritschl's of the early groups in Christianity: a strict Jewish Christian group, demanding full observance of the Jewish law by all, which was fairly quickly marginalized; a moderate Jewish Christian group, usually seen as demanding full observance of the law by Jews but only observance as outlined in the Apostolic Decree by gentiles; and a gentile group usually seen as recognizing no Jewish law, or only the Apostolic Decree. They did not, however, accept Ritschl's conclusion that the catholic church developed almost entirely on a gentile basis. Rather, they reintroduced Baur's analysis and applied it to Ritschl's groups. After the strict Jewish Christian group left the mainstream church, the moderate Jewish Christian group was made the thesis in this new schema, the gentile Christian group the antithesis, and the early catholic church the synthesis of these two remaining groups. The only major author who consistently maintained Ritschl's

position was Adolf Harnack. Several authors who worked within this "early consensus" stream are reviewed in the appendix.

1.5 Jean Daniélou's Schema

It has been a widely held view that Christian theology, in the narrow sense of the term, first came about when the tenets of Christianity were expressed in the categories of Greek thought. In active rejection of this view, Hans Joachim Schoeps⁴ set himself the task of recovering the theology of the Ebionites, a marginal Jewish Christian group less open to Greek thought than was the gentile Christian church. Daniélou⁵ does not agree that the Ebionite group was a legitimate descendant of the Jerusalem community, but he does very much agree that Semitic thought could produce a Christian theology using only its own genius, without recourse to Greek thought forms. In his view, long before the Greek mind reflected on the Christian message and gave us what we now think of as Christian theology, the earliest Christian community had produced a theology conceived of entirely within the bounds of Semitic thought patterns. The major formal factor in this theology was apocalyptic. It was not until the late second century that Christian theology worked out in Greek categories began to dominate Christianity. Daniélou's goal is to enrich modern Christianity by recovering and setting out this early, Semitic, Jewish Christian theology.⁶

On the basis of this interest in theology, Daniélou

developed a theoretical understanding of the development of the early Christian church fundamentally different from that of Baur and those worked out in reaction to Baur. He sees orthodox Christianity as essentially one unified stream flowing down from the original community. Early in the history of this stream, the question of the admission of gentiles arose. The solution was quickly given: gentiles were admitted without the demand that they keep the Jewish law. This led to practical problems of fellowship between Jews and gentiles within the church due in large part to Jewish nationalism, which will be discussed below. However, there was never any real question that gentile Christians were full Christians, and any group which rejected them effectively removed itself from the developing orthodox church. This one developing tradition maintained a Semitic, Jewish Christian theology and leadership until at least the time of Clement of Alexandria. When the ethnic gentile element matured enough, because of its increasing numerical predominance it began to take over the church leadership and to replace the Semitic, Jewish Christian theology with a theology conceived of in Greek philosophical categories. Thus the whole, orthodox stream of Christianity eventually traded its Jewish Christian theology for a gentile Christian theology through a process of unitary growth, and not through dialectic conflict.

As this schema makes clear, Daniélou divides the problem of early Christian attitudes toward the Jewish law

into two distinct issues, and holds that these two were dealt with in very different ways. The first issue was a religious one, and was quickly resolved. According to Daniélou, at the religious level the church developed in one great stream, under the guidance of God and an authoritative leadership. Groups which did not follow the decisions of apostolic councils effectively removed themselves from the main, legitimate stream of the Christian church. Questions concerning the basis of the admission of gentiles, and the fundamental significance of the Jewish law for the Christian church, would fall into this category. The second issue might best be termed sociological: how was the church to relate to the nation of Israel? This question was resolved over a longer period of time by the fact that as gentile membership became overwhelming and gentiles took over the leadership, the church naturally moved away from any identification with the nation Israel.

The two aspects of the problem may be illuminated by examining how Daniélou believes the early church dealt with circumcision and table fellowship. The religious question of the circumcision of gentile Christians was resolved in a definitive manner in a few clear steps. The God-fearing gentile Cornelius and the members of his household were filled with the Holy Spirit, and this fact Peter took as authorization to baptize them without any other conditions being imposed (Acts 10:1-11:18). Gentiles in Antioch and in the cities of Paul's first missionary journey were converted to Christianity without being told to keep the Jewish law.

When objections were raised, the leaders of the church in Antioch sent Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem to submit the question to the apostles and elders. The meeting in Jerusalem was a fully authoritative apostolic council presided over by Peter, and recounted in Acts 15:1-12 and Gal. 2:1-10. There it was definitively affirmed that salvation is based only on faith in Christ, and the mission to gentiles without the Jewish law was fully vindicated. Though battles may yet have been fought over this question, it was fully resolved for Paul, Peter, James and the whole orthodox church.

The question of circumcision had a second part which belongs to the second aspect of the legal question, the sociological issue. It had been agreed that faith in Christ was the sole basis for membership in the church. It was further generally agreed that this implied that circumcision was unnecessary for gentiles. But what did it imply for the Jews? The conclusion for Paul clearly was that circumcision was not necessary for Jewish Christians. The scandal of this position for most Jewish Christians was not at the theoretical level, but rather at the sociological level. Not to circumcise their sons, to abandon the Jewish law, would inevitably lead to a break with the Jewish nation. Betrayal of Judaism would have been particularly grave at that time when Jewish nationalism was especially strong and building toward the revolt against Rome. Most Jewish Christians therefore continued to practice the law. The

true question was, then, one of solidarity with the Jewish nation.

In his mission, Paul was concerned with presenting the gospel to the gentiles, and with liberating Christianity from Judaism. Peter, on the other hand, was concerned with showing Jewish nationalists that being a Christian was not inconsistent with commitment to the Jewish law and nation. Paul's work brought him into continued and growing conflict with nationalistic Jewish Christians. Paul's position was ultimately victorious only at the terrible price of complete rupture with Judaism.

The incident between Paul and Peter concerning table fellowship took place after the Apostolic Council's decision on the religious question of circumcision, and in no way called that decision into question. The clash led to another delegation being sent to Jerusalem, but this time Symeon was the representative of Antioch. This meeting in Jerusalem was only a meeting of the local Jewish Christian church presided over by James, and not an apostolic council. The occasion of this meeting is described in Gal 2:11-14 and the account of it is to be found in Acts 15:13-34. The Symeon mentioned in Acts 15:14 is Symeon the representative of Antioch mentioned in Acts 13:1, and not Simon Peter. The decision, the so-called Apostolic Decree, in effect maintained the idea of food regulations, while reducing them to a minimum.⁷ Gentiles converted by Jewish Christians subject to James's authority were instructed to observe this decree (they also observed the Sabbath, Pentecost, other

Jewish feasts, and followed Jewish liturgies in their services). The "Apostolic Decree" was, however, merely a disciplinary compromise, and proved in the long run to be unworkable.

The position of James and the Jewish Christian church in Jerusalem with regard to table fellowship was not shared by Paul or by the author of the book of Acts. For Paul, there was no fundamental reason for any sort of food regulations. The fusion of the two meetings in Jerusalem into one account in the book of Acts (Acts 15:1-35) and the omission of the incident in Antioch make Peter's role in Acts almost that of a precursor and supporter of Paul.

During the whole period of Paul's missions, Jewish Christians were still the majority in the church and thus most Christians would have been law-observant. But the fall of Jerusalem, and the consequent blow to Jewish nationalism, changed the sociological situation in such a way that Christianity could go its way separate from Judaism. The balance of the church changed from majority Jewish to majority gentile, and by the late second century, church leadership was gentile, assuring total rupture with any Jewish legal observances which might have been maintained out of solidarity with Judaism. Certain aspects of Torah-observance, such as the keeping of festivals and some laws not sanctioned by the Christian hierarchy, were maintained at popular levels and in some fringe movements. Some of these observances were re-introduced into the church in the

fourth century.

1.6

R.E. Brown's Schema

Raymond Brown's view of the development of the early church focuses on the various early Christian communities he identifies on the basis of the New Testament writings.⁸ Like Daniélou, Brown does not believe that gentiles made important contributions to the thought of the early church. Drawing the logical conclusion from this, he vigorously rejects the idea that there were theological or legal positions in New Testament times which could be called "Jewish Christian" and "gentile Christian." Rather, he holds that early Christian theological and legal diversity is to be traced to the varying points of view of the Apostles, and of the early, ethnically Jewish, Christian evangelists, as well as to differences in the development of the various communities they founded. Each early, ethnically Jewish, Christian community made gentile converts, thus creating various Jewish/gentile communities. Every one had its own distinctive history, including internal debates and occasionally schisms. A given community was usually held together by a moderating centre, which reconciled the opposing views as far as possible. In the same way, the early catholic church developed from these communities by means of compromise and consensus around a moderate, middle position.

Brown believes the following four types of "Jewish/gentile Christianity" can be clearly identified,

each with its own attitude toward the Jewish law:

1. Those who believed that circumcision and obedience to the whole Mosaic Law were necessary for full participation in salvation brought by Jesus the Christ;
2. those who did not require circumcision of gentile Christians, but did require the observance of some purity laws by gentiles;
3. those who required neither circumcision nor observance of food regulations by gentile Christians (but were not necessarily opposed to such observances by Jewish Christians);
4. those who did not require circumcision or observance of food regulations, and had fundamentally broken with all Jewish practices, seeing no lasting significance in the Jewish cult or feasts.

These groups and their legal views in some ways represent a more nuanced and extended version of the groups set forth in the tradition from Baur and Ritschl to the early consensus. They are, however, in many ways quite different because they are part of a very different schema, that is, they are conceived of as having arisen and interacted in a very different way. Unlike Baur and the early consensus schema, Brown does not suppose a three stage dialectical relationship. Unlike Ritschl, he most assuredly does not think that a gentile theological stream quickly predominated, losing all real understanding of its Jewish roots. Brown is closer to Daniélou in that the attitude toward the Jewish law of each of his groups is a critique

developed from within Judaism by Jews. It is in the true diversity of traditions where Brown differs most greatly from Daniélou. In Daniélou's schema, there was always one orthodox, authoritative, developing stream of Christianity. According to Brown, from the very earliest times there were several traditions in Christianity which were different from each other in significant ways. His groups' attitudes toward the Jewish law may best be understood by briefly tracing some of their history.

The views described as type 1 were held by Christians from the Pharisaic party mentioned in the book of Acts, as well as by Paul's opponents in Galatians. Their arguments won over at least some gentile Christians. This group was never reconciled to Paul, and would also have considered Peter a traitor. It was represented in Rome, and it may have been some of its members who betrayed Peter and Paul to their deaths.

Type 3 Jewish/gentile Christianity in its classic form was advocated by Paul early in his career. In Antioch, this type 3 Christianity clashed with type 1. Peter, who had originally also held a type 3 position, adopted a mediating position, that is type 2 Jewish/gentile Christianity. Paul's sharp reaction to Peter's adoption of this type 2 position may have been due more to his own loss of face in Antioch than to opposition in principle to Peter's argument. Paul's position changed with his experiences. As late even as his letter to the Galatians, he had held a fully

apocalyptic view of Christianity, which made Christianity something totally new, and therefore left no place for the Jewish law. But his troubles in Corinth led him to see some of the weaknesses of his position, and the strengths of Peter's mediating position. By the time he wrote to the Romans, he had worked out a greater place in his thought for salvation history and thus was able to give a more positive evaluation of Judaism and of the Jewish law.

The Christian community at Rome is the outstanding example of a Jewish/Gentile Christian group of the type 2. It had been evangelized before the 50's by Jerusalem Christians of type 2. Even though by the time Paul wrote to them, gentiles may have formed the majority, they continued in the type 2 beliefs they had received- holding the Jewish heritage in high regard, and holding to a mediating view on the law (some of its members, though, adhered to a type 1 position). This position of Rome goes far in explaining why Paul was at such pains in his letter to the Romans to deny the accusation that he held the views of group 4. Because of his moderated position, Paul was well accepted at Rome, but the more moderate Peter was always given the first place of honour. After the fall of Jerusalem, Rome took over much of the oversight of the missionary work of Jerusalem, and also of Paul's churches.

The vanguard of Brown's type 4 Christianity was the Jerusalem Hellenists, whose sharp critique of Judaism is recorded in Stephen's speech in the book of Acts. While also represented in the New Testament by the letter to the

Hebrews, Brown has developed his understanding of them largely from analysis of the Johannine literature. They began as a group of Christian Jews with little to distinguish them from other such groups. The entry of Jews opposed to the Temple and the entry of Samaritans into their group led them to adopt the "high Christology" so characteristic of the Gospel of John. Adoption of this Christology resulted in their expulsion from the synagogue. This sharp and traumatic break from the Jewish community set the stage for the fundamental rejection of Jewish law characteristic of type 4 Jewish/gentile Christianity. In the second century, the type 4 Johannine Christians who produced 1 John merged with the catholic church. They accepted its very foreign authoritative teaching structure, while the catholic church adopted the Johannine community's high Christology. Thus ended this community's very separate trajectory, with its radical rejection of the Jewish heritage.

2.1

Introduction

The goal of the second, third and fourth chapters of this dissertation is to determine the appropriate method for deciding whether Matthew is Jewish Christian or gentile Christian. Chapter one has outlined the most influential schemata of the development of the early church thereby showing the range of meanings presently attached to the terms "Jewish Christian" and "gentile Christian." This chapter initiates the search for an appropriate method by examining how the traditional view that Matthew is Jewish Christian has been defended. The methods used are set against the background of the appropriate schemata as described in chapter one.

This chapter focuses its investigation on the work of a representative selection of authors who classify Matthew as Jewish Christian within a schema which allows the existence of a real and distinct gentile Christianity. Daniélou and Brown's schemata do not admit authentic theologically or philosophically distinct gentile Christian positions until far later than the range of dates now generally accepted for the redaction of the Gospel of Matthew. Since the logic of

these schemata does not allow the question of whether Matthew is Jewish Christian or gentile Christian to be posed at a fundamental level, it is more useful to examine the overall validity of these schemata, rather than their particular comments on Matthew. This will be done in chapter four. Ritschl's schema has also contributed little of value for this chapter's investigations. Ritschl himself did not study this question. Harnack follows Ritschl's schema, but despite his voluminous corpus, does not seem to have clearly posed the question of the method of classifying Matthew in any way that would be useful in this chapter. In contrast, both Jewish and gentile Christianity are real options in Baur's schema and in the early consensus schema; so it is to them that this study now turns.

Three writers have been chosen to illustrate how Matthew has been classified as Jewish Christian. Baur himself has been selected as the best proponent of Matthew as Jewish Christian in his schema. Ernest Renan has been chosen as a nineteenth century example of how Matthew can be classified as Jewish Christian in the early consensus schema. Renan was a very broad-minded man, and one of the leading experts of his time in ancient Semitic languages. Nevertheless, there is an insidious anti-Jewish undercurrent to his classification of Matthew; this is fairly representative of his time. H.J. Schoeps has been selected as a more recent example of how Matthew can be seen as Jewish Christian within the early consensus schema. His

positive view of Judaism works a change in the manner in which Matthew is classified as Jewish Christian. This change has now been generally accepted in the scholarly world. (There is further discussion of these scholars in the appendix.) In the following section, each author is treated separately. First, Matthew is situated in the given author's schema; the author's supporting argument is then reviewed; and finally, this supporting argument is subjected to critique.

2.2

F.C. Baur

Ferdinand Christian Baur believes that Matthew is a product of the Jewish Christian phase of his dialectic schema. The original Gospel of Matthew was written in Hebrew. To substantiate this, Baur refers to the early church traditions which are often quoted in the better introductions; further, he argues strenuously that the logia referred to in those traditions most assuredly formed a complete gospel.¹ He believes that this Gospel was composed in Palestine by a Jewish Christian shortly before the fall of Jerusalem during the revolt against Hadrian (Evangelien, footnote pp. 605-609). The author is not, of course, the Matthew of Jesus' time. The Hebrew Gospel of Matthew existed in various recensions, one being used by Palestinian Christians (the Gospel "According to the Hebrews," Eusebius EH III. xxv.), another being found among the Nazarenes by Jerome. A recension of this Gospel also lies behind some of the quotations in the Pseudo-Clementine literature and in

Justin. This original Hebrew Matthew reflected a Jewish Christianity which had already developed beyond Judaism, and had proto-Christological elements.

At an early time the Hebrew Matthew was translated into Greek by a person unknown. This translation, or its subsequent editions, differentiated itself from the Hebrew original by stressing, extending and developing the universalising aspects of Christianity which had already been present in an embryonic form in the Hebrew Matthew (Evangeliën 579- 580). The Greek translation, or more likely its subsequent editions, was sufficiently different from the Hebrew original that the Ebionite Symmachus could polemicize against the Greek Matthew. Baur also notes that it would have been pointless for Jerome to translate parts of the Hebrew Gospel he knew (which Baur holds to be a recension of the original Hebrew Matthew) if the Greek translation had not deviated from the Hebrew original. In particular, Baur holds that the first two chapters (with the exception of the genealogy) of our canonical Matthew were not present in the original Hebrew.

The Synoptic Apocalypse is particularly important for Baur in clarifying details about the authorship and dating of Matthew, and therefore its Jewish Christian character. This apocalypse is a very good indicator because Baur does not believe Jesus could possibly have spoken as he is made to speak here. Matthew has in fact taken the liberty of putting the expectation of the Parousia (which was characteristic of his own period) on the lips of Jesus in

the form of a prophecy (Evangelien 604). That Jesus could not have spoken about the destruction of Jerusalem is shown by the fact that the author of Revelation (which is very early and reliable for Baur) knows nothing of such a destruction (Evangelien 605).

Baur makes a careful comparison of Mt 24 and Luke's apocalypse. In the Gospel of Luke the destruction spoken of is that of the First Jewish War, and it functions as a judgement of God for the Jews' rejection of Messianic salvation. As such it also guarantees the ingrafting of the gentiles. The expectation of the Parousia is only fulfilled in the kingdom of God, which of course includes gentiles. In the Gospel of Matthew, however, the destruction in question is not that of the First Jewish War, but rather that of the war against Bar-Cochba under Hadrian. The meaning of the tribulation is also very different and thoroughly Jewish Christian, representing the climax of evil and rebellion against God. The profanation of the Temple and the setting up of the image of Jupiter Capitolina (which is envisioned for the near future) is a "desolating sacrilege" which must without delay usher in the Parousia. With this as the immediate issue of events, Matthew focuses on the present tribulation in his apocalypse, while Luke fixes his attention and interest on the beginning of the period of great catastrophe, which stretches from the destruction of Jerusalem to the Parousia. It should also be noted that Matthew displays a greater interest in Palestine

in this section than does Luke, implying that Matthew is Palestinian (for this whole paragraph, Evangelien, footnote pp. 608- 609). It should be further noted that Baur is not at all dogmatic in his opinions about dating Matthew. This schema is presented merely as the best explanation he sees, up to that time, of the given data.

Baur's Argument

In his Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien, Baur reviews the relevant scholarship up to his time and suggests a change in direction. The object of the work of such critics as D.F. Strauss had been to discover the actual history lying behind the gospels, the so-called "Gospel history." Due to his high evaluation of John, and his insistence on its inconsistency with the synoptics, Strauss left the impression that the Gospels' contents were mostly myth. Baur, however, insisted that until scholarship weighed the relative value of each gospel as an historical source by an investigation of the particular character of each gospel, no further progress could be made toward discovering the "Gospel history". This idea in some ways foreshadows redaction criticism, but lacks redaction criticism's basis in the later developments in source criticism and its logical separation from questions of "Gospel history." Baur's insight, which is still fundamental for such work today, was an absolutely essential element in moving the critical study of the gospels forward. In practice, his critique evaluates the "Tendenz" of each

gospel, that is, its characteristic "stretching" of the gospel story from its original Jewish Christian form so as to fit a gentile Christian or early catholic form.²

It must be noted that while Baur's great advance over his time is in terms of his idea of weighing the gospels (Tendenzkritik), nevertheless, his goal remained the same as that of many of his predecessors and contemporaries: to discover the "Gospel history." No matter how much he might work with his own or any other critical method, the final criterion any conclusions had to face was that of what he judged to be "die objective Realität und Wahrheit des concreten Lebens der Geschichte" (Evangelien 40).

In his search for the "Wahrheit des concreten Lebens der Geschichte," he wanted to find the account of Jesus' life which was the most accurate and closest to "die objective Realität." Strauss's work did not give it, and no theory of synoptic relationships- even Griesbach's (which he and his school eventually in effect adopted)- fully satisfied as a method. The answer to finding "die objective Realität" lay elsewhere. His careful analysis of early Christianity, on the basis of the letters of Paul (I Corinthians in particular) and Acts, had shown him that the essential struggle of early Christianity was its struggle to liberate itself from particularism and to achieve universalism. This had worked itself out in the concrete historical reality of the dialectical clash between Jewish Christianity and its antithesis in Paulinism, leading to its final synthesis in early catholicism. The earliest and most

historically accurate account of the gospel history must then be found in an account which best reflects the first phase of the dialectic, and has not been distorted so as to be used by one of the following phases, i.e. which has no Tendenz.

Da die specielle Untersuchung der Evangelien den Beweis gibt, dass mehrere derselben nicht rein historisch sind, sondern in ihrer geschichtlichen Darstellung eine bestimmte Tendenz verfolgen, so kann als Massstab der Beurtheilung des Verhältnisses, welchem sie zu einander stehen, und ihres geschichtlichen Werths nur der Kanon gelte, dass dasjenige Evangelium den grössten Anspruch auf historische Glaubwürdigkeit zu machen hat, das am wenigsten einen bestimmten Tendenzcharakter an sich trägt. (Evangelien 620)

At this point it must be decided what the earliest phase of Christianity, i.e. Jewish Christianity, must look like. Since it developed out of Judaism, this first phase must in some ways resemble Judaism, yet in other ways it must be developed beyond Judaism. The particular character it shows must be that which Baur discovered for Jewish Christianity through his exegetical work. So first we must ask how Baur, in common with most nineteenth century Christian scholars, viewed the Judaism of Jesus' day.

For the nineteenth century, Judaism was an "external" legalistic religion, where favour with God was earned by careful observance of the law and tradition. This was before the time when Wrede and Schweitzer would show the importance of the apocalyptic element in first century Jewish thought. It was also before the time when E.P. Sanders could argue that first century Judaism was a "covenant nomism," where the covenant was central and not

forgotten, and law came out of covenant rather than vice versa. The opinions of Baur's milieu were rather on a direct path leading to Wellhausen's arguments about the decline of Judaism into a pettifogging religion of law and observances, in which the great call of the prophets was a dead letter. Thus a Judaism in which law had total primacy forms the background from which, in Baur's scheme, Christianity must emerge.

If the goal of the Jewish religion was the fulfillment of law, then the origin of Christianity must be in some way seen in the line of the perfect fulfillment of law:

Dass sich von dieser Idee aus, der vollendeten Gesetzes-Erfüllung, der Ursprung des Christenthums ganz so begreifen lässt, wie er der Natur der Sache nach gedacht werden muss, als eine immanente Entwicklung aus dem Judenthum, die aber als solche auch schon das Princip einer über dasselbe hinausgehenden, und von ihm specifisch verschiedenen Form des religiösen Bewusstseyns in sich hat, gibt dem Matthäus-Evangelium unstreitig das Gepräge einer historisch-treuen Darstellung des Urchristenthums. (Evangelien 614)

So, in Matthew Baur finds this sharing of a high regard for law and yet the deepening, interiorizing and spiritualizing of law. In Matthew's concept of dikaïosunē Baur sees both the goal of fulfilling the law, and the subjective possibility of fulfilling the law in such a pure, unconditional devotion to God that it comprehends just as much the abolition of the Old Testament law as the fulfillment of it. Just exactly this dialectic tension is to be found in the Sermon on the Mount, where the law is deepened, interiorized and spiritualized. This sermon, which Matthew brought together from many smaller groups of

sayings, functions as the announcement of the Messianic plan, which is then worked out in the rest of the Gospel. Once this framework of interpretation has been put in place, Jesus' attack on the devious use of the tradition of the elders to thwart the will of God (chapter 15) becomes crystal clear. In a legalistic Judaism, one law has been set over against another for the sake of cheating people and God, rather than looking deeply into the law (after the Jewish Christian fashion) to see God's will. This finally issues in the attack on the scribes and Pharisees found in chapter 23. Matthew's views seem to bear some relation to the views of Paul's opponents, but have clearly developed beyond them. These considerations taken together show that Matthew has developed beyond the very earliest Christianity, but is still to be situated in the Jewish Christian phase of the dialectic.

A secondary, rather subjective indication that Matthew belongs to the first phase of the dialectic process is the contention that the general framework of Matthew gives every indication of being historically accurate:

Ueberblickt man diese Darstellung der evangelischen Geschichte in ihrem ganzen hier dargelegten Zusammenhang, so lässt sich gewiss nicht verkennen, dass sich hier alles in einer sehr natürlichen Ordnung entwickelt, und es bietet sich nirgends ein zureichender Grund zu dem Zweifel dar, dass diess nicht auch wirklich, wenigstens in den wesentlichen Momenten, der geschichtliche Hergang der Sache selbst gewesen sey. (Evangelien 600)

This would be less true of a gospel written with a particular Tendenz, which would deform this historical

outline.

To further understand Baur's reasoning we must now distinguish between Matthew's Tendenz and Matthew's character. The Gospel of Matthew has no Tendenz since its position falls within the range of views which Baur came to expect of Jewish Christianity on the basis of his New Testament exegesis and his reflection on this exegesis, using his knowledge of Judaism and of dialectic philosophy. It cannot be over-emphasized that this exegesis and reflection are the basis of Baur's decision that Matthew is Jewish Christian. Since Matthew has no Tendenz, that is, does not stretch the gospel from its original Jewish Christian form so as to fit a gentile or early catholic form, it must therefore be the closest to the "Gospel history." Nevertheless, it is not pure history. Although not stretching the history toward any later phase of the dialectic, it does within its own phase give its own characteristic Matthean presentation. Since Matthew was written in the Jewish Christian phase by a Jewish Christian, the Gospel of Matthew shows a Jewish Christian character, but of course no Tendenz. This distinction may be approximated by saying that the story in the Gospel of Matthew is Jewish Christian in character, but is not tendentious.

For Baur, Matthew's Jewish Christian character shows itself primarily by its overall Jewish Christian presentation. Within the general framework of the story of Jesus, the author has chosen and ordered his material with

great literary freedom so as to achieve his goal of interpreting Jesus from the point of view of the Old Testament Messianic ideal. Jesus is still presented as the Jewish Messiah, whereas in Luke he is presented as the savior of mankind. It may be noted that this type of analysis of Matthew, like his Tendenzkritik of the other gospels, in many ways foreshadows Redaktionsgeschichte.

Many minor Jewish characteristics within Matthew constitute a secondary indication of Matthew's Jewish Christian character, according to Baur's analysis. Some of the stories which contain these minor Jewish characteristics may of course not be historically true, but just those which are not historically accurate are the best indicators of a Jewish Christian character. Those which we can determine to likely be historically accurate tell us little about Matthew. However, those which we think historically unfounded show the type of story which would grow up in Matthew's milieu and he would use to develop his interpretation of the meaning of Jesus' story, and thus give a better insight into Matthew's place in the dialectic process of early Christianity. This has proven to be a very fertile approach, playing a major role in our century in both Form and Redaction criticism. Let us review the minor Jewish characteristics which Baur discusses in his Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien.

Baur first refers to the famous saying about the law in Mt 5:17. But if Jesus actually said this, Matthew is just

reporting history. To use this to prove that the Gospel of Matthew is itself Jewish Christian, it would be necessary to prove these ideas were not part of Jesus' teaching. He even goes so far as to affirm, "Auch sonst begegnet uns in Hinsicht der Festhaltung des mosaischen Gesetzes nichts specifisch Judaistisches" (Evangelien 609). He also holds that we can draw no conclusions from Mt 23:3 where Jesus tells the disciples that they must observe and practice what the Pharisees and Scribes say (Evangelien 609). Further, he points out, nowhere does Matthew acknowledge what Baur claims to be the Ebionite principle of circumcision: the sign of admission to the Messianic kingdom is baptism and not circumcision, as indicated in Mt 28:19 (Evangelien 609-610).

Baur mentions Jesus' statement in Mt 15:24 that he was sent only to Israel as an indication of Jewish national particularism- but that it is hardly a solid principle of action is shown by its very context, he adds. He goes on to point out that Matthew unambiguously professes the universalism of Christianity in several places (Evangelien 610).

The arguments based on Jesus' being called the Son of David (Mt 22:41-46) carry more weight, nevertheless Baur can dismiss most of them. Most merely reflect a popular designation of the Messiah used by Jesus' contemporaries in the narrative. The genealogy at the beginning would only be of significance if it could be proven not to be correct. The scene Mt 22: 41- 45 is not likely historical. If it is

in fact pure fiction it may indicate a certain Jewish character since, despite the content of the saying, it does seem to set forth Jesus' Davidic descent. The intention of the redactor to prove that Jesus is the scion of David is very clear in the first two chapters of the Gospel. However, since Baur thinks that the first two chapters (except for the genealogy) were not in the original Matthew, he makes very little use of this section. This is probably why he fails to point out how well this analysis of the aim of the first two chapters links with his contention that Matthew shows Jesus as the realization of the Old Testament Messianic ideal.

According to Baur, Matthew is the Gospel which makes the greatest use of the Old Testament, seen particularly in his use of Old Testament proof-texts. Generally speaking, nothing can be done by Jesus or said about him unless it can be justified by an Old Testament text. He gives the following examples:

- the virgin birth Mt 1:22 (Is 7:14)
- birth in Bethlehem Mt 2:6 (Micah 5:2)
- the flight to Egypt Mt 2:15 (Hos 11:1)
- the murder of the children Mt 2:18 (Jer 31:15)
- settling in Nazareth Mt 2:23 (the prophet?)
- the appearance of John the Baptist Mt 3:3 (Is 40:3)
- Jesus' move to Capernaum Mt 4:14 (Is 9:1)
- healings and casting out of demons Mt 8:17 (Is 53:4)
- Jesus' command that he not be made known Mt 12:18 (Is

42:1)

- on teaching in parables Mt 13:14f and 13:35 (Is 6:9; Ps 78:2)
- the Pharisees as hypocrites Mt 15:18 (Is 29:13)
- the entry into Jerusalem Mt 21:5 (Zach 9:9)
- Jesus' Messianic dignity Mt 21:16 (Ps 8:3)
- Passion narrative Mt 26:31 (Zach 13:7)

Mt 27:9 (Jer 32:6; Zach 11:12)

Mt 27:35 (Ps 22:15)

(Evangelien 611- 612)

It should be noted that often the best indication of the Jewish Christian character of a section in Matthew is, according to Baur, its absence or alteration in the other gospels.

Critique

Considering only internal consistency and consistency with the critical data available at his time, Baur is very successful in integrating Matthew into his system. Matthew is Jewish Christian and written in Palestine, but since it was produced as late as AD 130, many of the less advanced aspects of the Jewish Christian position would already have been left behind in the process of Aufhebung. We see that the requirement of circumcision, a central demand at the time of the controversies with Paul, has been dropped and replaced with baptism (Mt 28:19). Any earlier hesitations about the universal mission of Christianity have been overcome, as can be seen from the command to go and teach

all nations. On the other hand, Christianity is still resolutely presented from the point of view of the Jewish religion, and especially of the Jewish law. It may surpass the Mosaic Law, but as the Sermon on the Mount so eloquently demonstrates, it does this starting from the Mosaic Law and in a way which Baur can interpret as coming from the first century Jewish point of view. Matthew's Jewishness may further be seen by comparison with Luke and Mark, but comparison with the Pseudo-Clementine literature shows that it is on a path which will lead to its being taken up into the early catholic synthesis. There are, however, a number of crippling flaws in Baur's system.

Baur's tentative dating of the Gospel of Matthew at the beginning of the Bar-Cochba revolt is precluded by J.B. Lightfoot's work. Nevertheless, a significantly earlier dating for Matthew is not an insurmountable problem. By means of the modifications characteristic of the early consensus schema, many critics have in fact accommodated a dialectical schema at least in part inspired by Baur to a much shorter period of time. The fatal flaws arise rather from his understanding of Judaism and of the synoptic relationships.

On the basis of his Tendenzkritik and without the benefit of later source criticism, Baur decided that Matthew was the earliest of the canonical gospels. As such, the synoptic gospels accurately reflected the early dialectic process: Matthew, the most Jewish Christian reflected the thesis; Luke, more gentile Christian in outlook, reflected

the antithesis; while Mark, which drew from both of these, reflected the early catholic synthesis. However, the intervening century and a half of modern technical research at the literary level has led to a broad consensus that Mark is in fact the earliest canonical gospel, and that Matthew and Luke both drew from Mark. If this analysis is correct, as is assumed here, Baur's understanding of Matthew cannot be correct. If Matthew copied from Mark, Matthew is unlikely to be more accurate in its general outline of the career of Jesus than Mark which served as its main source. More significantly for this dissertation, Matthew cannot be a pristine Jewish Christian gospel as Baur thought if those aspects which make it so in comparison to Mark represent not elements altered in the gospel story by Mark but rather altered in the Matthean redaction. If Matthew has systematically altered Mark with the intention of expressing a particular point of view, then he has done essentially the same thing as has Luke- so in effect, both have "Tendenz." This would totally eliminate any possibility of distinguishing "Tendenz" and "character" in the senses that I have suggested Baur gives them in his analysis. If the Two Source hypothesis is correct, then the synoptic gospels do not reflect Baur's dialectic schema for the rise of the early catholic church.

Baur's contention that Matthew is Jewish Christian is not necessarily completely invalidated just because the synoptics do not reflect his dialectic in the way he

believed they did. Matthew might still reflect Jewish Christianity in conscious reaction to the form of Christianity found in the Gospel of Mark. Or perhaps there is yet some other way Matthew could have incorporated the Marcan material while still being authentically Jewish Christian. So, although dealt a very heavy blow by the general acceptance of the Two Source hypothesis, Baur's analysis must stand or fall on his contention that Matthew represents "eine immanente Entwicklung aus dem Judenthum, die aber als solche auch schon das Princip einer über dasselbe hinausgehenden, und von ihm specifisch verschiedenen Form des religiösen Bewusstseyns in sich hat..." (Evangelien 614). And this it must do in the way Baur contended, outlined in the last section. However, given his view of Judaism, it seems that only if Baur was wrong in his analysis of Matthew can Matthew be held to be Jewish Christian in his sense of the term!

If it can be convincingly demonstrated that the content of Matthew implies that it developed out of the type of religion which most nineteenth century Christian critics held first century Judaism to be, then it did not develop out of Judaism. This is not the place to develop a refutation of that understanding of Judaism: one may refer to such works as E.P. Sanders' Paul and Palestinian Judaism. If in fact Baur was correct in his contention that Matthew grew out of such a legalistic background, then this might in fact favour not his own but rather Ritschl's position, since the type of legalism Matthew fights against, not

particularly reflected in Judaism, might in fact be the Christian nomism into which Ritschl contends Christianity fell.

The general acceptance of the Two Source hypothesis, the general rejection of the last century's view of Judaism, and the radical redating of the gospels show that the Gospel of Matthew cannot occupy the place Baur gave it in his dialectic analysis of early Christian development. It might still be possible to show that Matthew is Jewish Christian in some sense different from Baur's by re-using Baur's arguments that Matthew presents Jesus as the Jewish Messiah while Luke shows him as savior of the world, or by stressing the many minor Jewish characteristics of Matthew brought out by Baur. But these would have to be used to fit Matthew into a very different schema of early church development, or to fit Matthew into Baur's schema in a radically different way. Since Baur's fundamental arguments for his placing of Matthew in his schema have been rejected by modern scholarship, it simply will not do to ignore his fundamental points and to use his minor points as if they were the substance of his reasoning. The very way he minimized these secondary arguments himself³ shows he knew they could not themselves bear the weight of his argument. His arguments for his situation of Matthew have been fundamentally rejected by subsequent scholarship, therefore his characterisation of Matthew as Jewish Christian must be fundamentally rethought.

Schema and Matthew's Place

Renan's schema has aspects of Baur, Ritschl and the early consensus schema. He stands close to the consensus position in seeing a strict Jewish Christian group headed by James which was quickly marginalized, and in seeing Peter and Paul's groups interact in a rather dialectic fashion to produce the early catholic church. Matthew is judged to belong to an early phase of this consensus schema. This gospel was written for a circle of Jewish Christians who knew Greek and a little Hebrew and who lived in Syria, the area of Peter's missionary activity.

Renan's Argument

The earliest Christian literature consisted of little collections of Jesus' sayings, written in a mixture of Hebrew and Aramaic, and resembling Pirke Aboth in form. A traditional outline of Jesus' career evolved at an early time, comprising the witness of John the Baptist, Jesus' activities in Galilee, his last days in Jerusalem, his death, resurrection and his ascension to the right hand of his father. Jesus' sayings would be inserted at suitable places in this outline (évangiles 76-93). The first complete gospel was written in Aramaic about the year 75 in Batanaea, where Jesus' brothers and the remanent of the Jerusalem church had fled. This gospel was used by the Nazarenes until about the fifth century. This original "Hebrew" gospel underwent expansions and editions (the

Gospel of Peter and the Gospel according to the Egyptians being two examples) and was translated into Greek several times (évangiles 94-112).

Mark's was the first gospel composed in Greek. John Mark of Jerusalem wrote it on the basis of the traditional outline of Jesus' career, and without reference to the Hebrew Gospel we have just been discussing. It was written in Rome after the death of Peter (évangiles 113-127).

The Gospel of Matthew was written in Syria by a Jewish Christian for his fellows. It is assumed that his audience spoke Greek, but also knew a little Hebrew. The Gospel of Mark was found to be severely wanting in words of Jesus, so this new gospel was written with Mark as its frame, but adding the lacking logia from the Hebrew Gospel. Given Matthew's uniformity of style, it is probable that its author translated the sayings himself from the Hebrew (évangiles 173-197).

Renan deals in his characteristically romantic way with the concept of a gospel which is fully Christian, yet is still Jewish:

L'Evangile de saint Matthieu, comme presque toutes les compositions fines, a été l'ouvrage d'une conscience en quelque sorte double. L'auteur est à la fois juif et chrétien; sa nouvelle foi n'a pas tué l'ancienne et ne lui a rien ôté de sa poésie. Il aime deux choses en même temps. Le spectateur jouit de cette lutte sans tourments. Etat charmant que celui où l'on est, sans être encore rien de déterminé! Transition exquise, moment excellent pour l'art que celui où une conscience est le paisible champ de bataille sur lequel les partis contraires se heurtent, sans qu'elle soit elle-même ébranlée! Quoique le prétendu Matthieu parle des juifs à la troisième personne comme d'étrangers, son esprit, son apologétique, son messianisme, son exégèse, sa

plété sont essentiellement d'un juif. Jérusalem est pour lui "la ville sainte", "le lieu saint". Les missions sont à ses yeux l'apanage des Douze; il ne leur associe pas saint Paul, et il n'accorde surement pas à ce dernier de vocation spéciale, quoique les instructions apostoliques, telles qu'il les donne, contiennent plus d'un trait tiré de la vie du prédicateur des gentils. Son aversion contre les pharisiens ne l'empêche pas d'admettre l'autorité du judaïsme. Le christianisme est chez lui à l'état d'une fleur éclosée, mais qui porte encore les enveloppes du bouton d'où elle s'est échappée.

(évangiles 209-210)

Critique

Renan carefully preserves the Jewish heritage of Matthew's Gospel in the literary history he proposes for it. The Gospel of Mark, which gives it its narrative outline, was written by John Mark, a Jew from Jerusalem. The sayings of Jesus which Matthew adds to Mark come from the Hebrew Gospel, translated from the Semitic original by the author of the Gospel of Matthew himself. In like manner, the author himself is a Jew, who understands Hebrew and lives in a Jewish Christian community. He retains a romantic attachment to all that is poetic and beautiful in Judaism. Nevertheless, it is clear to Renan that Christianity is something essentially new and different from Judaism, from its very inception in Jesus' spirit. It follows then that even though John Mark was Jewish, he wrote his gospel in Rome in the Greek language. Matthew chose this Greek-language gospel as his framework, not the Hebrew Gospel.

The Jewish Christianity which Renan retains for Matthew is folkloric and sentimental, not essential. Even though Matthew uses the Hebrew Gospel traditions and will not give

Paul the dignity of apostleship on the same level as the Twelve, he nevertheless incorporates Pauline ideas and embraces a universalism which goes beyond the mere mission to the gentiles. Just as in Renan's view, Jesus' Judaism became excess baggage for him as he realized the import of his own ideas, so the Judaism still present in Matthew is doomed to fall away by the logic of the new faith. Matthew can really only be Jewish Christian because he is in Syria where Christianity had not yet been overwhelmed by the gentile flood. If the Judaism of Matthew is merely "les enveloppes du bouton d'où est sortie la fleur", then Matthew's Jewish Christianity is no longer essential to his Christianity.

2.4

H.J. Schoeps

The work of H.J. Schoeps presupposes the early consensus view of the evolution of the catholic church. In the Patristic period, Schoeps' main area of research, he restricts the term "Jewish Christian" to those who hold the doctrines found in the sources of the Pseudo-Clementine literature (and a few other sources), whom he sees as the direct successors of the strict Jewish Christians of New Testament times. The author of Matthew was a member of the moderate Jewish Christian group. His gospel shows the characteristics of the developing catholic church and, on the whole, has no judaizing tendency. It was composed in Greek, probably in Syria, and perhaps on the basis of a Hebrew-language collection of sayings of Jesus.

Schoeps' Argument

Schoeps' main source for the reconstruction of Ebionite theology is the Pseudo-Clementine literature. Two Pseudo-Clementine works are now extant: the Clementine Homilies, and the Recognitions, the latter witnessed only in Syriac and Latin translation. Working in a tradition going back to the Tübingen School, Schoeps holds that these two are reworked forms of one Christian recognition novel, called "G" (for "Grundschrift"). This G was based on sources, one of which, the Kerygmata Petrou, is the clearest literary statement of Ebionite thought. While the Kerygmata Petrou is then the most direct source for Ebionite thought, in later work Schoeps also uses all sections of the reconstructed "G" which reflect Jewish Christian characteristics (identified on the basis of other literature) as source material.

Other literature is also pressed into service by Schoeps to illuminate Ebionism. The translation of the Old Testament into Greek by Symmachus, dated between A.D. 160 and 180, is of value since the Church Fathers tell us that Symmachus was an Ebionite. Jewish Christian gospels can be reconstructed to some extent. The Gospel of the Nazoreans and the Gospel of the Ebionites (he leaves out the Gospel of the Hebrews as too fragmentary) are known to us by quotations and references in the Church Fathers. Schoeps considers these two probably to be different editions of the one work, which was heavily dependent on Matthew. He

also uses the Gospel of Thomas since, in his opinion, it seems to presuppose the Aramaic Gospel of the Nazoreans. Finally, he makes use of reports in the Patristic and Rabbinic literature.

Working from the sources outlined above, Schoeps traces the theology of the Ebionites in the mid to late second century. Let us briefly examine their christology and their view of the law. Jesus was a teacher and model of pious conduct who, because he fulfilled the law, was made Messiah at the time of his baptism. This understanding precludes any pre-existence or divine nature in Jesus, and is thus truly an adoptionist christology. After his death he was raised and became an angelic being; it was believed that he would return to establish a supernatural kingdom. The early importance of the idea that Jesus was the true prophet like Moses (Dt 18:15) led to extensive later development of parallelism between Jesus and Moses. According to this, Moses and Jesus were commissioned by God to establish a covenant with mankind, Moses for the Jews, Jesus for the gentiles. Their teaching was held to be identical, and conversion to Christ was equivalent to conversion to God and the Jewish law.

Like their ancestors described in Acts 15:5 and 21:20, the Ebionites were all zealots for the law, but after their own peculiar fashion. They intensified the law in several ways. Their practice of vegetarianism overcame imperfections in the ritual slaughter of animals for food. They obeyed a commandment of poverty (their name comes from

'ebyon "poor"), and communal sharing of goods. Their purification regimen consisted of ritual washings culminating in baptism (distinct from initiatory baptism, which they also practiced). On the other hand, they rejected several parts of the Torah including all animal sacrifice, the Temple and the Israelite monarchy. Given this view of sacrifice, Jesus is portrayed as being in conflict with the priests rather than with the scribes as in the synoptic tradition; it also follows that his death was not seen as sacrificial and expiatory. The rejection of these institutions was squared with their strict law observance by a theory of false pericopae. According to this theory, the law and interpretation were passed from Moses to the seventy, who in turn passed them on (which equals the "oral law," comments Schoeps), but false pericopae were allowed to creep in to test the believers--those whom God loved being led to see the error of these. They finally came to the position that the law was to be judged on the basis of the life and teachings of Jesus. All of Jesus' critique of the law was intended to bring out again the unity between the law and the will of God.

Based on the oldest sources in the Pseudo-Clementines, Schoeps argues that the teaching of the strict Jewish Christians in the earliest community consisted of the following four points:

1. Jesus is the prophet like Moses, foretold in Dt 18:15, and is in fact greater than Moses or John the

Baptist.

2. Jesus taught the resurrection from the dead and was himself raised. He first appeared in humility, and is to return in glory.

3. Baptism is necessary for the forgiveness of sins and admission to the Kingdom of Heaven. It replaces animal sacrifice as means of cleansing and expiation.

4. Jesus prophesied the destruction of the Temple which perpetuated the sacrificial system.

These points are not too far from the teaching of the early catholic church, but are nevertheless on the trajectory leading to the ideas outlined above held by the Ebionites in the later second century.

Examination of the content of the early strict Jewish Christian group's teaching, seen in the light of its later development, convinces Schoeps that Matthew was not produced by the strict Jewish Christian group. He even goes so far as to assert that the Gospel of Matthew represents rather the developing catholicity, and as a whole has no judaizing tendency (Theologie 64).

Its catholicity notwithstanding, Schoeps still finds Jewish Christian characteristics in Matthew. He identifies these as:

- the tendency to see parallels between the lives of Moses and Jesus;
- the introduction of quotations of prophecy into the narrative of Jesus' life, especially of his childhood and Passion;

- the opinion that Jesus demanded fulfillment of the Mosaic Law (Mt 5:17f; 19:17f 23:23 etc.) and even supported the Pharisaic rules (23:3,23);
- the presentation of his preaching as a New Law;
- the great interest in proof from prophecy (e.g. Mt 1:22; 2:15; 12:17; 17:23; 21:4; 27:9 etc.)
- the restriction of Jesus' mission to Israel (Mt 10:5f; 15:24)
- the Jewish penchant for numerical patterns including the observation that the Gospel seems to rest on a Pentateuchal five-book arrangement of the Testimonies (Schoeps here follows B.W. Eacon's famous study) (Schoeps Theologie 64-65)

In a more general light, Matthew wished to set forth the new righteousness as better than the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees- and this very fact leads his gospel to have a scribal character. These Jewish tendencies must have been clear to those who produced the Jewish Christian gospels, since according to Schoeps, they chose Matthew as the most appropriate basis for their own gospel.

The firm conclusion that Matthew is not a product of the strict Jewish Christian community, followed by the observation of clear Jewish Christian tendencies within the gospel, lead to the conclusion that Matthew was produced by a moderate Jewish Christian within the developing catholic tradition.

Critique

Schoeps's restriction of the term "Jewish Christian" to the Ebionite tradition has not met with general approval. Marcel Simon is correct in classifying Schoeps' definition as one based on doctrine. Simon's fundamental criticism of this approach is that it does not seem to be possible to find any definition based on doctrine which can encompass all the known instances of Jewish Christianity (Simon "Reflections" 57-59). It seems to me, however, that such an objection could be answered fairly easily within Schoeps' system in the patristic period if Schoeps' work were consistent: one could simply assert that this is the definition chosen for Jewish Christianity, and therefore all those contrary "instances" to which Simon refers would by definition not be Jewish Christian, and would have simply to be given another name.

The fatal flaw in Schoeps' definition is that it is not consistent with his own usage of the term "Jewish Christian," most especially in the early period which interests us. According to his definition, the only Jewish Christians were those who held the Ebionite doctrines, and their ancestors who had split from the rest of the Jerusalem community at the death of James. But as we have seen, Schoeps accepts the early consensus view on the evolution of the catholic church and therefore the existence of a group of moderate Jewish Christians which did not split from the developing catholic church. When he refers to this latter group, which he says produced the Gospel of Matthew, he is

forced to distinguish awkwardly between this Jewish Christianity and his regular Jewish Christianity "im Sinne des späteren Trennungsebionitismus" (Theologie 64). The fact that he believes moderate Jewish Christian groups continued as distinct entities for a long period of time underlines the inconsistency in his usage. Most of these difficulties could be solved by simply calling his subject "Ebionism" and using Ritschl's terms "moderate" and "strict Jewish Christians."

The weaknesses of Schoeps work, however, run far deeper than mere terminological problems. His whole study of Ebionism rests on a very thin base. Not one of the Jewish Christian documents he uses has come to us complete in its original form. While the Pseudo-Clementine literature is still extant and is quite substantial, the Ebionite parts must be isolated by literary criticism. The Jewish Christian gospels are known only by comments and short quotations in the Church Fathers, and the analysis of these is so difficult that complete agreement cannot be reached on even such a fundamental point as how many Jewish Christian gospels these fragments represent. Extracting information on any form of early Christianity from Rabbinic sources is notoriously difficult. Symmachus's translation, even if we had it complete, would only give clues to Ebionite thought, as the Targums do for contemporary Jewish thought. The Church Fathers' comments are difficult to co-ordinate amongst themselves, are usually hostile, and are far from

being inside reports.

A case can be made that Schoeps exaggerates the difference between the writings he analyses and the developing early catholic tradition. He holds that the Jewish Christians chose Matthew as a basis for their gospels as it was the one most appropriate to them. Since this implies that they knew several gospels, it also implies a significant contact with the early catholic church. There is, however, no real need to assume that they chose Matthew for doctrinal reasons- studies such as those of Edouard Massaux show that from a very early time Matthew was the gospel par excellence, and was the gospel by far the most frequently quoted in documents of the early church. In the same way, the very fact that Schoeps feels he can write a history of this group based to a large extent on comments by Church Fathers, shows that his subject group was not totally ignored by the church leadership. That several important and, according to Schoeps, characteristic documents of theirs (especially the Kerygmata Petrou) appear as sources in a catholic book demonstrates that their influence was felt in the church beyond just the Fathers. While none of these observations invalidates Schoeps' work, they do suggest that the group (or groups) reflected in the writings he analyses may not have been as greatly distanced from the developing catholic tradition as he suggests.

Schoeps is unable to make effective use of his extensive work on the Ebionites when he classifies Matthew as moderate Jewish Christian, since Matthew does not fall

within the doctrinal tradition leading to Ebionism. As we have seen, he even admits that Matthew has on the whole no judaizing tendency (Theologie 64). He is thus forced to leave the domain of doctrinal tendencies, where his strong arguments are, and argue on the basis of mere Jewish Christian characteristics.

3.1

Introduction

This chapter presents a concise history of the argument put forward in favour of gentile Christian authorship of Matthew. The critical work reviewed here is in the same broad intellectual stream as that reviewed in the last chapter and it addresses the central problems of classifying Matthew. The form of this chapter will be the same as that of chapter two: the work of selected scholars (in this case, four scholars) will be considered in chronological order. Each review will open with a brief statement of the author's pertinent points set against the background of the appropriate schema of early church development; his arguments will then be presented in more detail, and finally will be critiqued.

