MATTHEW WITHIN JUDAISM

EARLY CHRISTIANITY AND ITS LITERATURE

Number 27

SBL PRESS

MATTHEW WITHIN JUDAISM

Israel and the Nations in the First Gospel

Edited by

Anders Runesson and Daniel M. Gurtner

SBL PRESS

SBL PRESS

Atlanta

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Printed on acid-free paper.

Contents

Preface

To the readers of this volume it will soon become evident that it originated in a session held by the Society of Biblical Literature's Matthew Section (San Antonio, 2016) and continued the year after (Boston, 2017). The development of the book was greatly enhanced by the stimulating dialogue generated in those settings. We are very grateful to the participants in those sessions and to the other scholars represented in this volume for enthusiastically endorsing the project and contributing excellent and thought-provoking papers. What may be less obvious is the influence of important scholars behind the scenes whose input made the volume much better than it otherwise would have been. Amy-Jill Levine not only furnished a stimulating conclusion to the book but also provided important guidance at some pivotal points. David Horrell, then general editor of the Early Christianity and Its Literature (ECL) series, accepted the volume for the series and provided helpful guidance in the initial stages of the process. Shelly Matthews, now the general editor of the series, read the entire manuscript in detail, correcting a number of errors and lending her expertise to improving the volume in a number of respects. The editors are grateful to these scholars as well as the steering committee and participants in the Society of Biblical Literature's Matthew section, with whom we have worked over several years. Finally, we are grateful to Nicole Tilford for her leadership as the manuscript was turned into a book.

Anders Runesson
Daniel M. Gurtner
August 2019

Introduction: The Location of the Matthew-within-Judaism Perspective in Past and Present Research

Anders Runesson and Daniel M. Gurtner

As the title of this book suggests, *Matthew within Judaism* is a collection of specialized essays addressing key themes as they relate to the larger issue of the Gospel of Matthew and Second Temple Judaism. The subtitle further signals this dynamic through the word pair *Israel* and *nations* and echoes main concerns in recent Matthean scholarship. Together, the title and subtitle problematize the bidirectionality of central issues in Matthean scholarship: Matthew's Gospel *within* Second Temple Judaism, on the one hand, and Israel and the nations *in* Matthew's Gospel, on the other. The themes to be discussed in the book relate in various ways to these narrative realities.

As early as the writings of Papias, the Judaic character of Matthew's Gospel has been the subject of considerable conversation. More recent generations have framed the matter in terms of the Matthean community and its relation(s) to late first-century Judaism. Though scholarly discourse has ebbed and flowed, there has recently been a steep rise in interest in Matthew's Gospel understood as a Jewish text, and several monographs have already been authored arguing such a case from different perspectives.[1]

1. See, e.g., Matthias Konradt, *Israel, Church, and the Gentiles in the Gospel of Matthew*, trans. Kathleen Ess, BMSEC 2 (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2014); David L. Turner, *Israel's Last Prophet: Jesus and the Jewish Leaders in Matthew 23* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015); Matthias Konradt, *Studien zum Matthäusevangelium*, ed. Alida Euler, WUNT 358 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016); Anders Runesson, *Divine Wrath and Salvation in Matthew: The Narrative World of the First Gospel* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2016); Akiva Cohen, *Matthew and the Mishnah: Redefining Identity and Ethos in the Shadow of the Second Temple's Destruction*, WUNT 2/418 (Tübingen:

This renewed interest in understanding the nature of Matthew's story and its socioreligious location within first-century Jewish settings may be contextualized from a synchronic and a diachronic perspective, respectively. In the following, instead of a more traditional survey of recent research, we shall sketch briefly what we see as the key components of these two contexts, the larger interpretive matrix in which the current study of Matthew within Judaism is taking shape. In other words, the aim here is to frame an understanding of the larger picture of how present Matthean scholarship is connected with both its own past and the current moment of New Testament studies more generally for a more complete perspective of the field of scholarly inquiry into which the essays of this volume speak.

Synchronically, recent developments in the study of Matthew resonate with a larger context within which researchers reread New Testament texts more generally as expressions of specific forms of Judaism.[2] Con-

---

Mohr Siebeck, 2016); Catherine S. Hamilton, *The Death of Jesus in Matthew: Innocent Blood and the End of Exile*, SNTSMS 167 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017); Mothy Varkey, *Salvation in Continuity: A Reconsideration of Matthean Soteriology* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2017); Layang Seng Ja, *The Pharisees in Matthew 23 Reconsidered* (Carlisle, UK: Langham, 2018); John Kampen, *Matthew within Sectarian Judaism: An Examination* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2019).