The problem all these authors struggle with is how to determine the overall orientation of a gospel which contains both Jewish and gentile elements. A survey of these authors shows a growing sophistication in the method employed. Following the wise counsel of Baur, all reject simply adding up elements on either side to find which predominates numerically. Reuss applies the ideas of the mid-nineteenth

century and concludes that the Gospel of Matthew, as a complete work, does not show a Jewish party tendency. Weizsäcker refines this work by the use of source criticism. Within a gentile Christian gospel, authentic Jewish Christian source traditions have been dutifully recorded. The next refinement in this line of thought is provided by Nepper-Christensen. He argues that the Matthean community has gone through a major change, re-orienting the focus of its mission from the Jewish world to the gentile. This change is reflected within individual pericopae, and in the overall presentation of the gospel. The next logical step would be to show that the final redaction has taken the Jewish elements and in some way subsumed them to a gentile whole. But this final step has not yet been successfully taken. Strecker, the last author surveyed here, shows that Jewish elements are present not only in source material but also in the Matthean redaction. Unfortunately, his theory which resolves this dilemma in favour of gentile Christianity is so hard to test that it must be judged generally unsatisfactory. Thus after a century of advance and technical refinement, we now face the problem at the redactional level which was once faced at the level of the gospel as a whole: how does one determine the overall orientation of a gospel containing both Jewish and gentile elements?

Schema and Matthew's Place

Reuss is the earliest author surveyed to tend toward what we have called the "early consensus" view on the development of the church. Reuss situates the Gospel of Matthew at the end of the period of thesis and antithesis and at the time when the early catholic synthesis had just brought about the reconciliation of the earlier parties. Matthew is therefore not a party writing, and so not a Jewish Christian gospel.

Reuss says that the reminiscences of the apostles were passed on in the early church by means of oral tradition. These were later put in writing at various times (Hist of NT 163ff). In contrast to Baur, he accepts the growing consensus that Mark was the first gospel; he further holds that the Gospel of Mark is a revised and expanded version of a work written by John Mark of Jerusalem. In line with this opinion, he holds that Matthew was dependent on Mark for the material which the two gospels have in common, but "...for the discourses a particularly rich source was used... This source could certainly have been no other than the original writing of the Apostle Matthew." (Hist of NT 192)

Reuss's Argument

A careful comparison of Luke and Matthew did not convince Reuss that either of these gospels follows any party line in any precise or exclusive way. He certainly recognises the Jewish elements in Matthew, but feels that if

Matthew had really been a document of Jewish Christianity it would have found a way to omit scenes where Jesus praises the faith of gentiles (Mt 8:10; 15:28; etc.) and also perhaps the scene of Peter's denial, and would not have included aspects of what Reuss holds (with many of his contemporaries) to be material of a Pauline tendency (Mt 16:23; 20:28; 26:61), or expressing Christian universalism. He sets forth his reasoning on this quite clearly in several works. Two quotations should suffice to make his argument clear:

As proofs of the Jewish Christian tendency of the First Gospel (especially in comparison with Luke) are adduced: the genealogy of Jesus, i.1 (cf. Lk. iii.38), only from Abraham; the silence respecting the seventy disciples as representatives of all nations, while the twelve Apostles represent only Israel; the Parousia represented as to come before the Gospel had been preached outside of Palestine, x. 23; the Samaritans only mentioned to be excluded, x.5, cf. xv. 24, vii. 6; the first discourse of Jesus, with its declaration of the inviolability of the Law, v. 17f.; cf. also xi. 13 with Lk. xvi. 16, the former breaking off the point of the thought; the calling of the Gentiles, xxi. 11f., connecting with a condition which Luke, ch. xiv., omits; the sacredness of the Sabbath carried to the extreme, xxiv. 20; Peter expressly called the first Apostle (x. 2) and the rock upon which the Church is built (xvi. 17f.); the declaration of Jesus about the temple, xxvi. 61, represented as a false invention of his enemies; the eschatology wholly Jewish, xvi. 28, cf. Lk. ix. 27. But especially cf. Mt xxiv. with Lk. xxi.

Nevertheless it is to be maintained that no such tendency is consciously followed out by the author, nor is the history colored in the interests of party.- The idea of universality is plainly expressed, xxiv. 14, xxviii. 19, without the addition of Judaistic conditions; the exclusion of Israel in favor of the Gentiles appears in history, viii. 12, in parable, xx. 1ff., xxi. 28, 33 and even in the Baptist, iii. 9. The value of the Law is made to lie in the religious and moral element even more expressly than in Luke; cf. xxi. 40 with Lk. x. 26; xxiii. 33 with Lk. xi. 42. Indeed the fundamental principles of the so-called

Pauline tendency are not wanting even here, in the recorded discourses of Jesus, ix. 16f., xii. 8, xlii. 31f. The first to acknowledge Christ are the Gentiles, ii. 1ff., not the Jews, as in Lk. ii. 11ff.

The Gospel according to Matthew, as now extant, is not, therefore, a partisan writing, but a compilation, in which the author has faithfully and industriously collected the material of the history from the sources accessible to him. So far as the material exhibits in its details the coloring of a particular religious point of view, this coloring was already in it before it was used in this work, and was not the ground of its acceptance or rejection. (Hist of NT 195-196.)

Dans l'évangile selon Matthieu il y a une série de passages directement opposés à la tendance judaïsante, à l'esprit pharisaïque, qui demandait la circoncision des gentils et qui réservait le royaume de Dieu aux seuls membres du peuple juif. Il y en a d'autres qui renversent implicitement l'idée du caractère obligatoire de la loi mosaïque, ou qui dépassent, qui contredisent même les espérances vulgaires du judéo-christianisme.

Ainsi, l'universalité de la prédication évangélique est prédite et recommandée dans deux passages connus de tout le monde (Matth. XXIV, 14, et XXVIII, 19) et dont l'un exclut formellement toute idée de condition légale à imposer aux païens. Il y a plus. Ce même évangile revient à plusieurs reprises sur la perspective d'une déchéance des juifs, à qui Jésus annonce qu'ils se verront devancés et remplacés dans le royaume par ceux auxquels il n'avait pas été promis d'abord. Cette perspective se trouve dans l'histoire comme dans la parabole (Chap. VIII, 12; XX, 1 ss.; XXI, 28 ss., 33 ss.). Elle se trouve même déjà dans la bouche de Jean-Baptiste (Chap. III, 9.). Il est à remarquer que ces textes, qui abondent dans le sens de ce qu'on appelle la tendance de Luc, ne se trouvent pas même tous dans l'évangile de ce dernier. Le mot si connu du Seigneur sur l'impossibilité de mettre du vin nouveau dans de vieilles outres, se lit dans les deux livres (Matth. IX, 16, 17; Luc V, 36 ss.), et certes ce mot, sainement expliqué, condamne à lui seul le point de vue du judéo-christianisme étroit. La valeur de la loi est ramenée, des deux côtés, à son principe religieux et moral, à l'exclusion de la partie purement rituelle, mais bien plus expressément encore chez Matthieu que chez Luc (Luc X, 26; Matth. XXII, 40). De même, dans une autre occasion, c'est le premier de ces deux auteurs qui relève explicitement l'infériorité relative des préceptes lévitiques (Matth. XXIII, 23; cp. Luc XI, 42.). Si Jésus se met au-dessus du sabbat, Matthieu n'hésite pas plus que Luc à nous le dire

(Matth. XII, 8; Luc VI, 5.). Les paraboles du grain de sénevé et du levain, si contraires à l'esprit de l'eschatologie judaïque, ne lui manquent pas davantage (Chap. XIII, 31ss.). (Histoire 2:351-352)

Critique of Reuss

As noted earlier, Reuss is the first author surveyed here to tend toward the early consensus view of the development of the early church. He does however follow Baur's lead in posing the question of whether or not Matthew's gospel has an overall Jewish Christian character. Again like Baur, he often seeks to illuminate Matthew's basic character by comparing it with Luke. That he arrives at such a different conclusion is facilitated by a radical change in assumptions about the place of Matthew in the synoptic tradition. For Baur, Matthew is the first gospel, and has no "Tendenz" since it does not "stretch" the gospel from its original Jewish Christian form so as to fit a gentile or early catholic form. A Jewish Christian Matthew seen as the first gospel fits well in Baur's schema, as it might also in the early consensus schema. But if Mark is earlier, and is a source for Matthew, Matthew no longer has an obvious and natural place in Baur's schema or in the early consensus schema. If Matthew in fact used as a source a gospel which by Reuss's time was generally considered to be a product of the catholic synthesis, then it no longer follows naturally that Matthew is Jewish Christian. Adoption of the Two Source hypothesis within the Baur or early consensus schema logically reopens the question of whether or not Matthew is Jewish Christian. Reuss thus is

able to examine Matthew and draw his conclusion without a previous bias in favour of Jewish Christianity.

Reuss draws a very different conclusion from Baur, while both struggle with the same data. Baur concludes that Matthew is Jewish Christian and without "Tendenz," although he admits the presence of significant enough universalizing elements to situate it well beyond the initial Jewish Christian position. Reuss also sees these universalizing tendencies and finds Pauline elements, and concludes that Matthew must be situated after the "parties" had been reconciled in the catholic synthesis. The same elements are thus weighed somewhat differently by these two great scholars. This impasse shows the need of applying less subjective and more verifiable criteria to these elements so as to decide whether or not Matthew is Jewish Christian. This is what the present dissertation proposes to do.

3.3

C. von Weizsäcker

Schema and Matthew's Place

The view of the development of the early church worked out by Weizsäcker is closest to the early consensus schema. The early consensus schema developed out of Baur's views as modified by ideas such as those most clearly presented in Ritschl's critique. Weizsäcker's version of the early consensus contains more Ritschlian elements than is usual in authors who adopt the early consensus schema. While he admits that the Jewish Christian groups had a real influence

on the early catholic church, he argues that the catholic church developed essentially on a gentile basis, and was universalistic and free from the Jewish law. Since this gentile early catholic church was not a direct theological descendant of the Pauline mission (which established the first form of gentile Christianity), catholic Christianity could be called a "new" or "second" form of gentile Christianity.

The compilation of narratives on which the synoptics are based was first made in the early Jewish Christian church, and the discourse material in Matthew also comes from that same time and group. It is not clear when or in what group Weizsäcker situates the final redaction of Matthew. His comments seem to imply that our present form of this gospel comes in fact from the early catholic church and therefore from the new or second gentile form of Christianity.

Weizsäcker's Argument

Weizsäcker completely abandons Baur's Tendenz criticism of the gospels. For Baur, each gospel has a place in the battle between, or the reconciliation of, Jewish and gentile Christianity. Weizsäcker, on the other hand, believes that they represent a natural out-growth of the church's need and desire to hold to the teachings of Jesus and to be regulated by them. While the gospels are certainly different from each other, they are not tendentious in Baur's sense.

The critical tool which Weizsäcker does apply to the

gospels is source criticism. He distinguishes logia or discourses found in Matthew and Luke from a narrative source found in all three synoptics. We must now turn our attention to his view of the flow of the tradition from Jesus through the sources to Matthew.

An accurate reflection of Jesus and of his teaching was preserved by the early community in Jerusalem (Age II:34). There was in the first place a collection of sayings or discourses without an historical framework, which probably corresponds to the logia ascribed to Matthew by Papias' presbyter (Age II:44-45). The form the logia take in the Gospel of Matthew accurately reflects their form in the early Jewish Christian community: "What above all strikes the careful reader in Matthew's discourses is the observation that we are here still exclusively occupied with the secession of the Church from Judaism and its authorities" (Age II:44). The comparable passages in Luke reflect a later period in the Jewish Christian church (Age II:45).

Weizsäcker provides several short analyses to demonstrate that the discourses in the Gospel of Matthew are transmitted in a form that accurately reflects their form and usage in the early Jewish Christian church. The Sermon on the Mount, for instance, is obviously composite as is clear from its shifting audience and doubtful Sitz im Leben. But it is clear that it was put together for and by Jewish Christians, since the rules of conduct it espouses are given in contrast to the conduct of the world around them, a world

manifestly Jewish: 5:21-48 against the legal usages of the Scribes; 6:1-18 Jesus' judgement on and reform of pious usages; 6:19-34 worldly life versus perfect service of God. For several discourse sections outside the Sermon on the Mount, Weizsäcker argues that these accurately reflect Jesus or the usage of the early Jewish Christian church (or both).

In addition to these discourses, Weizsäcker distinguishes in the second place narratives about Jesus. Some of these circulated as detached units in the early Jewish Christian church, while others were collected into groups according to various principles. The early church passed on, reformed and added to these according to its needs, as was the case with the discourses. With the flight of the Jerusalem community to Pella and Jerusalem's subsequent destruction, the transmission of these traditions, as well as the transmission of the logia, to the church at large was almost completely brought to an end.

While Mark's Gospel best preserves the compilation of narratives on which our synoptics are based, it is Matthew who first combined the narratives and the logia. In fact, "... Matthew certainly made the first attempt at a history, i.e. he was the first to edit the whole existing material in the sources." (Age II:70) One source was presumably the Hebrew logia, of which Matthew used one of the various translations (Untersuchung 31-32). While he thinks that the author of Luke was a Pauline gentile Christian, he does not pronounce clearly on what Matthew was. On the one hand,

Matthew's material comes from the early Jewish Christian church (from an even earlier stage than Luke's), on the other hand Matthew in common with all the evangelists shows ideas that are universalist.

Critique of Weizsäcker

Weizsäcker's position on Matthew is radically different from Baur's. The real basis for Baur's assertions on Matthew is his Tendenz critique. While Weizsäcker shares a dialectical view of the development of Christianity, its particular expression in Tendenz criticism is completely dropped. Baur's second most important indication of Matthew's character is reversed. Baur felt that the overall presentation of Matthew demonstrated its Jewish Christian character, while individual examples were relatively poor guides. Weizsäcker, employing his source criticism, uses these very individual examples to show the Jewish milieu of Matthew's sources, leaving the character of the final redaction somewhat in question. One could summarize Weizsäcker's work on Matthew by saying that the presupposed Jewish milieu of the sources shows that they come from the early Jewish Christian church, while the final redaction of the Gospel is much later- implying probably the second, non-Pauline Gentile church.

3.4

Poul Nepper-Christensen

A significantly modified form of Baur's schema forms the background for Nepper-Christensen's thesis that Matthew is a gentile Christian gospel. In Baur's schema, Jewish and

gentile Christianity have separate beginnings, and interact as almost separate entities to produce early catholicism. According to Nepper-Christensen, the gentile Christian view comes into being in a dialectic struggle within Jewish Christianity. This internal struggle is brought about by the fact that gentiles accepted the gospel while, by and large, Jews rejected it. Nepper-Christensen's view could be assimilated to a growth model (like Daniélou's schema) were it not for the fact that the question of whether the mission is to be restricted to Jews or is rather to be primarily oriented toward gentiles, caused a real change in direction. The Matthean gospel was written from the gentile Christian point of view, at a time when the position that the mission should be directed to the gentiles had prevailed, but the struggle over this issue had not yet subsided.

Nepper-Christensen's Argument

Nepper-Christensen's conclusion that Matthew is gentile Christian is based on two types of argument. First, he reviews what he considers to be the central points of the traditional bases for classifying Matthew as Jewish Christian, and finds them wanting. Second, he looks at some Matthean special material, and shows how it indicates Matthew's gentile Christian character. This second type of argument is in part an attempt to demonstrate that Matthew shows a gentile shaping at the redactional level, although Nepper-Christensen does not use such terms.

The review of the traditional bases for calling Matthew

Jewish Christian starts with the testimonies from the early church which claim that Matthew was first written in "Hebrew." He finds these very questionable, but hesitates to dismiss them too quickly because of their unanimity. He therefore moves to a consideration of whether or not Matthew is in fact a translation from a Semitic-language original. Unable to find either support or conclusive reason to reject the idea on internal evidence alone, he looks at the relationship between the languages at use in Palestine in the first century. His conclusion from this study is that to write Matthew in Hebrew (a language not in popular use) would be a contradiction of its aims, and that the earliest written traditions about Jesus were written in Greek. This then contradicts the early church witnesses.

Nepper-Christensen next turns his attack to the traditional arguments based on analyses of the gospel of Matthew itself. Many have held that the Jewish character of the Gospel of Matthew can be demonstrated by the special role played by the concept of "fulfillment." Nepper-Christensen rejects this argument on the basis of a study of the formula quotations. He suggests that the formulaic introductions to these quotations may not have been written by the author of Matthew, but may merely have been received by him. Further, the Gospel of John has formula quotations which closely resemble Matthew's in form. In a more general way, "fulfillment" plays a similar role in all the gospels. One simply cannot decide whether the intended audience is Jewish or gentile Christian on the basis of comparative

statistics of Old Testament usage, when the role played by these quotations is the same in all the gospels! He also rejects as improbable the popular view that Matthew presents Israel, Moses and Elijah as "types" of Jesus.

The second type of argument presented takes the form of a review of special Matthean material, material which he holds to give positive evidence of gentile Christianity. The materials which he studies in greatest detail are Mt 10:5f, Mt 10:23 and the parable of the Canaanite Woman (Mt 15:21-28). Let us briefly look at his argument for the parable of the Canaanite woman. The first part of this pericope sets up an impenetrable barrier between Jews and gentiles, but then this only serves to highlight the fact that this barrier is broken in the latter part of the pericope. Thus the pericope as a whole shows a gentile bias. Nepper-Christensen sees in this pericope an older view that the mission should only be directed to the Jews being rejected and put in this newer framework in which the mission is conceived as directed primarily to the gentiles.

The process at work in the pericope of the Canaanite woman is indicative of the shaping of the gospel as a whole. Matthew was written at a time when the mission to the gentiles had already been underway for quite some time, but there was still a considerable struggle over it. There are many elements within the gospel which reflect the earlier exclusive orientation toward the Jewish mission. They however are reversed, as in the Canaanite Woman parable, by

elements assuming a priority for the gentile mission. The gospel opens with Wise Men from the East who bring presents to the Christ. Many interspersed elements give this pro-gentile-mission orientation, amongst which Nepper-Christensen lists: primarily Mt 24:14 and 28:18ff, but also Mt 13:38; 25:32; 26:13; 12:18ff; 5:13ff. The centurion recognizes the crucified Christ as Son of God. Most significantly, the whole gospel culminates by having the Risen Lord himself explicitly give the command to evangelize all nations- the new mission orientation from the Lord himself.

Critique

Early church traditions no longer have much influence on research into the background of Mark or John; it is curious how they have continued to have a major influence on research into Matthew. For this reason, Nepper-Christensen's examination of these statements plays a useful role. Also very useful is his review of pertinent opinions in twelve New Testament introductions published in the late nineteen forties and early fifties. The real interest of his work lies, however, in his overall claims about the gospel and his quasi-redaction critical method of supporting these claims.

The best arguments advanced are based on what contemporary phrasing might call redactional shaping. As pointed out earlier, such terminology is largely foreign to Nepper-Christensen's work, since redaction criticism as a

conscious discipline was still quite young when he wrote his thesis. Nor is his method exactly what most contemporary writers see as redaction criticism. He does not separate pericopae by form or source criticism, and then try to see what theological (or other) stand is implied by the way they are integrated into the gospel. Such analysis would not be useful, since he admits (as we shall shortly see Strecker does as well) that Jewish elements are indissolubly linked at almost all levels with non-Jewish elements. A more fundamental difference between his work and much redaction critical work is that he does not try to show that the tendency he isolates is the view of an individual. The identified tendency is rather one pole of a dialectic struggle, very much in the tradition of the Tübingen school, even though the struggle envisioned is different from the one postulated by the Tübingers.

The two poles which his quasi-redactional treatment brings out are on the one hand an older view that the Christian mission should be directed toward Jews (but not to the complete exclusion of gentiles) and on the other hand a newer view that the Christian mission should be directed toward the gentiles (but not to the complete exclusion of Jews). The earlier viewpoint may represent that of Jesus, and certainly represents an earlier stage of the community. It is part of the history of the early church. The latter view was occasioned by the general failure of the Jewish mission and the great success of the gentile mission. Thus, pericopae which contain elements in favour of Jewish

exclusivism, whose thrust is then reversed by their conclusion or the larger context, do reflect the historical experience of the Christian community. Such pericopae, with reversed meaning, are the natural result of the history of the Christian community. Since the final conviction of the majority of the community was that the Lord called them to a universal mission, it is again consistent with history that the general framework of the gospel, and the closing dominical command, explicitly undergird the mission to the gentiles.

This suggested view of the general shaping of Matthew raises at least two serious problems for Nepper-Christensen's contention that Matthew is gentile Christian. First, if Matthew is, as Nepper-Christensen claims, written for a gentile audience, how is it that it feels the need to take a position in an argument over the legitimacy of the gentile mission? If Matthew was written for gentiles, then those gentiles are, to a greater or lesser extent, the products of the acceptance of a gentile mission. They, if they preach the gospel, would be in a natural position to evangelize gentiles, not Jews. Why would it be necessary to have a gospel written for gentiles which argues in favour of what they are already doing? Surely that is a classic case of preaching to the converted! Several possible answers to this question might be advanced. Perhaps the first view of missions was so pervasive in the early community that it could not be eliminated from the record; or possibly gentile

questions about their place in the scheme of salvation had to be dealt with in this way; perhaps the struggle over the correct mission view was still so sharp that any Christian document, even one intended for gentiles only, had to argue the point. Some clear response to this question is required for Nepper-Christensen's argument, since he holds that the shaping in favour of the gentile mission is very fundamental in Matthew, from the Magi to the last words of the risen Christ.

The largest problem with the work reviewed here is that a change in mission orientation is not sufficient to demonstrate the gentile Christianity supposed by Nepper-Christensen. He is not unaware of this fact, but the true gravity of the problem is not brought out clearly in his work. Such a mission change could conceivably have been made within Jewish Christianity. Admittedly, this change in mission orientation is major, and could cause a break with the non-Christian Jewish world. But other elements of the Jewish community in the early Graeco-Roman world seem to have been actively and sometimes quite successfully proselytizing, yet they were still called "Jewish." The Jewish community also contained several sects, some of which rejected some or all of the rest of the Jewish community. Thus vigorous missionary activity and schisms may be poor grounds on which to replace the term "Jewish" by "gentile." Further, the fact that the postulated struggle over mission orientation went on within the tradition leading to Matthew might be taken as evidence that it was an intra-Jewish

Christian debate.

The real problem with selecting mission orientation as the key is that it does not touch an essential dividing point between Jews and gentiles. Is a Jewish Christianity with a new mission orientation really "gentile Christianity"? It is true that the success of the gentile mission meant that many gentiles entered the church. But was the theology or practice of these new gentile converts any different from that of the older ethnically-Jewish Christians? If there was no such real difference, then there is no useful distinction between "gentile Christians" and "Jewish Christians" except the ethnic one. "Gentile Christianity" would merely be the sum of gentile believers, "Jewish Christianity" the sum of Jewish believers.

The critical shortcoming that a new mission orientation may not be a sufficient proof of Matthew's gentile character is a fault this thesis hopes to rectify. The tradition in which Nepper-Christensen's work is written, and the importance he attaches to determining the place of Matthew, both suggest that he does assume a significance for the term "gentile Christianity" beyond a mere ethnic label. The addition needed to his case is to identify something which, unlike mission orientation, was an essential characteristic which might set Matthew apart from Jewish Christianity. The following chapters of this thesis will focus on precisely this problem, attempting to show that at least one important, identifying element of Judaism- dietary purity-

is absent from Matthew. This element, it will be argued, is (unlike mission orientation) indicative of a sufficiently radically different view of religion to justify the term "gentile Christianity."

3.5

Georg Strecker

Baur's schema forms the basis for Georg Strecker's view of the development of the early church. The Jewish Christian, Semitic language church was centred in Jerusalem from the time of its foundation until the Edict of Hadrian took effect, the flight to Pella being a later invention. Hellenist Jews learned the gospel from this community, and took it to the gentiles. Although the Jerusalem community itself observed the law, at the Apostolic Council it approved the law-free mission to the gentiles. The so-called Apostolic Decree later introduced certain laws for the gentiles so as not to endanger the ritual purity of Jewish Christians at meals with gentile Christians. The distinction between Aramaic-speaking and Hellenist Jewish Christians does not correspond to the division between strict and moderate Jewish Christians in the early consensus schema. The Hellenistic Jewish Christians observed the law just as did the Aramaic-speaking Jewish Christians, although for both the law had been relativized by their call in Christ. We will not trace in any detail Strecker's reconstruction of the later development of the Palestinian community, since its history after the very early stages had little if any influence on Matthew. Suffice to say that it

followed a path of accelerating return to a principle of legal observance. It should be noted that gentile Christianity followed a parallel but completely independent path to a religion based on a principle of legal observance.

The Matthean community was established by Hellenistic Jewish Christians. The author of the gospel comes from the second generation of this community. By this time in the Matthean community, and presumably in most Christian communities west of Palestine, gentiles had become the majority and had taken the lead in teaching, theology and missions. This brought about a change from Jewish Christianity, creating a gentile Christianity which was different from Jewish Christianity in non-trivial ways. For instance, its freedom from the law was complete rather than relative. Gentile Christianity's understanding of the Christian message, and especially of the sacrament, was influenced by the mystery religions. It was still subject, however, to strong Jewish Christian influences especially in the areas of ethics and liturgy. It probably adopted the form of the synagogue service, including the recitation of a Psalm, a Scripture lesson, sermon and blessing. It was in part the pressure of the "lesson" from the Jewish Scriptures which led the gentile Christian community to develop its own scripture. Matthew was a teacher who filled a formally commissioned office in his community. He wrote his gospel, using Mark, Q and his own community's Jewish Christian oral tradition. The goal of the book was to fulfill the kerygmatic task of the Christian teacher in the worship

service, in instructing catechumens, and in teaching in a more general sense.

Argument

In his Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit Strecker considers the problem of whether or not the Gospel of Matthew is Jewish Christian. He begins his investigation by ruling out reference to the ancient note by Papias: as with other gospel issues, this one must be resolved on the basis of criticism of the text alone. For his analysis he elects to follow the majority of New Testament scholars and assume the Two Source hypothesis of synoptic relationships. Having set these general parameters for his study, Strecker opts not to presuppose any particular definition of Jewish Christianity. Although he will of course eventually integrate his conclusions on Matthew into the schema he has adopted for early Christianity, he presumably does not wish to restrict at the outset the term "Jewish Christianity" to his schema alone. He sets out rather to examine Matthew element by element, testing each as he goes for possible Jewish character. This method, at least in principle, would allow him to find Jewish elements in Matthew whether or not they corresponded to his own view of the character of Jewish Christianity. His final conclusion is that Matthew does not show such characteristics as would allow one to conclude that this gospel was written in any sort of a Jewish Christian environment. Let us review his main arguments.

Strecker holds that if Matthew were Jewish, one should

expect to find Semitisms beyond the mere influence of the Septuagint. He deals first with the question of Aramaic influence. On the basis especially of the use of archesthai, he argues that Matthew of all the gospels shows the least Aramaic influence. Leaving aside subtle influences, there are of course a few actual Aramaic words in the text. These, however, come from the tradition and not from the Matthean redaction. Matthew actually reduces their number when compared to Mark.

Having rejected the idea of demonstrable Aramaic influence, Strecker holds that Greek-Semitic bilingualism could then only be supported by indications of Matthean knowledge of the Hebrew text of the Bible. On a study of the evidence, Strecker concludes that in quotations taken from Mark or Q, Matthew usually follows his Marcan or Q source, but when he varies from this the change is motivated by a free use of the Septuagint rather than the Masoretic text type. The Matthean quotations not taken from Mark or Q he finds also either to be directly taken from the Septuagint or at least based on the Septuagintal text type rather than the Masoretic text. A small residue of texts which do in his opinion reflect the Masoretic text or a Jewish setting come from pre-Matthean tradition. For instance, Christ's words from the cross (Mt 27:46) represent a variant tradition Matthew knew and chose because that form better explained why bystanders thought Jesus was calling Elijah.

In the preceding examples, Strecker is in general able

to demonstrate, at least to his own satisfaction, that the so-called Jewish elements do not stand up to scrutiny. A number of texts, however, do show true Jewish characteristics. This he does not deny, but deals with this problem in the same way as he does with certain of the Aramaisms and Scriptural quotes: he argues that the Jewish element is part of the tradition which Matthew has received and transmits, but that it is not part of Matthew's redactional work. The traditional Jewish material in fact often stands in tension with the Matthean redactional material. Strecker thus contrasts Mt 23:23, where the reader is told to do and keep whatever the scribes and Pharisees say and Mt 16:11, where the reader is warned to beware of their teaching. This tension is not to be resolved by a more subtle reading of the overall intent of the gospel. The positive evaluation comes from the tradition Matthew has received and passes on; the negative from his own contemporary views.

Redactional sections may also show Jewish influence, but this is not because Matthew or his community is Jewish, but rather because Jewish traditions have been transmitted to Matthew's time from an earlier stage when the community was Jewish Christian. Mt 5:32 introduces the restrictive clause parektos logou porneias to the Q source's general rejection of divorce (Lk 16:18). Some have alleged that a parallel with Shammai's position here is evidence of a Jewish character in Matthew's gospel. Strecker argues that

if Matthew had wished to add something new to his community's understanding of divorce it would have been necessary to give them a much more detailed argument. The simple way in which this restriction is added shows rather that the exception for porneia was likely something already being practiced in the Matthean community. This addition then comes not from any direct Jewish influence on Matthew, but rather was received from the tradition in which Matthew lived. If it is a Jewish influence, the influence was exercised on the community before Matthew's time.

It is clear to Strecker that Jewish additions come from the tradition and not from Matthew himself because what he himself adds sometimes stands in contradiction to rabbinic Jewish custom. For example, to interpret Zechariah's word (Mt 21:5) as meaning two animals does not square with the Jewish tradition. Strecker also feels that there is evidence that the Jewish Sabbath laws were stronger than supposed in Mt 12:11, where a person may save an animal which has fallen into a well.

Strecker further argues that Matthew clearly demonstrates consciousness of his own distance from the synagogue, and of the distance of Christianity from Judaism. This is first to be seen in such simple things as Matthew's references to "your" tradition (15:6) and "their" scribes (13:52; 23:34) and "your" or "their" synagogue. The distance from Judaism is thrown into sharp relief in Mt 15:1-20. That it contains anti-Jewish polemic is clear from the Matthean insertion of 15:12-14 against the Pharisees.

The Marcan list of vices is adjusted to the wording of the Decalogue, and the conclusion that "to eat with unwashed hands does not defile a person" is added. These changes lay the emphasis more clearly than in Mark on the "Christian" moral law in contrast with the ceremonial law, which is characteristic of Jews and which is unequivocally rejected by the Matthean redactor. Strecker feels that only by starting with the erroneous assumption that Matthew is Jewish Christian could one be led to think that Matthew is merely subordinating ritual food law to moral law.

Cultic observance of the Sabbath had also been eliminated in the Matthean community. The famous Matthean addition "nor on the Sabbath" (Mt 24:20) is not a Matthean addition, but rather the Matthean restoration of the underlying Jewish apocalyptic source, perhaps on the basis of his own community's tradition. Matthew passes on Marcan stories of healings on the Sabbath, and even introduces a new one (Mt 12:9-14), clearly showing that Sabbath observance is not assumed. Mt 12:1-8 justifies the breaking of the Sabbath. Strecker has an interesting interpretation of this pericope's closing words "I wish mercy and not sacrifice." "Sacrifice," he contends, represents the whole ceremonial law (Sabbath included), while "mercy" represents ethical conduct. To follow Jesus' decision is to acknowledge that his new order is characterized by ethical law, while the ceremonial law is now a thing of the past. The same conclusion is drawn from Mt 12:12.

Another indication of the distance between Matthew and Judaism is to be found in the retreat from the Jewish term "Rabbi." In Matthew the term is only used by Judas, in a traditional warning about the "Christs," and in the command not to be called "Rabbi" (Mt 23:7f).

In contrast to this distancing from Judaism is the Matthean attitude toward the gentile world. The closing admonition to evangelize all nations represents the Matthean community's overall view of the place of the mission and of the nations. In the history of salvation, Israel as a people has been rejected (the parable of the Vineyard and the Tenants, and the parable of the Marriage Feast) and the message goes to all people without distinction (and so basically to gentiles, but of course not rejecting Jews as individuals). In the same way the final judgement is to encompass all mankind. The disparaging uses of the terms ethnikos and ethnē sometimes come from the the tradition, but when they are redactional they refer to the hardened pagan.

The unambiguously gentile character of the redactional framework of Matthew leads Strecker to conclude that Matthew is gentile Christian. However, the presence of traditional Jewish elements, and some Jewish elements in the redactional work lead him to postulate that the Matthean community has a Jewish Christian past. This gentile Christian community must be a newer generation which is replacing the older Jewish Christian generation in the community. The older community from which the Matthean redactor's community

evolved explains the embedded Jewish Christian traditions and influences. Jewish Christianity continued to influence Matthew and his community only insofar as that influence could be integrated into the gentile Christian way of life. The independence of these gentile Christian elements places Matthew squarely with gentile Christianity and makes of it a major contributor in the early stages of the development toward the early catholic church.

Critique

The interest of this chapter is Strecker's argument that the Gospel of Matthew is gentile Christian, not in his more detailed view of the history of the Matthean community and of the Matthean redactor's role in that community. His comments about the formally commissioned office of teacher in the early Christian community are highly speculative, and hardly subject to verification from any other source for the early period. Such ideas are not essential to his general argument and will not be discussed in this critique.

The consensus of modern criticism is that the Greek book of Matthew is not a translation of a Semitic-language original. Nor is Aramaic or Hebrew influence on Matthew's Greek a major argument used by modern writers to argue for Matthean Jewish Christianity. Strecker's contention that Matthew follows his sources or the Septuagint is probably correct. The Septuagint was, however, originally translated for and by Greek-speaking Jews. It could thus be argued that Matthew was a member of a Hellenistic Jewish Christian

community which was not well versed in Hebrew and used the Septuagint. In general, arguments in this area are not of great value for arguing that Matthew's gospel should be considered gentile Christian.

Strecker's arguments involving a division between tradition and redaction are more ~~a~~ *à propos* of modern discussions. His individual examples are valuable, but an opponent could be excused for thinking that Strecker has assumed his conclusion before starting his proof. His general contention that Jewish materials are to be found in sections from the tradition, gentile in redactional sections, is clear. Since Marcan and Q materials could be deemed traditional, this contention could, to a large extent, be confirmed or called into question by a careful comparative study. Strecker, however, goes on to allow that some redactional sections show Jewish influence. As soon as this is admitted, any sort of controlled testing of his hypothesis becomes almost impossible. He theorizes that Jewish elements in the redaction come from the Jewish Christian elements which remained from an earlier stage in Matthew's gentile Christian community. What criteria could an impartial reviewer of this theory use to distinguish between Jewish Christian characteristics Matthew showed because he lived in a Jewish Christian community versus those he showed because his community retained earlier Jewish Christian characteristics? Until this question is answered, Strecker's arguments based on tradition and

redaction must be viewed with suspicion.

Texts which show a distance between Matthew and Judaism put Strecker's argument on firmer footing. But even here, some of his arguments suffer crippling weaknesses, often because this distance is explicitly or implicitly grounded in a distinction between "moral law" and "ceremonial law." While distinctions between moral law and ceremonial law were once heavily relied upon to show the evolving distance between Christianity and Judaism, such is no longer the case. His interpretation of "mercy" as "moral law" versus "sacrifice" as "ceremonial law" (Mt 12:8) has not received general assent. In fact, the distinction between moral and ceremonial law is not made explicitly in Matthew. This is a very difficult distinction, which may vary from group to group at a given time, and may be subject to change with time. While this distinction has been very important for research in the last century and a half, such a distinction is rarely evident in the New Testament texts. It follows from this that arguments which avoid the distinction between "moral" and "ceremonial" law, and deal rather with actual laws referred to in early Christian literature are more likely to be defensible.

Within the domain of what is generally called ceremonial law, Strecker deals specifically with purity and Sabbath observance. His argument that "nor on a Sabbath" (Mt 24:20) represents a restoration of the underlying Jewish apocalyptic source sounds again as if he assumes what needs to be shown. The healing stories and commentaries may, as

he suggests, justify not keeping the Sabbath. But others could argue they merely justify a change in the understanding of Sabbath observance.

Much stronger is his contention that Matthew rejects Jewish ritual dietary purity observances. He correctly identifies "to eat with unwashed hands does not defile a person" as a Matthean redactional conclusion, and in a footnote argues, against Gerhard Barth, that this pericope must imply the abolition of food laws. The argument is weakened, however, by making this only an instance of the more general rejection of ritual observance. The fundamental insight that a Matthean community which rejects dietary purity is inconsistent with an observant Jewish Christianity is sound, and forms the basis of the thesis I defend. It needs, however, to be distanced from the difficult general questions of ceremonial law, and each of its parts should be defended in detail. Most importantly, it must be shown that dietary purity is not just another "Jewish element" to be counted up for or against a particular background. All of this Strecker fails to do.

The strongest argument Strecker advances for the gentile Christian character of the Gospel of Matthew is based on the conclusion and overall shaping of the gospel. The closing of the gospel with the admonition to evangelize all the nations gives the movement to the gentiles a privileged place. The fact that the future is seen with the presence of Christ (Mt 28:20) amongst the nations, taken

with the parables of the Vineyard and the Marriage Feast certainly do seem to suggest a movement from Israel to the nations. Strecker's argument that this is the view of the gospel as a whole is not easily overthrown by contradictory elements within the gospel.

3.6

Conclusion

Georg Strecker's work represents a valuable attempt to show that the Gospel of Matthew is gentile Christian on the basis of a division between traditional and redactional material. His strongest arguments have to do with the general shaping of the gospel, most clearly seen in the addition of the closing commission to evangelize the nations. Equally sound is his basic intuition that nothing is proven simply by adding up Jewish versus gentile elements: they must rather be apportioned to tradition or redaction. Those skeptical of his conclusions may well, however, question how he divides between traditional and redactional material.

There remains one crucial problem with Strecker's work, even if one accepts his division between the active contributions of Matthew and traditional material. Once it is determined what Matthew contributed, how gentile does this have to be for Matthew to be gentile Christian? Or, how much of the Jewish Christian tradition must be superseded or rejected for the label "Jewish Christian" no longer to fit? Having wisely abandoned simply balancing Jewish and gentile elements in Matthew, are we now called to

balance Jewish and gentile elements in the redactional material? What is called for is a dividing line. Are there critical issues identified in first century documents which divide Jewish Christianity from gentile Christianity? Are these issues sharp and clear enough to discriminate unequivocally between groups? If such issues existed, then they and not some tally sheet with two columns should be the arbitrator of whether or not Matthew was Jewish Christian. The next chapter of this dissertation will argue that there are such critical issues.

4.1

Introduction

F.C. Baur's method of classifying the Gospel of Matthew was studied in chapter two and judged unsound. That part of his reasoning which is intimately associated with the Griesbach hypothesis must be rejected if the Two Source hypothesis is adopted. But even Baur's fundamental arguments which consider Matthew on its own merits, independently of its relationship to the other synoptic gospels, were rejected. These fundamental arguments, we may recall, hold that Matthew represents "Eine immanente Entwicklung aus dem Judentum..."¹ This line of reasoning was rejected not because the steps in his argument were faulty but because its point of departure- the nineteenth century understanding of first century Judaism- was faulty. Having opted for the Two Source hypothesis, this thesis must reject Baur's view of the relationship of Matthew to Luke and Mark. A careful study of Matthew's relationship to Judaism would be a reasonable way to evaluate Matthew's Jewish or gentile Christian character, but only if it could be based on something firmer than the nineteenth century's view of first century Judaism.

The second and third authors reviewed in chapter two, Ernest Renan and H.J. Schoeps, are representative of modern scholarship in adopting the early consensus schema, and classifying Matthew within that schema as moderate Jewish Christian. Renan accepted the growing evidence that Mark was written before Matthew, and that Matthew used Mark as a framework. His conception of Matthew as growing serenely out of Judaism accounts nicely for its Jewish content, but does not deal adequately with either the sharp conflict between Jews and gentiles in the church reflected in the New Testament, or even with the difficulty of the separation from Judaism which Renan alludes to elsewhere in his writings. Schoeps' approach is much more analytic, but scarcely more helpful. On the one hand he finds Jewish Christian characteristics in the gospel of Matthew, while on the other he sees that it cannot be situated within the Ebionite sphere. He thus classes it, almost by default, as moderate Jewish Christian. Both of these authors' conclusions depend heavily on the presence of Jewish characteristics in Matthew. This fact makes their work weaker than Baur's, since he argued convincingly that these Jewish characteristics cannot on their own bear the burden of proof. Their work is further disappointing in that, like Baur's, it fails to determine clearly the position of Matthew on the decisive issues which divided Jews from gentiles in the first century church.

The authors surveyed who argue for a gentile Matthew

(chapter three) have not been more successful than their opponents in escaping the impasse caused by the failure to base their classification on authentic, first century criteria. Baur's Tendenzkritik is rejected, and replaced by an attempt to discern the overall thrust or shaping of the gospel. More sophisticated methods are called upon to show that the Jewish elements of the gospel tend to be earlier in the tradition, and that later tradition and redaction show fewer of these Jewish elements. But while the methods are more refined, the same crucial questions remain: how does one determine the overall aim of the gospel? Given the fact that modern perceptions of first century Judaism are often inadequate and always incomplete, how does one determine what is or is not a Jewish element? How many Jewish elements in the gospel, or in the redaction, or even apparently underlying the redactional shaping, does it take to make Matthew Jewish Christian? Since these questions are not answered on the basis of authentic, first century criteria, the classification of Matthew by these authors remains very problematic.

Baur and his successors had in hand the means to evaluate Matthew's relationship to first century Judaism, but failed to see it. It was Baur's analysis of I Corinthians, Acts and Galatians which led him to postulate two types of Christianity, divided on certain central issues. These very texts had shown him the line where Jews within the church had felt it necessary to say, "No; this far and no further!" If Baur had tried to integrate Matthew

into his schema on the basis of the same issues he used to construct that schema, he would have been able to transcend his own century's misunderstanding of Judaism. In this chapter, we will return to the texts Baur and his successors used as evidence of a division within the church. This division, since it is evidenced within the texts themselves, does not depend on any modern understanding of first century Judaism. It rather takes note of lines of demarcation as they are recorded in the Acts of the Apostles and the letters of Paul. The goal of this chapter is to determine what criteria taken from these first century texts themselves may be applied to Matthew to determine on which side of this line of demarcation Matthew stands.

4.2

Galatians

A record of several incidents which interest this dissertation is to be found in Paul's letter to the Galatians. In the early part of this letter Paul recounts two sharp controversies in which there was some tension regarding the applicability to gentile Christians of certain Jewish practices. In the first the issue was circumcision. In the second, the issue was in some way related to Jewish dietary purity. In both cases, Paul argues that according to his gospel, converts to Christ are not bound to observe Jewish practice.

In narrating the first incident, Paul tells the Galatians that his gospel, by which gentile Christians might remain uncircumcised, was accepted by the pillars of the

Christian church at a meeting in Jerusalem.² This represents a link in his argument against opponents who, in addition to questioning his status, were apparently telling the Galatians that they should adopt certain Jewish practices.³ Paul insists that when he set out his gospel before the influential men of Jerusalem, they accepted it. The first evidence that Paul adduces to prove this is that "Titus who was with me, even though he is a Greek, was not constrained to be circumcised" (Gal 2:3).⁴ This statement is followed by the explanation "dia tous pareisaktous pseudadelphous" (Gal 2:4). The grammatical relationship with the preceding is unclear, but we may probably read it as the explanation of why the question of circumcision had arisen concerning Titus: "because of the false brothers who had sneaked in." "False brothers"⁵ had asked that gentile believers be circumcised. Paul feels that to yield to them would have been to yield to enslavement. He insists that he resisted them⁶ "in order that the truth of the gospel (he aletheia tou euaggeliou) might remain continually with you [the Galatians]" (Gal 2:5). The influential men of Jerusalem saw that Paul had been entrusted with the gospel to the uncircumcised as Peter had been to the circumcised (Gal 2:6-10).⁷ Paul sees this as proven by their giving the right hand of fellowship. The influential men of the Jerusalem church thus agreed that those gentiles who were converted might legitimately remain uncircumcised, as demonstrated by the case of Titus.⁸ Traugott Holtz notes that the Council clearly decided against the necessity of

circumcision for gentile Christians, but in so doing it did not eliminate the difference between Jews and gentiles, but rather confirmed that distinction (Holtz 353). If this line of thinking is pursued, one might claim that it was this Council which first recognized different positions for Jewish Christianity and gentile Christianity.

The second incident which Paul narrates is the division in the Antiochene Christian community between Jews and gentiles at meals. There Paul opposed Peter to his face "because he stood condemned (kategnōsmenos ēn)" (Gal 2:11). The account represents another link in Paul's argument against opponents who were apparently telling the Galatians that they should adopt certain Jewish practices. Peter had been making it his practice to eat with the gentiles (the verb is in the imperfect). The context makes it clear that Paul approved of this practice and followed it himself. But when some came down from James, Peter made it his practice to draw back and separate himself (both verbs again in the imperfect) as did the rest of the Jews including Barnabas. The issue focused on here, then, is one in which Jews withdrew and separated themselves as a group from the gentiles at meals. It is reasonable to conclude that they withdrew out of consideration for some aspect of Jewish purity. Since it was specifically at meals, dietary purity in a broad sense seems to have been at issue.

This account preserves the earliest record of a real, physical division between Jews and gentiles within the early

Christian church. This point is so critical to Jewish self identification, that it is only in this context of eating with gentiles or of refraining from eating with Gentiles that Paul uses the terms living "in a gentile manner (ethnikos)" rather than "in a Jewish manner (Ioudaikos)". The letter to the Galatians does not give precise motives for the Jewish objection to eating with gentiles. However, questions of what food may be eaten, under what circumstances and in what company represent one of the best attested traditional divisions between Jews and gentiles.⁹ This division is attested in Jewish sources and in gentile sources, as outlined in the first two excurses at the end of this chapter.

The incident at Antioch is of central importance because it shows how divisions between Jews and gentiles characteristic of the age continued to divide Jew and gentile within the Christian church. The meeting in Jerusalem admitted gentiles into the Christian church without circumcision. On this basis Holtz argues that the council did not eliminate the difference between Jews and gentiles but rather confirmed the continued validity of an existing distinction within the Christian church. The incident at Antioch confirms that at least James may have interpreted the Jerusalem decision in this way. To Paul such an understanding was anathema.¹⁰

In Gal 2:14a Paul states his view that the observance of distinctive Jewish dietary practice at meals, at least in a community with gentile Christians, is a rejection of his

understanding of the gospel. In Gal 2:6 he spoke of not yielding to those who advocated circumcision for the sake of hē alētheia tou euaggeliou. Here he sees that in separating themselves at meals, the Jews "ouk orthopodousin pros tēn alētheian tou euaggeliou." The exact meaning of orthopodousin is not clear.¹¹ It is clear, however, that in Paul's view to accept distinct Jewish practice at meals, at least in a congregation including gentiles, puts these Jews in the same situation as those who advocated circumcision: they are not proceeding in line with the truth of the gospel.

Starting at Gal 2:14b Paul argues that observing Jewish purity law is a rejection of the gospel he preaches: "If you [Peter] being a Jew live in a gentile and not a Jewish manner, how is it possible that you compel the gentiles to Judaize (pōs ta ethnē anagkazeis ioudaizein)?" (Gal 2:14).¹² What does Paul mean by ioudaizein? Does he mean that somehow Peter, in stressing Jewish dietary purity, was by implication telling the gentiles that they too should practice Jewish dietary purity? Was his separation in fact a condemnation of gentiles, and a clear implication that they should go all the way and become Jews? To pose the question in this second way is to miss the point of Paul's argument. E.P. Sanders has convincingly demonstrated that Paul's analysis of the human predicament, and of the shortcomings of Judaism, do not flow directly from Paul's experience of the human condition but rather are deductions

worked out from his overwhelming experience of being in Christ. Paul makes the crucial point, which Sanders argues lies at the heart of his polemic against the law, in the following argument against Peter's action: "if righteousness is through the law, then Christ died for no purpose" (Gal 2:21). Paul's belief is, of course, that Christ's death most certainly did have a purpose, and that it was effective in bringing about justification. Applying to Paul's declaration the rule of logic that if A implies B, then not B implies not A, gives the result that "if Christ died for a purpose, then righteousness is not through the law." This is the exact conclusion which Sanders argues that Paul then applies to the Jewish law. If Christ had to die to bring justification, then justification must not be available in any other way, specifically it must not be available through the Jewish law. This type of reasoning lies behind his argument with Peter, and explains his accusation of Peter, and his conviction that Peter's actions were a rejection of the gospel. Whether or not Peter and the others actively urged the gentile Christians to "Judaize" in any general sense is not the central issue. In separating themselves and showing the gentiles that they saw a real role for Jewish purity law in the situation even of the Antiochene Christian community, they were allowing a role for the Jewish law which Paul reserved for Christ alone. Paul's feelings are so deep at this point, that when he sees that the Galatians may have been persuaded in a similar way to accept a role for Jewish law in the place of

Christ (as Paul sees it), he exclaims, "O foolish Galatians, who has bewitched you... did you receive the Spirit from works of the law, or from the obedience of faith?" (Gal 3:1). Thus what Paul means by "ioudaizein" is "to practice Judaism," whether in whole or in part, rather than to depend only on Christ. Thus as Paul saw it, in practicing dietary purity in that situation, Peter was rejecting the gospel by introducing the Jewish law where only Christ had a place.

Paul takes great pains in the letter to the Galatians to set his view on a solid theoretical basis. He feels that Christians are not subject to the Jewish law at all, and certainly not to considerations of Jewish dietary purity or to the other issue of this letter, circumcision. Paul can hardly be accused of not trying to be clear as he adds explanation to explanation to convince the Galatians that their justification is a matter of faith in Christ and not a matter of obedience to the law. The law once had its place, but has it no more: "... the law was our paidagōgos to Christ, in order that we might be justified from faith; since faith has come, we are no longer under a paidagōgos" (Gal 3:24-25). This assertion in Paul's view applies to all who are in Christ, since "there is neither Jew nor Greek... for we are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal 3:28). Thus Paul's opposition to Peter's practice in Antioch had a theoretical basis which was carefully expounded to the Galatians.

The theoretical basis of Paul's opponents is not given

in Galatians. A great deal of energy has been expended by commentators in trying to imagine why those who came down from James advocated separation at meals, what Paul's opponents in Galatia were saying and why they were saying it. But history has transmitted only Paul's explanations, not his opponents'. While the theoretical basis of their position may never be known, they almost certainly had one, and it was convincing enough to sway believers in Jerusalem, Antioch and, Paul greatly fears, Galatia. Whatever their unknown theory, it could certainly draw on ample traditional bases. Circumcision had long been a distinguishing mark of those following the God of Israel, with solid basis in the canonical scriptures. The same may be said for dietary purity, as can be seen in Lev 11-16, Dt 14:3-21 and the many texts cited in this chapter's first excursus.

The two issues discussed so far have opposite outcomes. The first issue is resolved to Paul's satisfaction. The gentile in question is accepted by the leaders as a Christian without circumcision, a decision which Paul takes as a confirmation of his understanding of the gospel. In the second, the issue is some way related to dietary purity. In this case those he cares most about- Peter and Barnabas- are swayed to observe the aspect of Jewish dietary purity which is at question. If the earlier agreement confirms Paul's understanding of the gospel, Paul takes this disagreement as a violation of his view of the gospel, just as he takes the Galatians' possible conversion to the ideas of his opponents as a betrayal of his gospel.

To classify Matthew it is essential to note the real divisions in early Christianity, not to speculate on the unknowable. Paul tells us that some had objected to uncircumcision amongst gentile Christians, but that in Jerusalem the pillars had accepted Paul's mission to convert gentiles to Christianity without imposing circumcision. This difference of opinion about what was required- or perhaps merely desired- of gentile Christians was either continued or re-emerged, since Paul fights it in this letter to the Galatians. Circumcision is not mentioned with respect to the Antiochene incident. At that time, the Christian community was split into two groups at meals: one group included all the Jews (save Paul) and presumably observed Jewish dietary purity; the other group included all the gentiles (and Paul) and presumably conducted itself in a non-Jewish way. Peter did not adopt a mediating position. At first he lived as a gentile with respect to meals. When certain people came down from James, he did not mediate: he went over to their position. There was no grey zone: with the sole exception of Paul, all the Jews separated at meals; all the gentiles ate as gentiles.

4.3

Acts

The book of Acts has always been an indispensable source for research into the development of the early church. Its perspective on the tensions between Jews and gentiles in Christianity and in particular on the so-called Apostolic Council is of particular interest.

The narrative of Peter's vision, the conversion of Cornelius and the sequel in Jerusalem bear on the question of commensality and dietary purity (Acts 10:1-11:18). (On the present writer's view that the contents of this and other related sections in Acts explain Luke's Great Omission, see the introduction, note 11.) The critics who question the historical basis of Acts 10:1-11:18 have some very well-founded arguments on their side.¹³ Since there is no independent evidence for any of this account, it is best not to base any arguments on a presumption that the events narrated actually took place, at least when and as described. What this narrative does reflect, however, is at least Luke's perception of certain tensions in the early Christian community. He knows that the first Christians were all Jewish, but that shortly some gentile converts were made. The first community of gentile Christians in Luke's account is the household and friends of the gentile Cornelius. Peter is persuaded to go and associate with these gentiles through a vision. In this vision something like a great sheet is let down from heaven, containing all the types of animals. Peter is instructed to "slaughter and eat" (Acts 10:13; 11:7). To his protest that he has never eaten unclean things, the heavenly voice replies, "What God has declared clean, do not declare unclean!" (Acts 10:15; 11:9). When Peter first returns to Jerusalem after the baptism of Cornelius, the accusation which the author of Acts has the Jewish church (hoi ek peritomes) bring against

Peter is that he ate with uncircumcised men (Acts 11:3)- the very issue so central in the Antiochene incident. Thus, although the historical nature of these incidents is unclear, Luke indicates that in his view there was at a very early time a controversy over whether or not Jewish Christians could eat with gentiles. If the vision were interpreted according to the words of the heavenly voice, it would appear to imply the abolition of dietary purity with respect to different types of animals. However within the context of Acts it is used to justify the sending of the gospel to gentiles, and more significantly for this study, to justify Peter's eating with gentiles.

The next incident of great importance for the question of Jews and gentiles in the early church is the so-called Apostolic Conference (Acts 15). This section rests on a solid historical basis, as is demonstrated by the parallel first person account by Paul, an actual participant in the events, whose comments on them have come to us in his letter to the Galatians.¹⁴ When there are discrepancies between the two accounts- and there are several- there can be no question that the account by Paul, an actual participant, must be preferred to the later Lucan version which is at best a second hand account. This exegetical principle is not to be rejected by alleging that Paul has slanted his account to make a point- for Luke has most assuredly done the same, on the basis of mere second hand knowledge.

In both accounts, the question of circumcision is discussed in the meeting at Jerusalem. For Luke the meeting

is an apostolic council, to which Paul and Barnabas had been sent as delegates. The participant Paul, in contrast, says he met in private with "tois dokousin," but also counts the meeting as very important. He does not say he was delegated by the Antiochene church; but his reason for going, that he went up "kata apokalupsin" is arguably an even stronger reason than the one Luke gives. Although differing on the character of the meeting, the second (or later) hand report and the eye-witness account agree that the contention by some that gentile Christians should be circumcised was an issue. Both agree that the decision was that gentiles need not be circumcised.

Only for Paul did the agreement about circumcision resolve all problems about Jewish law. For the other parties in Jerusalem, Antioch, Galatia, and for Luke, more needed to be said. It is safe to assume that all the parties took for granted that all Christians are under a divine obligation to conduct their lives according to high moral standards. The issue is, to what extent are Christians called upon to observe Jewish purity and related laws which differ from gentile practice? Paul's argument in Galatians makes clear that he feels no such obligations fall on gentile Christians- nor ultimately on Jewish Christians either. But it is equally clear that many did not agree with him. A decision on circumcision did not necessarily imply all was settled. Thus James could agree to accept gentiles without circumcision, but demand that Jewish

Christians not eat with gentiles. In Acts, the Council is convened on the question of circumcision, but despite a decision against the demand for the circumcision of gentile Christians and despite the earlier vision permitting commensality, Luke still believes gentile Christians to be subject to a few basic dietary purity laws.

Luke's account of the Apostolic Council concludes with a gentile Christianity which observes certain, limited purity laws, and a Jewish Christianity which is fully observant of the Jewish law. As is the case in Paul's letter to the Galatians, after dealing with the question of circumcision Luke moves to matters related to Jewish purity. This is a logical step: having just dealt with what was for gentiles the most offensive and difficult aspect of the Jewish law, Luke then has the Council come to a general decision on the applicability of the other parts of Jewish purity law which were strange to gentiles. Luke is almost certainly incorrect in introducing the so-called Apostolic Decree (Acts 15:23-29) at this point, as the Pauline discussion in Galatians shows.¹⁵ It is, however, extremely unlikely that a Christian such as Luke would simply invent a decree which legislated in the name of the Holy Spirit and the Apostolic Church. The decree is thus more likely out of place than invented. As such, it would represent a theory and practice known to Luke. It decrees that only the purity matters specifically mentioned would apply to gentiles.¹⁶ In this context, porneia is also probably viewed as a purity question, showing how difficult it may be to maintain a

clear distinction between "ritual" and "moral" purity. Suffice to say that the gentiles were to be subject to no Jewish purity laws save those explicitly mentioned. He does not concern himself greatly with the continued life of the Jewish church. Nevertheless, there is no indication at the Council that their Jewish legal practice is expected to change. Later references assume rather that their Jewishness continues: when Paul returns to them, he learns that they are all "zealots for the law" (Acts 21:20), and on their suggestion he performs a meritorious gesture under the law (Acts 21:23ff). Luke thus fully recognizes and gives a theoretical basis to a gentile Christianity which is distinct in its practice from Judaism, and a continued Jewish Christianity which observes the law, including, of course, dietary purity.

The book of Acts thus presents a set of parameters for use in classifying Matthew theoretically different but in practice broadly similar to those presented by Paul. As already familiar from Galatians, Peter is presented as eating with gentile Christians and creating a scandal amongst the Jewish Christians. (Unlike the Peter of Galatians, he does not retreat from this position.) Thus Luke presents as clear a division as does Paul. On the one side there are gentile Christians who live as gentiles and are only subject to a very limited number of purity regulations, and with them there are the Jews converted in the Diaspora who seem to move in a generally gentile milieu.

No controversy arises within this part of the Christian church. On the other side there are the Jewish Christians, centred in Jerusalem, who observe the whole Jewish law.

4.4 Implications for Brown's and Daniélou's Schemata

It is not the object of this thesis to present a detailed critique of the schemata outlined in chapter one. The observations on Galatians and Acts, however, have certain clear consequences. Both these sources show a real division between two groups within the early church. Luke and Paul give evidence of a Christianity lived in a gentile way, and each gives a theoretical basis for this. Luke and Paul also give evidence of a Christianity lived in a Jewish way, although the basis for this is not given. These observations, so basic for Baur and those who followed him in one way or another, clash with the schemata of Daniélou and Brown. So, even though a detailed critique of the schemata is not an object of this dissertation, the problems with these two schemata are too closely related to the basis on which Matthew is to be classified to be ignored here.

The evidence reviewed in this chapter renders Raymond Brown's schema untenable because it invalidates his most basic premise. We recall that Brown argues that there were no "gentile Christian" theological or ecclesiological stances in New Testament times. Rather he holds that there was a great diversity within early ethnically-Jewish Christianity, and that as each of these early tendencies made gentile converts, these converts would adopt the views

of those who evangelized them. This would not lead to Jewish Christians and gentile Christians, but to a diversity of groups and communities, each of which would be made up of Jews and gentiles. But this schema is contradicted by the New Testament evidence just examined. This evidence, both from Paul and Luke, has demonstrated the existence of Christians who were from a gentile background and who lived as gentiles in the most pertinent sense of the word, that is, they did not live as Jews. Paul and Luke each gives a different theoretical basis in their writings for their different, but both emphatically gentile, types of Christianity. This whole phenomenon of gentile Christianity provided with not one but two recorded theoretical bases in first century documents (Galatians and Acts) cuts the ground out from under Brown's fundamental, constitutive assumption that distinct gentile theological positions or ecclesiological stances did not emerge until the second century.

Even though Brown's schema must be rejected, some might still wish to follow him in his analysis of the positions of Paul and Peter. Their positions might then be pressed to find parameters for classifying Matthew. Brown claims Paul practiced at first a Christianity which required neither circumcision nor observance of food regulations by gentile Christians (but was not necessarily opposed to such observances by Jewish Christians) (type three in his schema). Paul is then supposed to have moved closer to a "mediating position" advocated by Peter, which did not

require circumcision of gentile Christians, but did require the observance of some purity laws by gentiles (Brown's type two). On the evidence of the texts reviewed above, and taking cognizance of the recent work of Pauline scholars such as E.P. Sanders, both of these positions are seen to be a misunderstanding of Paul's grasp of Christianity. What is "required" of all Christians, no matter their ethnic or religious background, is that they be grasped by the new creation brought about by the death of Christ. To state that Paul did not require circumcision and dietary purity of gentiles but did not necessarily oppose these in Jews is entirely to miss the point. These things could not be required of anyone, since if they were required then Christ's death would have been in vain (e.g. Gal 2:21). Thus Paul would never have understood himself as subscribing to Brown's position three, nor later would he have seen his understanding of the new creation in Christ as requiring "some purity law" (Brown's position two). For further discussion of Paul's position as expressed in Romans and I Corinthians, see the third excursus at the end of this chapter.

Brown's comments on Peter are to be situated in a long tradition of the interpretation of Peter's role in the early church, and are congenial to several schemata of early church development. Brown, and very many others, claim Peter advocated a "mediating position," which did not require circumcision of gentile Christians, but did require

the observance of some purity laws by gentiles. But this is not supported by the texts. They show Peter eating with the gentiles in Antioch, and then withdrawing from so doing. Thus the only eye-witness report in existence does not show Peter occupying a mediating position, but rather first living like a gentile in the Antiochene congregation, then having his mind changed and living in a Jewish manner. Nor does Luke indicate that Peter occupied a mediating position. In the book of Acts, Peter at first thinks a Jew should not associate with gentiles, but then is persuaded by a vision to spearhead the acceptance of gentiles without circumcision. He then eats with gentiles. In his speech at the Apostolic Conference he argues that gentiles should not be required to bear the "yoke" of the law, a yoke which he says Jews also have been unable to bear (Acts 15:10). Paul's later references to Peter in I Corinthians show him in a Pauline gentile congregation.¹⁷ Paul's first letter to the Corinthians is by most theories of Paul's career to be situated between the time of the Antiochene incident and the letter to the Galatians. In both these Paul vehemently attacks the position Peter adopted in Antioch. So, if Peter had been advocating any role for Jewish dietary purity when he came to Paul's congregation in Corinth, one would have expected Paul to oppose him. But he does not. All this evidence concurs to suggest that Peter shifted from observing dietary purity to not observing dietary purity. The texts show a clear vacillation, and certainly not that he occupied a mediating position.

For Daniélou, Jewish Christianity is that type of Christianity which reflected Semitic forms of thought, and whose theology was mostly worked out in the categories given by Jewish apocalyptic, rather than Hellenistic philosophy. This definition has never had a great following in the academic community, largely because the definition of Jewish Christianity is very broad and rests on an imprecise basis. (Marcel Simon's critique of this position is outlined in the appendix.) His own definition of Jewish Christianity aside, Daniélou is quite capable of making a practical distinction between gentile groups of Christians and Jewish groups of Christians in the early church. As briefly pointed out in chapter one, and discussed in more detail in the appendix, he distinguishes sharply between the theoretical question of gentile obedience to the law and the practical question of commensality. In his view, an authoritative Apostolic Council decreed that gentiles were not subject to the Jewish Law. By contrast, he argues that the so-called Apostolic Decree was not a conciliar decision, but merely a disciplinary compromise by the Jerusalem church to regulate Jewish-gentile relations. It did not work well. Thus, the early church had a Jewish Christian theology, and accepted faith in Christ as its only basis of admission. Yet, for nationalistic reasons, the Jews continued to identify with Judaism and therefore to practice the Jewish law. Daniélou thus fully accepts a division of the church into a gentile and Jewish section by practice. His difference from the

line of interpretation instituted by Baur at this point is that he has this difference based on a nationalistic alignment with Israel rather than a religious or theological (in the broad sense) tendency.

Daniélou's analysis is a modern reading of the records which finds no solid basis in the texts. Paul's arguments against Peter at Antioch, as presented and perhaps expanded in the letter to the Galatians, are not at all based on the type of nationalistic alignment proposed by Daniélou. The analyses of the pertinent passages at the beginning of this chapter suffice to show the deep religious motives Paul gives for his opposition to Peter at Antioch. The same goes for the other Pauline texts where he opposes dietary purity or circumcision. Luke also gives no hint of a nationalistic basis for not requiring obedience to the Jewish law on the part of gentiles, nor for the limited purity regulation contained in the Apostolic Decree. As pointed out above, there is no text available which outlines the view of those who advocated obedience to dietary purity, circumcision and sabbath law. Thus no text affirms that Jewish Christians remained obedient to the law merely out of solidarity with the Jewish nation, while the religious character of the arguments against them gives no basis for the contention that their arguments were national in character. On the other hand, the analyses which open this chapter show debates at the religious level. Thus the arguments marshalled against Brown's schema also rule out Daniélou's division between Jewish and gentile Christians on the basis

of solidarity with the Jewish nation. His main definition, based on Semitic categories of thought, has already been found wanting.

The basic problem with Daniélou's schema, as with Brown's, is that he rejects any fundamentally different gentile Christian view of the church before the second century. Against this the evidence of Paul and Luke is decisive. Both Paul and Luke show the existence of gentile communities which lived in ways conflicting with the Jewish law, and both Paul and Luke give a theoretical basis for this lifestyle. For Paul this basis is the new creation in Christ. For Luke it is a development guided by God through vision and Apostolic Decree. Daniélou's single orthodox stream does not allow for this true gentile Christian position. (His secondary division on the basis of nationalistic identification is clever, but not supported by the New Testament evidence.)¹⁸ Thus the two major schemata which fundamentally deny a distinct gentile Christianity—the schema of Brown and the schema of Daniélou—cannot stand in the face of the New Testament record of Paul and Luke.

4.5 Conclusion: Matthew and Jewish Dietary Purity

The discussion in this chapter has clear implications for the classification of Matthew. In chapters two and three, attempts to classify Matthew as either Jewish Christian or gentile Christian against the background of the various schemata were reviewed. These attempts, though often ingenious, foundered for two basic reasons. The better

approach tried to classify Matthew against the background of first century Judaism, but failed because its understanding of first century Judaism was inadequate. The weaker approach failed because it merely added up Jewish elements in Matthew, without having a method for deciding which elements are truly decisive. This dissertation argues that these approaches represent a blind alley. The true solution is to return to the texts which were the basis for the schemata. As this chapter has demonstrated, these New Testament texts show historically how Jews and gentiles divided in the early Christian church. Neither any modern reconstruction of first century Judaism, nor any modern debate on how many (or few) Jewish characteristics make Judaism, but the real instances of division witnessed by first century texts give the only valid criteria on which Matthew may be classified.

The New Testament texts studied in this chapter reveal Jewish dietary purity to be the main divisive issue. The position of Paul is the most clearly presented. For him, there is no theological place left for Jewish dietary purity in Christianity. Although Paul saw his understanding as applicable to all Christians, the record of Galatians and Acts shows that his opinion was not accepted in Jewish Christian circles. Thus if Matthew rejects Jewish dietary purity, then in this respect it falls within the type of gentile Christianity which follows Paul's teaching.

The gentile Christian position of Luke on dietary

purity is also clear. In the book of Acts he shows the church, guided by God, coming to the understanding that the gentiles are called to Christ in historical continuity with the Jewish people, but with new revelation from God to and through the leaders and assemblies of the church. In this way, the gentiles are dispensed from any general observance of Jewish dietary purity, except that they should refrain from the things explicitly mentioned in the Apostolic Decree. Thus if the Gospel of Matthew does not expect Christians to observe dietary purity except for those few items, then it may be classed as gentile Christian.

Both Paul and Luke bear witness to a Jewish Christianity very concerned about dietary purity, and which itself observed Jewish dietary purity. It is reasonable to assume that this view also had a solid theoretical basis, since the others just reviewed did, and since emissaries from James to Antioch were able to persuade Peter and all the other Jews there (save Paul only) of the correctness of this view. The theoretical basis for this position has not been preserved in the New Testament records, although the fact that such observance is demanded in the scriptures would probably have been quite sufficient. If the Gospel of Matthew argues for the observance of Jewish dietary purity and assumes such a practice for Christians, then it may be classed as Jewish Christian.

Was there a "moderate" Jewish Christian party as alleged by the early consensus schema? This study has brought forth no solid evidence for a consistent party-like

split within Jewish Christianity. Peter certainly did not adopt a mediating or moderate position at Antioch: he and his fellow Jews vacillated between two types of practice. So no party divisions have been clearly discerned within Jewish Christianity. Jewish Christians as a group have been seen to be characterized by observance of the dietary laws, except for the Jews in Antioch, who were apparently decisively convicted of their error. On the other hand, some of the texts reviewed (especially Acts 15) assume that certain Jewish Christians, while holding to dietary purity for Jewish Christians as a group, did not feel such observance was necessary for gentile Christians. If such is the case, then, as Ritschl and Harnack have correctly pointed out, their theory implies two types of Christianity. There would be a Jewish Christianity which observed dietary purity, and a gentile Christianity which did not observe dietary purity, again except perhaps for certain essentials such as those outlined in the Apostolic Decree. It might be argued that Matthew was written by such a Jewish Christian, either for a Jewish Christian or a gentile Christian audience. Thus if Matthew shows respect for Jewish dietary purity but acknowledges that its application, outside his group, was not universal, Matthew could be Jewish Christian. Or, again, if Matthew assumes that dietary purity is not essential, but reflects the knowledge that it was once required and that within the group of Jewish disciples was still required, Matthew could have been written by a Jewish

Christian for a gentile Christian audience. Thus, duality in the theory or practice of Jewish dietary purity could indicate a Jewish Christian authorship for Matthew.

Are there other options possible for Matthew? It would always be possible to imagine an indefinite number of other hypothetical options. However, those already presented seem to best correspond to the documentary evidence; to go beyond the evidence into pure speculation would be to adopt an unsound method, or perhaps it would be to abandon method altogether. But even the possibility of otherwise unattested options is not a great problem for the thesis that Matthew is gentile Christian. Jewish dietary purity has been shown to be a watershed issue. No matter what other unattested options there might be, if they utterly reject Jewish dietary purity then they fall on the gentile Christian side of the divide.

Only the type of gentile Christianity taught by Paul rejects dietary purity at a theoretical level. Christians following the type of gentile Christianity supposed by Luke would live as gentiles, but their observance of the Apostolic Decree would at least mitigate the tendency to ascribe no significance to dietary purity. Jews, the New Testament texts demonstrate, as a group in the church continued to respect the Jewish dietary law. The only group of Jews in the texts who did not respect dietary purity prove this point. They disregarded it in an Antiochene gentile setting; upon this becoming known, they agreed with the Jewish Christian envoys and returned to a Jewish

lifestyle, obedient to Jewish dietary law. Only Christians following Paul's understanding completely reject any significance for dietary purity and live as gentiles among the gentiles, as did Paul himself. No Jewish Christian group of which the New Testament or other early Christian literature has any record does this. Thus, if it can be shown that the Gospel of Matthew totally rejects Jewish dietary purity, then the only category available for it on the basis of the authentic first century texts is that category evidenced by Paul, an option which has long been called "gentile Christianity."

Jewish Dietary Purity in Jewish Sources

Extant Jewish works dating from the last centuries before the common era and in the first century of the common era give evidence of the importance of dietary purity during this period. Dietary purity plays a major role in the book of Judith. It is significant that Judith does not eat the gentiles' food, but rather only what her servant brings her. In chapter 11, Judith concocts a story to mislead Holophernes: The Jews cannot be overpowered unless they sin against God, she tells Holophernes. But she knows that since their food has run out, they plan to eat things which God in his laws has commanded them not to eat, and they will also eat the first fruits and tithes. When they do these things, God will hand them over to destruction. That this is a story made up to mislead Holophernes is beside the point for our purposes. It is told in such a way that it appears that the author expects the audience, both Holophernes within the story, and more importantly, the implied readers and hearers of the tale, will know that there are special dietary rules which God has given the Jewish nation, and that he would punish them severely if they broke these rules. In the perhaps contemporary story of the deported youths transmitted to us in the book of Daniel, we find the same concern as Judith has not to eat the food of the gentile conquerors (Daniel 1). Again, Tobit would not eat the food of the nations in exile in Nineveh (Tobit 1:10-13).

In 167 B.C. Antiochus IV Epiphanes published a decree ordering that the Jews no longer keep the Sabbath, circumcise their sons or observe the Law of Moses, including its directives on dietary purity. But "many Israelites strongly and steadfastly refused to eat impure food. They accepted death, in order that they might not be defiled by food and in order not to profane the holy Covenant; and they were killed" (1 Maccabees 1:62-63). (cf. II Macc 6:18ff) This reaction, probably incomprehensible to the Greeks, shortly culminated in the Maccabean Revolt.

The evidence from Philo concurs with what has already been presented. It is true that he understands the Torah laws as also having an allegorical meaning. Nevertheless, he stresses that they must also be literally obeyed: "... we should look on all these outward observances as resembling the body, and their inner meanings as resembling the soul. It follows that, exactly as we have to take thought for the body, because it is the abode of the soul, so we must pay heed to the letter of the laws. If we keep and observe these, we shall gain a clearer conception of those things of which these are the symbols; and besides that we shall not incur the censure of the many and the charges they are sure to bring against us." (Philo, The Migration of Abraham 16:93, Loeb Classical Library translation) Thus Philo feels the laws should be literally observed, and he assumes that the Jewish community would condemn any Jew who failed to observe them.

A different view of the law, specifically purity law, is implied by a saying attributed to Yohanan ben Zakkai: "It is neither the corpse which renders a man unclean nor the waters which purify, but the Holy One said, 'A statute have I enacted, an ordinance have I ordained, and you are not permitted to transgress my commandment...'" (Tanhuma Hukat 26: Pesiqta de R. Kahana, ed. Mandelbaum, p. 74, ls 2-12 quoted by Jacob Neusner, The Idea of Purity in Ancient Judaism 105). Neusner comments: "Whoever said it (the above statement attributed to Yohanan ben Zakkai) was a deep, critical thinker, but a conservative and observant Jew... What is attributed to Yohanan ben Zakkai is, to be sure, not really new. Paul had told the Romans nothing is intrinsically unclean. But he did not believe the laws of the Torah remained valid as a mode of salvation. And every rabbi believed exactly that. Yohanan ben Zakkai's saying derives, after all, from a movement that affirmed the Torah as the continuing and permanently valid will of God. The purity laws were part of God's will..." (Jacob Neusner, The Idea of Purity in Ancient Judaism 107). Paul's statement in Rom 14:14 means that all things are clean, but if someone considers something to be unclean because of weakness of conscience or incomplete Christian understanding, then for that person the thing in question is unclean. The tradition reflected in the Yohanan ben Zakkai saying probably means that nothing is pure or impure in the sense of having any special physical qualities, but rather things are pure or impure because God has so declared them. Thus for Paul the

impurity lies in the conscience of the person, for Yohanan ben Zakkai impurity lies in the mind, or at least in the law, of God. The two positions should lead to opposite practice. Paul's position implies that as a person becomes more mature, he or she should see that all things are pure in themselves. The person would then be free not to observe purity law. The Yohanan ben Zakkai position implies that as a person becomes mature, he or she should be even more careful in respecting purity laws because they do in fact reflect God's will.

The point demonstrated for this dissertation by this survey is that observance of dietary purity established a line which the ancient Jewish community itself recognized as a dividing line between itself and the gentile world, a line across which the pious would not step. Although the later Rabbinic tradition decided that dietary purity was not a sufficiently crucial point of the law to call for martyrdom, it has remained to this very day as an important part of that line of demarcation carefully observed by religious Judaism. If the term "Jewish" in "Jewish Christianity" is to mean more than merely an ethnic group, then "Jewish Christianity" must designate a position which requires circumcision and reverence for the Mosaic Law, including Sabbath observance and dietary purity, at least for its Jewish adherents.

Jewish Dietary Purity in Gentile Sources

The practice of circumcision and the observance of the Sabbath were frequently noted, and usually ridiculed, by pagan observers of Judaism. The dietary practices of the Jewish nation were, however, also frequently commented upon with greater or lesser insight by pagans. Menahem Stern's two-volume Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism contains a useful collection of passages, which has served as a basis for the following survey. The Jewish abstinence from pork seems particularly to have interested gentile on-lookers. Strabo of Amaseia (c. 64 B.C.E.- c. C.E. 25) believed that Jews abstained from all meat (The Geography of Strabo XVI, 2:37). Epictetus (c. A.D. 50-130) makes the particularly interesting comment: "Come, tell me, are all things that certain persons regard as good and fitting, rightly so regarded? And is it possible at this present time that all the opinions which Jews, and Syrians, and Egyptians and Romans hold on the subject of food are rightly held?- And how can it be possible?- But, I fancy, it is absolutely necessary, if the views of the Egyptians are right, that those of the others are not right; if those of the Jews are well founded, that those of the others are not.... This is the conflict between Jews and Syrians and Egyptians and Romans, not over the question whether holiness should be put before everything else and should be pursued in all circumstances, but whether the particular act of eating swine's flesh is holy or unholy." (Epictetus

Dissertationes I.XI.12-13; and I.XXII.4, Loeb Classical Library translation). Parallel comments on characteristic differences in dietary purity were made in the second century by Sextus Empiricus, which are of sufficient interest to quote at some length:

"Similar things to these (referring to the preceding discussion about the variety of views on religion and the gods) are found also in respect of food in people's worship of the gods. For a Jew or an Egyptian priest would sooner die rather than eat pork, a Lybian considers tasting mutton to be one of the most unlawful things, some Syrians think the same about doves, and others about cattle. It is right to eat fish in some temples, but in others it is sacrilegious. Of the Egyptians who are deemed to be wise, some believe it to be unholy to eat the head of an animal, others the shoulder-blade, others the feet, others some other part. A priest of Zeus Casios at Pelusium would not offer an onion in sacrifice, just as a priest of Aphrodite in Lybia would not taste a garlic. They keep away from mint in some temples, in some from [another variety of mint?], in some from celery. Some say it would be better to eat the heads of our fathers than to eat beans. But to others these things are indifferent. We consider it unholy to eat dogs' flesh, but some Thracians are reported to eat dogs. In the same way this was customary with Greeks, on account of which Diocles, urged on by the physicians, ordered dog-meat be given to certain of the patients. Some even, it is said,

eat human flesh indifferently, which is considered to be unholy by us. If the things pertaining to religious and irreligious actions came naturally, they would have been practiced in the same way by all. (Sextus Empiricus, Hypotyposes III, 222-226, Teubner, trans. by present author).

Plutarch was well aware that Jews abstained from pork; the question posed in his Table-talk is whether they abstain from reverence or aversion for the pig (Moralia, Table-talk IV, Question 5). Juvenal also refers to the abstinence from pork (Satire XIV, 96-106). More interesting are the comments of Tacitus, who besides referring to the Jewish abstinence from pork, also refers to the division at mealtimes: "... the Jews are extremely loyal toward one another, and always ready to show compassion, but toward every other people they feel only hate and enmity. They sit apart at meals..." (Tacitus, Histories V. 5.1-2, Loeb Classical Library translation).

Romans and I Corinthians

In Rom 14 and I Cor 8-11 questions of diet are again raised. The tone Paul adopts in these letters is quite different from his strong reactions in Antioch and in his letter to the Galatians. This leads Brown and others to conclude that Paul changed his view on the role of Jewish dietary purity in Christianity. The texts do not support this view, and in fact give further evidence that Brown's general schema is incorrect.

The importance of Pauline material for this dissertation is the distinction between Jewish Christianity and gentile Christianity, and not Pauline theology. Thus, this dissertation will not be concerned with deciding whether or not Paul's theology is consistent or coherent,¹⁹ nor whether or not his practice was in general consistent.²⁰ Only two questions are critical for this excursus in discussing Romans 14 and I Cor 8-10: did Paul continue to hold that Jewish dietary purity has no fundamental place in Christianity (against Brown's minor assumption)? and, do these sections reflect a gentile Christianity which had theological or ecclesiological positions distinct from Jewish Christianity (against Brown's major assumption)?

There can be no doubt that in his letter to the Romans, Paul continues to hold Jewish dietary purity to have no place in Christianity.²¹ He emphatically tells them, "I know and am convinced in the Lord Jesus that nothing is

impure in itself" (Rom 14:14) and "all things are clean" (Rom 14:20). Given Paul's positions in Galatians, it is clear these statements in Romans mean that Paul excludes at least Jewish dietary purity from Christianity. Paul did not change his views on Jewish dietary purity in his letter to the Romans.

It appears that the majority in Rome shared Paul's view and thus represent a gentile Christianity distinct from the Jewish Christianity of Jerusalem. There is not enough information in Romans, however, to be certain of the position of those whom Paul characterizes as weak in the faith. Their practices could have been a form of dietary purity coming from another religious tradition, or perhaps vegetarianism and abstinence from wine introduced to avoid meat and wine offered to pagan gods. If this was the case, then neither the "strong" nor the "weak" were observing Jewish dietary purity, and neither group could be classified as Jewish Christian. But given the reference to the observance of certain days (Rom 14:5), and the fact that some of the Roman Christians were Jews (probably indicated by Rom 2:17-3:8; 7:1, and by some of the names in Rom 16), it seems more likely that the dietary practices referred to were based on Jewish dietary purity.²² If this is so, then the church at Rome provides another striking example of a division between Jewish Christians and gentile Christians on the basis of Jewish dietary purity. In either case, the situation of the Roman church would contradict Brown's schema by showing a gentile group living deliberately as a

gentile group within Christianity, different in its observances from the Jewish Christianity of Jerusalem.

In I Cor 8 Paul demonstrates the same attitude toward diet as he does in his letter to the Romans: "Food will not bring us before God: neither if we do not eat are we lacking, nor if we eat do we have more" (I Cor 8:8).²³ Thus, in Paul's view, food is a matter of indifference with respect to God. He is ready, however, to counsel against eating food offered to pagan gods when it could cause harm to another Christian (I Cor 8:1-13). This is not dietary purity, because the food itself is not subject to purity or impurity, nor is the eater; what is at issue is the good of the weaker fellow Christian.

In I Cor 10:19-21, Paul counsels against eating food offered to idols on the grounds that a person cannot share both the table of God and the table of demons. Some might hold that this argument of Paul's, unlike the earlier one, could be construed as being based on a principle of ritual dietary purity. Such a problem is not relevant to this dissertation, unless it could be shown that by this reasoning Paul was introducing specifically Jewish dietary purity into his proclamation. It would be very difficult to demonstrate on the basis of this one short argument that Paul, in contradiction to his frequently and strongly stated view, wished his Corinthian converts to practice Jewish dietary purity.

Contrary to Brown's basic thesis, I Corinthians assumes

a gentile Christian congregation which held a position distinct from Jewish Christianity. The problems alluded to in I Cor 8 and 10 show that at least some part of the congregation took Paul's views on diet so thoroughly to heart that they did not observe any religiously motivated restraint whatsoever in what or with whom they ate. In his remonstrance, Paul does not ask them to adopt a Jewish Christian position. The dietary observance he does call them to- the avoidance of food offered to idols- he tries to set on a moral basis. Whether one considers this dietary counsel to be moral or ritual, its resemblance to the first article of the Apostolic Decree of Acts 15 is unmistakable. In Luke's story, the object of the Council which issued this decree was to decide upon the basis on which gentiles would be admitted into the Christian church. The promulgation of the Apostolic Decree, far from assimilating the gentiles to the Jews, officially sanctioned the distinction between Jewish Christians and gentile Christians. Thus, while Paul probably did not know this, the general rejection of Jewish dietary purity coupled with strong advice against eating food offered to idols comes very close to Luke's understanding of gentile Christianity.

This short review of Rom 14 and I Cor 8-11 has supported the conclusions drawn in the body of chapter four. Although much less vehement in his rhetoric, Paul continues to hold that Jewish dietary purity has no constitutive place in Christianity. Romans and I Corinthians have been found to support the evidence of Galatians and Acts for a gentile

Christianity which was distinct from Jewish Christianity and which did not observe Jewish dietary purity. The existence of this gentile Christianity, as outlined in chapter four, contradicts assumptions so fundamental to Brown's schema of early church development that Brown's schema must be judged untenable.

5 MT 15:1-20: JEWISH DIETARY PURITY REJECTED

5.1 Introduction

Jewish dietary purity is at issue in Mt 15:1-20. Chapter four has established Jewish dietary purity as a critical and decisive issue in the division between Jewish Christianity and gentile Christianity. The object of this chapter is to establish clearly the position adopted on Jewish dietary purity in Mt 15:1-20.

The main contribution of this chapter toward the thesis that Matthew does not reflect a Jewish Christian position is the demonstration that Mt 15:1-20 rejects the concept of dietary purity. However, a secondary contribution to the thesis comes as a by-product of the method employed to analyse Mt 15:1-20. In a careful comparison of Mt 15:1-20 with Mk 7:1-23, it is shown that the Matthean pericope may be satisfactorily understood as a redaction of the parallel Marcan text, without need of assuming a Jewish Christian background or bias on Matthew's part. This subsidiary contribution to the thesis finds its strength in the fact that one might expect a Jewish Christian background or bias to be especially prominent in a section such as this where a distinguishing characteristic of Judaism is under

discussion. Since space and time constraints prevent this analysis from being extended to cover the whole of the Gospel of Matthew, and because it is more subjective in nature than an argument based on the acceptance or rejection of dietary purity, it will only be considered as minor confirmation of the thesis. The demonstration of the thesis stands upon the decisive role of Jewish dietary purity in dividing Jewish and gentile Christianity.

The argument of this chapter is based on the Two Source hypothesis of synoptic relationships. (For a general discussion of the position of this dissertation on the Two Source hypothesis, see the introduction, section 3.) According to that theory, as generally accepted today, Matthew used Mark as his primary source, adding material he held in common with Luke (usually referred to as "Q") and material which is unique to his gospel (often called "M"). With the exception of a short section against the Pharisees (Mt 15:12-14), Mt 15:1-20 is, according to the Two Source hypothesis, entirely a Matthean redaction of Mk 7:1-23.

On the assumption that Matthew used Mark as his source for this pericope, the greatest quantitative changes which Matthew makes in Mark's text are the omission of Mark's note on traditional ritual cleansing (Mk 7:3-4) and the addition of the logia on the Pharisees (Mt 15:12-14). Next in quantitative importance is his transposition of the quotation from Isaiah to a later point in the section. Some repeated statements are resolved into single ones, a few

clauses are dropped and one added. Beyond these, Matthew makes several small adjustments to arrive at a final form which is almost one quarter shorter than Mark's. If the logia on the Pharisees are not counted, Matthew's text is fully one third shorter than that of Mark. In what follows, the text of Matthew will be compared to its Marcan source section by section. It is assumed that the reader has before her or himself a Greek synopsis of this material.

5.2

Mt 15:1-2¹

In his introduction to the pericope, Matthew eliminates Mark's long explanatory note on Jewish ritual cleansing. In the Marcan version, the text opens with the arrival of the Pharisees and scribes who notice that some of Jesus' disciples eat with unclean, that is, unwashed hands. The story is then interrupted by this note which explains the practice, identifies it as part of the tradition of the elders, and gives other examples of this tradition as it touches on ritual dietary purity (with the exception of "and beds," if in fact these words should be part of the text). The text then picks the story up again and has the opponents ask why the disciples transgress the tradition of the elders by eating with unclean hands. In the Matthean text, the reader learns that the disciples are not living by the tradition of the elders by eating with unwashed hands in statements by the opponents themselves, without any intrusion by the narrator.

It is generally held that Matthew eliminates the note

on traditional ritual cleansing (Mk 7:3-4) because the background information given there was not needed by Matthew's Jewish Christian audience (e.g. Fenton 249, Bonnard 225). Since there is much debate about the accuracy of Mark's comments, it could also be argued that Matthew eliminates this note because his readers would have known it to be inaccurate. These explanations, plausible as they may be, are, however, not necessary to explain the Matthean omission. As we have already noted, an examination of Matthean and Marcan parallels shows that Matthew tends to abbreviate Mark's text. Abbreviation with an eye to the main points of the story can explain this omission. All that is necessary for the story being told in this section is present in the Matthean text. In their accusation, the Pharisees and scribes say that the disciples transgress the tradition of the elders by eating without washing their hands. The first verse of Mark's special note adds that the Pharisees and all Jews unless they wash their hands puqmēi (whatever that may mean) do not eat, thus keeping the tradition of the elders. While Matthew's calling hand-washing a "tradition of the elders" would perhaps imply to a Hellenistic reader that this was a general Jewish practice, the following story is comprehensible whether hand-washing is assumed to be a general Jewish practice or only a special Pharisaic tenet. The rest of the comments in Mark's special note play no role whatsoever in the story. If no special assumptions about Matthean background are introduced, the simplest explanation for the omission of Mark's explanations

at this point is the elimination of unnecessary details in conformity with Matthew's well demonstrated policy of conciseness.

Mt 15:1-2 brings together Mark's introduction (Mk 7:1), the observation on the disciples' conduct (Mk 7:2), and the implied attack (Mk 7:5). Pharisaioi kai grammateis of Mt 15:1 corresponds not only to Pharisaioi kai tines tôn grammateon² of Mk 7:1, but also to hoi Pharisaioi kai oi grammateis of Mk 7:5. Mark is forced to repeat the designation of the people asking the question because he inserts a long explanatory note between introducing them and relating their question. No repetition is necessary for Matthew since he drops this note on ritual cleansing. The Pharisees' and scribes' question in Mt 15:2 is an even clearer example of the Matthean policy of rephrasing in one clear statement what Mark expresses repetitively in two or more separate statements. The second part of the Pharisees' and scribes' question in Mt 15:2 is most closely parallel to the corresponding question in Mk 7:5, but also reflects Mark's report on the Pharisees' and scribes' observation of the disciples' conduct in Mk 7:2, just before the note on ritual cleansing. As is the case with Mark's repetition of "Pharisees and scribes," this rephrasing of the earlier observation as a question has probably become necessary for the sake of clarity after the train of the narrative is interrupted by the digression on the tradition of the elders. Matthew, not having this digression, can fuse the

two into one clear question.

Matthew changes the verb in the first clause of the scribes and Pharisees' question from ou peripatousin to parabainousin. The original Marcan verb is commonly held to be a technical term: "The Palestinian origin of the [Marcan] story is revealed by the use of peripateo (ii 9), used here only in the Synoptic Gospels in the Hebraic sense of 'to live' or "conduct one's life" (halach) (Taylor 377). Allen agrees that Mark's is a "more technical" term (Allen 163). This view may well be correct, nevertheless peripateo functions in a comprehensible way in Greek with no reference to usage in Hebrew. While Moulton comments that in the sense required here, anastrephethai would be the correct term (Moulton Grammar, prologue 11), in his Vocabulary he notes that Menander uses peripateo in a sense almost equal to "to live" in Epitr. 12, while Liddell and Scott cite it in a metaphorical sense meaning "to live" in Philodemus (peri parrêsias, dated first century BCE). It might still be objected that Matthew reduces the severity of the charge against the disciples, since the charge of "not living according to the tradition of the elders" (whether a technical term or not) is far more sweeping than the mere charge of transgression (parabaino) at a particular point. However, the charge is immediately specified in Mark's text as eating with unwashed hands, so that Mark's text is at exactly the same level of specificity as Matthew's. Matthew's text of 15:2a is thus a clear and comprehensible re-phrasing of Mark's text as understood purely from the

point of view of the Greek language.

Mark uses the term koinais chersin in both the parts fused by Matthew, but in the first part glosses it with tout'estin aniptois, while in the digression he uses the verb niptomai (middle). Matthew drops the term koinais entirely, and uses only the other term, niptomai. The particular Matthean use of the koinos family of words is of significance for the thesis being advanced in this chapter. This usage will be noted, and conclusions drawn at the appropriate places in the discussion of Mt 15:1-20. A general excursus on the term koinos is to be found at the end of this chapter.

5.3

Mt 15:3-9

5.3.1

General

The section Mt 15:3-9 functions as a general condemnation of the tradition of the elders. In Mt 15:2 the Pharisees and scribes attack Jesus (or at least his disciples) by asking why his disciples transgress the tradition of the elders. The case they raise involves hand-washing. Jesus counter attacks by asking them why they transgress the command of God on account of their tradition. The case he raises is one in which their tradition is formulated in a way which leads a person to disobey God's commandment to honour his parents (see the discussion of korban in 5.3.2). This example is not dealt with as a specific and unusual case of perversity. If this were the

case, it would be no answer to the question why his disciples transgress the tradition at another, totally unrelated point. Rather, Matthew 15:3b is seen as a representative case, which can by a general condemnation of the tradition answer any attack on non-observance of the tradition. This point cannot be overstressed: if the Matthean Jesus generally accepts the tradition of the elders and only criticizes it at this point of evasion of responsibility to parents, then Mt 15:3-9 is not an answer to what precedes it. If, however, Mt 15:3-9 does in fact logically follow Mt 15:1-2 and is a response to the question there, then Mt 15:3-9 must be understood as a general attack on the tradition of the elders.

A survey of some Matthean conflict stories tends to support the contention that this section rejects the tradition of the elders. In the other conflict stories, Jesus accepts a common basis of argument, usually the Scriptures, and defeats his opponents on that basis. Satan when tempting Jesus (Mt 4:1-11) once quotes from the Scriptures; Jesus does not dispute the value of Scripture, but quotes a more appropriate Scripture in response. When Jesus's disciples are criticized for plucking grain on the Sabbath (Mt 12:1-8 par Mk 2:23-28), again Scripture is not attacked, but rather another Scripture is quoted. Matthew adds to his Marcan source another argument quoting Scripture, and a taunt claiming that the opponents would not have accused the innocent if they had understood a particular Scriptural section. In Mt 12:22-30 (par. Mk

3:22-37) Jesus is accused of casting out demons by the prince of demons. Jesus opposes them with a logical argument which presumably both sides would admit. He then further, in a section absent from Mark, argues his innocence on the commonly accepted basis that both he and his opponents' disciples cast out demons. In the controversy on divorce (Mt 19:1-9 par Mk 10:2-9), the dispute opens with exchanges based on common acceptance of Scripture. When the Pharisees object to Jesus' position with an argument based on the Mosaic Law, Jesus does not attack the Mosaic Law, but rather those who received it: God's true will was not perverted by Moses, but rather he allowed a concession because of the people's stubbornness. Jesus reveals God's true will, without insulting Moses. When the authority of Jesus is questioned (Mt 21:23-27 par Mk 11:27-33), Jesus links the argument to the question of John. Here the discussion breaks off because the opponents- not Jesus- refuse the suggested common basis for discussion. When Jesus is questioned on the problem of paying taxes to Caesar (Mt 22:15-22 par Mk 12:13-17), Jesus chooses, and his opponents unwittingly accept, the inscription on a coin as the common ground. Finally, the question about resurrection (Mt 22:23-33 par Mk 12:18-27) is raised on the basis of the Scriptures. Jesus accepts the common basis, but argues that the Sadducees understand neither the Scriptures nor the power of God. Jesus gives the correct interpretation based on knowledge of the Scriptures and the power of God.

If this is a fair selection of controversy stories, we may conclude that the general pattern includes the acceptance of a common basis, from which Jesus then develops his position and defeats his opponents. The common basis is usually the Scriptures, although a number of other common bases are also represented. The controversy in Mt 15 proceeds in a totally different manner. The opponents challenge, referring to the "tradition of the elders." If Jesus had accepted the validity of the tradition of the elders, one might have expected an argument taking the form of the arguments found in the other controversy stories. Jesus would not attack the tradition, but show by deeper understanding of this tradition and of the power of God how one comes to a correct understanding (cf. resurrection controversy). Or perhaps he might accept their coin, that is, the tradition of the elders, and turn it against them. Or he might have linked his authority to that of John, and thus frightened his opponents out of continuing their criticism. Or he might have argued that he was showing God's true will, which the basically good tradition had allowed to be mitigated due to the people's stubbornness (cf. divorce controversy). Or he might have shown a logical inconsistency in their attack, adding perhaps that on occasion even the Pharisees do not wash their hands (cf. prince of the demons controversy). Or he might have found a basis in the commonly accepted tradition why at least his disciples were justified in this action, capping it off with a taunt that if they really understood the tradition, they

would not condemn the innocent (cf. plucking on the Sabbath). Or finally, he could have simply quoted a more appropriate tradition. But he does none of these things. He seeks no common ground in the tradition of the elders. What he does do breaks entirely with the pattern Matthew otherwise follows in his controversy stories. Jesus does not accept the basis or logic of the attack and show the error of the attack. He instead attacks the very idea of the tradition to which the Pharisees and scribes refer.

The attack on the scribes and Pharisees in Mt 23 does not formally contradict the preceding argument, since the attack is not a controversy story. It does nevertheless pose a problem in that it appears to make Jesus approve of the authority of the Pharisees. This may be a traditional unit which Matthew has retained even though it contradicts the general redactional intent of Matthew, but other explanations are possible.³

This Matthean section, after opening with a counter attack against scribes and Pharisees, and rejecting the tradition of the elders buttressed by what is presented as a conclusive example, characterizes the opponents as "hypocrites," and finally brings this section to a conclusion with a thundering quotation from the prophet Isaiah. The Scriptures are thus shown to foretell the Pharisaic attempt to replace the commandments by their own tradition.

The question in Mt 15:1-2 and the issues in Mt 15:3-9 are quite distinct. The first part concerns the question of the washing of hands before eating. This practice may have been part of a Pharisaic program to eat all meals in a state of ritual purity. Both the New Testament and the later-redacted Mishnah are witness to the fact that questions of ritual purity were matters of much discussion in Judaism during the first centuries of the common era. The discussion in Mt 15:3-9 does not deal at all with ritual purity.

There is a wide and general current of interpretation of Mt 15:3-9. According to Allen's volume on Matthew in the International Critical Commentary (1907):

The custom which the Lord was reproving was this, that the scribes allowed a man by a formula to dedicate all his property to the Temple, and so escape the duty of supporting his parents. A legal formula thus became more sacred than the divine command expressed in Scripture. In Mt. this is described thus: 'Moses said, Honour thy father etc. But you say, A man need not honour.' (Allen 164)

J.C. Fenton expresses a similar view in his 1963 commentary:

The example from your tradition (v. 3) is a regulation for vows: a man could set apart his property for God, while retaining the right to use it himself, and thus prevent its use by anyone else- e.g. in this case by his father. (Fenton 250)

Even the great champions of Jewish background- W.F. Albright and C.S. Mann- give a similar interpretation:

By allowing a man to dedicate his property and possessions to the temple, the oral law (the tradition of the elders) had in effect permitted a man to escape the obligations of the fifth commandment (Exod xx 12). In this way an oral tradition could empty God's word of meaning. (Albright and Mann 184)

Setting aside for the moment the value of this tradition of interpretation as an understanding of the Matthean text, let us examine the possible historical referent of this text. That is to say, let us investigate the extent to which this text may reflect an historical situation in the time of Jesus' ministry, or at least an historical situation very early in the church's history, while it was still functioning within Judaism.

The common interpretation seems to be the following: there was a tradition that a man could, by pronouncing a certain legal formula, donate all his possessions to the Temple (or to God). Once his possessions belonged to the Temple, he was no longer free to dispose of some of them for the support of his parents, presumably in their old age. The donor nevertheless would have retained the use of his possessions for himself. The unscrupulous could thus make use of this formula of dedication to escape supporting their parents. Since the command to honour one's parents obviously implies supporting them economically when need be, this tradition had the effect of contradicting God's law.

The word "dōron," which is a key term here, Matthew has taken from Mark, where it translates the Hebrew or Aramaic korban. This translation in the Marcan text agrees with the Septuagint, which also translates korban as dōron (65 times thus; once as dōreisthai, according to the work of Camilo Dos Santos 186). This usage is attested for the period of the composition of the gospels by its occurrence in

Josephus' Antiquities IV, 73, and by archeological artifacts. A tomb discovered during construction work in the suburbs of Jerusalem and dated to the first century C.E., was found to contain an ossuary with an inscription including the word korban.⁴ The translation has been subject to debate, but Fitzmyer renders it thus:

All that a man may find-to-his-profit in this ossuary (is) an offering to God from him who is within it (Fitzmyer 96)

Though not strictly referring to a person's "property," this inscription, which is probably roughly contemporary with the gospels, gives an example of the use of korban in a man's dedication of something to God. Fitzmyer further notes the discovery of a stone jar inscribed with the word krbn in an excavation near the temple area (Fitzmyer 100). The word identifies the jar as a gift, most likely for temple service. The historical background for the use of the word korban for a gift to God or to the Temple is thus fairly well established for the appropriate period.

The practice of dedicating a "gift," referred to as korban, may be well established, but the generally received interpretation of this text supposes a slightly more specialized meaning for this term. Bonnard does a good job of clearly tracing the steps from this meaning of korban to the one supposed in the common interpretation of this passage:

ce mot hébreu a revêtu une triple signification: d'abord le don, particulièrement à la divinité (Exod. 20.28; 40.43, etc.), puis le trésor du Temple (chez Josèphe, Guerre juive 2.175, cf. Mat. 27.6), puis la formule juive juridico-religieuse par laquelle on

soustrayait quelque chose à la vie profane pour en faire une offrande; c'est à ce troisième sens que notre texte fait allusion... (Bonnard 228)

It is not without significance that Bonnard cites Biblical or Jewish passages for his first and second senses but not for his third. Examination of Jewish texts may suggest a different third interpretation.