2. While the extensive work of recontextualizing the Pauline literature and the historical Paul within Judaism has received a lot of attention, this academic development is much larger and shows no signs of slowing down. On Paul, see the studies in Mark D. Nanos and Magnus Zetterholm, *Paul within Judaism: Restoring the First-Century Context to the Apostle* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015), and, most recently, Paula Fredriksen, *Paul: The Pagans' Apostle* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017). On the gospels, the most recent works include two PhD dissertations: Wally V. Cirafesi, "John within Judaism: Religion, Ethnicity, and the Shaping of Jesus-Oriented Jewishness in the Fourth Gospel" (PhD diss., University of Oslo, 2018); John Van Maaren, "The Gospel of Mark within Judaism: Reading the Second Gospel in Its Ethnic Landscape" (PhD diss., McMaster University, 2019). On Mark, see also Daniel Boyarin, *The Jewish Gospels: The Story of the Jewish Christ* (New York: New Press, 2012). On Luke-Acts, as compared with Matthew, see especially Isaac W. Oliver, *Torah Praxis after 70 CE: Reading Matthew and Luke-Acts as Jewish Texts*, WUNT 2/355 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013). The new monograph series published by Wipf & Stock also belongs within this larger development in the field: the New Testament after Supersessionism (NTAS); the first volumes were published in 2017. While this series speaks of postsupersessionism as a "family of theological perspectives that affirms God's irrevocable covenant with the Jewish people," the readings provided in these monographs are based firmly in historical analysis of the New Testament texts. In the context of academic journals, the *Journal of the Jesus Movement in Its Jewish Setting: From the First*

trary to much previous research, such studies often problematize or reject approaches that aim to understand the New Testament against the *background* of Judaism and Jewish life. Instead, they approach these texts as specific *expressions* of Judaism, as part of one (diverse) trajectory among several others within a pluriform ethnoreligious tradition that displayed, as did other trajectories, various levels of openness to non-Jews.[3]

One of the key insights that lies behind this wider development concerns the diversity of Judaism in and around the turn of the era. Current readings of New Testament texts in the context of Judaism, or as expressions of Judaism, thus have deep roots in scholarship on Second Temple Judaism, a field that has itself evolved significantly over the last half-century or so, building on critical work done already in the early twentieth century.[4] Briefly stated, the basic logic at the hermeneutical core of the

---

to the Seventh Century (www.jjmjs.org), established in 2014 and now published by Hebrew University, University of Oslo, and DePaul University, has an interdisciplinary focus and emphasizes methodological diversity in the approach to issues related to early interactions between the Jesus movement, in its diverse forms, and other Jews in the ancient Mediterranean world.

3. For sources and discussion of the place of non-Jews in Jewish thought and practice, see Terence L. Donaldson, *Judaism and the Gentiles: Jewish Patterns of Universalism (to 135 CE)* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007); David C. Sim and James S. McLaren, eds., *Attitudes to Gentiles in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, LNTS 499 (London: Bloomsbury, 2013).

4. One of the most influential studies paving the way for a new understanding of Judaism in the field of New Testament studies was, unquestionably, E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977), 33–428. Sanders, however, was not the first to problematize the way in which New Testament scholars dealt with and understood ancient Judaism. For earlier work in this area, see esp. George Foot Moore, "Christian Writers on Judaism," *HTR* 14 (1921): 197–294; Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim*, 3 vols. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927–1930); Erik Sjöberg, *Gott und die Sünder im palästinischen Judentum nach dem Zeugnis der Tannaiten und der apokryphisch-pseudepigraphischen Literatur* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1939); Claude G. Montefiore and Herbert M. J. Loewe, *A Rabbinic Anthology* (London: Macmillan, 1938). Montefiore also wrote commentaries on the Synoptic Gospels, understood from a Jewish perspective: *The Synoptic Gospels, Edited with an Introduction and a Commentary*, 2nd rev. ed., 2 vols. (London: Macmillan, 1909–1927). See also Henrik Ljungman, *Guds barmhärtighet och dom: Fariséernas lära om de två "måtten"* (Lund: Gleerup, 1950). For contemporary studies on Jewish interpretation of the Bible, which deal, comparatively, also with Christian interpretive approaches and thus continue along a similar trajectory as the above, see Karin Hedner Zetterholm, *Jewish Inter-*

developments we observe today—which then evolve in different directions as scholars tackle the issues at hand from different perspectives—is that, if Judaism can no longer be understood as a monolithic entity, it would be methodologically fallacious to approach the New Testament against the background of, or comparing it to, "Judaism."[5] Rather, focusing on the various expressions of Judaism in and around the first century CE as comparanda opens up new ground for a more complex understanding of the nature of the texts included in the New Testament and how they fit discursively and socioreligiously within this heterogeneous landscape. Mutatis mutandis, the study of ancient Judaism has begun to incorporate into its curriculum the study of the New Testament.[6] We have likely seen

---

pretation of the Bible: Ancient and Contemporary (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012). See also Wayne O. McCready and Adele Reinhartz, eds., *Common Judaism: Explorations in Second-Temple Judaism* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008), a volume dedicated to Sanders on the occasion of his retirement from Duke University. This volume includes an updated discussion of "common Judaism" by Sanders (*Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 11–23). Sanders's impact on the field is discussed extensively in a special issue of *JJMJS* celebrating the fortieth anniversary of *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*: *JJMJS* 5 (2018): 1–110.

5. This concern was raised explicitly, as applied to the study of Matthew, already by Alan F. Segal, "Matthew's Jewish Voice," in *Social History of the Matthean Community: Cross-Disciplinary Approaches*, ed. David L. Balch (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 3–37, esp. 15, 35, 37. As Segal points out, even a movement such as Pharisaism displayed a certain level of diversity, a fact that serves as a point of departure for, e.g., Seng Ja, *Pharisees in Matthew 23*. Such a situation should not, however, come as a surprise, considering the widely recognized diversity within the Jesus movement itself as it developed in the first and later centuries, which is witnessed both within and outside the Christian canon.