Reflection on the tractate Nedarim ("Vows") in the third division of the Mishnah may give clues as to a more likely third interpretation of korban and thus a more likely historical background for this section. "Nedarim" is concerned with the regulation of vows. Perhaps the most common type of vow dealt with in this section is the vow to abstain from something, or to deny someone else the use of a thing or of one's services. Most of these are introduced by the word korban (or one of its substitutes, such as konam, konah, or konas, all held to be equally binding), followed by a reference to the thing or service to be denied. It may be, as Danby seems to imply in a note to his translation of the Mishnah (Danby 264 note 6), that when a person cut himself off from another by a vow, he said that anything which the other might give him should be to him like a offering to God (a korban), that is, a thing which he was not entitled to use. This usage might then have been extended by analogy to vows where one declared he would not give a thing or render a service to another. Or it may be simply that people swore by the gift (korban) on the altar in rash oaths, as is implied in Mt 23:18. Whatever the origin of this usage of the term, it is clear from the

Mishnah that when a person prefixed korban to a saying, that saying was held to have the force of a vow. Whether or not the thing or service in question was really held to be specially dedicated to God is not discussed in the Mishnah: the question is rather whether or not the denial of a thing or service to the other person may be revoked.

Nowhere in the Mishnah is there explicit discussion of why a person might pronounce the various types of vows under discussion. Because of the nature of many of the vows discussed, one is almost inevitably led to the conclusion that much of the background for this section is sayings uttered in the heat of family arguments. This is in fact what Jacob Neusner assumes for his discussion of Nedarim 9:1-12 in his popular, little book Learn Mishnah.

If one has, in a fit of anger against father or mother, rashly uttered a vow such as "Korban, anything you might have benefited from me," what are the person's responsibilities when he comes to his senses? The problem is that one, through rash utterance, has fallen between two sets of Torah laws: one set stresses the inviolability of vows to God (e.g. Nb 30:2-16; Lev 27:1-34; Dt 23:22-24), while the other set (more familiar to Christians) comprises the laws of filial piety, best represented by the fifth of the Ten Commandments. In this situation, to obey one is to break the other. Nedarim 9 seems to deal with cases similar to the one under discussion in Matthew, that is where a man's vow in some way prejudices the rights or dignity of

his parents. The final decision of the Jewish Sages, as recorded in Nedarim 9:1, is that a man may repent of such a rash vow out of respect for his parents. The fact that there is some debate about this recorded in the Mishnah, taken into consideration along with the synoptic pericope, would seem to indicate that some Jewish scholars in the early period may well have decreed that a man was bound by even such a vow. The decision by a group of religious leaders that a vow offending parents must be honoured, would be based on a high evaluation of the importance of Torah law on vows, and certainly not on a desire to circumvent obligation to parents.

Decisions against parents' interest need not have been frequent to have been notorious. Just as modern courts are subject to popular anger and ridicule for letting the guilty off on a technicality, so an ancient court would have been despised and ridiculed for allowing a person to avoid supporting parents. The scandal would have been all the greater if the person had gone to the court to find a way to escape a rash vow, and the court had decreed on this technical basis against what most have always felt to be right and just. As stressed here, such a decree would have been against the final, Jewish majority tradition. Despite this fact, the technical decision of a Jewish court against parental support could have become known in the gentile world, where it could have been seized by those with little sympathy for Judaism as an example of how "their law" works.

There is some danger in using Mishnaic material to

illuminate New Testament texts because the Mishnah was redacted much later than the New Testament. Can Mishnaic discussions, and their pre-suppositions, be applied to the early first century? There is no general answer, but in the case of korban I believe there are hints that the answer should be in the affirmative. The nature of rash vows, as opposed to gifts to the Temple, is such that one would not expect archeological confirmation from artifacts. One does not normally inscribe a pot to immortalize a fight with one's father. However, the warnings about oaths in the logia ascribed to Jesus in the New Testament seem to indicate that rash oaths were in fact a problem in Jesus' time. Josephus is witness that there was a korban oath in his time and earlier. In a section of Against Apion where he speaks of non-Jewish literary references to Jews and Jewish customs, he alludes to comments by Theophrastus in his book Laws:

he (Theophrastus) says that the laws of the Tyrians prohibit the use of foreign oaths, in enumerating which he includes among others the oath called "Corban." Now this oath will be found in no other nation except the Jews, and, translated from the Hebrew, one may interpret it as meaning "God's gift." Against Apion I 167 (Loeb)

The context shows that, even though Josephus maintains the traditional translation "gift," he in fact presumes the thing in question not to be a gift, but rather an identifiable oath. If Josephus was correct in his understanding of Theophrastus, then there was a korban oath centuries before the New Testament; if Josephus was not

correct in his understanding of Theophrastus, this is still evidence that there was a korban oath of some kind which was already traditional by the time of Josephus. Returning to the gospel, it should be noted that the Marcan form in question bears a general resemblance to the form of the korban vow as represented in the Mishnah: the word korban (or its circumlocution) is pronounced, then there is a reference to the thing to be denied, just as in Mark.⁵ So, we know that there was a problem with oaths in New Testament times, that there existed a korban oath, and that at least in Mishnaic times a korban vow took a form generally like that found in Mark.

Presuming that the Mishnah may be used as a source on this question, let us review the historical basis being suggested here for Mt 15:3-9. In fits of anger, people sometimes vowed that their parents should not benefit from any of their money or possessions. On coming to their senses, they consulted Pharisees on how they might be released from their rash vows. Vows are regulated by the Torah. Because of this the Pharisees sometimes (or at least on one notorious occasion) decided that a vow could not be broken even if it was injurious to parents.

The common interpretation of Mt 15:3-9 states that there was a Pharisaic tradition which in effect allowed a person to circumvent responsibility to parents. If the historical background suggested for Mt 15:3-9 on the basis of the Mishnah is correct, then what is at question is the balancing of two sets of Torah laws, those on vows and those

on filial piety. It is possible that some Pharisees insisted that even rash vows against parents must be observed. If this was the case (and the Mishnah discussion strongly suggests it was), the motive of this discussion was a high respect for Torah law on vows. But it is very unlikely that this was the majority position of the Pharisees. The final decision of the rabbis (who are generally viewed as the successors of the Pharisees) was in agreement with Jesus, and against what is here ascribed to the Pharisaic tradition. At an even more basic level of reasoning, it seems hard to believe that a group which rendered decisions injurious to parents could successfully aspire to spiritual leadership in a nation. While the example of the Red Guard in China during the 1960's might be suggested as just such a case, the intervening decades have seen them and their thinking fall into disgrace, while the Pharisees' power and prestige on the contrary became greater and greater (presuming the rabbis are in fact their descendants). For these reasons, a decision against parental support cannot be considered a "Pharisaic tradition," as the common interpretation claims it to be. Decisions against parental support by certain individuals, though excellent material in a polemic, do not constitute a fair basis to make of their ideas the "tradition" of the whole group. Thus the generally accepted interpretation of Mt 15:3-9 does not stand up well to examination as an interpretation of the history lying behind this text.

Let us return to an examination of Mt 15:3-9 at the redactional level. The historical basis for Mt 15:3-9 may be a problem about balancing Torah laws, yet the text in its present state does not seem to deal with the problems this background raises. The Marcan text may still carry echoes of the attempt to reconcile two Torah laws in its introduction, where it says, "You set at naught the commandment of God in order that you may establish your tradition." In Matthew, however, any such echo (if that is really what it is in Mark) is gone, his introduction being a simple rhetorical attack on the opponents' practice: "Why do you transgress the command of God on account of your tradition?" The technical term korban, omnipresent (in various guises) in the Mishnaic discussion of this question, present in Mark, and presumably a crystal clear term to a Jewish audience, is dropped by Matthew. If this had really been understood as a problem of weighing commandments, a saying on the weightier matters of the law might have been in order here. If it had been understood as a problem of rash vows, a saying against oaths- such as the one Matthew includes in the Sermon on the Mount at Mt 5:33-37- would certainly have been in order here. Nor is there any hesitation in calling this "the tradition" of Jesus' scribal and Pharisaic opponents without any qualification. These observations make it clear that, while the historical background of Mt 15:3-9 may be a balancing of vows (or perhaps an infamous decision), this is certainly not the point that Matthew has in view.

The preceding discussion leads to an apparent problem, which is in reality easily resolved. The problem may be expressed in two ways. First, the above discussion calls into question the generally accepted explanation of the historical background lying behind Mt 15:3-9- yet this common explanation seems to be an accurate commentary on the point Matthew makes in this text. Or, viewed from the other direction, the historical background suggested by the Mishnah is not well reflected in Mt 15:3-9. This is a problem, however, only if one assumes that Matthew re-wrote the Marcan text with a real understanding of the Jewish background. The problem disappears if the Two Source hypothesis is followed with no special added assumptions. In this latter case, the background suggested on the basis of the Mishnah may well be correct. If Matthew is working with Mark's text as his only source of information at this point, then it is not surprising that he reflects little of the proposed actual historical background of the question. He could not be expected to know more of the background than that available in his Marcan source. Whether or not the commonly accepted interpretation of Mt 15:3-9 is accurate as an explanation of Matthew's redactional intent is thus uncoupled from any questions about Jewish background. The meaning of Matthew depends only on his interpretation of Mark. To this we must now turn.

5.3.3 Mt 15:3-9 as a Redaction of Mk 7:6-13

According to the minor supposition of this chapter, Mt

15:3-9 may be satisfactorily understood as a redaction of the parallel Marcan section, without need of any added assumption of a Jewish Christian background or Jewish Christian bias influencing the redaction. The crucial importance of this for the thesis is the demonstration that Matthew does not change the general meaning of the Marcan source which is so opposed to the tradition of the elders. It is not argued here that we can now reconstruct how the Matthean redactor actually proceeded in his work. This section is rather intended to show how the logic of the contention of this chapter may be worked out in detail in Mt 15:3-9. Whether or not the actual historical redactor proceeded by exactly these steps can of course not be known.

In both the Marcan and Matthean versions of this story, Jesus does not deny that his disciples fail to observe the tradition- in fact, he does not explicitly answer the question at all, but rather moves to the attack. The attack is related to the opponents' question through the catch-word "tradition," although in the first part of this section it is "the tradition of the elders," while in the second part "your tradition" ("tradition of men" once in Mark).

A clue to the Matthean redactional form of this story lies in the displacement of the Isaianic quotation. After the accusation that Jesus' disciples do not walk according to the tradition of the elders, Mark has Jesus call their accusers hypocrites, and through Isaiah accuse them of serving God with their lips, while their hearts are far from

him, teaching as God's what are in fact teachings of men. Now, the mere fact that the scribes and Pharisees wash their hands before eating is hardly a sufficient reason to accuse them of hypocrisy and fraud. The basis of Jesus' attack is to be found in the section which follows, rather than in what precedes. If, however, the Isaianic quotation is removed, we come immediately to the accusation Jesus makes against the Pharisees, and the narrative then builds to end with the Isaianic denunciation. At that point the term "hypocrites" has a logical basis and, rather than coming as an unprepared explosion, the Isaianic quotation aptly caps off the section.

Starting from the Marcan text, if the Isaianic quotation is removed one is left with a double statement (Mk 7:8 and 7:9). The statements in Mk 7:8 and 7:9 are so similar that one may suspect with Taylor (338-339) that Mk 7:1-8 once circulated independently from Mk 7:9-13. If so, Mk 7:8 would have served as a conclusion to the pericope on the washing of hands, perhaps somehow drawing this sense out of the scriptural quotation, while Mk 7:9 would have served as the introduction to a pericope condemning a practice involving korban. To a limited extent, they still function this way in their present Marcan context. Whatever the historical explanation, in their present context they are repetitive. In the Matthean context they would have been equally repetitive, and with the scriptural quotation gone, could not have served as conclusion and introduction as they may in Mark. Matthew thus reduces the two to one, and

transforms it into a rhetorical question. This leaves a much more effective literary structure:

Mt has altered the sequence of the verses in Mk. in such a way that he makes a double antithesis: "why do Thy disciples transgress?" v. 2; "Why do ye transgress?" v. 3; "God said," v. 4; "But you say," v. 5; and makes the speech work up towards the rhetorical climax: "Ye hypocrites," etc. (Allen 163-164).

Some see a Jewish influence in this particular rhetorical construction: "Jesus answers their question with a counter-question in the rabbinic manner; the pattern 'question, counter-question' is the work of the Evangelist, who has contrived it by the manipulation of his source" (Fenton 249-250). True as it may be that this technique is rabbinic, a glance at Plato's dialogues will show that this question, counter-question pattern is in no way foreign to the gentile world. Matthew also had models for it within his Marcan source: Mk 11:27-33, where Matthew copies it, and Mk 10:2-12 where he modifies it. It is further to be noted that Matthew applies the same redactional technique to both parts of the question, counter-question set (which corresponds to the first set of antitheses in Allen's more apt description). The question is a conflation of Mk 7:2 and 7:5, while the counter-question is a conflation of Mk 7:8 and 7:9. Both parts drop the accusing Marcan verbs and use rather the Matthean parabainō.

Matthew's second set of antitheses follow Mark's very closely, varying in a significant way only at a few points. The most striking change is from "For Moses said..." in Mark to "For God said..." in Matthew. The change is not

religiously significant in itself, since Jews and Christians would agree that respect for parents is a command of God. Nor is it a change from Mark's earlier narrative, since Mark twice, once in each of the preceding two verses, refers to "abandoning" or "setting aside" the commandment of God. Mark then sets up as a contrast the Pharisees' and scribes' abandoning the command of God so as to follow their own tradition. Matthew improves the stylistic consistency by referring to command of "God" rather than "Moses". In the same way (as Allen also points out (p. 164)) the literary affect is greatly increased in Matthew compared to Mark in the statement about the effect of the "gift". While in Mark's version the statement that "you no longer let him do anything for his father or mother" is a conclusion drawn by Jesus, in Matthew's version, by contrast, this conclusion is put into the mouths of the Pharisees and scribes themselves, so that their command is made explicitly the opposite of God's will. Matthew also drops the technical term korban (see the preceding section on "korban").

The three Old Testament quotations in this section are of such a character as to support the thesis of this chapter. The first two citations, tima ton patera kai ten metera (Ex 20:12) and ho kakalogon patera e metera thanatōi teleutato (Ex 21:17) are taken word-for-word from Mark (with some manuscript hesitations over the presence of pronominal adjectives), and correspond to the Septuagintal form of the text. The third Old Testament quotation in this section

clearly reflects Isaiah 29:13, and is a variant within the Septuagintal rather than the Massoretic tradition. What is important for our work here is that with the exception of the insignificant change of houtos ho laos to ho laos houtos, Matthew follows Mark without trying to conform the citation to the Massoretic tradition. This concurs well with the contention that this Matthean pericope can be accounted for on the basis of the Marcan text with no further reference to Jewish background.

Matthew's absolute dependence on Mark for the quotation from Is 29:13 goes beyond mere matters of the exact wording of the text. Stendahl has stated the matter in this way:

The line of thought in the quotation is wholly dependent upon the LXX's translation of maten which must revert to wethohu instead of the M.T.'s wathehi. The Targum agrees with the M.T. Even the syntactical form rests on the LXX. In the M.T., as in the Targum, the sentences are joined thus: Since this people approach me with their mouth... therefore I shall..., while the LXX turns the causal clause into an affirmative clause; the quotation is based on this. It is impossible to decide whether Jesus referred to this passage in its Semitic form, or if the quotation is added in a church where the LXX scriptures were used. In the former case we must suppose that the LXX form appeared to fit even better than the Semitic one, and thus influenced the Greek rendering; there is no direct way from the one to the other. In any case the LXX form is a sine qua non for the narratives of Mark and Matthew....

To summarize, there is almost complete agreement between Mark and Matthew and equally clear is their dependence on the LXX; there is no dependence upon the M.T. Even Lagrange repudiates Zahn's assumption of such a dependence. (Stendahl 58)

Given the facts as Stendahl presents them, Matthew's exact following of Mark creates no difficulties for the thesis being defended in this chapter. According to the thesis advanced here, if (as was probably the case) Matthew knew

the Scriptures very well, it is likely that he knew them only in the Septuagint form.⁶ The difference from the Massoretic text is then not problematic, since the form used in this story reflects the sense of the Septuagint quite well. But if Matthew were imagined to reflect a Jewish Christian background and bias, it would be necessary to explain why he was willing to put on the lips of Jesus a quotation from Isaiah which does not agree with either the Massoretic text or the Targum.

The style in Mt 15:3-9 is more elegant than in the Marcan source, but the thrust is the same: the Pharisees and scribes set aside God's law to establish their tradition. The understanding proposed here for Mt 15:3-9 does not presuppose any knowledge of Jewish background on Matthew's part. We may well suspect that the question on hand-washing circulated at one time separately from the attack on lack of respect for parents. Whether they did originally go together, or were later artificially joined, they stand together in the Marcan tradition. Matthew takes them together and re-works them as we have indicated. This re-working makes it even clearer that Jesus responds to the Pharisees' and scribes' initial attack by claiming that they transgress God's command on account of their tradition. In fact, we have seen in the preceding section that Matthew does not seem to reflect the questions which were probably at issue at the origin of this story in the time of Jesus or of the early church. The possible echoes of these roots

(balancing of two commandments, technical term korban) still present in Mark are dropped in Matthew. In the long history of human confrontation, there are probably relatively few examples of arguments where the party attacked sticks strictly to the topic of the original accusation. But, the way Mark and Matthew pass from the question of ritual purity to that of oaths without seeming to indicate any appreciation of the change of topic (for example, by having the Pharisees protest) does seem easier to explain if one supposes a milieu where these questions were not currently debated.

Even the generally held interpretation that Matthew is condemning a scribal practice that allowed a man to willfully circumvent the commandment to honour his parents, does not bring out clearly the immediate function of this section in Matthew. The immediate function of this section is to give grounds for a sharp rejection of the tradition of the elders, in answer to the accusation of not washing before eating. For this purpose, the story in Mark gives Matthew enough information and it is not necessary to assume Matthew was drawing on any further knowledge of Jewish background, or was writing with a Jewish Christian bias.

5.4

Matthew 15:10-20

5.4.1

General

Mt 15:10-20 rejects dietary purity, and holds purity to be exclusively a moral category. As in the earlier sections, so here it is argued that the text of Mt 15:10-20

may be satisfactorily understood as a redaction of the parallel Marcan text, with no assumption of a Jewish Christian bias being necessary. Matthew does abbreviate and reformulate Mark's text in a more elegant fashion. He does not restrict the rejection of dietary ritual purity to the question of hand-washing, or in any other way alter the basic meaning of his Marcan source. It is here, in these eleven verses, that the Matthean position on Jewish dietary purity is most fully and clearly set forth.

5.4.2 The Parable (Mt 15:11, parallel Mk 7:15)

The parable about what does and does not defile a person is the focus of Mt 15:10-20.⁷ Following the Marcan order, the Matthean section has Jesus call the crowd and tell them the parable. Then departing from Mark's text, Matthew underlines the importance of the parable by having the disciples say to Jesus, "You know that when the Pharisees heard this saying they were greatly offended (eskandalisthēsan).". This comment is rather remarkable, since Matthew did not indicate that the Pharisees were offended when their tradition was attacked (Mt 15:3-6), nor when they were called hypocrites (Mt 15:7-8), nor when their worship of God was called vain (Mt 15:9). In response to the disciples' report about the Pharisees' reaction, Jesus pronounces two short warnings against the Pharisees. After these sayings, Peter asks Jesus to explain "this parable" (some manuscripts omit "this"). One might then reasonably expect an explanation of one of the sayings against the

Pharisees. This reasonable expectation, about to be disappointed, is probably why some manuscripts do not have the word "this." Instead of an explanation of one of these sayings, we are presented with an commentary on the parable about what does and does not defile a person. The rest of the pericope is devoted to a commentary on this parable. All of these elements, both those taken from Mark and those introduced by Matthew, concur to focus on the parable of Mt 15:11 as the key statement of the Mt 15:10-20 section, and perhaps of the whole pericope (Mt 15:1-20).

Given the claim that the Matthean redaction does not change Mark's fundamental rejection of dietary purity law, it is useful to examine the Marcan source text in some detail. To fully understand the Marcan parable in its context, it is necessary to examine not only the Marcan parable itself, but also to ask what interpretation of this parable Mark assumes in his following commentary.

Mark opens this section by introducing the "crowd," which is then to "hear" and "understand." This is followed by the parable, in the authoritative words of Jesus himself, which is the focus of this section. According to this parable, there is nothing external which entering a person can render him unclean, but rather the things which come out of a person render him unclean. In the parable itself it is not indicated what the things from outside which enter a person might be. Without the following Marcan explanation it would be far from clear what this refers to. Food,

liquids and air enter a person's mouth, while sights enter the eyes and sounds the ears (n.b. "mouth" is not specified in the Marcan parable). By means of sights and sounds, ideas enter a person. Further, anything done to a person might be said to enter that person. In the same way, the by-products of all these things- actions, ideas, food and drink- all may be said to come out of a person. In the absence of the clear explanation given by Mark, any combination of these possibilities could be construed as the meaning of the parable.

In Mk 4:34, Mark set forth the principle that Jesus spoke to the crowds in parables, but in private he explained everything to his own disciples. This is what then appears to take place here. But is Mk 7:18-23 itself really an interpretation of the parable? Few Marcan parables are accompanied by an interpretation. The parables in the pericope on Jesus and Beelzebul (Mk 3:20-30) and the parable of the Vineyard and the Tenants (Mk 12:1-12) are made very clear by their immediate literary contexts. Two parables, this one on clean and unclean, and the Parable of the Sower, are followed by some sort of a question by the disciples and then some sort of an explanation by Jesus. In the interpretation of the Parable of the Sower (Mk 4:13-20), each significant element in the story is explicitly or implicitly referred to, and linked with its intended meaning (even if there are some inconsistencies). This is not at all the case with Mk 7:18-23. First, the negative part of the parable is repeated in a slightly different phrasing,

slightly clarifying the grammar so that the negative pronoun ouden is changed to pan and the negation is moved nearer the verb, giving ou dunatai. One might then expect the earlier ouden plus description to be equated with something, as in the interpretation of the Sower. But not so. One searches in vain for any explicit interpretation. Nonetheless, as we shall see, it is crystal clear what Mark thinks this parable means. What we actually find in Mark's commentary appears to be the step which logically follows an interpretation: an explanation, or perhaps even a defense, of the idea represented by the parable as implicitly interpreted here. That is, the Marcan commentary does not say that the parable means "x," rather it assumes that the parable means "x," and explains why the position "x" is the correct position.

Let us examine the interpretation ("x" in the argument above) which lies behind the explanation or defense to be found in the Marcan commentary. Mark has Jesus and his disciples go into a house away from the crowd, where the disciples ask him about the parable. Jesus repeats the first, negative half of the saying only slightly re-phrasing it, explaining that "the things from outside which go into a person" do not go into his kardia but rather into his stomach, intestines and finally are eliminated. Since this traces the route of food through the body, the discussion clearly assumes that the "things from the outside going in" means "food." Jesus then similarly repeats the second, positive half of the parable only slightly re-phrasing it,

assuming "that which comes out of a person" means "moral evils," as indicated by the appended list of moral evils.

Once this key has been seized, the interpretation which the text assumes for the parable is clear. "That outside a person which goes into him" has been interpreted as "food." Applying this interpretation to "Nothing that is outside a person which goes into him can render a person unclean" produces the meaning: "No food can render a person unclean." "The things which come out of a person" has been interpreted as "moral vices," as indicated by the appended list. Applying this interpretation to "The things which come out of a person are the things which render a person unclean" produces the meaning: "moral vices, as exemplified in the appended list, are the things which render a person unclean." Thus by applying the interpretation assumed by Jesus (in the Marcan text) of the enigmatic elements in the parable we arrive at the interpretation underlying the Marcan commentary: "No food can render a person unclean. Moral vices are the things which render a person unclean."

The parable thus interpreted according to the key deduced from the Marcan text contradicts the Torah. The first part of the "purity code" (Lv 11-16) explicitly declares large classes of animals unclean and forbids them as food. These prohibitions are also found in Dt 14:3-21. Beyond the class of animals unclean in themselves, a person is made unclean by eating any animal which has died of natural causes (Lv 11:40). Contrary to our parable as interpreted here, the Torah is quite emphatic that there are

large numbers of things from the outside which, entering a person, render him unclean.

The inclusion of katharizōn panta ta brōmata is a good indication that we have correctly understood the interpretation supposed in the Marcan commentary on the parable. Only if the parable is interpreted as meaning that dietary purity is rejected, may it be concluded that in so saying Jesus "cleansed all food." As with the rest of the Marcan commentary, however, this statement does not set forth the meaning of the parable (it is not an "interpretation"), but rather explains or defends the position advocated by the parable if the parable is interpreted in this way (it is an "explanation"). As symbolically expressed above, the Marcan commentary does not say that the parable means "x," rather it assumes that the parable means "x," and explains why the position "x" is the correct position. The phrase katharizōn panta ta brōmata confirms our claim that this position "x" is the view that denies dietary purity. It has been necessary to deal thus far with the Marcan commentary on the parable before dealing with the Matthean form of the parable so as to be able to understand the parable in its Marcan setting. Having done so, we now turn to the parable itself in the Matthean text.

The Matthean parable about what does and what does not defile a person (Mt 15:11) represents a re-editing of its Marcan source (Mk 7:15) at the level of grammar and vocabulary, but more significantly it represents a re-

editing at the level of what might be called "parabolic style" (discussed in the next paragraph). At the grammatical level, most of the changes may be seen as simple improvement. Mark's statement is long and complicated: a subject, ouden, modified by two subjective completions exōthen tou anthrōpou and the participial phrase eisporeuomenon eis auton, with the point coming in a subordinate clause ho dunatai koinōsai auton. Matthew greatly simplifies and clarifies the statement: the participle is used substantively and is made the grammatical subject of the sentence, exōthen is dropped as logically unnecessary (what "goes in" must come "from outside") and the word which gives the punch, koinoi, is moved from being an infinitive in a subordinate clause to being the main verb of the whole sentence; and finally the negative sense is no longer awkwardly expressed by a negative pronoun ouden, but is rather expressed by the adverbial ou which negates the whole sentence. It should be noted that in the parable Matthew follows Mark and uses a word from the koinos family every time Mark does so in his parallel. Matthew does say that these things do not defile (koinoi) a person. We recall that he did not follow Mark in referring to hands as defiled (koinais).

At the level of meaning (as opposed to grammar), the Matthean parable represents a re-editing of the Marcan parable, in which the Marcan interpretation has been introduced into the text of the parable itself. The Marcan parable asserts that there is nothing external which

entering a person can render him unclean, but rather the things which come out of a person render him unclean. In the discussion of the Marcan parable, it was argued that without the subsequent Marcan interpretation, "that which enters a person" could mean many different things, including food, water, air, sights, sounds, ideas, things done to the person- and even this list is far from exhaustive. "What comes out of a person" could be the by-products or results of any of these things. The subsequent Marcan discussion, however, clearly assumes that "that which goes into a person" means "food," and "that which comes out of a person" means moral vices. Matthew, however, changes "that from outside a person going into him," an ambiguous phrase, to "that which goes into the mouth." There can be no question that, apart from certain special contexts, in ordinary discourse when one refers to "that which goes into the mouth," such a phrase is understood to mean "food," or perhaps "food and drink."⁸ Thus, the normal understanding of Matthew's "that which goes into the mouth" would be "food," or perhaps "food and drink." So, it is clear that Matthew has taken the Marcan interpretation of the first half of the parable, and introduced it into the text of the parable itself. In contrast to the situation obtaining in the Gospel According to Mark, where the parable itself is enigmatic about what in fact does not defile, in Matthew it is clearly implied in the parable itself that it is food which does not defile a person.

One may suspect that Matthew wrote the second half of the parable to be an elegant counterpoint to the first half. What goes into the mouth does not defile a person, rather what comes out of the mouth defiles a person. Going into the mouth represents food. Coming out of the mouth represents the expression of a person's inner moral being. Matthew has already linked inner moral being with what comes out of the mouth in the dominical saying, unique to his gospel: "out of the over-abundance of the heart the mouth speaks" (Mt 12:34, where the context is knowledge of whether a person is good or evil). This opinion he re-reiterates in his own words a few verses later in our section, "the things which come out of the mouth come out of the heart" (Mt 15:18), followed by a list of moral evils. Of course, not all the sins listed are literally committed by word- but this is not the point. "Out of the mouth"- a person's speech, his word- reflects the moral being. True to the Marcan interpretation, Matthew's parable denies that food defiles, and asserts that defilement comes rather from the words and actions which issue from the person.

Matthew presents a parable which contradicts the Torah on ritual purity. What may be said of the Marcan interpretation of the parable may therefore be said of the parable itself in Matthew. The Matthean parable claims, "not that which goes into the mouth defiles a person," whereas the "purity code" (Lv 11-16) and Dt 14:3-21 explicitly declare large classes of animals to be unclean, and the former also declares that the eating of any animal

which has died of natural causes renders a person unclean.

The significance of this parable cannot be overstressed.⁹ As we have noted, Matthew has surrounded this parable with redactional markers which show it to be crucially important. He has altered the Marcan source parable by introducing the Marcan interpretation into the parable itself. In Matthew the parable itself clearly means that food does not defile, but rather immoral words and actions defile. Nothing in the rest of the pericope calls this clearly stated and stressed assertion into question. The rest of the pericope is merely commentary.

5.4.3 Plants to Be Uprooted and Blind Guides (Mt 15:12-14)

Between the parable and the commentary the Matthean text introduces two short sayings against the Pharisees. The question which introduces them at Mt 15:12, unique to Matthew, was discussed briefly above. There it was noted that this rhetorical question redactionally stresses the importance of the parable. The task now at hand is to determine the redactional meaning of Mt 15:12-14, the unit which Matthew has interpolated into the story at this point. But before coming to conclusions on Mt 15:12-14 as a unit, it will be useful to pose the question of how to interpret the "plant" image in Mt 15:13. Is it to be read, as many do read it, in the light of Old Testament and early Jewish use of this image, or does the assumption of such a background not help in understanding Mt 15:13?

The use the "plant" image is being put to in Mt 15:13

must be determined, at least at the redactional level, by the meaning given it by its context, first in this pericope, and then in the gospel as a whole. At these two levels the usage is quite clear and consistent. Within the context of this pericope, the Pharisees and scribes question Jesus about the conduct of his disciples. After some sharp criticism of the practices and beliefs of the Pharisees, Jesus' disciples warn him that the Pharisees have taken great offense at his saying against dietary purity. He answers that "Every plant which my heavenly father did not plant will be uprooted. Leave them be..." The closest reasonable antecedent of "them" is "the Pharisees," thus leaving this "plant" image sandwiched between two references to the Pharisees. The implication seems to be that the Pharisees are plants not planted by the heavenly father, which will be uprooted. There is no explicit indication whatsoever in this pericope who might be indicated by the other implied group, that is, by the plants planted by the father. Uprooting generally kills plants, so the fate envisioned for the Pharisees is obviously an unpleasant one. But again we note that this "uprooting" is not explicitly interpreted anywhere in this pericope. Looking only at the context within the pericope, we see that the pericope is directed against the Pharisees, implies that they are not planted by God, which is obviously a sharp criticism, and says that they will be uprooted, obviously meaning some kind of an undesirable fate.

Let us next examine the "plant" image in the context of

the Gospel of Matthew as a whole. The image of "plant," "planting" or something planted (generally a "vineyard") while it occurs frequently in the Gospel of Matthew, is used to convey only a very restricted number of ideas. These ideas may be roughly classified as "encouragement," "the kingdom" and "classification and judgement." The last two groups are closely related, in that the "classification and judgement" sometimes explicitly, and perhaps always implicitly, relates to the kingdom of God in some way. Encouragement to faith seems to be the point of the story of the Cursing of the Fig Tree (Mt 21:18-22). The "kingdom" parables or sayings in which a plant is central are: the Parable of the Mustard Seed (Mt 13:31-32), the Parable of the Yeast (Mt 13:33), and to some extent the logion of the Lesson of the Fig Tree (Mt 24:32-35); in the Parable of the Workers in the Vineyard (Mt 20:1-16), the human workers are central, but the "vineyard" is the backdrop. The image of the beautiful flowers of the field (in the section Mt 6:25-34) in its most immediate context is an encouragement to faith, and in its larger context is related to the kingdom.

By far the largest group of sayings which use the "plant" or "vineyard" image in Matthew are those which deal with classification and judgement. In the Baptist's preaching, directed to the Pharisees and Saducees, trees which do not produce good fruit are to be cut down and thrown into the fire, just as the chaff is to be separated from the wheat and burned (Mt 3:7-12). Two similar sayings

are pronounced against false prophets in Mt 7:15-20. In the first, a tree's species is known by the type of fruit it bears. In the second, whether a tree is good or not is determined by the quality of its fruit- and in the case of a bad tree, it is cut down and burned. This latter saying, with its reference to chopping and burning dropped, is repeated against the Pharisees in Mt 12:33-37. The Parable of the Sower (Mt 13:1-9) and its interpretation (Mt 13:18-23) is also a parable of classification and judgement in that the various hearers of the word class themselves into groups by their response. In the Parable of the Two Sons (Mt 21:28-32) and the Parable of the Vineyard (Mt 21:33-44), the human actors are in the foreground, while the "vineyard" forms the backdrop. But just as in the earlier "plant" parables and sayings of "classification and judgement," the characters are judged on the basis of their actions ("fruits"). For these last two parables, Matthew notes that the chief priests and Pharisees knew that Jesus was speaking about them.

The longest and most carefully interpreted parable which by its content may be classed as a parable of "classification and judgement," but which is also explicitly a parable of the kingdom, is the Parable of the Weeds among the Wheat (Mt 13:24-30, interpretation 13:36-43). The situation it presents is very like our logion in Mt 15:13. Two types of plants, one planted by the protagonist, one by his enemy, grow in the same field. They grow together until harvest time, when the weeds, interpreted as the sons of

evil, are to be gathered and burned. That eschatological punishment is in view is made explicit in the interpretation.

It is clear from this survey that Mt 15:13 fits well into the pattern of usage of the "plant" image in Matthew. Its place in this pattern is unmistakable. It certainly does not fit the small category of "encouragement," nor is there explicit reference to "the kingdom." But it does seem to fit the "classification and judgement" category very well. In the sayings of this group the first characteristic is some sort of a division between two or more groups. In Mt 15:13, "plants which my heavenly father did not plant" seems to imply a classification of two types of plants: those planted by the heavenly father, and those, the focal point of this saying, not planted by the heavenly father. This group of sayings then characteristically concludes with an unpleasant judgement or punishment for one of the groups identified. This is the case here: the wrong plants will be uprooted. These "classification and judgement" sayings are often directed against the Pharisees. Comparison with Mark, or in the case of Q sayings, with Luke, show the application to the Pharisees to be a Matthean redactional addition in the case of Mt 3:7-12 and in the pair Mt 21:28-32 and 21:33-44. The one who plants and judges in these parables seems in general to be the Son of Man, but in the Parable of the Vineyard (Mt 21:33-44) it is God. Thus Mt 15:13, with planting by God, classification and judgement, fits very

comfortably within the Matthean pattern of usage of the "plant" image.

If Matthew were in fact a Jewish Christian gospel, knowledge of the Jewish background of the "plant" image might be quite useful in understanding Mt 15:13. This is the position held by many commentators. Pierre Bonnard comments in this vein:

Les v. 12 à 14, propres à Mat., n'appartenaient probablement pas d'abord à ce contexte... Cependant, l'idée qu'ils expriment convient à ce contexte: la prétention des pharisiens de constituer la vraie plantation (phuteia) de Dieu, d'être les seuls responsables du peuple élu, est maintenant mise en question par Jésus et ses disciples. L'idée de plantation appliquée au peuple élu a son origine dans Es. 60.21; elle était fort répandue dans le judaïsme tardif, spécialement chez les esséniens: "Quand ces choses arriveront en Israël, le conseil de la communauté sera affermi dans la vérité en tant que plantation éternelle" (Règle 8.5, cf. 11.8; Ecrit de Damas 1.7; Jubilés 1.16; 7.34; 21.24; Hénoc 10.16); "le paradis du Seigneur, les arbres de la vie, ce sont ses saints; leur plantation est enracinée pour l'éternité; on ne les arrachera pas pendant toute la durée du ciel; car le lot et l'héritage de Dieu, c'est Israël" (Ps. Salomon 14.2s). (Bonnard 229)

Paul Gaechter in his commentary on Matthew makes the significant addition of Is 5:1-7 to Bonnard's list of Old Testament and early Jewish texts which form a background for the image of "planting." But he feels that the image used in those texts could only correspond to an image of the Pharisees if the Pharisees were spoken of as an "association" or "union" or "chabura." Since this is never the case in Matthew, he turns to an interpretation of this image in the context of Jesus' ministry. There he gives the "planting" image its traditional Old Testament and early Jewish sense of "the people of Israel." Insofar as they were

misled by the Pharisees and turned away from Jesus, the true Messiah, they were no longer the "planting" of his father and were destined to be uprooted (Gaechter 497). Other commentators are content to note the traditional meaning of the "planting" image. A.W. Argyle comments: "Israel is described in Ps 80:8 as a vine which God planted" (Argyle 118).

In the cited Old Testament and early Jewish texts, the "plant" or "vineyard" image normally represents Israel, usually Israel as restored or blessed by God. In Jub 1:16 and Is 60:21 the "plant" is Israel as brought back from the Babylonian exile and established in the land. In a similar way, the "plant" in Abraham's blessing of Isaac (Jub 21:24) refers to Israel as descended from Abraham and Isaac. In some cases the "plant" image appears to be extended to include all the descendants of Noah (Jub 7:34), and even perhaps the whole angelic and celestial world, according to Dupont-Sommer's interpretation of Rule 11:8 (Dupont-Sommer 102). I think it more likely that these last two really have as their intended referent the sectaries for which the document was written, as is more clearly the case with the "plant" images in Damascus Document 1:7 and Rule 8:5. These four examples, if my interpretation is correct, then become references to Israel since their sect understood itself to be the true Israel. Israel is represented as God's "vineyard" in Ps 80 and Is 5:1-7. The former is a reflection on the present lamentable state of God's vineyard

in comparison with its state when brought out of Egypt and established in greatness, and a plea for its restoration. Is 5:1-7 is unique amongst the texts cited here in that it uses this image of Israel as God's "vineyard" to condemn Israel and to call judgement upon it.

All of these examples, if my understanding of them is correct, have in common that the "plant" or "vineyard" stands for Israel. Nothing in the context of Mt 15:13 indicates that plants, either those not planted by the heavenly father, or the implied plants planted by the heavenly father, represent Israel. Further, never is any "plant" or "vineyard" image in Matthew explicitly interpreted as representing Israel. Plants rather usually represent people in general, who are divided into groups on the basis of their response to Jesus' or the Baptist's teaching. In the first Matthean "vineyard" parable (The Parable of the Two Sons, Mt 21:28-32), the backdrop "vineyard" remains uninterpreted. In the second (The Parable of the Vineyard, Mt 21:33-44), the "vineyard" is interpreted as meaning the kingdom of God (v. 43).

Not only the interpretation of the image, but also the way in which the image is used in the cited Old Testament and early Jewish texts contrasts sharply with the use of this image in Mt 15:13. In the Old Testament and early Jewish texts, the "plant" or "vineyard" is always seen as a unity. Generally, this means that Israel is seen as a unity which will be established and blessed by God, or on occasion, punished by God. The image, in the cited texts,

is truly of a unity, even though the Israel in question may only be a remnant. By contrast, in Mt 15:13 and most of the Matthean "plant" sayings, the very point is division. Some of the plants, those not planted by God, will be uprooted in Mt 15:13. Division is in fact of the essence in all those sayings, which constitute by far the largest group, which I have labelled "classification and judgement." The most essential point in the use of the metaphor in Matthew is very different from the point in the cited Old Testament and early Jewish texts.

Examination of the suggested Old Testament and early Jewish texts thus turns out not to be useful for understanding Mt 15:13. The "plant" image in Mt 15:13 is given a very different interpretation from the one it has in the cited background texts, and the type of application in Mt 15:13 ("classification and judgement") is very different from its application in the suggested background texts. Our study has shown that this conclusion is capable of being extended to the Gospel of Matthew as a whole: the interpretation and application of the "plant" image has a certain consistency in Matthew, and the interpretation and application of the "plant" image has a certain consistency in the suggested background texts, but these two sets of interpretations and applications are quite different. From these two observations we may draw two types of conclusions: conclusions about the use commentaries make of Old Testament and early Jewish literature in illuminating Mt 15:13, and

more general conclusions about the general contention of this chapter.

The commentaries of Bonnard and Gaechter are illustrative of two of the problems which may arise from starting with the Old Testament and Jewish background of this image. Bonnard fails to notice that the image is not used in Mt 15:13 in the same way as it is in the texts he quotes. Having failed to simply read Mt 15:13 in its context, he introduces the inappropriate Old Testament and early Jewish meaning, he then applies this to the Pharisees: "la prétention des pharisiens de constituer la vraie plantation (phuteia) de Dieu, d'être les seuls responsables du peuple élu, est maintenant mise en question par Jésus et ses disciples" (Bonnard 229). It is unnecessary to point out that the Pharisees nowhere in Matthew claim to be the true planting of God. The incorrect assumption about the meaning of "plant" draws Bonnard progressively further and further away from the redactional sense of the Matthean text. Gaechter notices the lack of correspondence to the image in the cited texts. He then abandons any attempt to interpret the Matthean text, and rather launches into a highly speculative attempt to understand this one verse, now stripped of its context, in his hypothetical reconstruction of the career of the historical Jesus. Thus misconstruing or abandoning the redactional meaning of the "plant" image in Matthew by applying an Old Testament and early Jewish meaning to it leads both of these commentators to miss the basically simple redactional significance of Mt 15:13.

Having discussed in some detail the question of how to interpret the "plant" image in Mt 15:13, it is now time to return to the broader question of the interpretation of Mt 15:12-14 as a whole in its context. Recapitulating the context, the pericope opens with a hostile question to Jesus on why his disciples do not keep the tradition of the elders on hand-washing. Jesus responds with several specific points, which in the context of the attack-retort must be understood as a general attack on the tradition of the elders. He then delivers a parable which in very clear, almost unparabolic terms rejects the concept of dietary purity. The disciples note, at this point, that the Pharisees, when they heard this saying, took great offense. This redactionally stresses the importance of the parable, and of the Pharisaic opposition to the ideas expressed in it. Jesus then pronounces the "plant" saying against them. We have seen that this saying follows the pattern of the "classification and judgement" sayings in Matthew. By their reaction to Jesus' words, and especially his saying on purity, they are "classified" as not belonging to God, and are "judged" to be rejected.

Verse 14 continues this idea of rejection of the Pharisees. The next image to be used against them is introduced by the admonition, "aphete autous". The exact force of the verb aphienai here is open to discussion. Bauer, Arndt, Gingrich and Danker seem to suggest the sense of "tolerate", which while possible, seems very unlikely to

me (Bauer Lexicon 126). Somewhat more likely in this context is the sense "leave," giving the idea "leave them be"; or perhaps even the stronger "abandon, neglect," giving the active sense of "abandon them," or "abandon their teaching."

After having, in effect, said that God rejects the Pharisees and that his disciples should reject them, Jesus characterizes them as blind guides of the blind- and if the blind lead the blind, both will fall into a pit. This image of blind guides is fairly common; what of course interests us in this chapter is its use in the Gospel of Matthew. Here again, Matthew is very consistent. The image is used repeatedly in chapter 23 (and only there) to attack the scribes and Pharisees. In chapter 23, at Mt 15:14 and throughout the Gospel of Matthew, the Pharisees are assumed to be leaders of the people. This characterization of them as blind guides then bolsters the admonition to "let them be" or "abandon" these leaders. Only at the beginning of chapter 23 do we have the apparently contradictory command to obey them.¹⁰

If this analysis is correct, Mt 15:12-14 represents a redactional stress on the Pharisaic rejection of Jesus' teaching (particularly on ritual purity), and a consequent conclusion that the Pharisees do not belong to God, and should not be followed. These conclusions are based on an analysis of this section in its context. The images have been interpreted as the context appears to demand, with careful attention to the Matthean usage of the images,

especially the image of the "plant." Suggested illumination of the "plant" image using Old Testament and early Jewish sources has proven to be counterproductive.

5.4.4 The Commentary (Mt 15:15-20)

General

The Matthean commentary on the parable (Mt 15:15-20) is a literarily improved, clarified and abbreviated redaction of the Marcan commentary (Mk 7:17-23). The commentary in Mark is fundamentally a justification of the rejection of ritual dietary purity and affirmation of the need for moral purity, presented in a manner likely to impress those already sympathetic to this position. We recall that Mark's commentary is written in such a way that it also includes the elements necessary to interpret the parable in the correct way, since the parable itself is enigmatic. Matthew follows the main thrust of the Marcan commentary very faithfully, by making his commentary also a justification of the rejection of ritual dietary purity and an affirmation of the moral nature of purity. In the Matthean redaction this commentary is considerably simplified because the desired interpretation of the parable is unambiguously present in the text of the parable itself. Elements in the Marcan commentary which aid the interpretation of the parable are now repetitive and superfluous, and are thus eliminated. The balance of the commentary is further abbreviated and literarily polished.

The Commentary: Mark (Mk 7:17-23)

The Marcan parable and its interpretation were discussed in the last section. There it was noted that the Marcan commentary does not explicitly interpret the parable, but rather defends a presupposed interpretation of the parable. As expressed symbolically, the Marcan commentary does not say that the parable means "x," rather it assumes that the parable means "x," and explains why the position "x" is the correct position. This position "x" is the view that denies ritual dietary purity and affirms that purity is exclusively a matter of morality. In the last section, the commentary was examined only as necessary to see what interpretation of the parable is presupposed by the Marcan text. In this section we will further examine the Marcan commentary to see how it defends its position on purity.

The symbolism of the parable is developed so as to justify the rejection of ritual dietary purity. According to Mk 7:19, everything external going into a person cannot render him unclean because (hoti) "it does not go into the 'heart' (kardia).". Now it is obvious to anyone with even the most rudimentary anatomical knowledge that food does not go into the heart, but rather into the stomach, so this statement must have a second sense to have significance here. The balancing statement on the interpretation of what comes out of a person gives this second sense. The second meaning must be such as to fulfill the sense "for out of the heart of people come evil designs..." Therefore, the second

meaning given to the heart must be the figurative sense in which it means the seat of a person's moral decisions and actions (or at least his or her evil moral actions). Adding this interpretation from Mk 7:21ff, Mk 7:19 says that food does not render a person unclean because it does not go into the heart either in the real sense or in the figurative sense of the seat of moral action.

This justification of why food does not render a person unclean is given in the Marcan text by Jesus himself. There is no discussion of a Scriptural basis for this statement. The justification, according to the Marcan text, of why food does not render a person unclean is that it does not enter into the faculty which is the seat of moral action. This implies that something which does not in any way influence a person's moral choices or behavior does not render unclean. No matter if the Torah says the contrary. That this is in fact the firmly held position defended here is substantiated by the balance of the pericope. At the close of the pericope (Mk 7:23) it is stated that the appended list of moral vices renders a person unclean. Again, this is stated with no reference to Scripture. This justification of the position set forth in the Marcan interpretation of this parable thus shows that for the interpreter, purity and impurity are moral categories and moral categories only, having nothing to do with dietary practices. The fact that the speaker feels the justification "it only enters the stomach" is convincing, shows that he is already persuaded that purity is not really a dietary, but rather a moral

category.

The tension between the parable as interpreted here and the Scriptural teaching on purity is clearly felt in the text of the Marcan commentary. The problem is dealt with in the form of a short phrase which has no exact parallel elsewhere in the Gospel According to Mark. The phrase in question is katharizôn panta ta brômata (Mk 7:19). This phrase stands out in the narrative flow of this section as much as it stands out grammatically. Although its textual pedigree is of a very high quality, its grammatical awkwardness is great enough to have given rise to simplifying variants. Its head term being a masculine singular participle, it most likely refers back to legei at the start of 7:18, as Origen, Chrysostom, Gregory Thaumaturgus and many modern commentators hold. As such, it stands as a commentary on Jesus' words: in so saying, Jesus "cleansed all foods." Whether this comment comes from the tradition Mark received, whether it is Mark's own comment, or whether it is a very early marginal note which worked its way into the text we are unlikely ever to know. Whatever its origin, its function is clear. Somewhere in the history of the transmission of this parable with this interpretation, someone felt the need to clarify the relationship of this word of Jesus to the Scripture. Many resolutions might in theory be possible. The author of this short note has chosen to accept as valid the idea that some food was once ritually unclean, and to state that by his

authority Jesus has changed this, making all food clean.

Mark turns next to a commentary on the positive half of the parable. As was pointed out earlier, what defiles a person is interpreted as evil moral actions, which are summarized in the appended list. After the list of vices (Mk 7:21-22), Mark ends the pericope not by literally tying the whole section together, but rather by re-iterating the point just made, that is, that these vices defile a person (Mk 7:23). While there is no comprehensive concluding remark, it is clear that this is the end of the pericope since the following verse has Jesus get up and go from there to the region of Tyre, where a different (although thematically related) incident takes place.

The Commentary: Matthew (Mt 15:15-20)

The move from parable to commentary is marked by a change of focus from Jesus and the crowd to Jesus and the disciples. While Mark has Jesus and his disciples go into a house away from the crowd (Mk 7:17), Matthew marks the separation from the crowd merely by having the disciples come to Jesus for private discussion (Mt 15:12a). The disciples' comment and the two short sayings against the Pharisees which follow have already been dealt with. Matthew then makes Peter the disciples' spokesman in asking for an explanation of the parable (Mt 15:15). The parable being so much less enigmatic in Matthew's text, Jesus has good reason to be incredulous at his disciples' slowness, and to answer them much more emphatically than in the Marcan source: "Are

you still (akmen) without understanding?" (Mt 15:16).¹¹

The single verse Mt 15:17 comes as Jesus' response to the disciples concerning the first part of the parable, and as such corresponds to the Marcan commentary on the negative part of the parable (Mk 7:18b-19). Three Marcan phrases are missing in this Matthean parallel verse. First Matthew eliminates the redundant Marcan ou dunatai auton koinōsai (Mk 7:18). Since Matthew's parable now unequivocally implies that food (or perhaps food and drink) does not render a person unclean, it is no longer necessary to interpret the parable as meaning food cannot render a person unclean. Given the unequivocal nature of the Matthean parable, repetition of the Marcan interpretation would have produced a double expression of the same idea. We have already noted that it is characteristic of the Matthean style to eliminate one of the terms of redundant statements- within this very pericope we have seen two other examples. While the Marcan text tells us twice that the disciples did not wash before eating (Mk 7:2 and 7:5), Matthew tells us only once (Mt 15:2). Likewise, the double Marcan statement that the Pharisees abandon the commandment of God in order to keep their own tradition (Mk 7:8 and 7:9) is reduced to a single statement in Matthew (Mt 15:3). Thus once it is noted that the Matthean redaction has introduced the Marcan interpretation of the negative part of the parable into the parable itself, the elimination of this phrase is seen to be fully consistent with the general Matthean redaction of the Marcan source.

The Marcan phrase hoti ouk eisporeuetai autou eis ten kardian (Mk 7:19) is also absent from Mt 15:17, but only just. Instead of this negative phrase in the section on the negative part of the parable, Matthew has a positive phrase in the section on the positive part of the parable (Mt 15:18). In Jesus' explanation of why food does not defile, Mark has Jesus tell us food does not defile because it does not go into the heart. Since in its Matthean version the parable from its telling refers to food, it becomes unnecessary to say the obvious, that food goes through the body, and not into the "heart." "Heart" is kept only in the sense of "organ of moral choice" in the explanation of that which does render a person impure. In the Matthean pericope, Jesus tells us that what comes out of the mouth (already said to defile) comes out of the heart and this does defile a person. It should be noted that in making this assertion here he follows Mark in using the verb koinoo, again in contrast to the way he dealt with koinais chersin. Matthew and Mark agree in defining what comes out of the heart as moral vices (although the exact content of their list differs somewhat). They thus agree that food does not defile, but defilement is rather to be associated with the "heart," which is used in the sense of the seat of moral action.

The third phrase dropped from the source is katharizon panta ta bromata. Matthew did not drop this phrase because he thought some food still defiled. As we have seen,

Matthew has introduced the Marcan interpretation of the parable into the parable itself, making the parable say that it is not what goes into the mouth which defiles a person. Matthew has further surrounded the parable with redactional indications of its great importance. The clarity of Matthew's parable, and its prominence, simply exclude the possibility that he wished to deny or to soft-pedal Mark's rejection of the category of ritually-unclean food.

The very clarity of Matthew's redaction of this section indicates what are likely the primary reasons for his omission of katharizōn panta ta brōmata: the phrase is inelegant and redundant. Its inelegance is witnessed in ancient times by the variants which are found in great enough number not to call the text seriously into question, but to show significant embarrassment with the text. Its inelegance is witnessed in both ancient and modern times by the difficulty commentators find in identifying its antecedent- the difficulty is small enough to make most commentators agree the antecedent is legei (see above in the section on the Marcan commentary), but it is great enough that they agree there is reasonable ground for debate.

The primary reason, however, for the absence of katharizōn panta ta brōmata is most likely its redundancy.¹² It has been repeatedly argued here that the Matthean form of the parable contradicts Levitical purity laws. It was suggested that it was this very tension which led someone to add katharizōn panta ta brōmata. The awkward way this note is attached to the rest of the narrative in Mark shows that

it is somewhat of an afterthought, if not an actual addition after the rest of the narrative was complete. As such, perhaps at least momentarily- and possibly for some time- the narrative was viewed as complete without this addition. Both at that possible earlier moment, and later when Matthew had removed the phrase, it should in fact have been clear to anyone with the Scriptural knowledge Matthew demonstrates, that there is a tension between Jesus' words and Leviticus. Although the details of how this tension is to be resolved may be very complex, it would be quite clear to anyone with Matthew's view of Jesus' authority that Jesus' word must be paramount. This fact is underlined, rather than contradicted, by the way Matthew has Jesus deal with the Mosaic Law in Sermon on the Mount in the section following Mt 5:17-20.¹³ Viewed in this way, katharizōn panta ta brōmata is quite unnecessary. In this very pericope we have seen several examples of how Matthew eliminates redundant expressions; this then constitutes another example.

What is the function of Mt 15:17 if it is not an interpretation of the negative part of the parable, if it avoids simply repeating that food does not defile, if it does not repeat Jesus' explicit justification of the fact that food does not defile and if it does not repeat katharizōn panta ta brōmata? What it does in fact repeat from the Marcan text is the description of the path food takes through the body, which, as in the Marcan text, is presented as an explanation of why food does not defile. It

is well marked as such an explanation: the parable clearly means that food does not defile; the disciples (through Peter) ask for an explanation; Jesus is amazed at their lack of comprehension, and asks "You know, do you not, that..." and goes on to this tracing of the route of food through the body. This is all that Matthew finds necessary as a justification.

Matthew's explanation of why food does not defile shows him to be even further than Mark from any sympathy for dietary ritual purity. All that Matthew finds necessary as a justification of the plain statement that "It is not that which enters the mouth which renders unclean" is a tracing of the route of food through the body. This is the explanation of a person already convinced that purity is only a question of morality.¹⁴ To a Torah-observant person, it is self-evident that certain food defiles. This is so because that is simply the way the universe is ordered, or because God so commanded in the Torah. But, for a person who sees purity as a moral category, it is not food which renders impure, for after all it just goes through the body; such a person agrees with Mark that morality concerns the kardia (perhaps best rendered "mind").

Mt 15:18 having been dealt with in conjunction with discussion of the preceding verse, let us briefly examine Matthew's redaction of Mark's list of evils (Mt 15:19, parallel Mk 7:21-22). Matthew follows his Marcan source (with stylistic improvements) in asserting that what comes from the organ of moral choice is evil designs (dialogismois

Donerol). In Mark, these evil designs are then exemplified in a list of twelve evils. Matthew presents a list of six evils. One or both of two principles may lie behind his choice of items. The first possibility is well expressed by A.H. M'Neile "Evil thoughts 'come forth from the heart' only when they issue in action; Mt. therefore, after dial. pon., selects external actions..." (M'Neile 229). A second possibility, also advocated by many commentators, is that Matthew has conformed his list to the Decalogue. According to this idea, Matthew followed the order found in the Massoretic Text and the text of the Septuagint as in the Codex Alexandrinus for the fifth, sixth (doubled as moicheiai and porneiai), seventh and eighth commandments. Blasphemiai might reflect the command not to take the Lord's name in vain. Since the Codex Alexandrinus tradition of the Septuagint is well represented in Matthew,¹⁵ both these explanations of Matthew's editing of his Marcan source fall within the range and style of Matthew's normal editing of Mark, and call for no special assumptions about Jewish background.

While Mark ends the pericope with a conclusion that basically refers only to the last few verses of this pericope, Matthew ties the whole pericope together in the last verse. As Neusner comments,

Mk. 7:23 concludes the pericope, which Mt 15:23 [a misprint for Mt 15:20] further embellishes. It seems to me Matthew has supplied nothing more than a redactional improvement, linking- and mixing up- two quite separate matters [washing of hands and cleanness of foods] in his concluding summary. (Neusner Idea 62)

This embellishment basically constitutes the second part of the final verse. Matthew 15:20a is thus simply another example of the Matthean practice of reproducing Mark's text in an abbreviated and stylistically-improved form. In Mt 15:20b, Matthew then explicitly links this section concerning what renders a person unclean to the introductory question on the washing of hands. In this way the whole pericope is drawn together as a cohesive literary unit.¹⁶

It is in this final verse of the pericope that the logic of Matthew's usage of the koinos family of words becomes clear. Mark says that immorality defiles (koinoi) a person. Matthew agrees and follows Mark both in the idea and the words used to express the idea. Mark tells us, through parable and commentary, that food does not defile (koinoi) a person. Matthew agrees, and again, despite his re-writing of the parable, uses the same verb to assert the same idea. If, then, defilement has to do only with morality, it makes no sense to refer to koinais chersin (Mk 7:2,5). Mark was likely prepared to allow this contradiction in usage because it was not on the lips of Jesus, but rather his opponents', and was carefully explained- or perhaps he simply failed to notice it. But it certainly did not escape the notice of Matthew. He conspicuously removed from the opening accusation this usage which is inconsistent with the point of the pericope. In his final resume (Mt 15:20) he reiterates the point that immoral practices defile (using the verb koinoo). Then,

tying the conclusion back to the opening accusation, he pointedly avoids the Marcan koinais chersin and rather says that to eat aniptois chersin does not defile (koinoi) a person- and after all, how could it? Matthew has just repeatedly underlined that only immorality defiles (koinoi). Thus Matthew with great care redactionally conforms his usage of the terms in the koinos family to his rejection of ritual dietary purity and affirmation of the importance of moral purity.

The reasoning which probably lies behind Matthew's final redactional conclusion (Mt 15:20b) appears to be totally out of touch with early Jewish reasoning. If, as this chapter holds, Matthew's only source for this pericope is Mark, the logic which leads to his final conclusion may be inferred with some degree of probability. Mark's opening remarks lead Matthew correctly to conclude that the tradition of the elders considers unwashed hands to be unclean, and that one should not eat with unclean hands. After a general attack on the tradition of the elders, Jesus, in the Marcan text, says that no food defiles a person. Since in Mt 15:20b, Matthew links this response on food to the question of unwashed hands, it appears that Matthew concluded that, in the logic of the tradition of the elders, unclean hands transfer uncleanness to food, which then renders the person unclean by eating it. This is certainly the idea which some modern readers have derived from the Marcan and Matthean texts. Some modern critics have in fact suggested that Matthew is only thinking about

food rendered unclean by unclean hands, and is thus attacking only the tradition of the elders, and not ritual dietary purity in general. This final, erroneous conclusion is excluded by the decisive, general rejection of any food-based defilement in the parable and commentary, as argued above. For Matthew, the reason that food touched by unwashed hands does not defile (besides the fact that such hands are not "defiled") is that no food defiles- defilement is a moral category only. Nevertheless, his understanding of the opponents' logic is that for them impurity is dietary, and travels from hands to person, probably by means of food.

The difference from early Jewish thinking is not just in rejecting dietary ritual purity. Matthew's reasoning about how the tradition of the elders functions appears to be incorrect. There is no documentary evidence in any ancient Jewish source of which I am aware that shows any Jewish group held the opinion that eating with unclean hands defiled a person. None of the commentaries or studies consulted in the preparation of this exegesis could cite any Jewish text which held eating with unwashed hands defiles a person. Thus, unless some important, pertinent documents have been lost, this final, concluding Matthean statement (Mt 15:20b) shows that Matthew was merely following his Marcan source, and was not in intimate enough contact with the Jewish milieu to know how the tradition of the elders functioned. The apparent fact that in the tradition of the

elders, impurity was not held to be transmitted in the way assumed in the Matthean text, if correct, is a very strong argument against assuming a Jewish Christian background for the Gospel According to Matthew. The more important point, of course, is that Matthew rejected the validity of dietary purity, whether or not he really understood how it functioned.

5.5 Conclusion

This chapter argues that Mt 15:1-20 may be satisfactorily understood as a redaction of Mk 7:1-23 without need of any added assumption of a Jewish Christian bias influencing the redaction. On this basis, a detailed comparative study has been made of the Matthean and Marcan texts, highlighting the changes Matthew has made. The character of these changes has been considered, and, when deemed appropriate, compared with redactional changes Matthew makes to his source material in other parts of the gospel. It was found that the same sort of literary phenomena at work in other parts of the gospel were equally at work here. It was not found necessary to assume that Matthew disagreed with the substance of the ideas present in his Marcan source. Since the logic of the changes traced in this chapter would not hold if reversed (that is, if Matthew were assumed to be a source for Mark), if the argument of this chapter is cogent, it gives added support to the Two Source theory of synoptic relationships, against such other theories as Farmer's form of the Griesbach hypothesis.

The major contribution of this chapter to the thesis is the conclusion that Matthew follows his Marcan source in rejecting the concept of dietary purity. The Marcan source, particularly the "parable" (Mk 7:15), was examined in detail. It is clear from the following section that Mark assumes the parable to mean that "No food can render a person unclean. Moral vices are the things which render a person unclean." It is argued that in his redaction, Matthew rephrases the parable in such a way as to eliminate the remaining enigmatic elements in the saying, and to make it even clearer that the meaning is "food does not defile, only immorality defiles." He then introduces some new material into the narrative in such a way as to stress the importance of the "parable." Matthew's commentary on the parable shows even less sympathy for the concept of dietary purity than does Mark's.¹⁷ Matthew ties the whole pericope together by linking this rejection of dietary purity to the question of hand-washing in a way which seems to have an internal logic, but may be in conflict with the way the Jewish community understood dietary purity at that time. The conclusion of this chapter is thus that Matthew completely and without reservation rejects the concept of dietary purity.

Let us summarize the view of the Mt 15:1-20 which is implied by the analysis presented in this chapter. The pericope opens with a hostile question to Jesus on why his disciples do not keep the tradition of the elders on hand-washing. Jesus responds with a counter-attack, in which he

points out a case where their tradition leads to a person not fulfilling God's command to honour parents. In this context, this response must be understood as a general attack on the tradition of the elders. He then delivers a parable which in very clear, almost unparabolic terms rejects the idea that a person may be made impure by eating, and affirms that immoral actions render a person impure. The disciples note, at this point, that the Pharisees when they heard this saying took great offense. This redactionally stresses the importance of the parable, and of the Pharisaic opposition to the ideas expressed in it. Jesus then pronounces two sayings by which he rejects the Pharisees. In response to Peter's request for an explanation of the parable, Jesus asks rhetorically if they do not know that food only goes through the digestive tract and is eliminated. This response in no way deals with the problem of the contradiction between Jesus' position and both Torah teaching on purity, and later Jewish beliefs on dietary purity; it is an irrefutable argument only to someone already convinced of the correctness of this position. Jesus then affirms that immoral acts, exemplified in a list perhaps influenced by the Decalogue, do defile a person. The pericope is then tied together by a phrase which explicitly answers the question which opened the pericope: since impurity is caused only by immorality, to eat with unwashed hands does not defile a person.

Usage of the Word "Koinos"

A survey of the standard reference works fails to reveal a single pagan, pre-Christian instance of a word from the koinos family used to express concepts in the domain of purity. It seems that the words normally used for this field were taken from the katharos family: katharos, katharizo, akathartos etc. The Septuagint translation of the Hebrew scriptures follows normal Greek in not using koinos for "ritually unclean"; the first Septuagintal use of koinos in this sense is in I Macc 1:47 where it refers to ritually unclean food. This ritual sense is not found in Philo, but Kittel's TWNT cites four occurrences in Josephus: Ant. 3:181; 11:346; 12:320; 13:4. (In my view, it is doubtful that Ant. 3:181 and 13:4 should be classed as examples of the term used in a purity sense.)

R.P. Booth has advanced a plausible theory on the origin of this unusual use of koinos (Booth 120-121). Following W. Paschen, he suggests that this usage developed in situations such as the crisis created by the policy of Antiochus Epiphanes. Faithful Jews were forced to eat such things as pork, which were "common" to the surrounding nations, but "unclean" according to the Torah. The word koinos thus came to be applied first to food from prohibited animals, and then by analogy, Booth suggests, this term was extended to other types of dietary ritual impurity. The conclusions of both the Marcan and Matthean pericopae seem further to indicate that at least by the time of the writing

of the Gospels, the use of koinos in the Greek Biblical tradition had been extended to include the concept of impurity both in its ritual sense and in its metaphorical sense of immorality.

Christian writers follow this new usage of the koinos family, but display great care in its use. Words of this group occur in the sense of purity twenty-four times in the New Testament, ten times in forms of the adjective koinos, fourteen times in forms of the verb koinoō, distributed as follows:

koinos, in sense of "impure": Mk 7:2,5; Ac 10:14,28; 11:8; Rom 14:14 (three times); Heb 10:29; Rev 21:27

koinoō, in sense of "to defile": Mt 15:11 (twice), 18, 20 (twice); Mk 7:15 (twice), 18, 20, 23; Ac 10:15; 11:9; 21:28; Heb 9:13

These twenty-four instances are concentrated in a few pericopae and most are quite closely related in sense. Our Matthean section and its Marcan parallel account for twelve of the twenty four, that is, exactly half the New Testament occurrences. Five of the remaining twelve occur in Peter's vision of clean and unclean animals, or in its interpretation (Acts 10:14, 15, 28; 11:8, 9). In each of these five cases the word from the koinos family is intimately associated with a word of the katharos family. Paul uses the term three times in Rom 14:14 when discussing food, but then makes a parallel statement in verse 20 using the kathar root (Rom 14:14 ouden koinon; 14:20 panta men kathara). In Heb 9:13, the writer tells us ei gar to haima

tragon kai taurôn kai spondos damaleôs rhantizousa tous
kekoinômenous hagiazei pros tēn tēs sarkos katharoteta,
posōi mallon to haima tou Christou... kathariei tēn
suneidēsēsin hēmōn ktl... Thus the usage of koinoō is to some
degree clarified by the context, which includes two
instances of words of the katharos family. In fact, in the
dozen instances of koino- words outside Mt 15 and Mk 7, only
three are not elucidated by the use of a kathar- word: Heb
10:29, Acts 21:28 (both books where such a connection has
already been made) and Rev 21:27. This need to explain what
apparently was a very unusual usage seems still to have been
felt in Justin's time, leading him also to gloss koina with
a kathar- word: ou dia to einai auta koina ē akatharta ouk
esthiomen (Dialogue with Trypho 20:3).

Mark follows the general practice of glossing words
from the koinos family with words from the katharos family
when he adds to Jesus' words the explanation katharizōn
panta ta brōmata (Mk 7:19). In Mk 7:2, however, Mark does
not gloss koinais chersin with a katharos family word, but
rather explains the perceived problem by saying that the
hands were aniptois, and then gives a longer explanation in
his note on ritual cleansing using the verb niptomai. This
reflects very ancient Greek usage. In the sixth book of the
Iliad the Trojans, after having been put to flight in the
fields by the Achaeans, are rallied by Hector. Hector then
returns to the city, where his mother proposes to get him
some wine so that he may make a libation to Zeus. To this
he replies (in part), "chersi d'aniptoisin Diī leibein

aithopa oinon hazomai" (Iliad 6:266-267, "I fear to offer sparkling wine to Zeus with unwashed hands"). This cultic association of the nīpt- root is continued in the Septuagint. The verb nīptomai (middle) is used of the ritual washing of the priests' hands and feet in the bronze basin (Ex 30:17-21), and again in the cast metal Sea (II Chr 4:1-6), and of the hands of the innocent in the case of the unsolved homicide (Dt 21:6). In his gloss and note, Mark thus replaces a word which was unusual in a cultic sense with a term having centuries of cultic use in a sense quite appropriate to the story at that point.

The task of this final chapter is to set forth the configuration of the early church as implied by the research of this dissertation, and then to situate the Gospel of Matthew against this background. The results may be briefly anticipated. The early church was divided on the basis of practice into Jewish Christianity and gentile Christianity. The observance of Jewish dietary purity by Jewish Christianity but not by gentile Christianity proved to be a dividing line and a source of conflict. The Gospel of Matthew rejects the idea that Jewish dietary purity is any part of God's will. Matthew thus represents a gentile Christian position.

6.1 Jewish Christianity and Gentile Christianity

This dissertation has outlined five schemata of the development of the early church which are representative of work done over the last century and a half. Two of these were found to be in conflict with the evidence reviewed in the letters of Paul and the Acts of the Apostles. Raymond Brown's schema is based on the belief that there were no distinctive gentile Christian theological or ecclesiological

stances in New Testament times. But the letters of Paul and the Acts of the Apostles show Christians who lived as gentiles. Paul and Luke both give a theological basis for this gentile Christianity, as outlined in chapter four of this dissertation. In that same chapter (and in the first appendix) Jean Daniélou's schema is rejected, as is his secondary distinction between ethnic Jewish Christianity and ethnic gentile Christianity on the basis of nationalism. The rejection of these two schemata leaves three schemata which all postulate some forms of Jewish Christianity and gentile Christianity.

The evidence reviewed in this dissertation supports the hypothesis of a division in Christianity between those who lived in a Jewish manner and those who lived in a gentile manner. Such a division being well attested in the texts, the use of the terms "Jewish Christian" and "gentile Christian" in modern research seems quite appropriate. The evidence thus supports the fundamental insight of F.C. Baur.

Baur's schema can no longer be accepted without modification. Almost immediately upon its publication, voices were raised to object to its characterization of the opposition between the most famous two apostles. This dissertation's research supports those protests. Far from being the leader of the Jewish Christian party, it seems doubtful that Peter was even a life-long member of it. Baur's identification of the "Christus Party" with Peter has found no favour in scholarship. As discussed in chapter

four, Paul does not attack Peter as the leader of a rival party in Corinth. Church tradition later has Peter in Rome, and does not record any struggle with Paul's gospel. I Peter, which later tradition attributes to Peter, is the most Pauline outside the authentic letters of Paul. As also argued in chapter four, the texts do not show Peter embracing a mediating position between that of Paul and his opponents. It rather shows him alternating between a fully gentile Christian position, and the position advocated by at least some Jewish Christians in Jerusalem. Without being absolutely conclusive, the evidence suggests that Peter did finally adopt the gentile Christian position in one form or another.

While Baur's schema may need significant correction at many points, the critical question for this dissertation is whether or not it needs fundamental modification with respect to the number of groups in the early church. Specifically, were there "strict" and "moderate" Jewish Christian parties, as the schema of Ritschl and the early consensus view contend? A case can be made for strict and moderate tendencies or tensions within Jewish Christianity on the basis of the evidence reviewed in this dissertation. Starting from this fact, Ritschl divides Christianity on a soteriological basis: one group, including gentile Christians and moderate Jewish Christians, accepts Jesus Christ as the sole basis of mankind's reconciliation to God, while the second group, made up of strict Jewish Christians, believes that such reconciliation is still also based on the

Jewish nation and law. The texts may in fact support the idea of a division of opinions on what might be called soteriology, perhaps similar to these ideas outlined by Ritschl, and adopted in the early consensus schema. But the evidence is not there to support the existence of sharply divided parties in early Jewish Christianity. As far as the evidence for the New Testament period shows, this remained a division of opinion, not a party division. There was no division in practice in Jerusalem, because there was no division of practice in Jerusalem. All practiced Jewish dietary purity, because all were Jews in a Jewish environment, all "zealots for the law."

Having affirmed the existence of Jewish Christianity and gentile Christianity, we must now consider how these two interacted according to the evidence reviewed in this dissertation. There appears to be a strong link between Jewish Christianity and Jerusalem. Peter and the Jews in the Antiochene church returned to a Jewish way of living upon the arrival of people from James, who presumably came from Jerusalem. Further, in at least in some cases, Paul's Judaizing opponents claimed authority from Jerusalem. According to Acts, when Paul returned to Jerusalem he learned that the Christians there were all zealots for the Jewish law, and in Jerusalem Paul himself observed the law. Even though there is no solid evidence for parties within Jewish Christianity, and even though Jewish Christians were apparently unanimous in observing the Jewish law in

Jerusalem, it is clear that there were differing opinions on how to act with respect to gentile Christianity in the diaspora. The texts reviewed in chapter four show that, at first, Peter and the Antiochene Jews simply adopted a gentile lifestyle, but later were persuaded to return to a Jewish lifestyle. Paul's Judaizing opponents lived in a Jewish way, and called Paul's congregations to do the same. But as argued above, it appears that Peter returned to living as a gentile amongst the gentile Christians by the time of Paul's first letter to the Corinthians.

The second aspect of the interaction between Jewish Christianity and gentile Christianity which Baur's schema outlines is the diachronic one. Did these two forms of Christianity in fact interact dialectically to produce early catholic Christianity? There is no direct evidence that this was the case. Much of the indirect evidence used by Baur would now be rejected. Many aspects of Jewish Christianity he found in later Christian writings are based on a view of Judaism which is now untenable (see especially the arguments in the appropriate part of chapter three of this dissertation). He assumed a much later emergence of early catholic Christianity- and hence a longer period for the dialectic interaction- than can now be accepted. Perhaps most importantly, writing when he did he could assume a dialectic movement in history, an assumption which is much less readily accepted in the present day.

In closing, the pertinent conclusions on Jewish Christianity and gentile Christianity may be briefly

summarized. Jewish Christianity was established in Jerusalem and in areas under its immediate influence. Adherents of Jewish Christianity observed Jewish dietary purity and circumcision. The churches established by Paul, and the churches known by Luke outside Palestine, lived in a gentile way, not observing circumcision or Jewish dietary purity except perhaps the limited purity regulation of the Apostolic Decree. This division is so well documented and clear in the New Testament texts that on its basis the Gospel of Matthew may be characterized as either Jewish Christian or gentile Christian.

6.2 Matthew: Jewish Christian or Gentile Christian?

The conclusion of chapter five of this dissertation, on the basis of Mt 15:1-20, is that the Gospel of Matthew does not accept Jewish dietary purity as part of God's will. The arguments presented in that chapter trace in detail how Matthew has redacted his Marcan source, and show that Matthew does not reject or limit Mark's attack on Jewish dietary purity. This research shows in fact that Matthew has even less sympathy for ritual dietary purity than Mark does, and considers purity valid only as a moral category. This opinion represents the redactional position of the author of the Gospel of Matthew (see arguments in the introduction and in chapter five). Any later redactors of Matthew, if there were any (no compelling case has been made for such), did not find it necessary to alter the Matthean

rejection of Jewish dietary purity. Thus a place in the evolution of early Christianity must be found for Matthew in which there is no sympathy for Jewish dietary purity, but rather where purity is only accepted as a moral category.

The position of Matthew is incompatible with that of Jewish Christianity according to all the contemporary records. In chapter four, the evidence of Paul and Luke on Jewish Christianity was reviewed. The evidence showed a Jewish Christianity centred in Jerusalem which observed Jewish dietary purity. There was, however, controversy recorded within this group about the conduct which should be required by Jewish Christians of the new gentile converts to Christianity, and of the appropriate Jewish Christian behavior in relation to the gentile Christians. But neither side of this controversy gives rise to the type of view expressed on Jewish dietary purity in the Gospel of Matthew. Those demanding observance by all Christians could not, of course, have written Matthew with its rejection of dietary purity. But neither could those Jewish Christians who did not demand observance by gentile Christians have written Matthew. A writer who accepted Jewish dietary purity for Jewish Christians but did not demand it of gentile Christians would hold to a double standard, or at least to two levels of practice, as, for instance, seems to be indicated in the book of the Acts. But there is no suggestion in the Gospel of Matthew of two levels of practice on Jewish dietary purity. There is no redactional indication in Matthew that he believes his readers will be

subject to a different law than the original believers. Nor does Matthew call his readers to ignore some commandments, at risk of bringing upon himself the fate of being "called the least in the Kingdom of Heaven" for having "set aside one of the least of these commandments and teaching others to do so" (Mt 5:19). For him dietary ritual purity is not one of the commandments, and in fact is associated with the tradition which frustrates the will of God. Chapter five, however, provides an even stronger argument against authorship by this type of Jewish Christian. In that chapter it was argued that the Matthean explanation of why food cannot defile is phrased in such a way that it would be convincing only to those who already accepted as given that purity is valid only as a moral category. Such a position is not attributed to anyone who could be called Jewish Christian in the documents which have been examined in this dissertation. It was further noted in chapter five that, unless significant early evidence has been lost or misunderstood, the writer of Matthew may even have misconstrued the way in which the "tradition of the elders" functioned with respect to dietary purity. These considerations show that there is no place in Jewish Christianity as it is known from first century documents for the views on Jewish dietary purity expressed by Matthew.

The Matthean rejection of Jewish dietary purity dictates that the Gospel of Matthew be situated in the stream of gentile Christianity. Its position within that

stream may be estimated by a review of the data from Paul and Luke. In chapter four it was seen that Luke reflects a form of gentile Christianity whose members were dispensed from any general observance of Jewish dietary purity, but were authoritatively commanded to observe the Apostolic Decree (Acts 15:29). While these modest requirements are most certainly not a call to Jewish dietary purity, they are still a little shy of Matthew's bold statement "It is not what goes into the mouth which defiles a person" (Mt 15:11). Much closer to the Matthean position is Paul's view. As seen from the discussion in chapter four, Paul leaves no theological place for Jewish dietary purity in Christianity. Paul, however, did not just deal with theology in the abstract, but had to deal with practical problems from a pastoral perspective. Perhaps on this basis he allowed for certain practices, such as abstinence from food offered to idols, a practice which may resemble dietary purity. Since Matthew makes no such exceptions, it could be argued that he is even further from Jewish Christianity and more resolutely gentile Christian than Paul. But since Matthew's writing is a story which does not need to deal with particular cases as do Paul's letters, it is hard to be certain how he might have reacted to certain practical situations. What can be said, though, is that Matthew's theological rejection of Jewish dietary purity is so categorical as to put him unequivocally within the gentile Christian stream. He is certainly further from the Jewish Christian position than the gentile Christian position reflected by Luke.

This dissertation thus concludes that the Gospel of Matthew represents a gentile Christian position.

Supplementary Conclusions on Early Church Evolution

The body of the final chapter of this dissertation has presented all the evidence necessary to decide whether Matthew reflects a Jewish Christian or gentile Christian position. The New Testament evidence is so clear and unambiguous on the question of Jewish dietary purity, that no further discussion of the development of the church beyond that presented in Acts and the letters of Paul was found necessary for the work of this dissertation on Matthew. It would be of interest, however, to draw out the implications of this dissertation's research for understanding the evolution of the early church. This excursus will thus present, very briefly, the schema of early church development which seems to be implied by the evidence. It should be stressed that the work in this excursus does not constitute any part of the basis on which Matthew was classified; it is rather a supplementary comment, and is more speculative than the conclusions about the Gospel of Matthew.

The evidence reviewed seems to indicate that Jewish Christianity was centred in Jerusalem, while gentile Christianity was the dominant form outside Palestine. Paul and Luke give evidence of gentile Christians continuing to live as gentiles. Some gentiles may have been converted to Jewish Christianity (perhaps the case where certain of Paul's opponents triumphed), but there is no clear New Testament evidence for this. Jewish Christianity was and

remained, as it seems from the New Testament evidence, Jerusalem-centred. While the Jerusalem community itself lived in a traditionally Jewish manner, its views on how gentile Christians should act were divided. There is very little evidence about the conduct of Jews in the church outside Jerusalem. Paul certainly adopted a gentile lifestyle and it appears likely that other Jews about whom we have some information- Peter and Apollos for example- also adopted a gentile lifestyle while amongst gentiles. In all probability, some Jews in the Diaspora lived as Jewish Christians, but New Testament evidence for such Jewish Christians is very weak.

The development of the early catholic church must remain somewhat less clearly defined since there is less direct evidence for it than there is for Jewish Christianity and gentile Christianity in the very early church. The lack of sympathy for Jewish traditions shown in the Gospel of Matthew and the strong warning by Ignatius against listening to any who "proclaim Judaism" (Ignatius to the Philadelphians, chapter 6) militate against the idea of a synthesis of Jewish Christianity and gentile Christianity. Furthermore, since it has been noted that Jewish Christianity was centred in Jerusalem, with the fall of Jerusalem the power and attraction of Jewish Christianity would have of necessity been greatly reduced. The ever-increasing gentile majority (see, even during Paul's lifetime, the evidence of Romans 9-11) would have put great

pressure on those Jewish Christians who were in close contact with gentile Christians to go over to gentile Christianity, or at least to tolerate that their children do so. A few more physically or socially isolated Jewish Christian groups (such as the Ebionites) remained distinct for some time. Gentile Christianity no doubt preserved some of Christianity's Jewish heritage, but it essentially assimilated its Jewish members to a gentile lifestyle. Although Ritschl was wrong in his division of the groups in the very early church, he was probably correct in asserting that the early catholic church was built largely on a gentile base. It is thus likely that most of its Jewish elements came from its reading of the Old Testament (see the letter to the Hebrews' uses of the Old Testament) rather than from a synthesis with Jewish Christianity.

The schema advanced here thus accepts the division between Jewish Christianity and gentile Christianity inspired by Baur. It does not accept the full dialectic development he suggests. Rather it suggests that gentile Christianity, while built on the teaching of the Old Testament and the Jewish Jesus, nevertheless was always identifiably gentile and was only influenced in a limited way by the Jewish Christians which it assimilated. Jewish Christianity slowly faded away, while the early catholic church was established largely on a gentile basis.

SURVEY OF RESEARCH INTO THE RISE OF
THE EARLY CATHOLIC CHURCH

Chapter one of this dissertation presented five of the most influential and representative theories of the development of the early Christian church. In that chapter, only as much information was presented as was necessary for a full consideration of the problem of whether the Gospel of Matthew reflects a Jewish Christian or gentile Christian position. This appendix will set the contentions of chapter one on a firmer basis by presenting a fuller discussion of the contribution of certain major scholars from F.C. Baur to Raymond Brown.¹

7.1 The First Period:

From Baur and Ritschl to a Consensus Position

7.1.1 F.C. Baur

F.C. Baur's goal in tracing the early history of Christianity is to understand the development of mankind's religious consciousness². He sees religion as essentially a moral system, although by this he means something broader than might be implied by the English word "moral". The motor which moves the process of development forward is the

dialectical clash of thesis and antithesis giving rise to a synthesis. In the early history of Christianity, the thesis is Jewish Christianity, which is particularistic: it was oriented toward one nation, and expressed itself in the forms of Jewish cult. These forms characteristically include circumcision, obedience to the Mosaic Law, and certain regulations respecting relations with gentiles. The antithesis might be called Hellenistic Christianity, Paulinism, or (due to the element which quickly predominated) gentile Christianity. This form of Christianity was universalizing, tending to include all nations and expressing itself in forms not limited by Jewish tradition. It did not encourage circumcision, or obedience to the Mosaic Law or countenance any discrimination in relations between Jewish and gentile Christians. The synthesis, Catholic Christianity, maintained the universalizing aspect of gentile Christianity and the historical roots and ecclesiastical structure of Jewish Christianity, while tempering the stress on faith versus works of the former and rejecting the Jewish exclusiveness of the latter.

Baur's synthetic view of Christianity of the first century is by no means a product of unfettered imagination, as some would argue. Dialectical analysis is the method he uses to study the texts before him, but it is the careful consideration of these texts themselves which yields the results. Subsequent critical work has questioned the

validity of this type of dialectical reasoning, and justifiably decries Baur's misunderstanding of Judaism. Nonetheless, it is Baur's brilliant analysis which has set the agenda for research on Jewish Christianity.

Following the Book of Acts, Baur can trace a development of the early church consistent with his dialectical interpretation. The earliest Christian community in Jerusalem was made up of both Hebrew and Hellenist Jews. Even within this group, Hellenism represents for Baur first a universalizing principle, and second a tendency to spiritualize and internalize religion. The first attack against external worship (represented by the Temple) and call to spiritual worship is recounted in the story of the martyrdom of Stephen. The Hellenists' challenge to the received order was so great that they were forced to flee Jerusalem, leaving the mother church entirely composed of Hebrews, that is, Jewish Christians. In their eastern Mediterranean diaspora, the Hellenists' universalizing principle found expression in their preaching of the Gospel to gentiles.

The Hellenistic view, although present in the bud in the earliest community, came to flower in the thought and career of Paul. Setting out from Antioch, he preached Christianity as a universal religion, not bound by the particularism of the Mosaic Law. On the other side, Jerusalem continued to move within the bounds of the Jewish nation, both in the sense of only preaching to Jews and in the sense of continuing to observe the Jewish law.

Baur is able to reconstruct the first serious clash between Jewish and gentile Christianity from the early chapters of Galatians and Acts, informed by his earlier work on the various parties alluded to in 1 Cor. A group from Jerusalem had visited Antioch, and was distressed to see Antiochene gentile Christians claiming an equal place with them, while disregarding all the particulars of Judaism. In Baur's view, the Jerusalem delegates' position was adopted by the "pillar apostles," James, Peter and John. The ensuing meeting between Paul, Barnabas, Titus and the "pillars" resulted essentially in a recognition of the complete separation and independence of the two parties. The one party was to preach a Gospel of Jewish Christianity to Jews, the other a law-free Gospel to the gentiles.

While these two groups may have theoretically recognized and accepted each other and the line of demarcation between them, in practice there was of course crossing of this line and conflict between the two groups. The incident between Peter and Paul in Antioch is the most notorious instance of this conflict. Later, people from the Jewish Christian party went to Galatia (a mainly gentile Christian church) and were at least partly successful in convincing the church there that to be saved they must also take the whole yoke of the law upon themselves. Their thesis that circumcision (and therefore keeping the whole Mosaic Law) is necessary for salvation was immediately opposed by Paul with the antithesis that if a man is

circumcised he has no profit from Christ. A similar situation shortly obtained in Corinth as well, where representatives of the Jewish Christian party also arrived to try to win converts.

Jewish Christianity not only spread in Palestine and into the Pauline churches, it also spread by means of the natural relations between Jerusalem and the large Jewish communities of the Diaspora. An outstanding example of this would be the church of Rome, which Baur claims was made up predominantly of Jews, and was of a Jewish Christian theological persuasion.

In Baur's scheme, the clash between these two parties was sufficiently strong to lead him to the conclusion that Jewish Christians were partially responsible for the riot that broke out on the occasion of Paul's last visit to Jerusalem. There was no reconciliation during the lifetime of Paul.

The synthesis of these two ideas of Christianity was worked out in the period following Paul's death. It was brought about by the realization that the two parties really belonged together. The Jewish Christian party had originally insisted on the absolute necessity of circumcision for salvation. But as the number of gentiles entering the church became overwhelmingly preponderant, the Jewish Christians abandoned this position, and in a move toward Christian universalism, replaced circumcision with baptism (this is even the case in the Pseudo-Clementine literature). Only a small group of Jewish Christians

rejected this accommodation. The next step in this process was marked by the Apostolic Decree, which is of course dated quite late by Baur. With the promulgation of this decree (a sort of minimum of law) and the substitution of baptism for circumcision, free association between Jewish and gentile Christians became possible. Baur holds that in the early catholic church, the principle of universalism had won the day. Jewish Christianity brought into this synthesis its ecclesiastical structure, which allowed the church to grow into the cohesive institution of the catholic church. In this structure, the bishop functioned for each community as Christ himself, understood on the model of the Jewish Messiah, functioned for the whole church. This structure, therefore, brought together the two parties, leaving out only certain backwater movements such as Ebionism and various other groups branded as heretical.

Although outside our period, it should be noted that Baur held the church develops in all periods by a dialectical process of internal oppositions. In the second century, the antitheses the early catholic church faced were Gnosticism and Montanism.

7.1.2

Albrecht Ritschl

Baur studied the early history of Christianity to understand the development of mankind's religious consciousness. Ritschl's orientation was very different.³ For him, what lies at the heart of his study of the history of the early Christian Church is the question of its

understanding of mankind's reconciliation to God. This being the case, it is not surprising that the problem of how Christianity related to the law is of great importance for Ritschl.

In sharp contrast to Baur, Ritschl does not see the early catholic church as a synthesis of Paulinism and Jewish Christianity, but rather as a development of gentile Christianity which had finally separated itself from its Jewish roots. This separation was brought about both by external factors such as culture and politics, and by internal factors such as the inordinate demands made by the Jewish Christians on gentile Christians in the Apostolic Decree. Catholic Christianity was not a triumph of "Paulinism" either, since Ritschl by no means ascribes as much significance to Paul as does Baur. The catholic church misunderstood Paul as much as it did Peter, and neither had a dominant influence on it.

The divorce of the catholic church from its Jewish roots means that it lost its context for interpreting the Old Testament presuppositions on which it was built. This led to a drift into a new type of legalism, a legalism which was distinctly Christian, and not Pauline or Jewish Christian. It should be noted that from Ritschl's Protestant point of view, this loss was by no means religiously neutral, but was a real disaster for mankind, a disaster only to be reversed in the Reformation.

Let us review the history of the early Christian church,

and especially its struggles about the Mosaic Law, as viewed by Ritschl.

The Apostles at first followed Jesus' example in going only to Israel, believing perhaps that all Israel must be saved before the entry of the gentiles. Peter's conversion of the Roman centurion Cornelius does not really represent an exception, because Cornelius was added to the church as a proselyte. The initial attitude of the Christian Church toward the law was set by Jesus himself. He distinguished between two types of laws: those laws which pertain to man's highest end and are therefore permanently and universally binding; and those laws which exist for the sake of men, and are therefore adiaphora. As long as Christendom was contained within Israel, the Apostles could not distinguish between the national facets and the religious facets of the law.

The mission to the gentiles started in Antioch independently of the Apostles. It appears that in this city, gentiles were baptized without being asked to observe the Mosaic Law, but some time thereafter former Pharisees from Jerusalem demanded that they be circumcised and obey the whole law. This demand, Ritschl notes, is an indication of true Jewish Christianity. The original Apostles did not support this demand and found themselves in the position of having to oppose and yet conciliate this group. At the meeting held in Jerusalem, attended by Paul and Barnabas as delegates from Antioch, the solution adopted was the Apostolic Decree. The decree is pivotal for Ritschl's

understanding of this period. It in effect gave proselyte status to the new converts, thus preserving the priority of the Jews, while still allowing for full recognition of the gentiles as brothers and sisters. Full fellowship was maintained between Jewish Christians and non-Christian Jews. Gentile Christians, however, still remained ritually unclean, and thus full table fellowship was not established within the Christian Church itself. Ritschl is highly critical of this attempt at a solution, saying: "In dem Dekrete ist eine Norm des mosaischen Gesetzes direkt auf die Verhältnisse der christlichen Gemeinde angewendet. Muss man dies nicht so verstehen, dass eigentlich das ganze mosaische Gesetz im Christenthume gilt, jedoch aus äusseren Gründen nur ein Minimum davon bei den Heidenchristen durchgesetzt wird?" (Entstehung 131) The fact is, even James and Peter saw the converted Jews as the true people of the old covenant, and as the core of the new covenant- as we can see even from their letters (which Ritschl accepts as genuine).

The Apostolic Decree made sense in Palestine, where most Christians were Jewish. In the Diaspora, however, where most Christians were gentile, full communion between Jewish and gentile Christians was more important than full communion between Jewish Christians in the Diaspora and their co-religionists in Palestine. It quickly followed that this full communion was established in the Diaspora on gentile terms, that is to say, without observance of the Mosaic Law. This practice represents Paul's position.

While this was not a formal breach of the Decree, it was certainly less than full observance of the law by all Jews, which is of course what James had wanted.

Peter was sympathetic to Paul's position, and when he came down to Antioch he ate with the gentile Christians without concerning himself about their ritual uncleanness. When representatives came from Jerusalem to recall Peter to James's understanding of the Decree, Peter withdrew from such fellowship. Ritschl cannot find indisputable evidence that Peter returned to his position of ignoring questions of ritual purity and to full communion with gentile Christians, but he clearly suspects that Peter did eventually return to that Pauline position. This question is secondary. What is central is that Paul, Peter and even James were in complete agreement that faith in Christ is the condition for admission to the new covenant.

At this point there were essentially two groups within Christianity. The first group recognized faith in Christ as the only universal condition for full Christianity. Within this group we find the Pauline tendency which, while accepting the Apostolic Decree, did not require any further observance of the Mosaic ritual law from anyone; and the tendency of James, which expected the gentiles to observe the Apostolic Decree and ethnic Jews to observe the whole law. The second major group within Christianity at this time comprised the Jewish Christians in the strict sense of the term, which Ritschl often calls the "strenge (as opposed to "milde") Judenchristen." They did not recognize any form

of Christianity except that which is based on the Jewish people. Gentiles might therefore become Christians only through circumcision and obedience to the whole Law of Moses. This group, of course, did not recognize the apostleship of Paul, and are the people Paul refers to as demanding the circumcision of Titus, and were responsible for the opposition to Paul's work in Galatia. With the passage of time, those who held James's position became the Nazarenes, while the extreme Jewish Christians became the Pharisaic and Essene Ebionites.

The reason for the split between what became mainstream Christianity and the "strict" Jewish Christianity is self-evident. "Moderate" Jewish Christianity (the position represented by James), despite the general observance of the Apostolic Decree, still could not accept full communion with the gentile Christians. Its influence on gentile Christianity disappeared at least after the Bar-Cochba revolt, when Jewish Christians (with all Jews) were banished from Jerusalem, and gentile Christians replaced them in that important city. The positions of Paul and Peter did influence general Christianity, but not to a great extent. The true development of Christianity moved with the current of the increasing gentile majority, and grew in response to factors in the gentile world (such as Gnosticism and Montanism), with no relation to Jewish Christianity.

7.1.3

Edouard Reuss

Edouard Reuss was a professor at the Protestant

Seminary in Strasbourg, which was under German rule at the time. That strategic location allowed him to contribute to both French and German scholarship.

History

Based on Paul's statement in 1 Cor 15:6, Reuss notes that when Jesus left this world he already had hundreds of disciples, and according to Acts within a few more weeks had thousands (Théologie, I:282).⁴ This important and rather neglected fact, Reuss tells us, shows that the centre of gravity of the early church is to be found in the mass of disciples, not in a few individuals or a fortiori in the Twelve. The Twelve's influence would have been further circumscribed quite early on by the entry of a large number of priests and Pharisees, men with a far greater formal education than the Galileans. This mass of people had not believed in a new religion or new doctrine, but rather with repentance and baptism had believed that Jesus was the Messiah and herald of the End. This new conviction was, of course, entirely within the bounds of their Jewish beliefs. Further, based on the statement in Acts 21:10 ("all zealots for the law"), he claims that the mass of Christians were closer to the Pharisees than to any other Jewish group at the time. The bulk of the Christians remained faithful members of the synagogue and followers of all the traditions attached to it (Théologie I: 282-297).

While the mass of Jesus' followers remained fully attached to the Jewish institutions, the Hellenist Jews saw

that the gospel ideas were really incompatible with the Mosaic institutions. The clear expression of this fact, transmitted to us by Luke in the speech he has Stephen give, brought about a persecution of Hellenistic Christians. Some fled to Antioch, where gentiles were then converted to Christianity. The two groups, Jewish and gentile Christian, co-existed in harmony, sharing common meals. (Théologie I: 297-306)

The peace of this communion was shortly troubled by the arrival of Christian Pharisees from Jerusalem, who held that circumcision and the Mosaic code must be observed by all Christian men. It was decided to send a delegation to meet with the apostles in Jerusalem to iron out these difficulties. While Paul was expecting this to be a private discussion, members of the stricter party insinuated themselves into these meetings, making them very difficult. The decision of the Apostles was in favour of Paul, that uncircumcised gentiles should be admitted as full brothers in the church, only being asked to observe the Noachic commandments. (Théologie I:306-320)

Though this decision brought about a truce, three parties or opinions were already beginning to emerge. The Pharisaic Christians basically believed that the law was for all believers; the pillar apostles accepted gentiles without circumcision; and Paul shared the pillars' opinions but clearly was moving at a deeper level of understanding.

Although the compromise appeared destined for success,

it could not last. Paul moved from his earlier naive position to full realization that in Christ there was a new covenant, a new law, and therefore that the Mosaic covenant was no longer in effect for any group of Christians. The apostles held to the original compromise, the incident between Peter and Paul in Antioch being a hesitation of no real significance. The Pharisaic party returned to its true belief that the law applies to all, and soon began actively to take their gospel to the churches founded by Paul. (Théologie I: 342-353)

As time passed, the antipathy of some supporters of the Pharisaic position forced them toward what eventually became Ebionism. On the other hand, some who were opposed to the law drifted to antinomianism or to Gnosticism. But the great mass of the church did not push either of these positions to its logical limit, perhaps never even really understanding either. Nevertheless, the general influence of Paul's thinking was far greater than that of the other parties in the final form taken by the church. (Théologie II:265-290)

In Reuss's work we see the beginning of the pattern which would characterize the early consensus on the history of the church in this period. Reuss accepts Ritschl's contention that the division between Paul and the pillar apostles was not as deep and fundamental as Baur had held. Nevertheless, he cannot fully accept Ritschl's conclusion that the church developed along an essentially gentile trajectory, thus really abandoning Baur's idea of a

synthesis of Jewish and gentile. Reuss therefore feels that the position held by the pillar apostles (and perhaps even the position of the Pharisaic Christians) did influence the church, which however developed on a predominantly Pauline basis.

7.1.4

Ernest Renan

Ernest Renan is most famous for his life of Jesus, which is the first book of his Histoire des origines du christianisme.⁵ In that volume, he consciously sets himself apart from the growing consensus by crediting the Gospel of John with a high degree of historical accuracy. His preference for John accords well with his own idealistic, romantic view of Jesus. The perceived tension between the lofty, romantic mind of Jesus, and the generally baser but more practical minds of his immediate followers and Paul is an important theme in his presentation of early Christianity.

Renan shares the prevalent view of his time that the crucial spiritual achievement of late antiquity is the progress of the Jewish tradition from being a national religion to being a universal religion. He argues that to become universal, Judaism had to divest itself of its national and political aspects, of circumcision and similar practices: in short, it had to reduce itself to a sort of Deism (Book 2, p. 259). Many of its adherents had already accomplished this, and Judaism itself might have become the universal religion were it not for the fanaticism which took

hold of it, the same fanaticism which led to the First Jewish War. In taking these steps toward universalism, Judaism both prepared the way for Christianity, and foreshadowed many of the internal struggles it would have to endure.

History of the Early Church

During his ministry, Jesus had already seen the absolute necessity of the abrogation of the Mosaic Law and the complete emancipation of universal religion from Judaism (Book 1, pp. 230-232). Despite this, the church came to realize the essential difference between Jesus' ideas and Judaism only through a long struggle.

The original core of the church was composed of "Hebrews," and only Aramaic was spoken. Greek started to be used in about the third year after Jesus' death, Renan estimates, due to the influx of Hellenistic Jewish converts. Very quickly, conversions of Hellenists outnumbered those of Hebrews, so that even the apostles learned or improved their Greek. (Book 2, pp. 110ff)

Stephen's surprising speech in the book of Acts poses no problem for Renan's scheme. Since Christianity from its very inception in Jesus' mind stands in opposition to Judaism, Stephen's speech is not really a new development, but rather a statement of a basic insight of Christianity. As such, it causes a violent reaction from the Jewish authorities, but does not cause a corresponding reaction or split within the Christian community (Book 2, pp. 138ff).

The appointment of deacons is also accepted by Renan as a coherent part of the early church. These Hellenists were in fact appointed as the book of Acts states, and did serve as deacons in the church of Jerusalem; it was only when the church was first persecuted and much of the community dispersed that these talented Hellenists became evangelists. (Book 2, chapter 9. pp. 150-162)

The most significant step in early Christianity was the establishment of the church in Antioch by a number of Jerusalem Hellenists. This great development forced the question of the terms of admission for the gentiles, and also brought the recognition and naming of this new religious movement:

C'est ici un moment très-important. L'heure où une création nouvelle reçoit son nom est solennelle; car le nom est le signe définitif de l'existence. C'est par le nom qu'un être individuel ou collectif devient lui-même et sort d'un autre. La formation du mot "chrétien" marque ainsi la date précise où l'Eglise de Jésus se sépara du judaïsme. (Book 2, pp. 235-236)

In becoming a separate religion:

...la vraie pensée de Jésus a triomphé de l'indécision de ses premiers disciples. (Book 2, p. 236)

During this time Paul was converted and became associated with the church at Antioch. Renan holds that since resurrection as described in the New Testament is impossible, Paul's experience with the risen Christ was totally subjective. At first Paul preached circumcision (Book 3, p. 72, based on II Cor 5:16 and Gal 5:11), but later came to the conclusion that it was useless. This development, and in fact his whole doctrine of Christianity,

was his own, and not really that of the ideas of Jesus. His not knowing Jesus is a major point for Renan, who always considers Paul in some ways lacking in his understanding of Jesus. (Book 2, pp. 163-190)

Barnabas, who was the most advanced Christian in Jerusalem, led the support for Antioch. His zeal impelled him to move to Antioch. He later accompanied Paul to Jerusalem to examine this question of the basis for the admission of gentiles. Paul had hoped to meet privately with the pillar apostles since he knew that in a large and impassioned assembly, the narrower spirits would always gain the upper hand. At this time there were two clear parties: one (represented by Paul), which held circumcision to be without value; and one (represented by many Christian Pharisees) which held that a convert must become a Jew to become a Christian. Peter was totally indifferent to party questions, feeling no such question of principle to be worth risking the peace of the church. He was so greatly impressed by Paul that he was won over to him- but this very suppleness was later to create problems. The final decision was to admit gentiles while only asking them to observe the Noachic commandments. This compromise put the problem off more than it solved it. (Book 3, pp. 57-95)

Peter left Jerusalem and took up the life of a traveling evangelist in Syria, leaving James as the head of the church in Jerusalem. Horrified by the mass of new converts not attached to the Jewish religion, James hatched

a plan to follow Paul and try to persuade Paul's converts that they must be circumcised and practice the whole law. Representatives of James came to Antioch and persuaded Peter to withdraw from fellowship with the gentiles there. However, since Peter basically agreed with Paul, after the departure of James' people he probably resumed his eating with the gentiles. Nevertheless, a division remained, such that one could say that the church was divided into a Jewish parish and a gentile parish. (Book 3, pp. 278-310; for the final assertion, Renan refers to the Apostolic Constitutions vii, 46.)