6. See Segal, "Matthew's Jewish Voice," 3: "Therefore, the Christian evidence is more crucial for understanding and dating the development of rabbinic Judaism than the reverse, which exactly reverses the methodology most often used today." For an application of such an approach, see Serge Ruzer, *Mapping the New Testament: Early Christian Writings as a Witness for Jewish Biblical Exegesis*, JCPS 13 (Leiden: Brill, 2007). See also Jonathan Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006). The interdependent relationship between what eventually became Judaism and Christianity, as we define these religions today, is emphasized in several recent studies devoted to analyzing the so-called parting of the ways between these traditions. See most recently Joshua E. Burns, *The Christian Schism in Jewish History and Jewish Memory* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2016); Annette Yoshiko Reed, *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature*

only the beginning of this process of interpenetration between these academic fields, both in terms of the source material utilized and in terms of the methodologies, categories, and concepts applied. Indeed, to many researchers working with these and related issues, current scholarly practices in these respective fields in themselves challenge the very idea of the study of early Judaism and Christianity as belonging within distinct disciplines, both academically and in terms of how university programs are structured institutionally.

To this renewed attention given to the diverse nature of first-century Judaism, including the methodological implications for New Testament studies that follow from it, we must also add the more recent discussions of early Christianity, which problematize its existence as a distinct religion in the first century. Indeed, the term itself, *Christianismos*, was not used until the second century (Ignatius) and, even then, only rarely; it was unknown, as far as the evidence can tell us, to the authors of the New Testament texts.[7] While some scholars would still use terms such as *Christianity*, or *early*/*earliest Christianity*, referring to the nascent phases of

(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005). For the role of archaeology in the study of this issue, see Anders Runesson, "Architecture, Conflict, and Identity Formation: Jews and Christians in Capernaum from the First to the Sixth Century," in *Religion, Ethnicity and Identity in Ancient Galilee: A Region in Transition*, ed. Jürgen Zangenberg, Harold W. Attridge, and Dale Martin, WUNT 210 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 231–57. On the academic study of those in between, the so-called Jewish Christians, see the helpful discussion of the history of the field in F. Stanley Jones, ed., *The Rediscovery of Jewish Christianity: From Toland to Baur*, HBS 5 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012). Ancient Christian sources are collected in the now-classic volume by Albertus F. J. Klijn and Gerrit J. Reinink, *Patristic Evidence for Jewish-Christian Sects*, NovTSup 36 (Leiden: Brill, 1973).

7. It is often noted that, on three occasions, two texts included in the New Testament mention the term *Christianoi*, "Christians" (Acts 11:26; 26:28; 1 Pet 4:16). While some would understand this term to signal continuity with later forms of mainstream (non-Jewish) Christianity and thus represent a departure from Jewish settings, others would point out that the word basically means "Messianics" and that it should rather be understood as a group designation applied within a discursive context where we also find the use of terms such as *Pharisaioi* and *Saddoukaioi*. On this point, the authors of this introduction have slightly divergent interpretations. Whereas Runesson would emphasize the meaning of the term *Christianoi* in Acts and 1 Peter as intertwined with the Jewish setting in which it was used along with terms such as *Pharisaioi*, Gurtner puts more emphasis on continuity with later uses of the term *Christian* in the context of what we now refer to as Christianity.

the Jesus movement, many do so for convenience, aware of the problems involved. Others, however, are seeking new ways of defining and naming both the Jesus movement and the earliest texts it produced, signaling the nature of the texts as intertwined with Jewish life and thought rather than with their later (non-Jewish) reception.

It is when insights gained from these two larger areas of research—emphasizing the pluriform nature of Second Temple Judaism, on the one hand, and problematizing the assumption that Christianity existed as a distinct religion, on the other—coalesce that we see the current intensification of the study of the New Testament as a witness to a species within the genus Judaism, the latter itself entangled in the discursive and socioritual cultures of the Mediterranean world.

It is within this broader academic context that we may contextualize, synchronically, the current surge in the study of Matthew within Judaism. But within this context, research on the First Gospel displays, historically, a rather distinct trajectory when compared with other New Testament texts, since it has almost always been understood in both church and academia, in one way or another, as the "Jewish" gospel. Turning to the diachronic context of the study of Matthew, we shall highlight some of the larger issues involved when the First Gospel has been read as Jewish.[8]

Traditionally, the early church understood the Gospel of Matthew as having been authored by the apostle Matthew, that is, the Jewish tax collector turned disciple (see Matt 9:9; 10:3; see also Mark 3:18; Luke 6:15; Acts 1:13). The first undisputed evidence for this view is Irenaeus (ca. 180 CE; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.1.1; see also Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 5.8.2), but, as noted above, it can be traced back to Papias (ca. 70–163 CE), from whom Ire-

8. The following is not meant as a comprehensive discussion of all themes in the study of Matthew. The focus is rather on how this gospel has been studied in relation to Judaism more specifically. For more comprehensive discussions of the study of Matthew, see Graham N. Stanton, "Introduction: Matthew's Gospel in Recent Scholarship (1994)," in *The Interpretation of Matthew*, 2nd ed., ed. Graham N. Stanton, SNTI (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995), 1–26; Daniel M. Gurtner, "The Gospel of Matthew from Stanton to Present: A Survey of Some Recent Developments," in *Jesus, Matthew's Gospel, and Early Christianity: Studies in Memory of Graham N. Stanton*, ed. Gurtner, Joel Willitts, and Richard A. Burridge, LNTS 435 (London: T&T Clark, 2011), 23–38; David C. Sim, "Matthew: The Current State of Research," in *Mark and Matthew I: Comparative Readings; Understanding the Earliest Gospels in Their First-Century Settings*, ed. Eve-Marie Becker and Anders Runesson, WUNT 271 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 33–51.