According to Renan, the resolution of these conflicts came about in a way very similar to the one proposed by Baur. The Pauline and Petrine churches (most especially in Rome) realized their basic unity. However, he follows Ritschl in holding that Peter and Paul's disagreement was not nearly so deep or fundamental as Baur believed, so the basis for unity is much easier to see. The true Judaizing group was headed by James and centred in Jerusalem; so when Jerusalem was destroyed and this group fled to the Trans-Jordan, its influence on the church as a whole grew less and less. It eventually became the Ebionite sect. Except for this church and the churches of Syria, everywhere "the Jewish Christians were, as it were, drowned by the flood of new converts." (Hibbert Lectures 138)

7.1.5.

Carl von Weizsäcker

Carl von Weizsäcker succeeded F.C. Baur as professor of

Church History at Tübingen. He was apparently much less interested in a philosophical understanding of the development of the human religious consciousness than his predecessor, while being just as interested in a pragmatic tracing of the early period of Christianity. For Weizsäcker, following Baur, the essential question that stands behind the development of the church is whether or not Christianity is to reflect universalism rather than particularism. In the early Jewish Christian tradition there is a mixture of the particular and the universal. That which is of the essence is, of course, that which is universal- and this "purer tradition" (Apostolic 1:71)⁶ was passed on in the church, while the particularistic tradition was carried on in the marginal Ebionites.

History

After Jesus' death and resurrection, his disciples (who were mostly Galileans) quickly established their community in Jerusalem as a Jewish sect. This Christian Union or Sect was more like the Essenes in form than like a synagogue or school. Evangelists were sent out on the model of the mission of the Twelve in the Gospels and shortly made converts among the Jews of Jerusalem, Judaea and the Diaspora. Hellenist Jews joined the Jerusalem community early in its history, but in contrast to Baur, Weizsäcker does not believe that their views anticipate those of Paul, nor that Stephen is a precursor of Paul. The opposition to the Temple, so important in Stephen's speech, is not found

in Paul's thought. In that speech, Stephen may be expounding an Alexandrine line of thought, but no solid conclusions about the early Hellenists' views may be drawn, since most of the speech reflects later ideas.

The conversion of Paul was a decisive step in the development of early Christianity. Weizsäcker believes that Paul immediately began to preach a universalist Christianity completely free from the Jewish law. Working in total independence from Jerusalem, he established churches around Damascus, then founded the church in Antioch (sic), followed by churches elsewhere in Syria and in Cilicia. His hope was that by the results of his missionary work he could demonstrate to Jerusalem and the Jewish Christian church that his approach to the gentiles was the correct one. His fond dream was that Jerusalem would accept his congregations, and all would be united in one communion.

At first Jerusalem looked with favour on Paul's work. Later, however, large numbers of new converts who were "zealots for the law" joined the church in Jerusalem "... with the intention never, even as Christians, to abandon any part of the law" (Apostolic I: 183). This group of "false brothers" (as Paul calls them) demanded that at a minimum Paul's converts be circumcised. While this was a vocal group, it did not win over the bulk of the Jerusalem church. The controversy was sharp enough, however, that Paul came up to Jerusalem to meet with the "pillars," as recounted in Gal 2. While he holds that Gal 2: 1-10 corresponds to Acts 15, Weizsäcker stresses the difference between the two reports,

and concludes that we must follow the eye-witness account rather than the later idealized one. Peter could not have been the advocate of the Pauline gospel that Acts makes him out to be; Paul was not the submissive, obedient delegate Acts makes him to be; the so-called Apostolic Decree could not have been issued at this time, since Paul says "they added nothing to me" (Gal 2:6). Had the Decree been in effect, there would not have been the clash later in Antioch. It is more likely, therefore, that the decree came out of the conflict in Antioch. Following Paul's report, then, this was a private meeting in Jerusalem, not a general council, and its result was a sort of mission treaty between Paul and Barnabas on the one hand and James, Peter and John on the other.

The mission treaty was quite specific. According to it, each party recognized the full validity of the other's work, and affirmed their unity in faith and religion. It recognized the proclamation of a gospel to the circumcised by James, Peter, and John, and also recognized the proclamation of a law-free gospel to the gentiles by Paul. Weizsäcker draws from this treaty the exegetical conclusion that since Paul agreed to the treaty, he must in fact have preached first to gentiles in his missionary work, not to Jews first as Acts asserts. He further draws the philosophical conclusion that this agreement, since it marks the acceptance of gentiles, is a major step in the dialectical process: "the faith in which they (Jews and

gentiles) were at one became the higher unity, and the belief in Christ could not but develop into an independent religion." (Apostolic I:188)

The first problems resulting from this treaty occurred at the church in Antioch, which, we recall, Weizsäcker believes was founded by Paul. Gentiles in this church had of course been converted to Paul's law-free gospel, and the Jewish Christians there, following the founder Paul, did not observe traditional food laws or worry about any defilement their relations with gentiles might occasion. When Peter did likewise in Antioch, James sent representatives to call Peter back to observance of the law. In doing so he was not opposing Paul, but merely recalling Jews to their rightful duty, and was acting in line with the treaty with Paul. The position of James led to the division of the Antiochene church into separate Jewish and gentile congregations. This, of course, was a great blow to Paul's goal of bringing about the union of his gentile churches with the Jewish Christian church.

It is Weizsäcker's conclusion that Paul did not carry the day in Antioch. The clash probably resulted in the Apostolic Decree, which is incorrectly dated in Acts. In the earlier agreement, the pillar apostles had pledged not to reject gentile Christians. But since they did not abandon the law for their mission in Jewish territory (which Weizsäcker seems to interpret as covering Judaea and all the areas of Jewish colonization), the Apostolic Decree represents the conditions which would be laid on gentile

Christians in contact with Jewish Christians in Jewish territory. The effect of the Decree, however, was to create an exclusive Judaism within Christianity, a consequence which was anathema to Paul.

Following the clash in Antioch, Weizsäcker identifies three parties within the church. One party consisted of Paul and his churches. It adhered to a law-free gospel, and was composed mostly of gentiles, with of course some Jews. A second party consisted of the Lord's brothers, Peter, James, John and their converts. From I Cor 9:5 we know that they travelled about evangelizing; given the mission treaty, we must assume that, whether in Judaea or the Diaspora, they only converted Jews. The Petrine party in Corinth (I Cor 1:12) must not have been founded or encouraged by Peter. The relationship of this party to Paul was marked by tension and coolness, but there was no open hostility as both sides observed the mission treaty.

The third party was made up of the "Judaizers," those "zealots for the law" who had never been a party to the mission treaty, and did not respect its terms. They in fact systematically attempted to win Paul's churches over to their position that to be Christians, gentiles must become Jews who believe in Jesus as the Messiah. Since they presented this as the true teaching of Jesus, their followers in Corinth adopted the name of the "Christus Party" (I Cor 1:12). The book of Revelation represents their point of view. From the section where the 144,000

Jews are spoken of, we learn that the Christus party saw gentiles as second class Christians admitted only by martyrdom (Apostolic II: 19-20). On the death of James, a member of this party became the head of the Jerusalem community.

The further development of the Christian church was greatly influenced by the war. This crisis brought the Jewish Christian church to the realization that the Jewish nation was going the wrong way. This fundamental conclusion pushed all questions of zeal for the law into the background. The Christus party split from the Jewish nation and fled Jerusalem. They continued to influence the church, both opposing Paul and, more positively, contributing to the general heritage of the church, as evidenced by the letter of James and by the sources used in Luke and Acts.

In the end, a church emerged which in many ways might be considered a new or second form of gentile Christianity. The barrier between Jews and gentiles fell by the very weight of the large number of gentile Christians. This new church which developed amongst gentiles was resolutely universalistic and completely free from the particularism of the Jewish law. It developed amongst people who had not taken part in the battle between Paul and the zealots over the law. Because of this, it was as free of Paul's particular theology of justification by faith in opposition to works as it was of the law as proposed by the Judaizers, while yet showing some influence from both these traditions. This newer type of gentile Christianity developed quickly in

Rome, where Christianity had appeared independently of Paul, but since it was a natural development it soon became the dominant form everywhere.

Welzsäcker's view of the evolution of the early catholic church is a consummate weaving together of Baur's ideas and Ritschl's critique. With Baur, he carefully traces the budding and flowering of the strain of universalism. He has worked out a way for two opposing principles to struggle in dialectic tension to a new resolution. But he agrees with Ritschl that Peter and Paul's disagreement was not as fundamental as Baur thought, and that Peter and Paul were not as influential as Baur made them out to be. He also accepts Ritschl's contention that the catholic church developed on an essentially gentile basis, yet without abandoning Baur's view that the Jewish wing had a real and on-going influence.

7.1.6

J.B. Lightfoot

When we move from the study of F.C. Baur and those who follow in his tradition to J.B. Lightfoot, we must be prepared to deal with a radical change in philosophical paradigm and religious outlook. While Baur is a dialectic idealist, Lightfoot (who has much less interest in philosophy) has been described as a "commonsense empiricist" (Barrett, "Quomodo" 318).⁷ Their religious stances toward the Bible are just as different as their philosophies. Barrett holds that Baur seems to have felt himself quite free to pose any question about the New Testament, and to

follow his reasoning to any conclusion it seemed to demand.

On the other hand, he says:

Lightfoot was to some extent inhibited from asking the right questions by his theological beliefs, by his understanding of authority and especially of the authority of Scripture. This authority, he believed, was bound up with the authenticity of documents and the accuracy of historical statements. He was an absolutely honest man, as well as a very learned one, and he never fudged evidence in order to reach the conclusions that his piety required. But he either failed to put, or blunted the edge of, the sharpest questions... (Barrett, "Quomodo" 318)

Lightfoot's careful historical critical work on the Apostolic Fathers is well known. It is he who definitively established the seven-letter corpus of the letters of Ignatius as used in modern editions. More significantly for our studies here, Lightfoot convincingly demonstrated the authenticity and early date of this Ignatian corpus, as well as that of 1 Clement. These nearly undisputed facts have led Stephen Neill, in his The Interpretation of the New Testament, to see Lightfoot as the great champion who destroyed the synthesis of the Tübingen School. This opinion is greatly exaggerated. Ritschl published his fundamental break with Baur before Lightfoot published his famous Galatians commentary (which came out long before his volumes on the Apostolic Fathers), and in that commentary Lightfoot makes use of Ritschl, whom he views very favourably. Besides that, as will be seen below, Lightfoot's position is often quite close to Baur's. What does remain, however, is the unquestioned fact that Lightfoot's dating of 1 Clement and Ignatius precludes

Baur's tentative dating of the New Testament books, and either precludes his dialectic understanding of early Christianity, or forces it to be worked out in a much shorter period of time. Since Lightfoot offers no comprehensive alternative to Baur's scheme, his work really has had more the force of shortening its time-frame than of calling it into question.

History

Jesus himself left the church no instructions about the observance of Jewish customs: "He had charged them, it is true, to preach the Gospel to all nations, but how this injunction was to be carried out, by what changes a national Church must expand into an universal Church, they had not been told." (Gal 295) What is clear for Lightfoot is that the Mosaic ordinances were never an integral part of the Gospel message, but were related to it as "swathing bands" (Gal 295) might be to an infant. The movement to complete emancipation from the Jewish customs took place in three stages. In the first stage, the Gospel was preached to the gentiles with no reflection on this question; in the second stage, the church recognized that the gentiles should be free from the Mosaic Law. In the third and final stage, it was recognized that Jewish Christians as well should no longer be subject to the Mosaic Law. Let us trace Lightfoot's view of the development of the early church, noting these stages.

The first stage was set in motion by Stephen, whom Lightfoot regards as Paul's forerunner in sounding the

death-knell of the Mosaic ordinances. From the book of Acts, he recounts the stories of Stephen, of the persecution and dispersion to Antioch, of Philip and of Peter's conversion of Cornelius. The addition of gentiles to the church at Antioch precipitates the crisis which introduces the second stage of development.

The crisis of the second stage, concerning the basis of the admission of the gentiles, came to a head at the Apostolic Conference. The Pharisaic Christians held that the gentile converts must be circumcised (and presumably, although Lightfoot does not say so, keep the Mosaic Law), while Paul held that gentiles were to be fully admitted to all the privileges of Israel without circumcision. Lightfoot identifies Gal 2 and Acts 15, giving as much weight to Acts, a secondary source, as he does to the primary source provided by an actual participant. This choice seems to be a consequence of the religious position outlined earlier.

The problem of the second stage, that is the question of gentile freedom from the law, was resolved at least in principle at this conference:

The arrangement of the disputed points was effected by a mutual compromise. On the one hand it was decided once and for ever that the rite of circumcision should not be imposed on the Gentiles. On the other, concessions were demanded of them in turn; they were asked to 'abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication.'

The first of these decisions was a question of principle. (Gal 305-306)

While the decision that circumcision was eliminated for

gentiles was enunciated as a principle, the second set of conditions "were a temporary expedient framed to meet a temporary emergency. Their object was the avoidance of offense in mixed communities of Jew and Gentile converts." (Gal 307) They were drafted in such a way as not to press too heavily on the gentiles, while yet not infringing on anyone's principles. C.K. Barrett reports (from a set of notes by Lightfoot for lectures on Acts) Lightfoot's opinion that the pillar apostles "'(1)concurred with the principles of these Judaizers,' but were '(2) disposed to concession in practice, for the sake of peace.'" ("Quomodo" 313). A problem with this position (as Barrett implies) is that if this group on principle wished the gentiles to be circumcised, then the compromise did violate a principle. In his commentary on Galatians, Lightfoot says Peter "had declared himself plainly in favour of Gentile liberty..." (Gal 128).

The result of the Conference was that gentile Christian liberty from the law was fully recognized. It is not specified, however, whether gentiles were admitted as equal integrated members, equal but members of a separate organization, or second class members of the one church. Also left unsettled in the Decree was the question of Jewish Christian observance of the Mosaic Law. It is, however, clear that those Jewish Christians who lived amongst Jews continued to practice the law without really thinking the problem through. James, as head of the church

in Jerusalem, needed to relate only to Jews. "No troublesome questions of conflicting duties, such as entangled St Peter at Antioch, need perplex him. Under the law he must live and die." (Gal 365) Lightfoot puts the clash between Peter and Paul in Antioch down to the inconsistency of Peter's character. "And though St Paul's narrative stops short of the last scene in this drama, it would not be rash to conclude that it ended as the other (his betrayal of Jesus) had ended, that the revulsion of feeling was as sudden and complete, and that again he went out and wept bitterly, having denied his Lord in the person of these Gentile converts." (Gal 129) Those who came down from James he suggests had powers from James, but misused those powers.

The third stage, the emancipation of the Jewish church from the law, though implied by the Gospel message, in the East was precipitated by external factors. Much of the Mosaic ritual simply could not be observed after the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem. Shortly before this, a sharp wedge was driven between the Jewish Christian community and their Jewish confreres by the Christians' flight to Pella. These two unavoidable facts forced the Jewish Christian community in the East to face up to the question of the relevance and place of the law. The final division from Judaism was brought about by the appearance of Bar-Cochba. No one could accept both him and Jesus as Messiah. By this time many, perhaps most, Jewish Christians had abandoned the observance of the Mosaic Law, and lived in

a way similar to gentiles, within the catholic church. From this time on, Lightfoot identifies two groups of "Judaizing Christians," both of which observed the law:

1. The Nazarenes: This group, small and insignificant, lived in and near Pella. They observed the law, but rejected Pharisaic additions and interpretations of it. They were in full communion with gentile Christians who did not keep the law, and recognized the work of Paul. They, or a group similar to them, produced the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. It is to be noted that this group has some affinities with the position of the Apostles in Jerusalem at the time of the Apostolic Conference.

2. The Ebionites: This group, much larger and more important than the Nazarenes, was found in Palestine and throughout the Diaspora, even in Rome. They regarded the Mosaic Law as being binding on all Christians, and so regarded gentiles who did not keep the law as impure. They of course rejected Paul as an apostate. In Christology, they held Jesus to be only a man, son of Mary and Joseph. At first, they were Pharisaic, and as such were the direct spiritual descendants of Paul's opponents in Antioch and in his various mission churches. Later, large numbers of Essenes converted to this form of Christianity, and shortly eclipsed the Pharisaic Ebionism. It was the Essene Ebionites who produced the Clementine writings.

It is worthwhile at this point to summarize Lightfoot's view of the history of the church in Rome, as found in his commentary on Galatians (Gal 335-338). He feels there were, at a very early time, two separate communities in Rome, one a Judaizing Church and the other a Pauline Church. Paul arrived and strengthened the latter. Peter later arrived, but instead of deepening this rift, their personal cordial relations led to a union of the two bodies. This work of union was passed on to Clement. It was successful on the whole, but Ebionism (as well as myriads of other heresies) of course continued to plague the united Roman church. In Asia Minor, it was under the aegis of Paul and of John that judaizing was resisted, and the catholicity of the church was assured. Even in Palestine, the church which included native Jews became catholic for internal and external reasons, while incipient Ebionism was marginalized.

It is clear that Lightfoot follows the writers already reviewed in seeing the question of Jewish particularism versus Christian universalism as being absolutely central in the early development of Christianity. This question of whether or not the particularism of Jewish ritual observances was to be understood as an essential part of Christianity came to a point of crisis at the Apostolic Conference. There, the universalist option was chosen, but there remained several steps before it could be fully worked out. Although he speaks highly of Ritschl, and criticizes Baur, his position is in some ways closer to Baur's. He does agree with Ritschl and the general consensus that the

split between Peter and Paul was not at all as Baur portrayed it. But gone entirely is the schema of Ritschl's according to which the final form of the church owes little to the Jewish Christian element. Rather, the more moderate Jewish Christian and gentile Christian groups come together in what looks much like Baur's synthesis. In particular, Lightfoot's description of the evolution of the church in Rome precisely reflects Baur's general schema, merely played out over a much shorter period of time.

7.1.7

F.J.A. Hort

By the time F.J.A. Hort began his course of lectures on the subject, the term "Jewish Christian" had been used in sufficiently diverse senses that he felt careful definition was called for. He recognized that all Christianity, with the exception of forms such as Marcion's, rests on a Jewish basis and legitimately exhibits many Jewish characteristics, and may therefore be called "Judaic." In its earliest stage, the whole Christian church continued to be part of the Jewish nation and to observe its law. Hort, however, vigorously defends the position that the Jewish nation and their laws represent an earlier stage in God's design for mankind, and that this stage once passed should form no further part of Christianity. He thus makes much the same distinction between particular and universal elements as does Baur, except that while Baur expresses it in terms of development of the human religious consciousness, Hort expresses it in terms of the progress of God's "dispensation

of times and seasons" (Judaistic 3).⁸ Applying this view to the development of the early church, he asserts,

The only Christianity which can properly be called Judaistic is that which falls back to the Jewish point of view, belonging naturally to the time before Christ came, and still practically maintained by those Jews of subsequent ages who are not merely unbelieving members of a caste. It ascribes perpetuity to the Jewish Law, with more or less modification; thus confounding the conditions Providentially imposed for a time on the people of God when it was only a single nation, the people inhabiting Palestine, -confounding these Providential conditions with God's government of His people after its national limits were broken down and it had become universal. Judaistic Christianity, in this the true sense of the term, might with at least equal propriety be called Christian Judaism. Its position is not fundamentally or generically different from that of Mahometanism, though Jesus, not Mahomet, is its last great prophet. (Judaistic 5-6)

Hort speaks highly of the second edition of Ritschl's Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche and is clearly influenced by it. Nevertheless, in his work he assumes continuing influence of the moderate Jewish Christians on the church, and so is closest to the early consensus position. We need note only where his tracing of the church's development departs from this position.

Hort dissents from the scholarly consensus in that he does not believe the earliest church in Antioch included gentiles. Based on the likely reading "Hellenistas" in Ac 11:20, he argues that those evangelized in Antioch were Hellenist Jews, not gentiles. Despite his scholarly argument (Judaistic 58-60), it is hard to see how one can avoid reading "Hellenistas" as non-Jews, since the "Hellenistas" of Acts 11:20 are in contrast with the "Ioudaiois" of the preceding verse. His peculiar

1 interpretation at this point leads him to hold that the first gentile converts were made by Paul and Barnabas during their first missionary journey. "This incident in the synagogue at Pisidian Antioch is the true turning point at which Gentile Christianity formally and definitely begins, and so a Judaistic Christianity becomes possible. The year was either A.D. 50 or thereabouts." (Judaistic 64,65).

Hort disagrees with the general consensus that the four prescriptions of the Apostolic Decree issuing from that conference are related to the Noachic Covenant or to the conditions imposed on the resident alien. His criticism is based on the observation that the correspondence of the decree with either of its supposed antecedents is not exact (Judaistic 68-76). His critique is well argued, but his own contention that "they were meant as concrete indications of pure and true religion" (Judaistic 71) is so anachronistic as not to merit serious attention. He ends his discussion of the Decree with the contention that it was aimed specifically at the new converts from Syria and Cilicia, and is not to be taken as applying to all possible gentile converts.

Hort's writings imply that at this point in Christian history there were four groups. Two of these groups were made up of Christian Jews of Palestine. Both these groups kept the law, but one group felt all Christians should keep the law, while the other (which included all the original apostles) accepted gentiles as Christians without the law.

The second group's keeping of the law was not a matter of Christian principle. The third group was the gentile Christians, who did not keep the law. The fourth and final group was composed of Christian Jews of the diaspora, who in practice occupied a position intermediate between the Jews of Palestine and the gentiles. Of their theological position we hear nothing- but may reasonably assume Hort believed that by and large they realized the significance of the new dispensation for the law. Only the first of the Palestinian groups would be what Hort calls "Judaistic." Peter, James and John were members of the second Palestinian group, that is the group which accepted gentiles without the law.

7.1.8

Adolf Harnack

In visualizing the development of the early church Adolf Harnack follows Ritschl, and in fact pushes Ritschl's schema even further. In doing so he begins to seriously question the received categories. His attitude toward religion reflects that of the nineteenth century, but in his dissatisfaction with the by then traditional group divisions, he suggests modifications which are precursors of those of writers reviewed in the next chapter, and especially of Raymond Brown. He, like Hort, is uncomfortable with some authors' use of the term "Jewish Christian", and frequently attempts to clarify what it should mean.

F.C. Baur's insight that something other than merely

Paulinism is needed to explain the early catholic church is correct according to Harnack. But there are fundamental errors in his division of Christianity into Jewish Christianity and gentile Christianity. He was wrong to hold that Christianity's universalism comes from Hellenism, and wrong to equate Paulinism with gentile Christianity. Both Christianity's universalism and Paulinism were born on the soil of Judaism and share nothing with Hellenism. This contention, if correct, should explode the whole of Baur's schema. Harnack's tracing of the actual, historical development of the church is very close to Ritschl's, and thus need not be traced in detail; his general overview should however be outlined.

Jesus announced to the nation of Israel "...the government of the world and of every individual soul by the almighty and holy God, the Father and Judge." (Dogma I:58)⁹ This universal reign of God and his relationship to each individual soul is clearly not limited to any one nation, but by its very logic applies to all humanity. On this basis, Harnack believes that the universalism of Christianity is inherent in its very nature and is not something introduced from Hellenism.

The first great transition for Christianity was from the Christ himself to the first generation of believers, where it remained essentially non-Hellenistic. Of this stage, Harnack can say, "Original Christianity was in appearance Christian Judaism, the creation of a universal religion on Old Testament soil." (Dogma I:287) This

religion moved into the gentile world, where it was accepted by and large without the Mosaic Law. Even the "Pauline universalism is founded on a critique of Jewish religion..." and Paul's "idea of the Gospel, with all his Greek culture, is independent of Hellenism in its deepest grounds." (both quotations Dogma I:49 footnote 1), just as his theology is based on strictly Pharisaic doctrinal presuppositions (Dogma I:89). In the same way, the Christian view of the law was not merely a reaction to Hellenistic influence: "for there is no doubt that even before the rise of Christianity the Jews of the Diaspora allegorized the ceremonial Law, and that this paved the way for the Gentile church's freedom from the Law." (Mission and Expansion I:13 footnote 2)

Nationality and observance of the Mosaic Law are the basis of Harnack's definition of Jewish Christianity. The aforementioned view of the Law amongst Diaspora Jews is the reason why there was no conflict between Jewish and gentile Christians in Antioch before the arrival of the people from Jerusalem. Harnack follows Ritschl's line in analyzing the results of this conflict and of the ensuing Apostolic Council, and goes even further than Ritschl does. We recall that Ritschl spoke of two groups, the strict Jewish Christians and the mainstream church, itself divided into gentile Christians and moderate Jewish Christians. For him, the Apostolic Decree was a disaster since it created two classes of Christians. One might say that Harnack radicalizes this idea: if universalism is a basic and

fundamental part of Christianity, not coming from Hellenism, then anything which restricts Christianity to one nation is not fully Christian. By this definition, Harnack can go beyond Ritschl and call both the groups which retain a real and significant place for the nation of Israel in Christianity (both Ritschl's strict and moderate Jewish Christians) as "truly Jewish Christian." On the other hand, groups which fully recognize the universality of the Christian gospel (whatever their views on Israel in history) are therefore not gentile Christian, but Christian tout court. By the end of the Apostolic period, Harnack distinguishes four basic positions, each of which was held by at least some native Jews and by some native gentiles:

(1) The Gospel has to do with the people of Israel, and with the Gentile world only on the condition that believers attach themselves to the people of Israel. The punctilious observance of the law is still necessary and the condition on which the messianic salvation is bestowed (particularism and legalism, in practice and in principle, which, however, was not to cripple the obligation to prosecute the work of the Mission). (2) The Gospel has to do with Jews and Gentiles: the first, as believers in Christ, are under obligation as before to observe the law, the latter are not; but for that reason they cannot on earth fuse into one community with the believing Jews. Very different judgments in details were possible on this stand-point; but the bestowal of salvation could no longer be thought of as depending simply on the keeping of the ceremonial commandments of the law (universalism in principle, particularism in practice; the prerogative of Israel being to some extent clung to). (3) The Gospel has to do with both Jews and Gentiles; no one is any longer under obligation to observe the law; for the law is abolished (or fulfilled), and the salvation which Christ's death has procured is appropriated by faith. The law (that is the Old Testament religion) in its literal sense is of divine origin, but was intended from the first only for a definite epoch of history. The prerogative of Israel remains, and is shewn in the fact that salvation was first offered to the Jews, and it will be shewn again at the end of all history. That

prerogative refers to the nation as a whole, and has nothing to do with the question of the salvation of individuals (Paulinism: universalism in principle and in practice, and Antinomianism in virtue of the recognition of a merely temporary validity of the whole law; breach with the traditional religion of Israel; recognition of the prerogative of the people of Israel; the clinging to the prerogative of the people of Israel was not, however, necessary on this stand-point: see the epistle to the Hebrews and the Gospel of John). (4) The Gospel has to do with Jews and Gentiles: no one need therefore be under obligation to observe the ceremonial commandments and sacrificial worship, because these commandments themselves are only the wrappings of moral and spiritual commandments which the Gospel has set forth as fulfilled in a more perfect form (universalism in principle and in practice in virtue of a neutralizing of the distinction between law and Gospel, old and new; spiritualizing and universalizing of the law). (Dogma I:90-91.)

The term "Jewish Christianity" applies only to groups 1 and 2 in the preceding enumeration, and not to Jewish elements present in other Christian groups. Since Christianity developed out of Judaism and continued to use the Old Testament, the presence of Jewish and Old Testament ideas is to be expected and does not constitute evidence of Jewish Christianity:

for Christianity took possession of the whole of Judaism as religion, and it is therefore a most arbitrary view of history which looks upon the Christian appropriation of the Old Testament religion, after any point, as no longer Christian, but only Jewish Christian. Wherever the universalism of Christianity is not violated in favour of the Jewish nation, we have to recognize every appropriation of the Old Testament as Christian. (Dogma I:288-289).

Harnack goes on to specify that in his opinion, the term "Jewish Christian:"

should be applied exclusively to those Christians who really maintained in their whole extent, or in some measure, even if it were to a minimum degree, the national and political forms of Judaism and the observance of the Mosaic law in its literal sense, as essential to Christianity, at least to the Christianity

of born Jews, or who, though rejecting these forms, nevertheless assumed a prerogative of the Jewish people even in Christianity... "If a foreigner keeps the law, he is a Jew, but if he does not, he is a Greek." (Dogma I:289; Harnack's quotation is from Pseudo-Clem., Homil. XI. 26)

Since he dates the New Testament writings very early compared to Baur, Harnack can argue (as does Ritschl) that they were written by people who still understood the gospel in the same way as the earliest disciples. This would include a full understanding of the Jewish presuppositions and bases from which Christianity developed. However, just as there is a gulf between Jesus and the earliest Christians, so there is a gulf between the early community (most of the members of which came from Judaism even if they were not "Jewish Christian" by Harnack's definition) and their gentile converts. Since Harnack stresses the logical affinity of group 2 (corresponding to Ritschl's moderate Jewish Christians) with group 1 (Ritschl's strict Jewish Christians) more than does Ritschl, it is easier to see in his scheme how the whole Jewish Christian element is quickly outnumbered and has no influence on the early catholic church. The conflicts which led to the early catholic form of Christianity were not between Jewish and gentile Christianity, but between Christianity and "the united powers of the world in which it existed" (Dogma I:294). Since these converts could not understand much of what they received from Paul and the other missionaries, the early catholic doctrine was quite different from the Biblical one. The early catholic doctrine was worked out on the basis of

what the gentiles could understand from their Graeco-Roman religious background of the preaching of the Gospel of Jesus Christ and the exposition of the Old Testament. By about 140 CE the transition of Christianity to the gentiles with its emancipation from Judaism was complete. Christianity (without any adjectival modifier) grew among the gentiles, while Jewish Christianity continued for some time as a marginal movement with no influence on the early catholic church.

Not only does Harnack's work foreshadow later work on the question of "Jewish Christianity", it also foreshadows work on the character of the Pseudo-Clementine literature. While earlier authors had used this literature as a source for Jewish Christianity, Harnack calls into question the current interpretation of the Clementine Homilies and Recognitions. He questions the general consensus of his time that they were written in the period 150-170 CE, and rather insists that they are to be dated at the very earliest in the first half of the third century. His scorn for the conclusions drawn from these writings is clear:

At any rate, the historian who, until further advised, denies the existence of a Jewish Christianity composed of the most contradictory elements, lacking circumcision and national hopes, and bearing marks of Catholic and therefore of Hellenic influences, judges more prudently than he who asserts, solely on the basis of the Romances which are accompanied by no tradition and have never been the objects of assault, the existence of a Jewish Christianity accommodating itself to Catholicism which is entirely unattested. (Dogma I:315)

He argues that while the sources for this literature may be Jewish Christian, the final edition of the work is early

catholic. He then of course asserts in line with his Ritschlian position that Jewish Christianity had no influence on the development of the early catholic church. While his influence may not have been great enough to swing most people from the early consensus position on the development of the church to the theory of Ritschl, his conclusions on the Pseudo-Clementines largely closed the debate on that question until it was raised again from the perspective of the Tübingen School by H.J. Schoeps.

7.1.9

Trends in the Research

Reviewed to this Point (Baur-Harnack)

General

The basic question F.C. Baur posed was how the earliest community developed into the catholic church. His answer was that it involved a dialectic process: a thesis (Jewish Christianity) and an antithesis (Paulinism) producing a synthesis (catholic Christianity). The major element at question within this dialectic process is that of religious particularism versus religious universalism. In Jewish Christianity Baur found the religious particularism of the Jewish nation with its special Mosaic laws, especially circumcision. In Paulinism, he found the universal element, a religion open to all nations without distinction, and not observing the special Mosaic laws, especially circumcision. This universal element triumphed, and was taken up in the synthesis, as is implied in the term "catholic" church.

All the authors surveyed follow Baur in struggling with

how, and how quickly, the early community developed into the catholic church. Further, the idea that there was a development from a religion hindered by Jewish particularism to a universal religion is shared, in one way or another, by all the authors studied. From the vantage point of another age, we must also add that their attitude betrays at best little comprehension of and sympathy for Judaism, or at worst anti-Semitism.

The most significant opposition to Baur's ideas was mounted by Ritschl. Ritschl argued that the early Christian community was founded on faith in Christ, and that Jews and gentiles were both admitted on that basis. Paul and Peter were in agreement on this point. Ritschl does see an extreme Judaizing party, but it does not include Peter, and is marginal. Within the mainstream, there is no synthesis between Jewish and gentile Christian elements, but rather a process of growth. In this growth, Jewish elements are progressively marginalized and eventually lost, and the catholic church grows up in a purely gentile stream, based only on a limited number of elements it absorbed from its founders. In Ritschl's scheme, the catholic church develops, then, from general gentile Christianity, while the Nazarenes develop from the other part of the early mainstream, that is from the moderate Jewish Christians. The second, small, early Christian party, the extreme Jewish Christians who did not accept gentiles without the law, developed into the Ebionites.

In the period we have examined so far, most researchers adopted a schema which is an amalgam of the positions of Baur and Ritschl. They accepted Ritschl's analysis of the early groups in Christianity: a strict Jewish Christian group, fairly quickly marginalized, and a mainstream composed of a moderate Jewish Christian group, and a gentile group, these last two still recognizing each other. However, they did not accept his conclusion that the catholic church developed almost entirely on a gentile basis. Rather, they reintroduced Baur's analysis and applied it to the two groups of Ritschl's mainstream. After the strict Jewish Christian group is set aside, the moderate Jewish Christian group was made the thesis in this new schema, the gentile Christian group the antithesis, and the early catholic church the synthesis of these two remaining groups.

Toward the end of the period surveyed, authors such as Hort and Harnack began to question the use of the term "Jewish Christian," and to think through the definitions of this and related terms more carefully. It is true that since Baur's scheme was generally rejected, there was some ambiguity in these terms. Nevertheless, as long as there was a fairly clear schema of the development of the early church which was shared by most writers (our "early consensus schema"), some ambiguity in terminology did not create real difficulties. Only in the second period, surveyed in the next section, when this early consensus broke down, did the problem with these terms become

critical.

History of the early church (Baur to Harnack)

There is a surprising consensus that Jesus left no explicit instructions on the place of the Mosaic law in the new Christian community- surprising when one considers that Mark and Matthew have Jesus declare all foods clean, and that the rite of initiation is baptism and not circumcision (Mt 28:19). The agreement that Jesus must not have left clear instructions seems to be based on the idea that without this postulate, the whole struggle in Acts and the Pauline letters becomes incomprehensible.

As mentioned above, all agree that there is a struggle for Christianity to break forth from the bonds of the Jewish nation and the Mosaic laws. There is general agreement that Stephen's speech represents the first example of the working out of this new idea. He is usually seen as a forerunner of Paul. The persecution occasioned by Stephen's speech caused the dispersion of the Hellenist Christians, who began to preach the Gospel to gentiles in Antioch. It was because of this church in Antioch, and because of the missions launched from it, that the question of the responsibility of the gentiles with respect to the Mosaic Law was raised. A group of Christians from the Pharisaic party said that the gentile converts should be circumcised and observe the Mosaic Law. This clash led to a meeting in Jerusalem to look into this question, the so-called Apostolic Council.

The Apostolic Council is a subject of particular

difficulty. There is virtual unanimity that it took place, and for the reason just outlined. The position of Paul, opposing the Pharisaic Christians, was that the gentiles need not obey the Mosaic Law. Most of the writers surveyed seem to feel that he already thought that circumcision and the Law had no further value for anyone, but all agree that he was at least moving in that direction. The intermediate position, occupied at least by Peter, is somewhat less clear. Some think him indifferent in principle, at least one entertains the idea he in principle agreed with the Judaizers, but the trend seems to put him in principle in Paul's camp (although somewhat indecisively so) and have him, at the Council, take the mediating position that gentiles should be admitted without the law, while Jews should continue to observe the law. The result of the Conference was not the recognition of two separate Gospels (pace Baur). What did result was a temporary peace, based on compromise. Ritschl sees peace obtained on the grounds outlined in the Apostolic Decree, which he sees as important and disastrous, in that it created two classes of Christians. Reuss sees a truce, policed by the Noachic commandments as outlined in the Decree. Weissäcker sees peace based on a mere mission treaty. Lightfoot and Hort see peace achieved by a compromise that grants exemption from the law for gentiles on principle, but requires those gentiles under discussion (and only those) to observe certain requirements. Harnack dates the Apostolic Decree

later.

Amongst those who accept that the Decree was promulgated before the clash between Paul and Peter in Antioch, there is a general feeling that the Decree was vague, settling the question of gentile Christians, but leaving the relationship of Jewish Christians to the Mosaic law open. According to this line of thought, Paul could interpret it "liberally", reading the abolition of circumcision in it, while the Judaizers could interpret it "narrowly", reading it as supporting the validity of the whole law for Jewish Christians. Neither of these interpretations would conflict with the letter of the Decree. Following this line, some would see Peter leaning somewhat toward the first interpretation, James toward the second. When caught in the middle in Antioch, Peter wavered; most who follow this line suspect that Peter finally returned to full communion with gentiles on a Pauline basis.

Most authors finally arrive at the catholic church by a surprising combination of Baur and Ritschl, as noted earlier. Baur's two groups have been abandoned for Ritschl's two, which are interpreted as really three: Pauline Christians; moderate Jewish Christians; and extreme Jewish Christians. The extreme Jewish Christians, originally largely made up of Pharisees, are marginalized and develop into Pharisaic Ebionites. Later, due to a large influx of Essenes, the group becomes mostly Essene Ebionite. They are responsible for the Pseudo-Clementine literature;

their influence on the church is variously estimated. Baur's dialectic is then applied to the two remaining Ritschlian groups, very much counter to Ritschl's own opinion on the subject. The shock of the fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Temple (and for some writers, also the Bar-Cochba revolt) forced the moderate Jewish Christians to give very serious thought to their relationship to the Jewish nation and to the Mosaic code. On this basis many (probably most) were fully integrated into the gentile church, presumably abandoning the Mosaic Law. Some moderate Jewish Christians, the Nazarenes, continued to observe the Jewish law while accepting the law-free gentile churches. Harnack is alone among the later authors in rejecting this understanding of the catholic church- he continues to hold to Ritschl's position that the catholic church was constructed on an almost purely gentile basis.

A New Appreciation of Judaism

The period surveyed in the preceding section ended with a general consensus having been reached on the history of the rise of the early catholic church. Since this hypothesis seemed to fit the data well, little further work was done on this question for quite some time. Most scholars assumed some form of the early consensus schema as a background for their work while advancing research in other areas. Rudolf Bultmann, for example, used the labels "Palestinian Christianity," "Hellenistic Christianity," and (occasionally) "Hellenistic Jewish Christianity" when assigning an origin and trajectory to various pericopae. These terms reflect a particular variation on the early consensus schema.

The end of the early consensus schema was brought about by a change in attitude toward Judaism, and was catalyzed by the work of H.J. Schoeps. In the nineteenth century Judaism, and Jewish Christianity, had been viewed very negatively by Christian scholars. Baur, it is true, had assigned Jewish Christianity an important role in the development of the early catholic church. Nevertheless, amongst the Jewish Christian contributions to the final synthesis, those aspects which tended to be emphasized were ones traditionally not highly regarded by Protestants, such as an ecclesiastical hierarchy. Of course Jesus himself was Jewish, and the Biblical revelation of God was transmitted through Jewish and then Jewish Christian channels. But

these facts were hardly stressed, some authors such as Renan even going so far as to claim that Jesus had spiritually abandoned Judaism by the end of his career. Precursors of a change in attitude may perhaps be found in Schweitzer's rejection of the nineteenth century portrait of Jesus. Change was further advanced by the work of many, including G.F. Moore, to a limited extent by Billerbeck's commentary, and especially by W.D. Davies. Once Christian scholars had come to recognize that Jesus was authentically Jewish, and once they had acquired a new and more positive appreciation of Judaism, they were prepared to postulate that Jewish Christianity contributed in a significant and constructive way to the formation of the early catholic church. It took only the impetus of the work of Schoeps to set such critics as Jean Daniélou on the way to a complete re-evaluation of Jewish Christianity. This new view of Jewish Christianity so transcended the old that it could not but destroy the early consensus schema of the formation of the early catholic church.

The breakdown of the consensus occasioned a crisis concerning the meaning of the term "Jewish Christianity." F.C. Baur had taken the idea of Jewish Christianity and made it the thesis in a dialectical understanding of the developing church. However, when Ritschl and the later consensus view postulated the existence of both a strict and a moderate Jewish Christianity, the term of necessity lost some of its clarity. As we have seen, some critics had

begun to examine this problem in the first period, but as long as the early consensus prevailed the general schema was clear enough that some terminological ambiguity did not create difficulty. However, as soon as the common background, against which anyone's comments could be understood, had vanished, it became essential to define just what one meant by "Jewish Christianity." It follows that the second period exhibits a wide range of definitions of Jewish Christianity.

The second period surveyed will show the two related characteristics just outlined. In the first place, there will be new theories of the evolution of the early catholic church based on a more positive and nuanced appreciation of Jewish Christianity. In the second place, there will be a concern to define precisely what is meant by the term "Jewish Christianity."

7.2.1

H.J. Schoeps

After a long period of fairly general consensus and of little fundamentally new work on the questions of Jewish Christianity, Hans Joachim Schoeps reopened the work of the Tübingen School in this area, and thus initiated a new period of intensive study.¹⁰ This he accomplished not by concentrating on the question of groups in the New Testament, but rather by posing the question of the faith and theology of a post-apostolic group, the Ebionites. His study is a great advance in that he reviews all the available sources for this tradition so as to understand it

in its own right, not just as a deviant development used to illuminate the study of the New Testament or early church. Schoeps seeks to improve on Baur's work on the Pseudo-Clementines by means of careful source criticism, so as to base his conclusions only on what he identifies as the Ebionite sources used in the production of the present form of the literature. His contention that this group was as legitimate a successor of the early Jerusalem community as the early catholic church was of Pauline Christianity is the key to understanding why his work was so important in the dissolution of the early consensus on the evolution of the church in the first century.

In the opening pages of his Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums, Schoeps argues that Baur's uncritical use of the Pseudo-Clementines (seen as a unity and dated too early) brought that literature and the work of the Tübingen School into disrepute. Since the demise of the Tübingen School, Schoeps argues, few had been willing to discuss "Jewish Christianity" except insofar as it was simply defined as Christians of Jewish descent. While there is some truth to this, I feel the major reasons why subsequent research went another way are quite clear. Following the argument of the last chapter, Baur's theory of the development of the church in the early period was not abandoned because of any criticism of Baur's work on the Pseudo-Clementines, but because Ritschl (and others) successfully pointed out its incompatibility with certain New Testament data. The discussions eventually came to

centre on the "consensus position." Again, I remain unconvinced by Schoeps' contention that the work of later Tübingers such as Hilgenfeld, Lipsius and Hausrath on the Pseudo-Clementines was ignored because of Baur's uncritical work on that literature. It was rather ignored because of the acceptance of the consensus position. Most scholars were primarily interested in the New Testament and the development of the early catholic church. The consensus position was that the branch leading to Ebionism had no influence (at least after the flight to Pella) on the formation of the catholic church; therefore literature reflecting Ebionism could be ignored because it had no bearing on their work. Since Schoeps equates Jewish Christianity with Ebionism, this then means that they could ignore Jewish Christianity in Schoeps' sense of the term.

Although Schoeps reappropriates Baur's work in linking the Pseudo-Clementine writings and the position of the Petrine party, he does not for that stray far from the way we have been tracing. He accepts the correction to Baur's work that Peter and Paul's disagreement was not as Baur thought. In fact, his detailed view of the development of the early catholic church, outlined below, is well within the range of views subsumed under the rubric "the consensus position." Schoeps did not himself destroy this consensus position, but rather provided the set of ideas which would do so.

Schoeps' work led indirectly to the end of the

consensus because he pioneered the movement to examine Jewish Christianity for its own value and not just as an essential but uninteresting stage in early Christianity. His major work is an account of the theology of Ebionism, which, by his definition, equals the theology of Jewish Christianity. His claim that Ebionism was as legitimate a successor of the early Jerusalem community as the early catholic church was of Pauline Christianity implies that the so called "Jewish Christian theology" Schoeps outlined is in some way a legitimate outgrowth of the Jerusalem community. The claim that a true theology developed from the roots of the Jerusalem community's thought independently of the catholic church inevitably raises the possibility that there might also be a "Jewish Christian" theology which was not Ebionite which developed from those same roots. In other words, if Schoeps was really writing the theology of the descendants of the strict Jewish Christian party, could there not also be a theology of the moderate Jewish Christian party? Jean Daniélou's answer to this question was a resounding "yes"! The re-evaluation of Jewish Christianity which ensued fundamentally changed the scholarly view of the Jewish Christian contribution to early Christianity. The change was so great that the new Jewish Christianity could no longer merely play the "thesis" role assigned it in the early consensus schema. It was thus the new view of Jewish Christianity which caused the break-down of the early consensus.

History of the Early Church according to Schoeps

Schoeps insists that only appearances of Jesus after his resurrection to many of the first Christians is sufficient to explain the genesis of the Christian community. The early community, which gathered around these witnesses to the resurrection, was a variegated group of Jews who believed that Jesus was the Messiah, and who saw themselves as making up the end-time community. Their common bases included the affirmation that Jesus' death effected atonement with God, and the acceptance of baptism as the rite of initiation into the community.

The membership of this original community was as diverse as that of the Jerusalem synagogues, running from followers of the baptism of John all the way to Zealots. This new community appears to have had a special attraction for members of the Greek language synagogues, made up in large measure of Diaspora Jews who had settled in Jerusalem.

These Hellenistai, though numerous, should not be identified as a party. This of course has been long the tendency in modern scholarship, exacerbated by the model of Jewish Hellenism, which had long existed. To be a Hellenistês meant nothing at a theological or party level. To believe in "Hellenism" meant to belong to a particular tendency within a community of many tendencies, but it did not mean that one belonged to a particular party. This must be strongly emphasized: for Schoeps, there is no early Hellenistic community, and no special Hellenistic kerygma in the early history of the community.

It is possible that during this early period there was extensive evangelization of Galilee and the area of the Decapolis. We cannot be certain about this, or really about much else in the very early period, since we lack good sources for what went on before Paul. Whether or not the Galilee was from early times a terra christiana, Christianity shortly spread to Antioch where, as we know from the book of Acts, some gentiles became Christians.

The introduction of significant numbers of gentiles into the church forced the early community to face the question of the basis on which these people would be admitted. Three basic positions eventually emerged: 1. the Pharisaic Christian conservative position, according to which circumcision was a sine qua non for Christians, as well as observance of the Mosaic Law. This position would see no distinction between Christianity and Judaism at least as far as lifestyle is concerned; 2. the moderate, group, including James and Peter, which carried the day at the Apostolic Conference. Their position demanded of gentile adherents observance of rules which more or less amounted to the Noachic covenant; 3. the Pauline position, representing a universalism emancipated from the Law.

As has already been stressed, Schoeps does not believe the third position to have existed before Paul, except perhaps as a tendency. It was Paul who laid the theoretical basis for this position, and therefore the so-called Hellenistic church's theology derives its basis from Paul.

In this Schoeps is expressly breaking with Bultmann, Heltmuller and Bousset, who are closer to the general consensus at this point. They postulated that Christian development had proceeded from Jesus, through the early community to Hellenistic Christianity and then to Paul. Schoeps reverses these last two: Paul does not receive and develop his views from an imaginary early Hellenistic Christian community, rather Paul lays the theoretical basis for a community which develops in this direction.

As long as James was alive, he continued to be a mediator between these various views, and there was no formal split. There was certainly divergence between Paul and the Jerusalem community, but no rupture. Schoeps feels that in the area outside of Jewish influence (by which I suppose he means outside Palestine, Trans-jordan and Syria) the Apostolic Decree was certainly never accepted, and further he dates the incident between Peter and Paul in Antioch after the Apostolic Council. Nevertheless, Paul and all Christians continued to recognize the pre-eminence of the Jerusalem community. As at Jerusalem, there were no truly separate parties in the Diaspora. For example, the church in Rome contained both Jewish and gentile Christians. It is true, however, that those who subscribed to the conservative, Pharisaic Christian interpretation of Christianity, the "zealots for the law," exerted great influence in Jerusalem and they or their representatives were the opponents referred to by Paul in Galatians and Corinthians.

For Schoeps, then, it was James who during his lifetime held back divisions. It was with his death and the flight of the Jerusalem community to Pella that the split came. This flight was occasioned by a prophecy which has come to us in a variant form in the Synoptic Apocalypse. On this basis, James' successor Simon (Simeon bar Clopas) led the Jerusalem community across the Jordan to safety from the impending destruction. This move took it out of living contact with the mission communities of the young, spreading Christianity. While it was still in Jerusalem and maintaining some contact with these communities, its leadership and authority had never really been questioned. As soon as it was removed from the scene, the opinions of the Jerusalem community were quickly and fundamentally forgotten, and had no further influence on the rest of Christendom. The group which crossed the Jordan became the Ebionites.

The great church continued to be formed both of Jews and gentiles. Eusebius' statement that Judaea was emptied of Christians at the time of the flight to Pella notwithstanding, Schoeps asserts that up to the time of the Bar-Cochba War the majority of Christians in Palestine were Jews. And of course, there continued to be Jews in the church throughout the Diaspora. In line with the consensus position, Schoeps believes that the early catholic church then slowly emerged as a synthesis of the moderate Jewish Christian groups and gentile Christians. Identifiable

moderate Jewish Christian communities continued within the great church into the third century. It seems that he sees these as smaller groups within the catholic church as well as congregations separate from but in communion with gentile Christian groups. In controversy with, but within the catholic church, these moderate Jewish Christian groups produced the Letter to the Hebrews, the Letter of Barnabas, and the Letter of James.

7.2.2

Jean Daniélou

The work of H.J. Schoeps deeply impressed Jean Daniélou.¹¹ However, while Schoeps had argued that Ebionism was a legitimate development of the thought of the early Jerusalem community, Daniélou maintained firmly that it was merely a Jewish Christian sect which had always been on the fringe of the "official community." It no doubt rankled him that Schoeps called his subject "the theology of Jewish Christianity," when for Daniélou it only represented the theology of one very marginal Jewish Christian group. For Daniélou, the theology of Jewish Christianity, if not further qualified, would be that of the mainstream of the Jerusalem community and of its orthodox successors.