naeus likely received this tradition.[9] While the idea that Matthew's Gospel was originally written in Hebrew is a much-disputed issue in modern scholarship, it is clear that the early church—and indeed, church tradition until the emergence of modern historical research in the eighteenth century—believed this to have been the case.[10] Our interest here, however, is not so much *that* these ancient and mediaeval authors thought this to be the case, but rather *what this understanding meant* for how they perceived of the nature of the First Gospel, especially as it was thought to have been written originally in Hebrew, that is, not only by a Jew but also for Jews, as Irenaeus claims.

A brief answer to that question would be that traditional readings of Matthew as written for Jews reflect (non-Jewish) Christian supersessionist concerns. That is, Matthew was thought to have been written in order to persuade Jews to become Christians, the conversion process implying that they left behind their Jewish identity as they joined a new religion. Judaism was, consequently, understood as having been replaced by Christianity, and Christians, not Jews, constituted the new, or true, people of God. Such reading practices were likely triggered not only by religious or theological concerns, as if there were in the Jesus movement some inherent qualities that necessitated a development in this direction, but more so by specific late-antique cultural, social, political, and economic factors. Indeed, as it became important in such contexts to lay claim to ancient Israelite/Jewish

9. On Papias on Matthew, see Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.39.16: "About Matthew this was said: 'Matthew collected the oracles [λόγια] in the Hebrew language [διαλέκτω], and each interpreted them as best he could'" (Lake). Robert H. Gundry, "The Apostolically Johannine Pre-Papian Tradition concerning the Gospels of Mark and Matthew," in Gundry, *The Old Is Better: New Testament Essays in Support of Traditional Interpretations* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 49–73, has argued that Papias, in turn, received this tradition ultimately from John the disciple of Jesus, thus contextualizing the claim in the first century. This suggestion has, however, not found many supporters in scholarship; for discussion, see David C. Sim, "The Gospel of Matthew, John the Elder, and the Papias Tradition: A Response to Robert H. Gundry," *HTS* 63 (2007): 283–99.

10. See Sim, "Gospel of Matthew, John the Elder," 284. Indeed, one may note also that Eusebius recounts a story of how a Hebrew version (*Hebraiōn grammasi*) of Matthew's Gospel was brought to India by Bartholomew and found there by a certain Pantainos, head of the school in Alexandria, who is said to have traveled to India in the late second century (*Hist. eccl.* 5.10). In other words, for Eusebius, not only did Matthew originate in Hebrew, but the Hebrew version was widespread due to the travels and missionary activities of the apostles.

traditions, discourses of divine condemnation of the Jewish people, as a people, were interwoven with Christian theology. The result was a theological worldview in which the marginalization, suffering, and even death of the former was necessary to claim the truth of the latter.[11]

While the explicit normative dimensions to such claims have since receded into the background, key features of this type of Christian theological understandings of the Jewish nature of Matthew's Gospel—that Matthew was written for Jews with the aim of converting them to (non-Jewish) Christians—have, until recently, remained prominent in modern scholarship. Indeed, around the mid-1900s, this mode of reasoning was taken to what would seem to be its logical conclusion, as a number of scholars, beginning with Kenneth Clark in 1947, argued that Matthew's Gospel was authored not by a Jew but by a gentile and displayed a gentile bias.[12] Thus, while the traditional understanding that Matthew was authored by a Jew aiming at converting Jews to (non-Jewish) Christianity—along lines similar to the medieval debates in which a converted Jew argued against leading representatives of his own former Jewish community[13]—these scholars in the mid-1900s and somewhat later seem to have

11. The examples of such discursive practices are innumerable, expressed both in writing and in art, from the church fathers—Jerome's commentary on Matthew provides a typical, and influential, case—to the medieval period (see the so-called living crosses, where one of the arms of the cross crowns the church and the other executes the synagogue; see Schreckenberg) and beyond. Heinz Schreckenberg, *The Jews in Christian Art: An Illustrated History* (New York: Continuum, 1996), 64–66; see esp. pls. 5–6, as well as fig. 2. To support this type of theology, certain readings of Matt 27:25 have been employed in larger theological discourses claiming that Jews live under an eternal curse, which in turn explains their current marginalization and suffering in Christian societies. Such readings have been upheld also in Protestant tradition; see, e.g., Martin Luther's *Vom Shem Hamphoras und vom Geschlecht Christi*, WA 53:587.

12. Kenneth W. Clark, "The Gentile Bias in Matthew," *JBL* 66 (1947): 165–72. See also Samuel Sandmel, *A Jewish Understanding of the New Testament* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1956); Poul Nepper-Christensen, *Das Matthäusevangelium: Ein judenchristliches Evangelium?*, ATDan 1 (Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1958); Georg Strecker, *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit: Untersuchung zur Theologie des Matthäus*, 3rd ed., FRLANT 82 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971); Sjef van Tilborg, *The Jewish Leaders in Matthew* (Leiden: Brill, 1972); Michael J. Cook, "Interpreting 'Pro-Jewish' Passages in Matthew," *HUCA* 54 (1983): 135–46.