Jean Daniélou's basic thesis is that early Jewish Christianity had a theology. In this he is opposing the idea that theology is uniquely the result of the encounter of the message of the Biblical tradition with the Greek style of thought. Long before the Greek mind reflected on the message of the Christian tradition and gave us what we

now think of as Christian theology, the earliest Christian community had produced a theology conceived of entirely within the bounds of Semitic thought patterns. The major formal factor in this theology was apocalyptic. Even though Jewish Christianity quickly became a minority in the church and its theology was overpowered by Greek thought patterns, it continued to exert a major influence on the whole of the church. Now that we have a much better understanding of the background of early Christianity- due to the discoveries at the Dead Sea, at Nag Hammadi and at other less important sites- Daniélou believes this Jewish Christian theology can be recovered and put in its context. His main sources for this theology are certain Old Testament pseudepigrapha, some non-canonical Gospels, the Didache, the Shepherd of Hermas, the Letter of Barnabas, the Letters of Ignatius, I Clement and traditions surviving in the Church Fathers. His goal, reflected in such books as The Theology of Jewish Christianity, is to enrich present-day Christianity by presenting this early Jewish Christian theology to the modern world.

From Daniélou's main interest we now turn to a part of his work which, although less central to him, is more in line with our interest, that is, his view of the development of the earliest church.

As we have seen, a very general consensus has developed that the problem of the admission of gentiles into the early church was a very difficult one, and that there is a systematic effort in the book of Acts to minimize the

gravity of this conflict. To this end, Daniélou argues that Luke has combined two layers of tradition which are in fact historically and logically distinct. The first of these revolves around the theoretical question of the significance of circumcision, and thereby the basis of admission into the new church. The second concerns the question of table fellowship between Jews and gentiles within the church.

The question of the circumcision of gentile Christians Daniélou believes was resolved in a definitive manner in a number of clear steps. The God-fearing gentile Cornelius and the members of his household were filled with the Holy Spirit, and this fact Peter took as authorization to baptize them without any other conditions being imposed. Meanwhile, gentiles in Antioch and in the cities of Paul's first missionary journey were converted to Christianity without being told keep the Jewish law. When objections were raised, the leaders of the Antioch church sent Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem to submit the question to the apostles and elders. The meeting in Jerusalem was a fully authoritative apostolic council presided over by Peter, and recounted in Acts 15:1-12 and Gal 2:1-10. There it was definitively affirmed that salvation is based only on faith in Christ, and the mission to gentiles without the Jewish law was fully vindicated. Though battles may yet have been fought over this question, it was fully resolved for Paul, Peter, James and the whole orthodox church.

The incident between Paul and Peter concerning table

fellowship took place after the decision about circumcision, and in no way called that decision into question. The Jewish Christian and gentile Christian communities in Antioch were separate, with the former continuing to observe Jewish law. Since the Eucharist took place in the context of a meal, the two communities could not celebrate it together. Here was Peter's problem: as a Jew, should he only eat with the Jews; or as an apostle, should he be above all divisions, and take part in both communities' Eucharists? The clash led to another delegation being sent to Jerusalem, but this time the representative of Antioch was Symeon. This meeting in Jerusalem was only a meeting of the local Jewish Christian church presided over by James, and not an apostolic council. The occasion of this meeting is described in Gal 2:11-14 and the account of it is to be found in Acts 15:13-34. The Symeon mentioned in Acts 15:14 is Symeon the representative of Antioch mentioned in Acts 13:1, and not Simon Peter. The decision in effect maintained the idea of food regulations, while reducing them to a minimum. It was merely a disciplinary compromise, and proved to be unworkable.¹²

The position of James and the Jewish Christian church in Jerusalem with regard to table fellowship was not shared by Paul or by Luke. For Paul, there was no fundamental reason for any sort of food regulations. However, since he believed each group should accept the other on the basis of Christian love, he was prepared to make certain concessions in practice (but not in principle) so as not to cause

trouble, especially on the question of meat offered to idols. Luke agreed with Paul. We have already noted that Daniélou believes the baptism of the Holy Spirit was the actual historical justification for Peter's baptism of Cornelius. The vision of the sheet full of animals both clean and unclean, which Peter is commanded to kill and eat (Acts 10:9-16), is actually part of an ancient apocalypse, which justifies Jewish Christian freedom to eat with gentiles. The addition of this fragment, the fusion of the two meetings in Jerusalem and the omission of the incident in Antioch make Peter into a sort of precursor and supporter of Paul's position.

The question of circumcision had a second aspect not yet discussed. It had been agreed that faith in Christ was the sole basis for membership in the church. It was further generally agreed that this implied that circumcision was unnecessary for gentiles. But what did it imply for the Jews? The conclusion for Paul clearly was that circumcision was not necessary for Jewish Christians. The scandal of this position for most Jewish Christians was not at the theoretical level, but rather at the sociological level. Not to circumcise their sons, to abandon the Jewish law, would inevitably lead to a break with the Jewish nation. Betrayal of Judaism would have been particularly grave at that time when Jewish nationalism was especially strong and building toward the revolt against Rome. Most Jewish Christians therefore continued to practice the law. The

true question was, then, one of solidarity with the Jewish nation.

In his mission, Paul was concerned with presenting the gospel to the gentiles, and with liberating Christianity from Judaism. Peter, on the other hand, was concerned with showing Jewish nationalists that one could be a Christian and yet keep the law. Paul's position brought him into continued and growing conflict with Jewish nationalist Christians. Despite the success of Paul's missions and the ultimate victory of his position, Jewish Christianity remained the dominant force in the church during his lifetime. Paul's position was ultimately victorious, but at the terrible price of complete rupture with Judaism.

At least as late as the year 57, Jewish Christians were still the majority in the church. But the fall of Jerusalem, and the consequent blow to Jewish nationalism, changed the sociological situation in such a manner that Christianity could go its way separate from Judaism. The balance of the church changed from majority Jewish to majority gentile.

The shift to a gentile majority did not immediately mean a change in leadership or theology. The Hellenistic church was too young to immediately take over the leadership. The early theology, Semitic in thought-forms and heavily influenced by apocalypticism, continued to be the church's only official theology until about the time of Clement of Alexandria. After his time, the gospel message presented in terms of Greek thought began to dominate, until

Hellenistic theology was the church's official theology. The Semitic thought-forms persisted at the popular levels, and in some fringe movements, and even reappeared in many church festivals and laws in the fourth century. But official church theology has from that time on always been Hellenistic.

The earliest church was concerned with living history, not with writing history. It therefore wrote very little. After the church split from Judaism, there was a conscious reaction against all that was Jewish. The thorough Hellenization of the church after the time of Clement of Alexandria pushed memory of the Jewish Christian church even further away. All of these factors serve to obscure our knowledge of the early Jewish Christian church. Daniélou reconstructs the historical outline we have just traced largely from the canonical sources. His true interest, of course, is early Jewish Christianity's theology, which he must reconstruct largely from non-canonical sources.

7.2.3

Marcel Simon

Marcel Simon's study of the relations between Christianity and Judaism in the period from the Second Jewish War to the promulgation of the Theodosian Code¹³ inevitably begged the very questions we are studying here. As a result, in a series of publications over more than a quarter of a century, he dealt with the history of Christian origins.¹⁴ A very important second type of contribution to these studies is his careful consideration and

classification of the various definitions of "Jewish Christianity."

The choice which Simon makes amongst the various available theories of the evolution of the early catholic church comes as quite a surprise. It had begun to appear that Baur's schema could no longer function on the cutting edge of scholarship, except as an inspiring historical artifact. While Schoeps greatly lamented the demise of the Tübingen School and followed Baur in his approach to the Pseudo-Clementines, he nevertheless did not adopt Baur's schema of church evolution. Simon, however, does resolutely adopt it. In Simon's view, there were two and only two fundamental conceptions of Christianity at work in the early church: a Jewish Christian one and a gentile Christian one. These two conceptions clashed, sometimes violently, but they did so without ever destroying the fundamental unity of Christianity. In working out the details, Simon of course makes changes to reflect the research since Baur's work, but without altering Baur's basic orientation. Early catholicism was most assuredly a synthesis of Jewish Christianity and Paulinism.

History of the Early Church according to Simon

Simon follows the majority opinion in seeing a movement toward universalism in the Jerusalem Hellenist group, and especially in Stephen. It is this group which leads the advance in evangelizing the gentiles, beginning in Antioch.

The sharpest contrast between Simon's work and most

others' is his interpretation of the early controversies at Antioch and the related Apostolic Council. These events resulted in two and not three positions. Partisans of the law had visited Antioch, and due to their protests the Apostolic Council was convened to consider the mission to the gentiles. The conclusion which Simon holds the Council reached was exactly what Baur had argued a century and more earlier: Paul was fully recognized as the missionary of a law-free gospel to the gentiles, while the Jerusalem apostles were to continue to preach a gospel including law observance to the Jews. Thus two distinct, valid types of Christianity were recognized for the two parts of humanity.

The situation of the church in Antioch posed a problem, because it did not fit either of the two categories considered at the Jerusalem Council. Paul of course assimilated it to his gentile mission, and local Christians of Jewish birth also ignored questions of purity at table so as to be able to eat with the gentiles and not divide the new community. When Peter arrived he at first accepted this state of affairs. However, when people came down from Jerusalem and objected strongly, Peter changed his mind, although whether he came to believe the two parts of the community should be separate or whether the whole church should be assimilated to the Jewish group is not certain. What is clear is that Peter was hesitating between gentile Christianity and Jewish Christianity, not creating a via media.

The conflict in Antioch brought home to the Jerusalem community the fact that it had not considered mixed communities in its original decision. Without the presence or participation of Paul, it reconsidered the problem and decided that to resolve this type of conflict it would be necessary for the gentile converts to obey the Noachic commandments. This was then codified in the so-called Apostolic Decree. According to this interpretation, the Apostolic Decree was in response to the incident between Paul and Peter in Antioch. While this is the most likely explanation of our texts, Simon notes that it is also possible that Jerusalem's reconsideration based on mixed communities came somewhat earlier. It is possible that the men who came down from James were in fact bearing the letter containing the Apostolic Decree, the Decree then being the cause rather than the result of the incident. In either case, Paul was not present and did not consent to the Decree. Simon prefers the former explanation, according to which the Antiochene incident precipitated the Decree. With this solution in mind, he interprets James' recital of the terms of the decree to Paul on the occasion of Paul's last visit to Jerusalem (Acts 21:25) as the first time Paul was officially informed of the Decree.

The Apostolic Decree is pivotal in clarifying a number of issues. At this point in the church's development, the drafting of the Decree demonstrates that the Jerusalem church's thinking was broader than Baur had postulated. But while Ritschl had been led to see two parties in the

Jerusalem community because of the Decree, Simon integrates the new insights without allowing for two Jerusalem groups. The Jerusalem church had fully accepted the gentile mission, but had then come to conclude that the dynamics of this new situation demanded the Apostolic Decree. This made the gentiles into "God-fearers," and, as Ritschl had rightly observed, into second class Christians in comparison with those who observed the full law. From this point of view it is natural that many, perhaps all, the members of the Jerusalem community would wish converts to take upon themselves full law observance and move on to the fuller type of Christianity.

The Jerusalem church, at first reserved, became actively involved in mission. Peter's visit to Antioch and the existence of a judaizing group with some Jerusalem connection following in Paul's wake demonstrate that the Jerusalem community wished to place the mission under its authority and to model the developing Christian church after its own image. It was also Jewish Christians who founded the church in Rome. Their influence was thus deep and wide in the early church, so much so that even Paul had to make concessions to them. Clearly Paul saw no fundamental reason not to eat meat offered to idols, but when he agreed in his first letter to the Corinthians that it might be necessary to abstain so as not to offend the weak, he was giving some ground to the Jewish Christian position as set forth in the Apostolic Decree. In Galatia the Jewish Christians

apparently wished Paul's converts to obey the whole law- and there is no indication that they were completely unsuccessful.

Jewish Christianity's great initial strength was reflected in the very major contributions it made toward the evolution of early catholicism. These contributions are well exemplified in the history of the application of the Apostolic Decree. Baur, we may recall, dated the Apostolic Decree quite late. By comparison, Simon dates it early, and believes it was widely accepted and long observed in the whole church. In the East, he finds record of it being considered binding as late as the sixth century.¹⁵ We recall that for the Jewish Christians the Decree was a minimum of law, imposed on the gentile Christians as the Noachic commandments were imposed on gentile God-fearers by the rest of Judaism: in both cases it placed them on the fringe of the authentic community. Once the Decree was fully integrated into early catholic Christianity, however, it functioned in almost the opposite way. Instead of putting the gentile Christians on the fringe of Judaism, it defined them as fully Christian and not Jewish at all. Thus an authentic and important Jewish Christian contribution to the synthesis became a mark of the church's separation from Judaism.

Despite its initial dominance and vigor, the Jewish Christian church soon waned in importance. The tremendous success of Christianity amongst pagans swelled Christianity's ranks with gentiles, while the Jerusalem

community was forced by the threat of the impending war to flee to Pella. The descendants of this group became progressively less and less important in the church as a whole. They were finally reduced to the level of an obscure sect, which, by not keeping up with the evolution of the catholic church, was soon regarded as heretical. It did, however, conduct one mission with more lasting success. Based on the Didascalia and the suspicion that there is some historical fact behind the Addai legend, Simon suggests that at an early period the Aramaic-language Jewish Christian church of Palestine undertook a successful mission on the eastern fringes of the Empire and beyond. This gave rise to a Jewish Christian church centred in Edessa and speaking mostly Aramaic or Syriac. It also had some Greek-speaking elements in the region of Antioch. This Syriac church was the most important form of Jewish Christianity which survived for a significant period of time.

Simon's Critique of Definitions of "Jewish Christianity"

Simon has carefully and critically studied the various definitions, implied and explicit, in use for Jewish Christianity and classifies them in three categories. Jewish Christianity may be defined by:

1. observance of Jewish law
2. a system of doctrines (Schoeps)
3. categories of thought (Daniélou).¹⁶

Simon finds definitions of types 2 and 3 to be severely wanting. Category 2, the definition used by Schoeps, he

dismisses quickly. To define Jewish Christianity simply by the Ebionite doctrines of the Pseudo-Clementines is to ignore other well-documented forms of Jewish Christianity. In fact, it does not seem possible to find any definition of Jewish Christianity based on doctrine which would encompass all the known instances. He also rejects Daniélou's category 3 definition of Jewish Christianity which is based on the contention that Jewish Semitic thought, and specifically apocalyptic thought, was dominant in the church at least until the middle of the second century. Simon argues that in the texts Daniélou uses as the basis of his theory we find Jewish and non-Jewish elements thoroughly intermingled. In fact, Simon holds, no matter what period of early Christianity we examine, even the very earliest, we never find exclusively Jewish Christian thought as defined by Daniélou. Simon therefore concludes that the theology of Jewish Christianity which Daniélou constructs is an abstraction which never existed as an independent entity. The Syro-Palestinian church mentioned at the end of the last section does to some extent fit Daniélou's conception of Jewish Christianity defined by Jewish Semitic thought forms. It was, however, geographically quite limited, and never exerted much influence on the church in general.

Observance of the Jewish law, that is, category 1 above, is the only valid basis for defining Jewish Christianity as far as Simon is concerned. He asserts that for the ecclesiastical authors of antiquity, a Jewish

Christian was a person who felt himself to be, wished to be, and in fact was, in the different manifestations of his religious life, both Jewish and Christian.¹⁷ Laying aside any question of how Christianity may define itself, Simon asserts that Judaism defines itself in the first place by orthopraxy and only in the second place by orthodoxy. It should further be noted that in the Antioch incident, the disagreement between James and Paul was not over any strictly doctrinal point, but rather over practice. So, on the triple basis of ecclesiastical usage, Jewish self-definition and usefulness in New Testament exegesis, Simon concludes that only by using the standard of observance of Jewish law can an historically valid and critically useful definition of Jewish Christianity be constructed.

The final problem of definition is to determine how much Jewish law must be observed to constitute Jewish Christianity. Again, Simon's answer is quite clear: the test is the level of Jewish observance demanded by the Apostolic Decree. As we have seen, he argues that this decree was probably drafted in response to the incident in Antioch, fairly rapidly was generally observed, entered as a distinctive and defining element into the early catholic synthesis, and was long considered binding, especially in Eastern Christianity. He therefore holds that any group which observed this much and no more Jewish ritual practice was not Jewish Christian; any group which observed Jewish ritual practice beyond that outlined in the Apostolic Decree was Jewish Christian.

The schema of early church development set forth by Raymond Brown rests on the conclusions he has drawn about specific early church communities. These conclusions in turn seem to be based on the type of New Testament interpretation which he developed in his study of the Johannine corpus. An important element which forms a part of this approach is the hypothesis that specific information about the history of a community may be inferred from its writings, even if those writings do not deal explicitly with the community (as is the case with the Gospel of John).¹⁸ His views on the evolution of the Johannine literature, and of the communities it reflects, are presented in his three volumes in the Anchor Bible series, and more recently in The Community of the Beloved Disciple.¹⁹ Since his work on the Johannine corpus, he has outlined his view of the development of the church in Rome,²⁰ and the sub-apostolic development of several communities as reflected in various New Testament and other early Christian documents.²¹

Brown vigorously rejects the idea that there were theological or legal positions in New Testament times which could be called "Jewish Christian" and "gentile Christian." Rather, he holds that early Christian theological and legal diversity is to be traced to the varying points of view of the Apostles, and of the early, ethnically Jewish, Christian evangelists, as well as to differences in the development of the various communities they founded. Each early,

ethnically Jewish, Christian community made gentile converts, thus creating various Jewish/gentile communities. Every one had its own distinctive history, including internal debates and occasionally schisms. A given community was usually held together by a moderating centre, which reconciled the opposing views as far as possible. In the same way, the early catholic church developed from these communities by means of compromise and consensus around a moderate, middle position.

From the various types of "Jewish/Gentile Christianity", Brown feels four can be clearly identified:

1. Those who believed that circumcision and obedience to the whole Mosaic Law were necessary for full participation in salvation brought by Jesus the Christ;

2. those who did not require circumcision of gentile Christians, but did require the observance of some purity laws by gentiles;

3. those who required neither circumcision nor observance of food regulations by gentile Christians (but were not necessarily opposed to such observances by Jewish Christians);

4. those who did not require circumcision or observance of food regulations, and had fundamentally broken with all Jewish practices, seeing no lasting significance in the Jewish cult or feasts.

The views described as type 1 were held by Christians

from the Pharisaic party mentioned in the book of Acts, as well as by Paul's opponents in Galatians. Their arguments won over at least some gentile Christians. This group was never reconciled to Paul, and would also have considered Peter a traitor. It was represented in Rome, and it may have been some of its members who betrayed Peter and Paul to their deaths.

Brown's group 4 is represented in the New Testament by the Johannine literature, the letter to the Hebrews, and by the Hellenists in the book of Acts. Because of his volumes on the Johannine literature, study of this group forms the bulk of Brown's published work.

At its inception, Brown sees the Johannine community as a Jewish Christian group still attached to the synagogue and virtually indistinguishable from the other Jewish Christian groups. Early in its development, a group of Jewish Christians opposed to the Temple (like those associated with Stephen in the book of Acts) who had converted some Samaritans, entered this community. The shift in thinking occasioned by the entry of the anti-temple group, as well as the need to express the significance of Jesus in new categories for the Samaritans, were catalysts for a major shift in the Christology of the Johannine community. It moved from the fairly "low" Christology it formerly largely shared with other Jewish Christian groups to the very distinctive "high" Christology we know from the Gospel of John. This high Christology led to affirmations about Jesus which eventually came to be regarded as blasphemous by their

non-Christian Jewish co-religionists. They were thus expelled from the synagogue.

The Johannine community was deeply scarred by their expulsion from the the synagogue. They consequently ceased to think of themselves as Jewish and developed an attitude of sharp conflict with respect to Judaism. This new situation facilitated a large influx of gentiles into the Johannine community. Gentiles were thus accepted into their community without the struggles we see reflected, for other groups, in the book of Acts, the letters of Paul and (according to Brown) the Gospel of Matthew. It was at this stage, about the year 90, that the community produced the Gospel of John.

The subsequent history of the Johannine community involves sharp internal division, with the two factions eventually merging into the great movements of the second century. One faction, representing the opponents of the author of I John, eventually moved toward docetism, Cerinthianism and Montanism. The other faction, those siding with the author of I John, eventually merged with the catholic church. They accepted its very foreign authoritative teaching structure, while the catholic church adopted the Johannine community's high Christology. Thus ended this community's very separate development.

Brown's type 3 Jewish/Gentile Christianity (best represented in the New Testament by Paul) clashed with type 2 at Antioch. "Paul maintained that the food laws did not

oblige the Gentiles; evidently Peter agreed but backed away from the exercise of that freedom when the issue gave signs of leading to a struggle with James and Jerusalem." (Churches 133) Because of Paul's carefully nuanced position in 1 Cor 8 about renunciation of a right out of concern for a brother, Brown feels that Paul's sharp reaction to Peter might have been due more to his loss of face in Antioch than to an opposition in principle to Peter's argument. In any event, Paul lost in Antioch, and felt so isolated that he left and went to Asia Minor and Greece where he could better maintain his view of the gospel. In Antioch, Peter's type 2 position, which mediated between types 1 and 3, carried the day. The compromise position, worked out in reaction to the clash, was to impose some purity laws on the gentiles. It was anachronistically inserted by Luke in the Acts 15 account.

Paul's position changed with his experiences. As late even as his letter to the Galatians, he had held a fully apocalyptic view of Christianity, which made Christianity something totally new. But the troubles he had with those people at Corinth who "had knowledge" but not love led him to see some of the weaknesses of his position, and the strengths of Peter's mediating position. By the time he wrote to the Romans, he had worked out a greater place in his thought for salvation history and was able to give a more positive evaluation of Law and of Judaism. He also felt the need in this letter to stress the difference between his position and that which Brown calls type 4.

The Christian community at Rome is the outstanding example of a Jewish/Gentile Christian group of the type 2. It had been evangelized before the 50's by Jerusalem Christians of type 2. Even though by the time Paul wrote to them, gentiles may have formed the majority, they continued in the type 2 beliefs they had received- holding the Jewish heritage in high regard, and holding to a mediating view on the law (some of its members, though, adhered to a type 1 position). This position of Rome goes far in explaining why Paul was at such pains to deny the accusation that he held the views of group 4. Because of his moderated position, Paul was well accepted at Rome, but the more moderate Peter was always given the first place of honour. After the fall of Jerusalem, Rome took over much of the oversight of the missionary work of Jerusalem, and also of Paul's churches.

7.2.5 Observations on the Second Period Surveyed

Daniélou holds that the early catholic church was a product of Jewish Christianity. This judgement rests on a schema remarkably similar in form, but very different in content, to Ritschl's. Like Ritschl, he stresses the earliest community's agreement that church membership was based exclusively on faith in Christ. This led to a single initial stream of Christianity, which shortly converted some gentiles. The fact that these gentiles were not constrained to obey the Law of Moses caused conflict, but those who did not acquiesce in the conciliar decision effectively removed themselves from the mainstream of Christian development. In

the mainstream of Christianity there was tension over the keeping of the Mosaic Law, as Peter and those like him did not want to offend Jewish nationalism, while Paul wished to liberate Christianity from Judaism. But, as with Ritschl, the two sides remained at one on the basis of Christianity. Again somewhat like Ritschl, the increasingly overwhelming majority of gentiles, and the blow to Jewish nationalism caused by the Jewish wars, led to an eventual complete rupture with Judaism (although for Ritschl the rupture was not with Judaism but with Jewish Christianity). The great contrast with Ritschl is not the basis Daniélou sees Christianity resting on, nor on the relative numbers of ethnic Jews and gentiles, but rather the make-up of the church leadership and, more significantly, the form and content of its thought. Jewish Christians long continued to supply the leadership of the church. And most significant for Daniélou, the church's theology was and long remained Jewish Christian, worked out in Semitic patterns and based on the dominant theological ideas of contemporary Judaism, seen of course in the light of the Christian experience. It is this contention that allows one to claim that for Daniélou, no matter the ethnic make-up of the church, no matter its practice with respect to Mosaic ritual, the church remained essentially Jewish Christian until about the time of Clement of Alexandria, and at a popular level, even longer.

Brown rejects the idea that there were theological

positions in the first century which could be called "Jewish Christian" and "gentile Christian." Nevertheless, in the scheme he sets out, each community is founded by ethnic Jews, and each community's development proceeds in ways determined largely by Jewish questions and conditioned by Jewish ways of thinking. Even though gentiles may well be present in each of the four postulated groups, distinctive gentile concerns are rarely central, nor is the Christian message presented according to any distinctively gentile thought system. Brown therefore implicitly agrees with Daniélou that the early Christian theological positions were all developed by Jewish Christians, and it was only after the development of the early catholic church that gentile thought could creatively take a place of leadership in the church. Within this basic conception of the early development of the church, which is very similar to that of Daniélou, we do see the influence of Baur. Like Baur, a group demanding observance of the Mosaic Law by all (type 1) clashes with a group not demanding such observance (type 3), producing a group between the two. There, however, the similarity ends. In Baur's schema, these two groups interact for over a century to produce something new, a synthesis. In Brown's schema, the two groups clash and immediately a compromise (not a synthesis) is worked out. The new position (type 2) is not something essentially new, but was present, at least potentially, from the very beginning.

The major change in modern scholarship reflected in

Brown's work is the growing tendency to postulate great diversity in early Christianity.²² Baur, with his dialectic method, was able to abstract from complexity and deal at a theoretical level in a way which finds little acceptance today. He was also able to ignore the Gospel of John as a factor in the first century of the church's development, since he dated the tensions which produced it to the church's second century. But Brown, who dates the Gospel of John well within the church's first century, and traces the tradition which produced it back very early in the church's history, feels he must reflect this Johannine complexity in his view of early church development. Thus, this diversity is not only reflected in the Johannine tradition, but, as he argues in The Churches the Apostles Left Behind, also in several other traditions and heritages. The relations and mutual influences between these various traditions and communities in the major centres become quite complex, and can certainly not be explained by Baur's dialectical tension. But just as there is an increased appreciation of early Christian diversity, so there is a loss of clarity in the meaning of the terms "Jewish Christianity" and "gentile Christianity" in Brown's work. Although Baur, Ritschl and Daniélou used these terms in somewhat different senses, each was clear about what he meant by them. The fact that Brown drops these terms and replaces them with his four types of Jewish/Gentile Christianity does reflect a greater appreciation of diversity, but robs "Jewish Christian" and

"gentile Christian" of the precise meaning they had in much of the earlier work.

These two outstanding schemata of the second period surveyed show this period to be characterized by the breakdown of the earlier consensus on the evolution of the early church and by the consequent breakdown of a consensus on the meaning of the terms "Jewish Christian" and "gentile Christian." The newer more positive evaluation of first century Judaism caused the dissolution of the early consensus on church evolution, while a new sensitivity to early Christian diversity has allowed contemporary critics to postulate various types of Jewish and gentile groups within the church. It is not yet clear whether or not a new consensus is emerging on the basis of the new views of Judaism and of Christian diversity.

The work of this dissertation suggests that the new attitudes toward first century Judaism and toward early Christian diversity may have inadvertently led critics to overlook a fundamental division in the early church. Acts and the letters of Paul do show a divisive conflict within the early Christian community over the observance of Jewish dietary purity and circumcision. The importance this conflict had in the early church, as evidenced in these texts, is not sufficiently reflected in the schemata of the second period. In the last chapter of this dissertation, I have drawn out what seem to be the implications of Acts and the letters of Paul for a schema of early church evolution. It would be beneficial for scholarship to re-weigh these New

Testament texts before coming to any new consensus on early church development.

It is useful for this dissertation briefly to summarize the positions on the Jewish law held by the various postulated groups in the schemata of the four most important authors surveyed. The obvious should perhaps be pointed out: the debate is not over law in the sense of moral law. All the groups agree that all Christians should live according to high moral standards. Law which is under discussion in Baur's work is that which is particularistic in Jewish law, including such things as circumcision and purity laws. Whether the practices in question come from the written Torah or from the oral Torah would not seem to be significant, but rather the significance lies in their place in the development of the human moral consciousness. The scandal of Jewish Christianity is its retention of particularistic Jewish practices. Gentile Christianity rejected these elements, in direct line with its earliest roots in the Hellenist group in Jerusalem, which criticized, for instance, the Jewish institution of the Temple. As time passed and the two groups moved toward a synthesis, these particularistic elements were progressively eliminated. Circumcision was replaced by baptism on the Jewish Christian side early in the process. In respect to law taken in the sense we have been using, the early catholic synthesis maintained most of the elements of gentile Christianity and few of Jewish Christianity.

In Ritschl's schema, the strict Jewish Christians maintained circumcision and the Jewish law as practiced by

contemporary Judaism. The moderate Jewish Christian group may well have held a similar basic view of law, but as we see from the Apostolic Decree, recognized a form of Christianity for gentiles which only required a minimum of special Jewish law. The mainstream of Christianity, however, soon moved away from this whole discussion, and formed its own distinctive Christian system of law (Ritschl calls it a "Christian nomism") bearing little relation to any Jewish understanding of law.

In Daniélou's schema, the Apostolic Council authoritatively decreed circumcision unnecessary for gentiles. In the churches established by Paul's mission, the gentiles did not observe any of the Jewish purity laws. Most Jewish Christians continued to observe all Jewish laws. Gentiles converted by Jewish Christians from Palestine were of course not required to be circumcised, but did observe some ritual law as outlined in the so-called Apostolic Decree. They also would have observed the Sabbath, Pentecost, other Jewish feasts, and have followed Jewish liturgies in their services. These elements, suppressed by the church leadership in the second and third centuries, resurfaced in the catholic church from popular and local groups in the fourth century.

R.E. Brown is particularly clear on each of his groups' stance with respect to the Jewish law. Group 1 believed all Christians should observe all Jewish law as then practiced. Group 2 encouraged and group 3 tolerated full observance of

the law by Jewish Christians, but they did not require circumcision of gentiles. Their point of division was on purity laws related to food: group 2 required the observance of some laws in this area, while group 3 did not. Group 4 had fundamentally broken with all Jewish ritual or purity laws of any kind.

NOTES TO INTRODUCTION

1. See, for instance, Langrange vii-vx.
2. See Edouard Massaux, Influence de l'évangile de saint Matthieu sur la littérature chrétienne avant saint Irénée (Louvain: Publications Universitaires de Louvain, 1950).
3. The classic source for knowledge of Jewish Christianity is the comments of the Church Fathers. These are now conveniently available in the original languages and translation in A.F.J. Klijn and G.J. Reinink, Patristic Evidence for Jewish-Christian Sects (Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1973). F.C. Baur's idea of using the Pseudo-Clementine literature to reconstruct the position of the earliest Jewish Christian party, while itself being rejected, inspired later followers of Baur to use the proposed sources of this literature as a major source of knowledge of a later form of Jewish Christianity. In addition to these, Schoeps uses the Gospel of the Nazareans, the Gospel of the Ebionites (both incomplete reconstructions from references and quotations), the Gospel of Thomas, and Symmachus' Old Testament translation. To these Daniélou adds the Didache, the Shepherd of Hermas, the Letter of Barnabas, the Letters of Ignatius and I Clement.
4. "Where else could such a stream of thought (to make the Sabbath a Christian day of rest) have its source, as it has done among all Sabbatarians both in the past and today, except in the fourth commandment of the Law, a Law which was not deemed to have been altered by Christ expressis verbis?" W. C. van Unnik, "The Significance of Moses' Law for the Church of Christ According to the Syriac Didascalia," Sparsa

NOTES TO INTRODUCTION

Collecta. The Collected Essays of W.C. van Unnik, 3 Vols. (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1983) 3: 32. The Didascalia divides between the Law, which comprises all given before Israel worshipped the Golden Calf (therefore including the Decalogue), and the Second Legislation, which is made up of all given later. Christ confirms the Law, but sets aside the Second Legislation. Van Unnik argues in this article that while the details of the Didascalia's argument are unique to the Didascalia, some such resolution of the question of the applicability of Old Testament law to the church is a commonplace in early Christianity.

5. Note the comments of John P. Meier who accepts the idea that Matthew might well have been Jewish Christian in the ethnic sense of the term, but that the content of the gospel is such that even if this were the case his Jewish Christianity is without significance in the way the term is generally used, and in effect amounts to gentile Christianity (Meier Vision 22-23).

6. For a good introduction to the area of reader-response criticism, see Jane P. Tompkins, Reader-Response Criticism, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1980).

7. See, for instance, James Moffett and Kenneth R. McElheny, ed, Points of View (New York and Toronto: The New American Library, 1966).

8. Patte explicitly assumes that Matthew is the Christian author he presents himself as being, and finds that assumption to be confirmed by his research: "I am assuming

NOTES TO INTRODUCTION

that Matthew's Gospel is not fraudulent or hypocritical. But even when this is the case, the text reflects its author's system of convictions, which drives the author to write such a hypocritical discourse. Features of the text-inconsistencies among different dimensions of meaning-reveal the hypocritical character of the text. I did not detect such inconsistencies in Matthew's Gospel." (The Gospel According to Matthew, p. 14 note 10)

9. There has been a large number of publications on the synoptic problem in the last few decades. But the Two Source hypothesis has been the common denominator for most of these: they either attack the Two Source hypothesis, defend the Two Source hypothesis, propose an alternative to the Two Source hypothesis, or simply plead that minds should remain open to the possibility of solutions other than the Two Source hypothesis at least in the study of specific pericopae. The Two Source hypothesis is truly the dominant theory against which anyone offering an alternative must struggle. In a recently published article (Michael Pettem, "Le premier récit de la multiplication des pains et le problème synoptique," Studies in Religion/ Sciences religieuses 14:1 (1985) 73-83), I have argued the superiority of the Two Source hypothesis in explaining the relationship between Matthew, Mark and Luke's accounts of the Feeding of the Five Thousand. According to B.H. Streeter, there are more minor agreements of Luke and Matthew against Mark in the Feeding of the Five Thousand than in any other section of comparable length (Streeter, Four Gospels 313). In this article, I have thus tested the

NOTES TO INTRODUCTION

Two source hypothesis and found it sound in what should be, for it, a difficult pericope.

10. In addition to Farmer's defense of the Griesbach hypothesis, some Matthean scholars have been attracted to Antonio Gaboury's new proposed solution to the synoptic problem (A. Gaboury, La structure des évangiles synoptiques, Supplements to Novum Testamentum 22, Leiden: Brill, 1970). According to his hypothesis, there was a primitive gospel which had all the material of the triple tradition found in Mk 1:1-13 and 6:14-16:8 (that is, the primitive gospel had all the triple tradition except what is to be found in Mark chapters 1 to 6). The work of Gaboury is sharply criticized and rejected in favour of the Two Source theory by F. Neirynck, "The Gospel of Matthew and Literary Criticism," L'évangile selon Matthieu. Rédaction et théologie, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 29, ed M. Didier, Gembloux (Belgium): Duculot, 1972 37-69). His article comes out of the twenty third session of the "Journées bibliques de Louvain" (September 1-3, 1970) where the topic was the Gospel of Matthew. It should be noted that at this congress "nearly all the participants viewed the Matthean redaction on the basis of literary dependence upon Mark and the Q source" (Neirynck 37), that is to say, they assumed the Two Source hypothesis.

11. There is no compelling reason to believe that Luke possessed a defective copy of the Gospel of Mark, missing this section. It is more likely that his Great Omission

NOTES TO INTRODUCTION

reflects a choice on his part. The nature of the missing material may be the clue. Some of this material deals with Jewish law and the question of relations with non-Jews. It is possible that Luke dropped this material because he planned to deal with these questions in more detail and in a more historically appropriate context in his second volume, the book of the Acts of the Apostles. I plan to develop these ideas in more detail elsewhere.

12. Ernest L. Abel, "Who Wrote Matthew?" NTS 17 (1970-1971) 138-152 finds two levels of redaction in Matthew. For a brief statement and critique of his article, see the last note to chapter three.

If the original redactor of Matthew is the only significant redactor of the gospel, then the point of view reflected in Mt 15:1-20 is representative of the Gospel According to Matthew as a whole. If there was a significant secondary redaction of Matthew after the original one (and no such hypothesis has ever gained serious following in the academic community), then it still seems reasonable to assume that Mt 15:1-20 also reflects the point of view of this second redaction since it did not alter Mt 15:120. If one believed that Matthew was subject to a secondary redaction which differed in point of view from the primary redaction in Mt 15:1-20, one would have to demonstrate the following propositions: First, one would have to show that the second redaction so clearly altered the first that it must have disagreed with the point of view of the first as expressed in Mt 15:1-20. Second, one would have to explain

NOTES TO INTRODUCTION

why it is that the second redaction which so greatly altered Matthew in other places so as to clearly show its opposition to the point of view expressed in Mt 15:1-20, failed to alter Mt 15:1-20, the very point at which it so clearly opposed the first edition. The difficulty of such a position is so great that it may be concluded that if the Two Source hypothesis of synoptic relationships is adopted it follows that Mt 15:1-20 reflects the final redactional point of view of the Gospel of Matthew.

NOTES TO CHAPTER ONE

1. The terms "Jewish Christian" and "gentile Christian" have been used in a great variety of senses. Although careful work has been done on defining "gentile Christian," there has been more preoccupation with defining "Jewish Christian." It follows that looking at the meaning assigned to "Jewish Christian" is more instructive. Without being in any way exhaustive, the following eight examples are illustrative of the ways in which the terms "Jewish Christian" and "Jewish Christianity" have been used. The list is adapted from Marcel Simon and André Benoît Le judaïsme et le christianisme antique 258f.

1. The whole early catholic church is Jewish Christian because of its Jewish roots.
2. All Christians who are of Jewish birth, no matter their practice or theology, are Jewish Christian.
3. All Christians of Jewish birth who continue to observe Jewish religious practices within Christianity are Jewish Christian.
4. All Christians of any ethnic origin who observe the Jewish Law are Jewish Christian.
5. All those who hold the doctrinal system found in the proposed sources of the Pseudo-Clementine literature are Jewish Christian. (Thus Jewish Christianity is equal to Ebionism.)
6. Jewish Christianity is a form of Christianity, not necessarily linked to the Jewish community, which was the dominant form of Christianity from the time of the origin of Christianity until about the middle of the

NOTES TO CHAPTER ONE

second century, which is characterized by Semitic thought-forms, and by a theology which is Jewish in expression, and essentially apocalyptic in form.

7. Jewish Christianity is a Judaizing movement within the catholic church, characterized by a syncretistic appropriation of elements from the Old Testament, contemporary Judaism and other sources. (This definition is intended to include such tendencies as those in Antioch opposed by Chrysostom.)

8. Jewish Christianity is defined as the Aramaic- or Syriac-language church of Syria-Palestine. This is similar to definition 6, except that this definition refers to a geographic region, rather than to a time period.

No such definition of "Jewish Christian" or "Jewish Christianity" will be adopted in this dissertation. Rather than a short definition, the full theoretical background against which these terms have been used in the most important scholarly work will be outlined. In this way, the dissertation will avoid becoming a simple exercise in testing whether Matthew best fits into the category "Jewish Christian" or "gentile Christian" according to a given definition. Because the theoretical background of the terms is brought out, this thesis will be able to deal with the problem of what is an appropriate use of the terms "Jewish Christian" and "gentile Christian" in the early church. Matthew will then be classified as either "Jewish Christian"

NOTES TO CHAPTER ONE

or "gentile Christian" on the basis of a careful study of the appropriate use of these terms.

2. The principal works of F.C. Baur consulted in the preparation of this section are: "Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde, der Gegensatz des petrinischen und paulinischen Christenthums in der ältesten Kirche, der Apostel Petrus in Rom," Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie 4 (1831): 61-206, reprinted in Ferdinand Christian Baur, Ausgewählte Werke in Einzelausgaben, ed. K. Scholder (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Friedrich Fromman, 1963) vol. 1: 1-146; Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien, (Tübingen: L.F. Fues, 1847); and The Church History of the First Three Centuries, trans. A. Menzies, 2 vols. (London: Williams & Norgate, 1879), (First German edition 1863). A complete bibliography of F.C. Baur may be found in P.C. Hodgson, The Formation of Historical Theology (New York: Harper & Row, 1966) 285-294.

3. For the general orientation of Ritschl's work, I am following the extremely helpful article by Philip Hefner, "Baur Versus Ritschl on Early Christianity," Church History 31 (1962): 259-278. The outline of early Christianity's development is as found in: Ritschl, Die Entstehung der altkatholische Kirche, 2nd ed. (Bonn: Adolph Marcus, 1857). There is a major change in Ritschl's thinking between the first and second editions of this work.

4. See: Hans Joachim Schoeps, Theologie und Geschichte des Judentums (Tübingen: Mohr, 1949). See also: H.J. Schoeps, Jewish Christianity, trans. D.R.A. Hare

NOTES TO CHAPTER ONE

(Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969); Urgemeinde-Judenchristentum- Gnosis (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1956); Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History, trans. H. Knight (London: Lutterworth, 1961).

5. The works of Daniélou consulted for this section are: Jean Daniélou and Henri Marrou, Nouvelle histoire de l'Eglise. 1. Des origines A saint Grégoire le Grand (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1963); Jean Daniélou, The Theology of Jewish Christianity, trans. and ed. John A. Baker, A History of Early Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea, vol. 1 (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964); L'Eglise des Apôtres (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1970). In 1946, Daniélou took over the column "Bulletin d'Histoire des Origines Chretiennes" in Recherches de Science Religieuse. In 1947 he introduced a section called "Judaïsme et Christianisme", which he continued to write until 1973. This column consists of detailed reviews of current literature on Christian beginnings, and is a mine of information both on the literature itself and on Daniélou's views.

6. His main sources for reconstructing the theology of early Jewish Christianity are certain Old Testament pseudepigrapha, some non-canonical Gospels, the Didache, the Shepherd of Hermas, the Letter of Barnabas, the Letters of Ignatius, 1 Clement and traditions surviving in the Fathers.

7. This division of traditions in Acts 15 (and a related

NOTES TO CHAPTER ONE

division in Acts 10) is outlined in L'Eglise des Apôtres (1970). His division of Acts 15 follows Stanislas Giet (Université de Strasbourg), "L'assemblée apostolique et le décret de Jérusalem." Recherches de Science Religieuse 39 (1951): 203-220. An interesting argument on separate Jewish and gentile eucharists as the crux of the dispute in Antioch is set forth in Nouvelle histoire de l'Eglise (1963), at which time he did not yet seem to divide Acts 15 into two traditions.

8. The works of Raymond E. Brown consulted for this section are: The Gospel according to John, 2 vols. (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Volume 1, 1966; Volume 2, 1970); The Community of the Beloved Disciple (Toronto: Paulist, 1979); The Epistles of John (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1982); The Churches the Apostles Left Behind (London: Chapman, 1984); and R.E. Brown and John P. Meier, Antioch and Rome (New York: Paulist, 1983).

NOTES TO CHAPTER TWO

1. Peter Hodgson claims the opposite in The Formation of Historical Theology. A Study of Ferdinand Christian Baur (New York: Harper & Row, 1966) 218.
2. This I see as the meaning Baur generally gives the term "Tendenz" in his exegetical works. I freely admit that his use of the term may not always be consistent within these works, and that in his less specifically exegetical works he may use the term in quite a different way; the distinction I make is not made by Hodgson or, to the best of my knowledge, by any other expert on Baur. My argument in this section depends on Baur's understanding of Matthew, which I think is fairly clear, even though the term "Tendenz" is sometimes unclear.
3. See Evangelien 609ff.

NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR

1. Baur, Evangelien 614; see discussion in chapter two.
2. In this dissertation, it is accepted that one and the same meeting lies behind the account in Gal 2:1-10 and Acts 15. For scholarly opinions on this question, see the appropriate note in the following discussion of Acts 15.
3. "... it becomes clear that the opponents had pressured the Galatians into accepting Torah and circumcision" (Betz 6); Betz later outlines in more detail what position he believes Paul's opponents in Galatia held (Betz 8-9).
4. The ambiguity of Paul's statement in Gal 2:3 and its most likely resolution is outlined by F.F. Bruce:

(i) Far from their requiring the circumcision of Gentile believers, not even Titus was compelled to be circumcised; or

(ii) Not even Titus was compelled to be circumcised; he was circumcised indeed, but on his own initiative (or on Paul's). As the sentence stands, the placing of 'not even' (oude) before 'Titus' imports an emphasis which is more appropriate to the former than to the latter alternative. Bruce Gal 112.

Betz holds even more strongly that Titus was not circumcised.

5. Who were these false brothers and where and when did they sneak in?

WHO: There is a very broad consensus that they were Jewish Christians, and not non-Christian Jews. See Klaus Wegenast Das Verständnis der Tradition bei Paulus und in den

NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR

Deuteropaulinen. Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962: 47 who points out that Paul calls non-Christian Jews adelphoi kata sarka (Rom 9:3).

WHERE AND WHEN? - at the Jerusalem conference: many assume, since Paul is speaking of the Jerusalem conference, that the false brothers sneaked into the meeting at Jerusalem (Betz 90).

- at Antioch before the conference in Jerusalem: Watson argues that "sneaked" in could be better applied to the Antioch congregation than the "supposedly secret" meeting in Jerusalem; he further argues on the basis both of Gal 2 and Acts 15 that it was a crisis in Antioch caused by these men's contention that brought about the Jerusalem meeting (Watson 50-53).

- at Antioch after the conference in Jerusalem: Bruce holds that Gal 2:3 implies that the question of circumcision was not even raised at the Jerusalem meeting, and thus that the whole question was raised at a later date (Bruce 115-117).

Betz's comment, directed toward the first two of the above options, may be the best comment on all three of these options: "However, one possibility does not exclude the other. Paul talks about the opposition in Jerusalem for the precise purpose of discrediting his present opponents. Schlier (p. 71) denies that there is an identity of the present and the past opponents except for the insistence upon circumcision. What else is needed?" (Betz 90, note 304) This general conclusion is *à propos* of the discussion in

this dissertation: opponents at some time in the past had paralleled the present opponents' pressure to circumcise gentile Christians.

6. The first hand of D and some other witnesses to the Western text omit "oude," making Paul admit here that he did yield for a time to his opponents. The possibility that this variant represents the original text is very remote. For discussion see Metzger et al., A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament (UBS 1971) 591-592; Bruce Gal 113-115.

7. "To the nations, to the circumcision:" territorial or ethnic division? Betz opts for a territorial division, partly on the basis of the Pauline usage of the preposition eis (Betz 100). But a purely territorial division poses problems. "... were the Jerusalem leaders debarred from evangelizing the Jews of Ephesus, Corinth or Rome? Almost certainly not." Bruce 125. An ethnic division faces the corresponding problem: if Paul were limited to evangelizing gentiles only, then he could not have preached in the synagogues of the Diaspora, as Acts has him do regularly. Perhaps the best solution, though an inelegant one, is to conclude with F.F. Bruce: "But perhaps the issue was not defined so precisely; in either case, it must have been difficult to define the boundaries of the two mission-fields." (Bruce 125).

8. E. Dinkler reconstructs what he believes to be the conference's official decree, which lies behind Paul's

NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR

report here, Dinkler "Der Brief an die Galater," Verkündigung und Forschung (1953-1955) 182f; Signum Crucis 279ff; Die Petrus- Rom- Frage" 198.

9. "Important as the distinction may be between what one may eat and with whom one may eat, Paul never makes that a basic distinction" (Richardson 351-352).

10. The Incident in Antioch: For a review of the history of interpretations of this conflict, see Rene Kieffer Foi et justification à Antioch: interprétation d'un conflit (Gal. 2,14-21) (Paris: Cerf, 1982) 81-132. As the title of this monograph suggests, Kieffer's interest is focused more on the theological interpretation of the conflict than on the events themselves; but since an understanding of the former rests on an understanding of the latter, he treats the events themselves in some detail. He first presents the major Church Fathers' interpretations up to Thomas Aquinas; he then devotes an important section to the seminal work of Martin Luther, followed by modern interpreters, including a short section on Jewish interpreters. The importance he accords F.C. Baur in setting the agenda for the last century's discussion is to be noted.

The classic work of Franz Overbeck (Über die Auffassung des Streits des Paulus mit Petrus in Antiochien (Gal. 2,11 ff.) bei den Kirchenvätern, Basil, 1877) was republished in 1968 by the Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

The ideas of some important exegetes on this conflict, and how it influenced their views of the development of the early church, are outlined in the appendix to this

dissertation.

Betz, in a short excursus, summarizes the facts clearly and concisely: Cephas had taken up table fellowship with the gentile Christians, and perhaps adopted a gentile way of life; when the delegation from James arrived Cephas and the other Jewish Christians separated themselves and observed Jewish ritual separation from the unclean (Betz Gal 103-104).

James D.G. Dunn in his major article on this question ("The Incident at Antioch (Gal. 2:11-18)" JSNT (18, 1983) 3-57) outlines three possible ways of understanding the conflict:

(a) the whole community at Antioch had completely abandoned all Jewish dietary purity; the men from James demanded only observance of the laws explicitly set out in the written Torah, or perhaps even only the laws of the Apostolic Decree;

(b) the table-fellowship at Antioch had included a fair degree of observance of dietary law; the men from James demanded that the gentile Christians become fully proselytes including circumcision;

(c) the gentile Christians had been observing some purity laws; the men from James called for much more scrupulous observance of ritual purity and tithing.

Dunn opts for (c). A strong argument against this is presented by Rabbi Cohn-Sherbok in his response to Dunn ("Some Reflections on James Dunn's: 'The Incident at Antioch

NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR

(Gal 2.11-18)'" JSNT (18, 1983) 68-74). After praising Dunn for his presentation of complex rabbinic data, he asks what bearing all that data has on the problem at hand, and proceeds to several devastating comments: "Dunn does not provide any explicit documentation to support his hypothesis that the table-fellowship before the arrival of the men from James involved a fair degree of observance of the dietary laws... The epistle itself contains no such information nor for that matter is there any clear indication of the content of the emissaries' criticism of Peter and his fellow Jewish Christians. All we can be certain of is that Peter ate with gentiles (tōn ethnōn sunesthien), and was criticized for doing so." Cohn-Sherbok 70-71. Cohn-Sherbok rather follows the account of Galatians, assumes a basic historicity for Acts, and argues that Peter, after his experience with Cornelius, concluded that gentiles should not be regarded as unclean. In withdrawing at mealtimes, Peter was leaving the gentile Christians with a choice either "to take on the yoke of the law or suffer a line of division to be drawn through the church." Cohn-Sherbok 72.

George Howard holds the unusual position that the problems in Antioch, and in Galatia, were due to the fact the Paul's non-circumcision gospel had been made known to the Jewish Christians for the first time at the Jerusalem meeting and "there had been insufficient time for this new development in the church's mission to have been understood by all and for the news of it to have been thoroughly and properly circulated." (Howard 21) According to Howard, the

NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR

central meaning for Paul of Christ's salvation was that God had become the God of all, not just of the Jews only (e.g. Howard 62); this was, however, accomplished by still respecting the line of demarcation between the two. Gentiles were called to the gospel of Christ but remained uncircumcized gentiles, and Jews remained obedient to the Mosaic Law. This revelation was still new to Peter when he came to Antioch and "He had to turn back until the matter was cleared in his mind and his doubts were removed." (Howard 45) Peter did come around to Paul's understanding by the time Paul wrote I Corinthians. This view of Paul's understanding of the gospel makes him, rather than James or Peter, the originator of what in the early consensus schema of church evolution was called the moderate Jewish Christian position. This idea clashes with the view of most of the classic interpreters of Paul. The arguments presented later in this chapter against Brown's view that Paul moves toward the Petrine position in Brown's schema are also strong arguments against Howard's thesis.