13. There are several examples of this infamous practice, staged by Christian authorities aiming at converting Jews. Perhaps one of the more well-known is the

taken the same normatively embedded version of history and stripped it of one of its components (the Jewish "prosecutor") without challenging the core of the theological narrative itself, that is, the replacement paradigm. In a way, this makes hermeneutical sense, as the paradigm itself grew from and was nurtured within non-Jewish Christian communities from late antiquity onwards.

The suggestion that Matthew would have been written by a non-Jew met with resistance rather soon, however, and did not succeed in convincing the majority of New Testament scholars. Interestingly, from this time onward we see a double trajectory developing in Matthean scholarship, a fork in the road, or parting of ways of sorts, if the expression be allowed. Both of these trajectories regard Matthew as written by a Jew, or within a Jewish setting, but they do so in fundamentally different ways. The first reverted, one might say, to the basic approach of the traditional Christian reading of Matthew but added much sophistication to its overall reconstruction of the author, the text, and its context. One of the most important voices exemplifying this trajectory, reinventing and modernizing the basic narrative of the church fathers, has been and remains Protestant exegete Ulrich Luz.[14]

For other scholars, however, this type of reconstruction, in which Matthew's Jewishness is interpreted as an example of someone who parts ways with his own former "religion," even understanding the very peoplehood of Israel to have lost its meaning, leaves the text with a narrative scar that

---

Paris trial of 1240 against the Babylonian Talmud—and, of course, against the Jewish defense panel under the leadership of Rabbi Yeḥiel ben Joseph. In this "trial," the key prosecutor was Nicholas Donin, an apostate Jew turned Franciscan friar. For an interesting discussion of this tragic episode in French history in light of the larger issue of the history of the Jewish-Christian schism, see Burns, *Christian Schism*, 1–18.

14. See especially his multivolume commentary on Matthew, first published in German and then revised and translated into English as Ulrich Luz, *Matthew: A Commentary*, rev. ed., trans. James E. Crouch, 3 vols., Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001–2007). See also Graham N. Stanton, *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992); Petri Luomanen, *Entering the Kingdom of Heaven: A Study on the Structure of Matthew's View of Salvation*, WUNT 2/101 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998); Boris Repschinski, *The Controversy Stories in the Gospel of Matthew: Their Redaction, Form and Relevance for the Relationship between the Matthean Community and Formative Judaism*, FRLANT 189 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000); Paul Foster, *Community, Law and Mission in Matthew's Gospel*, WUNT 2/177 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004).

does not seem to heal, no matter the level of theoretical sophistication. These scholars, uneasy with reconstructions they feel create both narrative and historical inconsistencies, represent a new trajectory, moving away from both the traditional Christian replacement narrative and the gentile-bias approach of the mid-1900s. While diverse approaches and perspectives are contained within this overall trajectory, which we have chosen to call "Matthew within Judaism," the common ground that may be identified understands the Matthean narrative and the context in which it was produced—its inception history—not as something to be understood against the background of Second Temple Judaism, but as an expression of it. As such, Matthew's Gospel is believed to cede to the historian its appropriate original meaning(s) when read together with other diverse forms of Judaism around the turn of the era.

At its core, this new trajectory, which aims at restoring the first-century context of the First Gospel, thus departs from more than fifteen hundred years of normative and theological readings of Matthew and should not be confused with the other types of readings mentioned above, in which Matthew is also regarded as the Jewish gospel. In fact, as it emphasizes the historical otherness of the Matthean world in relation to current mainstream Christian theology and problematizes, on methodological grounds, the so-called replacement or supersessionist paradigm, which the church fathers weaved into this theology, the Matthew-within-Judaism trajectory does not sit comfortably with much of traditional Christian hermeneutics. For these scholars, Matthew's Gospel represents a form of Judaism, not Christianity.

While this trajectory in Matthean studies—the Matthew-within-Judaism paradigm—recently experienced a major surge as it merged with the larger developments in New Testament studies we discussed above and which constitutes its synchronic context,[15] it is rooted in work done some thirty years ago.

One of the first studies signaling an emerging break with earlier understandings of the nature of Matthew's Jewishness was Amy-Jill Levine's *The Social and Ethnic Dimensions of Matthean Salvation History*, published in 1988.[16] This often-quoted monograph triggered further research taking a

15. See above, n. 1, for examples of recent monographs.

16. Amy-Jill Levine, *The Social and Ethnic Dimensions of Matthean Salvation History: "Go Nowhere among the Gentiles …" (Matt. 10:5b)*, SBEC 14 (Lewiston, NY: Mellen, 1988). Levine, who was one of the first suggesting that Matthean communi-

social-science approach, including especially those works that highlight the ethnic dimension and the issue of circumcision. The same year, W. D. Davies and Dale Allison published the first volume of their unmatched three-volume commentary on Matthew.[17] This commentary has provided a solid verse-by-verse foundation for renewed scholarship on Matthew as a Second Temple Jewish text. Its publication soon led to a rise in interest in Matthean scholarship more generally. Indeed, it likely represents the single most influential commentary on Matthew since the time of the church fathers; it is difficult to envisage the emergence of the current developments without it.[18] Two years later, in 1990, J. Andrew Overman's *Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism: The Social World of the Matthean Community* took the social-science perspective further as he worked extensively with what he called formative Judaism in order to place Matthew in a Jewish social setting, understanding Matthew as representing a Jewish group opposing a majority form of Judaism in Galilee.[19] Subsequently, in 1996, Overman published a commentary, *Church and Community in Crisis: The Gospel of Matthew*, thus working his social science–based Matthew-within-Judaism perspective into commentary form.[20]