Watson sees the basic problem as the difference between a reform movement within Judaism (the Jewish Christians' view) and a sect. He accepts that Paul had been teaching a gospel free from all Jewish law, and that Peter did try to "Judaize" the Antiochene gentile Christians after James's delegation arrived, in the sense that he and the Jewish Christians tried (successfully in Watson's view) to attach the Antioch church to Judaism. (Watson 53-56)

NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR

Traugott Holtz presents a very well balanced review of this conflict in the article "Der antiochenische Zwischenfall (Galater 2.11-14)" (New Testament Studies (32, 1986) 334-361). She points out that despite the clash between Paul and Peter in Antioch, Paul still insists that his gospel is fundamentally the same as Peter's, as he demonstrates by the reference to the witnesses to the resurrection in I Cor 15 and in other places (Holtz 349-350). She makes two points which are very important for the thesis that Matthew is gentile Christian. Firstly, "Vor allem aber setzt sich in der werdenden Kirche, wie wir noch sehen werden, die uneingeschränkte Mahlgemeinschaft von Juden- und Heidenchristen, die Paulus in Antiochia verteidigt, nicht durch, sondern wird mit gleichsam ökumenischer Geltung unter bestimmte Bedingungen gestellt, die jüdischen Vorschriften entsprechen" (Holtz 249). More to the point here, Holtz argues against Dunn (see above) that Paul's opposition to Peter cannot be understood as a question of degree. Holtz sees Dunn in effect saying that the men from James were asking that the gentiles obey more Jewish law. Holtz replies that the categorical terms Paul uses (such as ethnikos and ioudaizein in Gal 2:14) do not accept degrees of more or less, but call for an either/or choice: either a gentile lifestyle, or a Jewish lifestyle. Thus the question is not one of more or less law. For Paul, the conflict can only be understood theologically: the law-free gospel is for all who believe, Jew or gentile.

The point for the discussion in this dissertation is

that Paul's argument here is an argument of principle, not of quantity. Holtz has perhaps overstated the starkness of the alternatives. Nevertheless, she is right in holding that the question for Paul is not whether the gentile Christians should observe the Noahic law, the whole Torah or both written and oral Torah. Paul rather opposes the demand of observance of Jewish law in principle. This is the essential point for the dissertation: Paul opposes the observance of Jewish dietary purity in principle.

11. It has been suggested (G.D. Kilpatrick, N.T. Studien für R. Bultmann 1954 269-274) that the sense is "they were not on the right road toward the truth of the gospel." This accounts nicely for the classical sense of pros with the accusative. However, pros with the accusative meaning "with, in intimate connection with" is well attested for our period (cf. e.g. John's prologue kai ho logos en pros ton theon). This could then lead to a sense such as "go with the truth of the gospel."

12. Paul is clearly not using pos in the sense of "how?" as if he were requesting more information about Peter's technique. The sense of pos is "how is it possible that?" or even perhaps "by what right?" (Bauer Lexicon 732)

13. See the discussion in Haenchen 355-363.

14. The traditional problem is deciding which of the several visits to Jerusalem by Paul described in the book of Acts corresponds to the meeting Paul describes in Gal 2:2-

10. The first appendix to this dissertation presents the

NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR

views of several important commentators over the last century and a half.

The majority opinion has always been that Acts 15 corresponds to Gal 2:2-10. On this Lightfoot: "The later visit of the Galatian Epistle (Gal 1-10) coincides with the third visit of the Acts (Acts 15), when the so-called Apostolic Council was held, in all the most important features. The geography is the same. In both narratives the communications take place between Jerusalem and Antioch: in both the head-quarters of the false brethren are at the former place, their machinations are carried on in the latter: in both the Gentile Apostles go up to Jerusalem apparently from Antioch, and return thence to Antioch again. The time is the same, or at least not inconsistent. St Paul places the event 15 or 16 years after his conversion: St Luke's narrative implies that they took place about the year 51. The persons are the same: Paul and Barnabas appear as the representatives of the Gentile Churches, Cephas and James as the leaders of the Circumcision. The agitators are similarly described in the two accounts: in the Acts, as converted Pharisees who had imported their dogmas into the Christian Church; in the Epistle, as false brethren who attempt to impose the bondage of the law on the Gentile converts. The two Apostles of the Gentiles are represented in both accounts as attended: 'certain other Gentiles' (ex autōn) are mentioned by St Luke; Titus, a Gentile, is named by St Paul. The subject of dispute is the same; the circumcision of the Gentile converts. The character of the

NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR

conference is in general the same; a prolonged and hard-fought contest. The result is the same; the exemption of the Gentiles from the enactments of the law, and the recognition of the Apostolic commission of Paul and Barnabas by the leaders of the Jewish Church.

A combination of circumstances so striking is not likely to have occurred twice within a few years." (J.B. Lightfoot, Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians (London: Macmillan, 1896) 123-124.

The following detailed division of texts and sources is suggested by Kirsopp Lake:

	Gal	Ant. Source	Jer. Source
1 Paul's visit to Jerusalem	Gal 2:1-2	Acts 11:27-30	...
2 The 'Council' of the Apostles	Gal 2:3-10	...	Acts 15:3-29
3 Paul's return to Antioch	implied by Gal 2:11	?Acts 12:25	Acts 15:30
4 Peter's arrival in Antioch	Gal 2:11
5 The arrival of emissaries from James	Gal 2:12	Acts 15:1-2	...
6 A quarrel of Paul against Peter and Barnabas	Gal 2:13-14	?Acts 15:36ff	...

Kirsopp Lake, The Acts of the Apostles, vol 5, ed. K. Lake, H.J. Cadbury (London: Macmillan, 1933) 203.

This division is to be compared with the division suggested by Daniélou, on the basis of the ideas of Stanilas Giet, discussed in the first appendix.

NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR

The argument for the identification of Gal 2:1-10 with Acts 15 is so strong that the opposing position has always been hard to support. An argument against the consensus is presented by John Knox in his Chapters in a Life of Paul (New York: Abingdon, 1950) 68ff. His argument is interesting because it is related to his very well conceived re-thinking of the outline of the career of Paul.

As stated in the earlier section on Galatians, it is assumed in this dissertation that Acts 15 does in fact correspond to Gal 2:1-10. However, when there are discrepancies of detail, Paul's first hand account must be preferred.

15. Various opinions on the so-called Apostolic Decree are touched on in the first appendix to this dissertation. Its great importance for certain writers, such as Ritschl, is to be noted. See Haenchen 468-472 for a short discussion of the history of the problem and his solution.

While the majority of critics have concluded that the Apostolic Decree is at least out of place (if not invented) in Acts 15, some, of course, argue that Luke has correctly placed it here. The problem with such a contention is the fact the Paul makes no explicit reference to the decree in any of his letters. This glaring anomaly must be accounted for: if Luke has correctly placed this decree in his history, why is all reference to it absent from the only documents extant from the period, documents written by someone who was present at the promulgation of the Decree, and for whose congregations it was written? One line of

NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR

argument which takes these objections seriously and has an answer for them is that presented by John Hurd (see his The Origin of I Corinthians (New York: Seabury, 1965)). He dates the Apostolic Council later in Paul's career than most writers, holding that Paul had already evangelized Greece before the meeting. He argues that Paul did very much participate in and benefit from the bargaining which resulted in the Decree, and did in fact try to implement it in his congregations. But since it laid new obligations on the gentiles, without bringing them any new benefits beyond what Paul had already proclaimed they had, it was rather difficult for him to present as such. He thus tried to implement its contents without explicit presentation of it.

The significant point for this dissertation is not the exact dating of the Apostolic Decree. It is rather the type of gentile Christianity witnessed by Luke. Even if he has his dates wrong by a few years, and even if some of his points of detail on meetings and agreements recounted in his history are somewhat inaccurate, he nevertheless is a knowledgeable first century Christian whose description of first century gentile Christianity is of the highest value.

16. The text of Acts which includes only what might be called "ritual" purity laws is widely accepted as the better reading. For a concise review of the variant readings in the text of the Apostolic Decree, see Bruce M. Metzger, A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament (United Bible Societies, 1971) 429-434. If the Western text were

NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR

original, then the book of Acts would be setting down no "ritual" purity observances for gentiles, but only moral purity observances. In that case, it would be going as far in eliminating Jewish purity law from gentile Christianity as Paul and (as argued in the next chapter) Matthew.

17. Baur did not believe Peter was ever in Corinth. As outlined in chapter one and in the appendix, he holds that the "Peter" party in Corinth was Jewish Christian and reflected Peter's position.

18. It should be stressed that Daniélou's schema of early church development does not correspond to the evidence, and there is no evidence to support his secondary division in the church between Jewish groups and gentile groups on the basis of nationalism. But setting aside his idiosyncratic definition of Jewish Christianity (and the schema of early church development which accompanies it), his observations of differences between Jewish groups and gentile groups within the early church may be quite correct. Within the context of this secondary, practical division between Jewish groups and gentile groups (Daniélou's more narrow definition of gentile versus Jewish Christianity), it is interesting for this thesis that Daniélou probably considers Matthew to be a gentile Christian document. He is not very clear on this, but he seems so to classify it. He considers the text of Matthew to be "l'écho de la catéchèse en milieu antiochien" (Nouvelle histoire de l'église 54). As such, it transmits Jewish Christian (in the narrow sense of the term) traditions, but is itself redacted in a milieu where

NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR

gentiles predominate, and where that gentile element does not keep the Jewish ritual law. This means that it is the product of a community which, while still in close relationship with Jewish Christianity, practices its Christianity in a basically non-Jewish way. This view of Daniélou's is not invalidated by the general rejection of his theoretical constructs. Stated again, Daniélou implies that on the basis of gentile practice (shown originally by Peter's not sharing the communion with gentiles in Antioch), Matthew is not to be classed as Jewish Christian according to a definition of Jewish Christianity based on legal observances.

19. On the question of consistency see the recent article by J.C. Beker, "Paul's Theology: Consistent or Inconsistent?" (New Testament Studies 34 (1988)) 364-377.

20. For a useful discussion on Paul's principles of action which allowed him to be "as a Jew to the Jews", yet still to attack Peter for his actions in Antioch, see Peter Richardson, "Pauline Inconsistency: I Corinthians 9:19-23 and Galatians 2:11-14," (New Testament Studies 26 (1979-1980)) 347-362.

21. Michael Newton argues that purity is an important concept for Paul. In order to maintain the presence of God's spirit within the Christian community, the believers must remain "pure." However, at the crucial point of Jewish dietary purity, Newton is in agreement with this dissertation: "Paul did not keep, nor did he expect Gentile

NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR

believers to keep, the rules of kashrut (cf. Gal. 2:11f.).... So that peace may prevail within the community Jewish food laws are abrogated.... We would agree then, in conclusion, with Neusner that, for Paul, the impurity decreed by the biblical food laws, which we take to include both kosher laws and the impurity naturally associated with idolatry, was suspended. (Newton 100-102).

22. For a discussion of the options, see C.E.B. Cranfield, The Epistle to the Romans, I.C.C. (Edinburgh: Clark, 1979) vol. 2: 690-699.

23. One cannot help but note that Paul appears to have phrased his little attack on dietary purity in a humorous way here: "We don't lose by fasting, or gain by eating..."

NOTES TO CHAPTER FIVE

1. This chapter is subdivided as follows:

5.1 Introduction

5.2 Mt 15:1-2

5.3 Mt 15:3-9

5.3.1 General

5.3.2 The "Korban" Section

5.3.3 Mt 15:3-9 as a Redaction of Mk 7:6-13

5.4 Matthew 15:10-20

5.4.1 General

5.4.2 The Parable (Mt 15:11, parallel Mk 7:15)

5.4.3 Plants to Be Uprooted and Blind Guides (Mt 15:12-14)

5.4.4 The Commentary (Mt 15:15-20)

General

The Commentary: Mark (Mk 7:17-23)

The Commentary: Matthew (Mt 15:15-20)

5.5 Conclusion

5.6 Excursus 4: Usage of the Word "Koinos"

If one eliminates the headings which are intended only to facilitate the presentation of this dissertation, these chapter divisions outline what seem to be the natural units of this pericope.

Compare O. Lamar Cope's division of Mt 15:1-20

1-2 An introductory challenge by Pharisees and scribes criticizing the disciples' failure to wash their hands when they eat.

3-6 A counterquestion by Jesus concerning the allowance of dedicatory (Qorban) vows by the Pharisees.

7-9 The citation of Isa 29:13

NOTES TO CHAPTER FIVE

10-11 A brief explanatory statement for the people.

12-20 A more complete explanation of the explanatory statement for the disciples.
(Cope 52-53)

Jean Radermakers entitles chapter 15 "De la tradition des anciens à l'Eucharistie pour tous, par la foi au Fils de David" (Radermakers 207). If one is dealing with Matthean redactional intent, this title is not really appropriate because it fails to take into account that Matthew has taken the flow of this chapter directly from Mark. Radermakers finds five units in the chapter, the first two of which are 15:1-9 and 15:10-20. He notes the Matthean inclusion "manger les mains (non) lavées" at Mt 15:2 and 15:20 (Radermakers 207).

2. Vincent Taylor suggests that Mark's hoi Pharisaioi kai tines tôn grammateôn elthontes apo Ierosolumôn (Mk 7:1) makes a distinction between the local, Galilean Pharisees and certain of the scribes who came from Jerusalem (Taylor 334). Leopold Sabourin follows Taylor's interpretation of Mark, and notes that Matthew is different at this point (Sabourin 197). This may or may not be the correct understanding of Mark; whichever sense Mark intends, Matthew drops the article from Pharisaioi and keeps Mark's partitive sense of grammateôs by a simple anarthous construction. He sees these two as one group, from Jerusalem. It seems doubtful that Matthew has consciously taken local Pharisees and redefined them as Jerusalemites, since in other places where a similar change could have been made (e.g. Mt 9:11

NOTES TO CHAPTER FIVE

parallel Mk 2:16) he has felt no need to have the Pharisees come from Jerusalem. Whatever Mark's sense may have been, it seems likely that Matthew assumed both the Pharisees and the scribes came from Jerusalem, and the change (if any) in this respect was intended as only stylistic.

3. The opening words of chapter 23, and especially the admonition to do and keep all that the scribes and Pharisees say, are often cited as an indication of Matthew's Jewish Christian character. The burden of chapter four of this dissertation has been to show that the recorded causes of division within the early church were circumcision and Jewish dietary purity. It is not clear what theoretical view various groups within the church may have held on the authority of the scribes and Pharisees. Matthew here seems to affirm their historical authority in the opening words of this chapter, but then attacks them virulently for the rest of the chapter. Again, it could be argued that this chapter theoretically accepts the authority of the scribes and Pharisees; yet this chapter of the dissertation, if correct in its analysis, shows that the "tradition of the elders" is rejected by Matthew. These opening words of Matthew 23 are simply not a reliable basis on which to determine whether or not Matthew reflects a Jewish Christian position. Note the following comments on Matthew 23 by some scholars:

- Francis Wright Beare The Gospel according to Matthew: "In practice, it was the scribes, not the whole body of Pharisees, who were trained in the exposition and application of the Law, written and oral. The Pharisees did

NOTES TO CHAPTER FIVE

not generally possess the learning necessary for such a task, and could not properly be said to 'sit in Moses' seat.' They were meticulous in observing the requirements of the Law as interpreted by the scribes, but they claimed no teaching authority for themselves. Matthew links scribes and Pharisees indiscriminately as the leaders of the community after the destruction of the temple and the virtual elimination of the priesthood as an effective power in the national life." p. 448

Beare further notes the contradiction between the command to obey the scribes and the Pharisees in Mt 23:3 and the rejection of oral law in chapter 15, and says of this command to obey that "The words are no more than a foil for the charge that they do not themselves practice what they preach." p. 448

- Lagrange comments: "D'autant que l'autorité suprême était avant tous dans le Sacerdoce, qui avait la présidence du Sanhédrin, et qu'ici il n'est pas du tout question des prêtres. Il ne s'agit donc que de l'autorité des Pharisiens quand ils proclament la Loi." (Lagrange 437) In confirming this opinion he cites Jerome and Augustin De doctr. christ. IV, 27,59.

- Sabourin, for his part, comments: "Comme l'indique le premier verset du traité Abot de la Mishna, les Juifs professaient que la révélation divine, reçue par Moïse, fut transmise en succession ininterrompue, à travers Josué, les anciens, les prophètes et les membres du grand Sanhédrin (cf

NOTES TO CHAPTER FIVE

Act 15:21). Les scribes et les pharisiens, surtout les premiers, participaient à cette tradition vénérable et méritaient donc d'être écoutés. Cela ne signifie pas que tout ce qu'ils disaient représentaient la révélation authentique, et Jésus a souvent dénoncé leur interprétation inexacte des devoirs religieux, par exemple en Mt 12:1-8 et 15:1-20." (Sabourin 292)

- Very much in line with the thesis of this dissertation, Meier holds: "But such isolated sayings as Matthew 23:2-3 cannot carry the day against the weight of evidence indicating that Matthew's church is already an independent institution separated from the synagogue." (Meier The Vision of Matthew 16)

- J.D. Kingsbury comments: "In light of such passages as 23:8-10 and 16:6-12, those scholars are doubtless correct who contend that the seemingly positive words Jesus utters in 23:2-3 concerning the religious leaders serve not so much to pay tribute to them as to highlight the cleavage between what they say and what they do (cf. 23:3c). On this view, then, the function of these positive words is to serve as a contrast to the negative judgment that follows and in this way to lend greater prominence to the latter." (Matthew as Story, second edition, page 155 note 23.)

4. J.T. Milik, "Trois tombeaux juifs récemment découvertes au Sud-est de Jérusalem," Studi Biblici Franciscani Liber Annuus VII (1956-57) 232-267. The text and Milik's translation are reproduced in the "chronique archéologique," Revue Biblique 65 (1958) 409.

NOTES TO CHAPTER FIVE

5. For a detailed discussion of the relationship of the Matthean and Marcan forms to that of the Mishnah, see G.W. Buchanan, "Some Vow and Oath Formulas in the New Testament," Harvard Theological Review 58 (1965) 319-326.

6. Cope argues that Matthew's use of 'mouth' in v 11 probably indicates he was aware of its presence in the Heb text of Isa 29:13 (Cope Matthew 57, 59). This is not at all necessary as an explanation. Matthew reproduces the citation in its Marcan form, but might well have been aware of the reading toi stomati autou. These words are absent from Codex Alexandrinus, but present in many later manuscripts (see Ziegler, Isaias).

7. O. Lamar Cope comes to the same conclusion: "In verses 15-20 an explanation of the logion in vs. 11 is given to the disciples. These verses do not form a distinct unit but are dependent upon the context and upon vs. 11 for their structure and logic." (O. Lamar Cope Matthew 53)

8. Cope comments "It is fairly clear from the context and from a common sense application that 'what goes into the mouth' is intended to be food and drink" (O. Lamar Cope Matthew 58). Cope feels that Matthew's structuring here reflects knowledge of the presence of the word "mouth" in the Hebrew form of the quotation from Is 29:13. This position has not been accepted in this dissertation; for the argument, see note 6.

9. John Meier not only notes that Matthew follows Mark in the meaning of verse 11, but insists on the crucial

NOTES TO CHAPTER FIVE

religious importance of this position: "What Jesus says in verse 11 rejects not only Pharisaic tradition, but many written laws of the Pentateuch (especially in Leviticus), laws which carefully distinguish between clean and unclean and forbid the latter. Not just oral tradition, not just the written Torah of Moses, but really one of the indispensable pillars of Judaism and many other world religions is smashed to pieces by this one sentence in verse 11. (Meier, The Vision of Matthew 101)

10. On chapter 23, see note 3.

11. John Meier explains the disciples' lack of understanding in a way which would probably be a more correct understanding of how the disciples might have felt when Jesus actually pronounced this parable (if he did in fact ever pronounce it): "The reason for their obtuseness and the need for rebuke stem from the fact that, on the point of food laws, Jesus has gone beyond reinterpreting the Mosaic Law; he has simply abolished it." (Meier The Vision of Matthew 103) My explanation is, however, more faithful to the present context in the Matthean narrative.

12. John Meier comments: "That Matthew keeps the Markan revocation of the food laws, with the tremendous consequences that involves, is not fully appreciated by G. Barth, 'Matthew's Understanding of the Law,' in Tradition and Interpretation 90, and by C. Carlston, 'The Things That Defile (Mark VII.14) and the Law in Matthew and Mark,' NTS 15 (1968-69) 75-96, especially 88; see also Carlston's remarks in The Parables of the Triple Tradition

NOTES TO CHAPTER FIVE

(Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975) 28-35. Barth appeals to the fact that Matthew drops the phrase in Mark 7:19, 'cleansing all foods.' But, when one considers that Matthew in general streamlines Mark's material and that furthermore the phrase is awkward and grammatically ambiguous (does it modify Jesus or the latrine?), it is no wonder that he omits it. Nothing substantial is altered by the omission. Cf. also H. Hubner, 'Mark VII. 1-23 und das 'Jüdisch-Hellenistische' Gesetzesverständnis,' NTS 22 (1976) 319-345." (Meier The Vision of Matthew 103)

13. Mt 5:17-20 is, like chapter 23, a text which is frequently used to demonstrate Matthew's Jewish Christian character. It is not the text of Mt 5:17-20 itself, but rather the assumed Jewish Christian background against which it is read, which has made this text seem so Jewish Christian to many readers. The Gospel of Luke actually has a quite similar statement: "But it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away than for one stroke of the law to become void." (Lk 16:17) In the case of Luke, the almost universal belief that Luke is gentile Christian, and the immediate context, have allowed critics to see this statement in its more general context, and not to conclude that it proves Jewish Christianity. It is the contention of this dissertation that Matthew's stance on Jewish dietary purity is the most appropriate criterion for judging whether or not Matthew reflects a Jewish Christian position. Once the determination of Matthew's position has been made on the

basis of this authentic, first century criterion, then Mt 5:17-20 may better be understood in its proper context.

The goal of this dissertation is to outline a proper method for determining whether Matthew reflects a Jewish Christian or a gentile Christian position, not to propose interpretations for Mt 5:17-20. It might be pointed out, nevertheless, that there already exist scholarly interpretations of Mt 5:17-20 which are compatible with the thesis defended here. John P. Meier, for instance, accounts for tensions in Matthean statements about the law by postulating a Matthean schema of salvation history reminiscent of Conzelmann's work on Luke. Meier believes that Matthew preserves the strict Jewish Christian interpretation of the law, but reinterprets it for his community based on their place in salvation history beyond the death-resurrection. "... Mt sees the death-resurrection as an eschatological event in which the Kingdom breaks into this aeon in a new, fuller way. Mt has 'apocalypticized' the basic kerygma of Jesus' death and resurrection. This explains why the limitations of territory, nation and Mosaic Law should be observed during the public ministry of Jesus, while all these restrictions fall away after the death-resurrection... This is not to say that Mt is another John... The breaking in of the Kingdom has put an end to the old aeon in principle, but not in full-blown reality..." Meier Law and History 38-39.

In a study of Matthean vocabulary, he argues that "plerōsai the law" (5:17) means to fulfill the prophecies of

NOTES TO CHAPTER FIVE

the law, just as this verb is used in the Matthean fulfillment formula quotations. He interprets 5:18, in line with his salvation history thesis, as referring to the passing away of the old order. All things prophesied will come to pass before the old order ends with the death-resurrection of Christ. The following six antitheses explain what Christian justice is, and thus how Christian morality works itself out in relation to the older law.

14. It is very important to note that this is the argument of a person who has no sympathy for dietary purity, and that it is written in such a way that it would be convincing only to those who already have no sympathy for dietary purity. The implied reader thus has no sympathy for dietary purity; the fact that Matthew is the most cited gospel in extant early Christian sources shows that, at least as far as extant sources are indicative, Matthew had a good understanding of his readership. Otherwise perceptive commentators fail to reflect on these facts. Schweizer sees that Matthew rejects Jewish dietary purity, but fails to notice that the nature of the argument following the rejection means that both Matthew and the implied reader are not open to dietary purity. Thus, without duly considering the context of the following section, he comments on verse 11: "He does not bring up other commandments of the Law for discussion. But he could not have written verse 11 if the community had not considered the Old Testament dietary laws to be binding. That inward, not outward uncleanness is what

NOTES TO CHAPTER FIVE

matters still came as a shock." (Schweizer 325-326)

15. Stendahl 174: "It is, however, obvious that the Greek text upon which the evangelists were throughout dependent was closer to A than to B."

16. Lagrange offers this commentary on Mt 15:20 "Le début (du verset 20 est) comme Mc., mais plus concis. Mt. a en plus la seconde clause qui rappelle le sujet de la controverse et en donne la solution (inclusio). Prêter à Mt. l'intention de restreindre la portée des paroles précédentes, de façon à montrer que Jesus n'attaquait que la tradition, non la Loi, c'est oublier sur quoi roulait dès le début toute cette controverse." (Lagrange 307)

In the same vein Meier says, "To round off the pericope with a graceful inclusion, Matthew returns in verse 20 to where he started, the question of washing hands. But this inclusion must not lull us into thinking that Matthew does not mean what he says in verses 11, 17-19. (Meier The Vision of Matthew 103)

17. John Meier comments: "Matthew 15:1-20 abbreviates, inverts, and even adds to Mark 7:1-23. Matthew's modifications on the whole have the effect of sharpening the contrast and clash between the teachings of Jesus and the ritual laws taught by the Pharisees." (Meier The Vision of Matthew 100)

NOTES TO APPENDIX

1. For a good general bibliography of modern research into Jewish Christianity, see: F. Manns, Bibliographie du Judéo-christianisme (Jerusalem: Franciscan Press, 1979).
2. The principal works of F.C. Baur consulted in the preparation of this section are: "Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde, der Gegensatz des petrinischen und paulinischen Christenthums in der ältesten Kirche, der Apostel Petrus in Rom," Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie 4 (1831): 61-206, reprinted in Ferdinand Christian Baur, Ausgewählte Werke in Einzelausgaben, ed. K. Scholder (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Friedrich Fromman, 1963) vol. 1: 1-146; Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien, (Tübingen: L.F. Fues, 1847); and The Church History of the First Three Centuries, trans. A. Menzies, 2 vols. (London: Williams & Norgate, 1879), (First German edition 1863). A complete bibliography of F.C. Baur may be found in P.C. Hodgson, The Formation of Historical Theology (New York: Harper & Row, 1966) 285-294.
3. For the general orientation of Ritschl's work, I am following the helpful article by Philip Hefner, "Baur Versus Ritschl on Early Christianity," Church History 31 (1962): 259-278. Ritschl's outline of early Christianity's development is found in: Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche, 2nd ed. (Bonn: Adolph Marcus, 1857). There is a major change in Ritschl's thinking between the first and second editions of this work.

It should be noted that part of Ritschl's main critique of Baur's work was advanced before Ritschl by G.V. Lechler

in a prize-winning essay for the Teyler Theological Society of the Netherlands. This essay was published in 1851 under the title, Das apostolische und das nachapostolische Zeitalter mit Rücksicht auf Unterschied und Einheit zwischen Paulus und den Übrigen Aposteln, zwischen Heidenchristen und Judenchristen. The work of Lechler is not reviewed here because it did not have the influence on subsequent historical research that Ritschl's work had.

4. The works referred to in the section on Reuss are: Edouard Reuss, Histoire de la théologie chrétienne au siècle apostolique, 3rd ed., 2 vols. (Strasbourg: Treuttel et Wurtz, 1864); and History of the Sacred Scriptures of the New Testament, Trans. Edward L. Houghton, from 5th German edition (Edinburgh: Clark, 1884).

5. The works referred to in this section include various volumes of Ernest Renan's five volume Histoire des origines du christianisme. The following books in the series are cited:

Book 1: La vie de Jésus (Paris: Lévy Frères, 1863.)

Book 2: Les Apôtres (Paris: Lévy Frères, 1866.)

Book 3: Saint Paul (Paris: Lévy Frères, 1869.)

Book 5: Les Evangiles (Paris: Lévy Frères, 1877.)

Also cited is: Ernest Renan, The Hibbert Lectures, trans. Charles Beard (London: Williams and Norgate, 1880).

6. Carl von Weizsäcker, The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church, trans. J. Millar, 2 vols. (New York: Putnam's Sons, 1894-95).

NOTES TO APPENDIX

7. The books and article referred to in this section are:
C.K. Barrett, "Quomodo Historia Conscribenda Sit," New Testament Studies 28 (1982): 303-320; J.B. Lightfoot, The Apostolic Fathers, 2nd ed., 2 Parts in 5 Volumes, 1889-1890 (Reprinted, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981); Lightfoot, Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, 10th ed. (London: Macmillan, 1890); and Stephen Neill, The Interpretation of the New Testament (London: Oxford University Press, 1964).
8. All references in this section are to F.J.A. Hort, Judaistic Christianity (London: Macmillan, 1904).
9. The works referred to in this section are: Adolf Harnack, Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte, 3rd ed., Vol. 1 (Freiburg: Mohr, 1894); History of Dogma, trans. Neil Buchanan, Vols 1 and 2, (Boston: Little, Brown, 1901); The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries, trans. James Moffatt, 2nd ed. Vols 1 and 2, (New York: Putnam's, 1908); The Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels, trans. J.R. Wilkinson, Crown Theological Library, New Testament Studies, no. 4 (New York: Putnam's, 1911); What is Christianity?, trans. Thomas Bailey Saunders, Harper Torchbooks (New York: Harper, 1957).
10. The principal works of H.J. Schoeps consulted in the preparation of this section are: Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1949); Urgemeinde Judenchristentum Gnosis (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1956); Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History, trans. H. Knight (London: Lutterworth, 1961); Jewish Christianity, trans. D.R.A. Hare,

NOTES TO APPENDIX

(Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969 (German edition, 1964)).

11. The works of Daniélou consulted for this section are: Jean Daniélou and Henri Marrou, Nouvelle histoire de l'Eglise. I. Des origines à saint Grégoire le Grand (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1963); The Theology of Jewish Christianity, trans. and ed. John A. Baker, A History of Early Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea, vol. 1 (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964); L'Eglise des Apôtres (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1970). In 1946, Daniélou took over the column "Bulletin d'Histoire des Origines Chrétiennes" in Recherches de Science Religieuse. In 1947 he introduced a section called "Judaïsme et Christianisme," which he continued to write until 1973. This column consists of detailed reviews of current literature on Christian beginnings, and is a mine of information both on the literature itself and on Daniélou's views.

12. My account here is a reconstruction of what I think must have been Daniélou's final position. The division of the two communities and their separate Eucharists is taken from his Nouvelle histoire de l'Eglise (1963), at which time he did not yet seem to divide Acts 15 into two traditions. This division of traditions in Acts 15 and Acts 10 is outlined in L'Eglise des Apôtres (1970), where it is no longer clear whether or not he sees the two communities as strictly separated. His division of Acts 15 follows Stanislas Giet (Université de Strasbourg), "L'assemblée apostolique et le décret de Jérusalem," Recherches de

NOTES TO APPENDIX

Science Religieuse 39 (1951): 203-220.

13. Marcel Simon, Verus Israël. Etude sur les relations entre Chrétiens et Juifs dans l'Empire romain (135-425), (Paris: Boccard, 1942). Second edition Boccard, 1964.

14. The works consulted for this section are: Les premiers Chrétiens, Que sais-je? series 551 (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1960); Recherches d'histoire judéo-chrétienne (Paris: Mouton, 1962); "Souillure morale et souillure rituelle dans le christianisme primitif," Proceedings of the 11th International Congress of the International Association for the History of Religions 87-88; "Problèmes du judéo-christianisme," Aspects du judéo-christianisme, Colloque de Strasbourg, 23-25 avril 1964 (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1965) 1-17; "The Apostolic Decree and Its Setting in the Ancient Church," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library (1970) 437-460; "Réflexions sur le judéo-christianisme," Christianity, Judaism and other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty, Part Two: Early Christianity, ed. Jacob Neusner (Leiden: Brill, 1975) 53-76 and 437-460; Marcel Simon and André Benoît, Le judaïsme et le christianisme antique: d'Antiochus Epiphane à Constantin (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1968).

15. See Decree, and appropriate sections in Chrétiens.

16. See especially Simon's discussions of definition in judaïsme et christianisme 258ff and Aspects 6; however, most of his major writings discuss this problem to a greater or lesser extent.

NOTES TO APPENDIX

17. Thus stated in Aspects 1.

18. The view that it is possible to infer the history of a community from the gospel writings has recently come in for strong- and in my view well deserved- criticism. On this, see the comments on "transparency" in the Introduction to this dissertation, section Story and History (0.2).

19. Raymond E. Brown, The Gospel according to John, 2 vols. (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Volume 1, 1966; Volume 2, 1970); The Epistles of John (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1982); The Community of the Beloved Disciple (Toronto: Paulist, 1979).

20. R.E. Brown and John P. Meier, Antioch and Rome (New York: Paulist, 1983).

21. Brown, The Churches the Apostles Left Behind (London: Chapman, 1984).

22. One of the major catalysts for the idea of great diversity in early Christianity was Walter Bauer's Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity, trans. Robert A. Kraft et al. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971) originally published in German in 1934.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abel, Ernest L. "Who Wrote Matthew?" New Testament Studies 17 (1970-1971): 138-152.
- Albright, W.F., and C.S. Mann. Matthew. The Anchor Bible. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1982.
- Allen, Willoughby C. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Matthew. 3rd edn. The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: Clark, 1912.
- Argyle, A.W. The Gospel According to Matthew. The Cambridge Bible Commentary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.
- Bacon, B.W. "The 'Five Books' of Matthew Against the Jews." The Expositor. 8th ser. 15 (1918): 56-66.
- Barrett, C.K. "Quomodo Historia Conscribenda Sit." New Testament Studies 28 (1982): 303-320.
- Barth, Gerhard. "Matthew's Understanding of the Law." Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew. Trans. Percy Scott. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963. 58-164.
- Bauer, Walter. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. Trans. and ed. William F. Arndt, F. Wilbur Gingrich and Frederick W. Danker. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.
- . Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity. Trans. Robert A. Kraft et al. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971. (Original German edition, 1934; this translation is from the 1964 edition, which includes two supplementary essays by Georg Strecker.)
- Baur, Ferdinand Christian. "Die Christuspartei in der

BIBLIOGRAPHY

korinthischen Gemeinde, der Gegensatz des petrinischen und paulinischen Christenthums in der ältesten Kirche, der Apostel Petrus in Rom." Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie 4 (1831): 61-206, reprinted in Ferdinand Christian Baur, Ausgewählte Werke in Einzelausgaben. Ed. K. Scholder. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Friedrich Fromman, 1963.

---. The Church History of the First Three Centuries.

Trans. A. Menzies. 2 vols. London: Williams & Norgate, 1879. (First German edition 1863).

---. Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien, ihr Verhältniss zu einander, ihren Charakter und Ursprung. Tübingen: Ludw. Fues, 1847.

---. Paul the Apostle of Jesus Christ, his Life and Work, his Epistles and his Doctrine. A Contribution to a Critical History of Primitive Christianity. Trans. and ed. Eduard Zeller. 2nd ed. 2 vols. London: Williams and Norgate, 1876.

Beare, Francis Wright. The Gospel according to Matthew. Oxford: Blackwell, 1981.

Beker, J.C. "Paul's Theology: Consistent or Inconsistent?" New Testament Studies 34 (1988): 364-377.

Betz, Hans Dieter. Galatians. Hermeneia Series. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.

Bonnard, Pierre. L'évangile selon saint Matthieu. 2nd ed. Commentaire du Nouveau Testament I. Neuchatel: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1970.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Booth, Roger P. Jesus and the Laws of Purity. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 13. Sheffield: JSOT, 1986.
- Brown, Raymond E. The Community of the Beloved Disciple. Toronto: Paulist, 1979.
- . The Churches the Apostles Left Behind. London: Chapman, 1984.
- . The Epistles of John. Anchor Bible. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1982.
- . The Gospel according to John. 2 vols. Anchor Bible. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Vol. 1, 1966; Vol. 2, 1970.
- Brown, R.E., and John P. Meier. Antioch and Rome. New York: Paulist, 1983.
- Bruce, F.F. The Epistle to the Galatians. The New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- Buchanan, G.W. "Some Vow and Oath Formulas in the New Testament." Harvard Theological Review 58 (1965): 319-326.
- Carlston, C. "The Things That Defile (Mark XII.14) and the Law in Matthew and Mark." New Testament Studies 15 (1968-1969): 75-96.
- Cohn-Sherbok, Dan. "Some Reflections on James Dunn's: 'The Incident at Antioch (Gal. 2:11-18).'" Journal for the Study of the New Testament 18 (1983): 68-74.
- Cope, O. Lamar. Matthew. A Scribe Trained for the Kingdom of Heaven. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Series 5. Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1976.
- Cranfield, C.E.B. The Epistle to the Romans. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: Clark, 1979.
- Daniélou, Jean. "Bulletin d'Histoire des Origines Chrétiennes." Recherches de Science Religieuse. 1946-1973.
- . L'Eglise des Apôtres. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1970.
- . The Theology of Jewish Christianity. Trans. and ed. John A. Baker. A History of Early Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea 1. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964.
- Daniélou, Jean, and Henri Marrou. Des origines à saint Grégoire le Grand. Nouvelle histoire de l'Eglise 1. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1963.
- Davies, W.D. The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.
- Deutsch, Celia. Hidden Wisdom and the Easy Yoke. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 18. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987.
- Dinkler, E. "Der Brief an die Galater." Verkündigung und Forschung. (1953-55): 175-183; reprinted with addendum in Signum Crucis. Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament und zur Christlichen Archäologie. Tübingen: Mohr, 1967. 270-282.
- . "Die Petrus-Rom-Frage." Theologische Rundschau. 25 (1959): 189-230, 289-335; 27 (1961): 33-64; 31 (1965-

BIBLIOGRAPHY

66): 232-253.

Dos Santos, Elmar Camilo. An Expanded Hebrew Index for the Hatch-Redpath Concordance to the Septuagint.

Jerusalem: Duglith Publishers, Baptist House, n.d.

Douglas, Mary. Purity and Danger. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966.

Dunn, James D.G. "The Incident at Antioch (Gal. 2:11-18)." Journal for the Study of the New Testament 18 (1983): 3-57.

Dupont-Sommer, A. The Essene Writings from Qumran. Trans. G. Vermes. Oxford: Blackwell, 1961.

Epictetus. Trans W.A. Oldfather. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1956.

Eusebius. The Ecclesiastical History. Vol 1 trans. Kirsopp Lake; Vol 2 trans. J.E.L. Oulton. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1926 (vol 1), 1932 (vol 2).

Fenton, J.C. The Gospel of St. Matthew. The Pelican New Testament Commentaries. New York: Penguin, 1963.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "The Aramaic Qorban Inscription from Jebel Hallet et-Turi and Mk 7:11/Mt 15:5." Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament. London: Chapman, 1971: 93-104. Originally published in Journal of Biblical Literature 78 (1959): 60-65.

Gaboury, A. La structure des évangiles synoptiques.

Supplements to Novum Testamentum 22. Leiden: Brill, 1970.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Gaechter, Paul. Das Matthäus Evangelium. Vienna: Tyrolia, 1962.
- Giet, Stanilas. "L'assemblée apostolique et le décret de Jérusalem." Recherches de Science Religieuse 39 (1951): 203-220.
- Gundry, Robert H. Matthew. A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1982.
- Haenchen, Ernst. The Acts of the Apostles. Trans. R. McL. Wilson. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971.
- Harnack, Adolf von. The Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels. Trans. J.R. Wilkinson. Crown Theological Library, New Testament Studies no. 4. New York: Putnam's, 1911.
- . History of Dogma. Vols. 1 and 2. Trans. Neil Buchanan. Boston: Little, Brown, 1901.
- . Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte. Vol. 1. 3rd ed. Freiburg: Mohr, 1894.
- . The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries. Vols. 1 and 2. Trans. James Moffatt. 2nd ed. New York: Putnam's, 1908.
- . What is Christianity? Trans. Thomas Bailey Saunders. Harper Torchbooks. New York: Harper, 1957.
- Hefner, Philip. "Baur Versus Ritschl on Early Christianity" Church History 31 (1962): 259-278.
- Hodgson, P.C., The Formation of Historical Theology. New York: Harper & Row, 1966.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Holtz, Traugott. "Der antiochenische Zwischenfall (Galater 2.11-14)." New Testament Studies 32 (1986): 334-361.
- Homer. Homeri Opera. Ed. David B. Monro and Thomas W. Allen. 5 Vols. 3rd Ed. Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis. Oxford: Clarendon, 1920.
- Hort, F.J.A. Judaistic Christianity. London: Macmillan, 1904.
- Howard, George. Paul: Crisis in Galatia. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- Hurd, John, Jr. The Origin of I Corinthians. New York: Seabury, 1965.
- Ignatius. "The Epistles of Ignatius." The Apostolic Fathers. Trans. Kirsopp Lake. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1912. I: 166-277.
- Josephus. 10 Vols. Ed. vols 1-4: H. St. J. Thackeray; vol. 5: H. St. J. Thackeray and Ralph Marcus; vols. 6 and 7: Ralph Marcus; vol. 8: Ralph Marcus and Allen Wikgren; vols. 9 and 10: L.H. Feldman. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1926-1981.
- Juvenal. Juvenal and Persius. Trans. G.G. Ramsay. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1957.
- Kieffer, René. Foi et justification à Antioche: interprétation d'un conflit (Ga 2, 14-21). Lectio Divina 111. Paris: Cerf, 1982.
- Kilpatrick, G.D. The Origins of the Gospel According to St Matthew. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- . "Gal 2:14 orthopodousin." Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann. Ed. W. Eltester. Berlin: De Gruyter 1954: 269-274.
- Kingsbury, Jack Dean. Matthew as Story. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.
- . Matthew as Story. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.
- . "Reflections on 'The Reader' of Matthew's Gospel." New Testament Studies. 34 (1988): 442-460.
- Kittel, Gerhard (vols. 1-4) and G. Friedrich (vols. 5-10), ed. Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. 10 vols. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933-1979.
- Klijn, A.F.J., and G.J. Reinink. Patristic Evidence for Jewish-Christian Sects. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1973.
- Knox, John. Chapters in a Life of Paul. Nashville: Abingdon, 1950.
- Lagrange, M.-J. Evangile selon saint Matthieu. Paris: Gabalda, 1923.
- Lake, Kirsopp, and Henry J. Cadbury. The Beginnings of Christianity. Part I: The Acts of the Apostles. Vol. 5. Series editors: F.J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake. London: Macmillan, 1933.
- Liddell, H.G., R. Scott, H.S. Jones, and R. McKenzie. A Greek-English Lexicon. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.
- Lightfoot, J.B. The Apostolic Fathers. 2nd ed. 1889-1890 (Reprinted in 5 vols., Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981).
- . Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. 10th ed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- London: Macmillan, 1890.
- Manns, F. Bibliographie du Judéo-christianisme. Jerusalem: Franciscan Press, 1979.
- Massaux, Edouard. Influence de l'Evangile de saint Matthieu sur la littérature chrétienne avant saint Irénée. Louvain: Publications Universitaires de Louvain, 1950.
- Meler, John P. Law and History in Matthew's Gospel. Analecta Biblica 71. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976
- . The Vision of Matthew. New York: Paulist Press, 1979.
- Metzger, Bruce M. A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament. New York: United Bible Societies, 1971.
- Michaelis, D. Wilhelm. Das Evangelium nach Matthäus. 2 Vols. Schweizerisches Bibelwerk für die Gemeinde. Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag, Vol 1 1948, Vol 2 1949.
- Milik, J.T. In "Chronique archéologique." Revue Biblique. 65 (1958): 409.
- Mishnah. Trans. Herbert Danby. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933.
- M'Neile, Alan Hugh. The Gospel According to St. Matthew. London: Macmillan, 1915.
- Moore, George Foot. Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era. 3 vols. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1927-1930; reprint, 1966-1967.
- Moulton, James Hope (vols. 1-2), and Nigel Turner (vol 3). A Grammar of New Testament Greek. 3 vols. Edinburgh: Clark, Vol. 1: 1906; Vol. 2: 1919; Vol. 3: 1963.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Moulton, James Hope, and George Milligan. The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1952.
- Neill, Stephen. The Interpretation of the New Testament. London: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Neirynck, F. "The Gospel of Matthew and Literary Criticism." L'évangile selon Matthieu. Rédaction et théologie. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 29. Ed. M. Didier. Gembloux (Belgium): J. Duculot, 1972: 37-69.
- Nepper-Christensen, Poul. Das Matthäusevangelium: ein Judenchristliches Evangelium? Aarhus: Aarhus Stiftsbogtrykkerie, 1958.
- Neusner, Jacob. A History of the Mishnaic Law of Purities. 23 Vols. Leiden: E.J. Brill 1974-1977.
- . The Idea of Purity in Ancient Judaism. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1973.
- . Learn Mishnah. New York: Behrman, 1978.
- Newton, Michael. The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Overbeck, Franz. Der Streit des Paulus mit Petrus in Antiochen. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1968. (original edition: 1877)
- Patte, Daniel. The Gospel According to Matthew. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.
- Pettem, Michael. "Le premier récit de la multiplication des

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- pains et le problème synoptique." Studies in Religion/ Sciences religieuses 14:1 (1985): 73-83.
- Philo. Vol 4. Trans. F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1949.
- Plutarch. Plutarch's Moralia Vol. 8. Trans. P.A. Clement and H.B. Hoffleit. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1969.
- Radermakers, Jean. Au fil de l'évangile selon saint Matthieu. Lecture continue 2. Louvain: Institut d'études théologiques, 1972.
- Renan, Ernest. Les Apôtres. Histoire des origines du christianisme 2. Paris: Lévy Frères, 1866.
- . Les Evangiles. Histoire des origines du christianisme 5. Paris: Lévy Frères, 1877.
- . The Hibbert Lectures. Trans. Charles Beard. London: Williams and Norgate, 1880.
- . Saint Paul. Histoire des origines du christianisme 3. Paris: Lévy Frères, 1869.
- . La vie de Jésus. Histoire des origines du christianisme 1. Paris: Lévy Frères, 1863.
- Reuss, Edouard. Histoire apostolique. Paris: Sandoz et Fischbacher, 1876.
- . Histoire de la théologie chrétienne au siècle apostolique. 3rd ed. 2 vols. Strasbourg: Treuttel et Wurtz, 1864.
- . Histoire du canon des saintes Ecritures dans l'Eglise

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- chrétienne. 2nd ed. Strasbourg: Treuttel et Wurtz, 1863.
- . L'histoire sainte et la loi. Paris: Sandoz et Fischbacher, 1879.
- . History of the Sacred Scriptures of the New Testament. Trans. Edward L. Houghton, from 5th German edition. Edinburgh: Clark, 1884.
- Richardson, P. "Pauline Inconsistency: I Corinthians 9:19-23 and Galatians 2:11-14." New Testament Studies 26 (1979-1980): 347-362.
- Rigaux, Beda. Témoignage de l'évangile de Matthieu. Pour une histoire de Jésus II. Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1967.
- Ritschl, Albrecht. Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche. 2nd ed. Bonn: Adolph Marcus, 1857.
- Sabourin, Léopold. L'évangile selon saint Matthieu et ses principaux parallèles. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978.
- Sanders, E.F. Paul and Palestinian Judaism. A Comparison of Patterns of Religion. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. Matthäusevangelium. Vol. 1: 1,16-16,20. Die Neue Echter Bibel. Würzburg: Echter-Verlag, 1985.
- Schoeps, Hans Joachim. Jewish Christianity. Trans. D.R.A. Hare. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969.
- . Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History. Trans. H. Knight. London:

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Lutterworth, 1961.
- . Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums.
Tübingen: J.C.B Mohr, 1949.
- . Urgemeinde- Judenchristentum- Gnosis. Tübingen: J.C.B
Mohr, 1956.
- Schweitzer, Albert. The Quest of the Historical Jesus.
Trans. W. Montgomery. London: Adam and Charles Black,
1910.
- Schweizer, Eduard. The Good News According to Matthew.
trans. David E. Green. London: S.P.C.K, 1975.
- Sextus Empiricus. Sexti Empirici Opera. Vol. 1. Ed. H.
Mutschmann and I. Mau. Lipsiae: Teubner, 1958.
- Simon, Marcel. "The Apostolic Decree and Its Setting in the
Ancient Church." Bulletin of the John Rylands Library.
52 (1969-1970): 437-460.
- . Les premiers Chrétiens. Que sais-je? 551 Paris:
Presses Universitaires de France, 1960.
- . "Problèmes du judéo-christianisme." Aspects du judéo-
christianisme. Colloque de Strasbourg, 23-25 avril
1964. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1965.
- . Recherches d'histoire judéo-chrétienne. Paris:
Mouton, 1962.
- . "Réflexions sur le judéo-christianisme." Christianity,
Judaism and other Greco-Roman Cults; Studies for Morton
Smith at Sixty, Part Two: Early Christianity. Ed.
Jacob Neusner. Leiden: Brill, 1975: 53-76 and 437-460.
- . "Souillure morale et souillure rituelle dans le
christianisme primitif." Proceedings of the 11th

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- International Congress of the International Association for the History of Religions. Vol. II: Guilt or Pollution and Rites of Purification. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968: 87-88.
- . Verus Israël. Etude sur les relations entre Chrétiens et Juifs dans l'Empire romain (135-425). Paris: Boccard, 1942. Second edition, Boccard, 1964.
- Simon, Marcel, and André Benoît. Le judaïsme et le christianisme antique: d'Antiochus Epiphane à Constantin. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1968.
- Stendahl, Krister. The School of Matthew. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986. (First published 1954.)
- Stern, Menahem. Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism. 2 vols. Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1974.
- Strabo. The Geography of Strabo. Trans. H.L. Jones. 8 vols. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1956.
- Strack, H. and P. Billerbeck. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. 6 vols. Munich: Beck, 1922-1961.
- Strecker, Georg. "Christentum und Judentum in den ersten beiden Jahrhunderten." Evangelische Theologie (1956): 458-477.
- . Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit. 3rd. ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971. (First ed. 1962.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Streeter, Burnett Hillman. The Four Gospels. London: Macmillan, 1926.
- Tacitus. Histories and Annals. Vol. 2. Trans. C.H. Moore. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1956.
- Taylor, Vincent. The Gospel According to St. Mark. 2nd ed. 1966. (First ed. 1952)
- Tompkins, Jane P, ed. Reader-Response Criticism. Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press, 1980.
- Unnik, W.C. van. "The Significance of Moses' Law for the Church of Christ According to the Syriac Didascalia." Sparsa Collecta. The Collected Essays of W.C. van Unnik. Ed. C.K. Barrett, A.F.J. Klijn, and J. Smit Sibinga. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1983. 3: 7-39.
- Watson, Francis. Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Wegenast, Klaus. Das Verständnis der Tradition bei Paulus und in den Deuteropaulinen. Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962.
- Weizsäcker, Carl von. The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church. Trans. J. Millar, 2 vols. New York: Putnam's Sons, 1894-95.
- . Untersuchung über die evangelische Geschichte. Freiburg: Mohr, 1864.
- Ziegler, Joseph, ed. Isaias. Septuaginta Gottingensis vol. XIV. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1939.