Perhaps the best-known study, indeed, in many ways representing a foundational platform for the development of the Matthew-within-Judaism trajectory, is Anthony Saldarini's monograph *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community*.[21] Here we find a systematic, thematically oriented, and

---

ties likely continued the practice of circumcision, has since published extensively on Matthew, highlighting its Jewish context. In terms of terminology, however, Levine may still speak of Matthew as a Christian, not a Jewish, text. See Levine, "Matthew's Advice to a Divided Readership," in *The Gospel of Matthew in Current Study: Studies in Memory of William G. Thompson, S.J.*, ed. David Aune (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 30.

17. W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison Jr., *The Gospel according to Saint Matthew*, 3 vols., ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988–1997).

18. Other important commentaries written with special attention given to Matthew's Jewishness, understood from this new perspective, include John Nolland's *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005); David L. Turner, *Matthew*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008).

19. J. Andrew Overman, *Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism: The Social World of the Matthean Community* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990).

20. J. Andrew Overman, *Church and Community in Crisis: The Gospel according to Matthew*, NTC (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1996).

21. Anthony J. Saldarini, *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community*, CSHJ (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994). It may be noted in the context of the current

detailed take on Matthew's text understood, consistently, as an expression of Judaism, based on, as he says, "our increased knowledge of the first-century social history of Jews and Jewish-believers-in Jesus in Greater Syria."[22] A couple of years later, in 1996, David Sim established himself as major contributor to this developing trajectory as he published his PhD thesis, *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew*.[23] Only two years later Sim solidified this approach to Matthew with his equally important *The Gospel of Matthew and Christian Judaism*.[24]

In between these early and in many ways pioneering works and the recent explosion of Matthean studies taking a historical Matthew-within-Judaism perspective, we find a steady stream of important monographs building momentum. Understanding Matthew's Gospel through the lens of empire studies, in 2000 Warren Carter contributed an innovative take on the Jewishness of the text.[25] In 2007 Daniel Gurtner focused on the death of Jesus as understood through its interpretation in Matthew's version of the torn veil.[26] The same year Joel Willitts, and then in 2012 Wayne Baxter, approached Matthew as an expression of Judaism through analyses of its shepherd motif.[27]

---

volume that Saldarini's first chapter is titled "Matthew within First-Century Judaism." See also the discussion of Saldarini's work on Matthew in Alan J. Avery-Peck, Daniel J. Harrington, and Jacob Neusner, eds., *Christianity in the Beginning*, vol. 1 of *When Judaism and Christianity Began: Essays in Memory of Anthony J. Saldarini*, JSJSup 85 (Leiden: Brill, 2004).

22. Saldarini, *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community*, 4. He continues: "The final composition of the text and its setting within first-century Judaism are the key to understanding Matthew's view of Judaism and his group's place within it." This conviction lies at the foundation of the Matthew-within-Judaism research trajectory as it has developed today.

23. David C. Sim, *Apocalyptic Eschatology and the Gospel of Matthew*, SNTSMS 88 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

24. David C. Sim, *The Gospel of Mathew and Christian Judaism: The History and Social Setting of the Matthean Community*, SNTW (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998).

25. Warren Carter, *Matthew and Empire: Initial Explorations* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2001). Among his several books, *Matthew and the Margins: A Socio-political and Religious Reading* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2000) presents his overall take on the narrative and its progression.

26. Daniel M. Gurtner, *The Torn Veil: Matthew's Exposition of the Death of Jesus*, SNTSMS 139 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

27. Joel Willitts, *Matthew's Messianic Shepherd King: In Search of "the Lost Sheep of the House of Israel,"* BZNW 147 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007); Wayne Baxter, *Israel's*

Like multiple streams merging into a river, these monographs—and a large number of articles and book chapters—have contributed to the growth of the now substantial research trajectory we call Matthew within Judaism. In light of the current wider developments in New Testament studies, this river is now, in turn, joined by other streams of within-Judaism approaches to diverse texts and genres, which, taken together, may signal the emergence of a paradigm shift in the historical study of the New Testament. Again, this does not mean that Matthean studies have already developed into some sort of interpretive homogeneity within this trajectory, or even less so in terms of the study of the New Testament more generally. But it does mean that what we see now is very likely only the beginning of a major new development in New Testament studies, which moves toward a first-century Jewish understanding of these texts beyond traditional Christian approaches, even as the latter have been dressed in academic garb. Widening the perspective, it is too early to say what this will eventually mean hermeneutically for churches taking historical research seriously in their theological work, or for Jewish and Christian relations and dialogue. One thing is certain, though, and that is that this new historical paradigm will provide a major challenge—and therefore also new opportunities—in both of these settings. Discussions of such challenges and opportunities are, however, beyond the scope of this book.

In the present volume, which was born out of conversations from the Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meeting's Matthew Section (San Antonio, 2016), we aim to present some of the important current approaches to Matthew within Judaism. Doing so, we have not shied away from including critical voices that challenge this interpretive trajectory to develop its arguments further. Based on Society of Biblical Literature conversations and the recent developments in Matthean scholarship described above, we believe the time is right for precisely this type of multiauthored volume. It brings together numerous perspectives and views in one place, all recognizing that a suitable reading of Matthew within its inception-historical context requires careful consideration of the complexities of first-century forms of Judaism. While more work needs to be done and more perspectives are needed before we see the full interpretive potential of the Matthew-within-Judaism trajectory, the topics in which such

Only Shepherd: Matthew's Shepherd Motif and His Social Setting, LNTS 457 (London: T&T Clark, 2012).

discussions currently occur may be said to fall within five thematically arranged categories, and we have structured the book accordingly.

Part 1: Institutions and Law

Essays in this section contribute to our understanding of the basic social and political structures at play in and behind the text of the Gospel of Matthew as they relate to institutions.

In "Matthew and the Torah: Jesus as Legal Interpreter," James G. Crossley contextualizes Matthew's presentation of Jesus as halakic expert. He argues that not only does Matthew present Jesus as consistently torah observant, but he also presents Jesus as being conversant with the details of at least some strands of Pharisaic interpretation. There appears to be some connection, rivalry, and overlap with Pharisaic Judaism (at least as understood by Matthew), with acceptance of certain interpretations, shared assumptions in other instances, and sharp disagreements in specific others. Crossley finds this by covering a range of key legal topics in Matthew, including general statements concerning the torah as well as the so-called antitheses, divorce, *lex talionis* and vows, Sabbath, tithing, purity, handwashing, and burial of the dead (Matt 8:21–22) in relation to familial concerns. He concludes the essay with some reflections on the problems of connecting Matthew's presentation of Jesus and the torah with torah observance in the Jesus movement more broadly.

Jordan Ryan's contribution is titled "The Sermon on the Mount as Synagogue Teaching." Here, Ryan contends that the Gospel of Matthew situates Jesus's teaching activity during the Galilean phase of his ministry in synagogues in Matt 4:23. Though Matthew relates almost none of the content of Jesus's synagogue teaching (see 9:35), from a narrative perspective, the synagogue teaching in Matt 4:23–25 introduces the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount. Ryan's intent, then, is to examine the connection between the act of teaching in synagogues described in Matt 4:23a and Matthew's presentation of the Sermon on the Mount in chapters 5–7. He argues that Matthew's narrative of the sermon, though not set in a synagogue, clearly and intentionally evokes elements of a synagogue, harking back to the synagogue teaching described in its prologue in 4:23–5:2. While this literary connection has been made before, Ryan brings it into conversation with current scholarship on early synagogues. By considering the Sermon on the Mount and its connections to the institutional setting of the synagogue in light of current scholarship, he opens

up new avenues of interpretation and sheds fresh light on the eschatological dimension of the Sermon on the Mount from a narrative perspective.

In "Matthew and the Temple," Akiva Cohen seeks to locate Matthew's view of the temple within postexilic and rabbinic views of God's presence in the second temple. This context frames Matthew's view of the temple squarely within the dominant view of Second Temple groups who—in spite of various halakic tensions—understood the temple, and the קדש הקדשים, as the locus of God's presence. Cohen exposes the role of preunderstanding in the interpretive process by highlighting the divergent views held by Matthean scholars on Matthew and the temple. He also notes the trend in recent historical Jesus scholarship to portray Jesus's view of the temple as a *negative* one that distances Jesus from Judaism. Cohen then engages in intertextual readings of Matthean and rabbinic views of the temple, which illustrates some conceptual overlap but emphasizes the divergent way in which both Matthew and the Tannaim ground their theological programs. Finally, he discusses Matthew's view of the temple from various angles: Matthew's canonical context, recent scholarship—which emphasizes Matthew's *positive* view of the temple—the genealogy of Jesus, ἐκκλησία and temple, the fate of Israel and the temple's destruction, and the transformation of the Matthean temple.

Part 2: Ethnicity

Essays in this part recognize that basic ethnic categories saturate the text with meaning and in varying ways demonstrate how the use of ethnic identity functions in the formation of theology with special attention to the law.

Anders Runesson's contribution is "Aspects of Matthean Universalism: Ethnic Identity as a Theological Tool in the First Gospel." In it he acknowledges that when confronted with ethnic discourse in Matthew, scholars have traditionally emphasized passages commenting negatively on groups identifiable as Jewish and seen in such statements signs foreshadowing God's rejection of Israel. This type of approach is often paired with an interpretation of positive portrayals of non-Jewish characters as signaling a universal mission. Conversely, when positive Jewish characters are encountered (such as Jesus's parents and disciples), their ethnic identity goes unnoticed. Corresponding to this silence, negative statements about non-Jews are usually commented on in ways that avoid highlighting the significance of the ethnic identity of these characters.

These interpretations further add to a reading of the gospel in which indications of its critique of non-Jewish (political) culture and behavior vanish in favor of an assumed anti-Jewish outlook. Taken together, such interpretive practices have encouraged asymmetrical reading strategies in which the worst among characters identified as Jewish are compared with the best among non-Jewish individuals. The result has been a highly influential mode of interpretation in which Matthew's story is understood as a story of religious universalization, such that ethnicity—as a dynamic theological category—is neutralized. Contrary to such interpretive trajectories, however, a close reading of Matthew's narrative seems to reveal a sustained Matthean interest in ethnicity as a sense-making category. In fact, the entity "Israel" is never rejected in Matthew's story. This does not mean, though, that the gospel would not proclaim a form of universalism in which non-Jews would be addressed and included. Indeed, Runesson argues that Matthew's universalism is intertwined with ethnic discourses in intricate but narratively coherent ways. As the First Gospel is read through a lens focusing on ethnicity as a rhetorical and theological tool, light is also shed on major issues such as law and grace, showing how these, for Matthew, are part and parcel of a first-century Jewish worldview. After mapping the narrative role of ethnic categorization in three steps as related to group boundaries, shaming, and empire, the implications of ethnicity for how salvation is construed are addressed.

"His Glorious Throne: Israel and the Gentiles in Mission and Judgment in the Gospel of Matthew" is written by David L. Turner. Building on the work of Matthias Konradt, Turner considers how Matthew portrays the ultimate messianic renewal of both Israel and the gentiles in light of the consequences of Jerusalem's negative response to Jesus. This study engages the question of the future messianic renewal of Israel and the gentiles by considering the two texts that speak of Jesus sitting on "his glorious throne" (θρόνος δόξης αὐτοῦ). Turner examines the throne in biblical and Second Temple texts to consider Matt 19:28 and 25:31–46 in terms of mission and the future of Israel and the gentiles. He finds that mission in Matthew entails broader canonical themes pertaining to Jesus's fulfillment of the torah and its role in forming the people of God. Just as Israel was accountable to the law of Moses and the prophets' ongoing ministry, so the nations are accountable to the teaching of Jesus, which continues through the ministry of the apostles. The church's mission to gentiles, then, as well as to Jews, continues until the Son of Man—who is

also the Son of Abraham (see Gen 12:3; Ps 47:8–9) and the Son of David (see Isa 9:7; Jer 3:17)—comes to reign from his glorious throne.

Terence L. Donaldson's contribution is "'Nations,' 'Non-Jewish Nations,' or 'Non-Jewish Individuals': Matthew 28:19 Revisited." Here Donaldson revisits the long-standing debate concerning the phrase πάντα τὰ ἔθνη in Matt 28:19: Does τὰ ἔθνη here have the distinctive Jewish sense of "non-Jewish nations," or does it denote "all nations, including Israel"? At least until recently, the rendering "all the gentiles" has been tightly linked with an anti-Jewish reading of Matthew, in which the Jewish people as a whole, having rejected their Messiah (27:25), have in turn been rejected by God in favor of a new nation (21:43) drawn from all the non-Jewish nations (28:19). The appeal of the alternative interpretation of 28:19—that Jesus here commands a mission to all nations, including Israel—has been the perception that it leads to a less anti-Judaic reading of Matthew: the mission to all nations (28:19) represents an expansion, rather than an abrogation, of the mission to Israel commanded in chapter 10. While Donaldson has tended to favor the inclusive reading, his recent study of (πάντα) τὰ ἔθνη in Jewish and Greco-Roman usage has raised questions for him about its plausibility. In this paper Donaldson first sets out the evidence that seems to favor the exclusive sense, looking at (1) the full phrase πάντα τὰ ἔθνη and (2) the distinctive development in Jewish usage in which τὰ ἔθνη comes to refer to (non-Jewish) individuals rather than (non-Jewish) nations. Then he brings the results of this study into conversation with recent Matthew-within-Judaism approaches, to ask what it would mean for our understanding of Matthew's Gospel if it concludes with the inauguration of a new mission to "all the gentiles," one that is concurrent with and parallel to the already-established mission to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt 10).

Another approach to ethnicity questions is undertaken by Philip F. Esler in "Ethnic Identities in the Dead Sea Legal Papyri and Matthew: Reinterpreting Matthew 25:31–46." For his analysis Esler utilizes the ancient legal papyri that have survived from the Dead Sea region, especially the thirty-five documents of the Babatha archive. These, Esler explains, contain important evidence on a variety of ethnic identities that encountered one another in that context: principally Judean, Nabatean, Greek, and Roman. He finds that the pattern that emerges is one of strong ethnic boundaries that nevertheless allowed interactions between the various groups, with some interactions permitted or prescribed and others proscribed. With this in mind, Esler explains that Matthew's Gospel is a

text where ethnic identities and a transethnic Christ identity are pervasively present. On the imagined scenario that at around the end of the first century CE, not long after Matthew wrote his gospel, it reached the Dead Sea region and was read out to Christ groups there, this ethnic situation would have formed an important part of the context against which it was understood. In light of this interpretative matrix, Esler offers a fresh reading of Matthew's account of the last judgment (25:31–46).

Part 3: Jesus among Friends and Enemies

Contextual readings of Matthew in this section address Jesus among friends and enemies. The essays here move from general social settings and ethnic categories to deal with more detailed group-related components of the narrative. In so doing these essays contribute to how interpreters understand the Matthean world. This includes groups with direct and indirect political influence, respectively, and how they are portrayed and function in the story; individuals, as they belong to or relate to the aforementioned groups; and Jesus himself—how he is portrayed, likewise, as belonging to or relating to these same groups, and what this may tell us about messianic models applied by the author(s) ("Christology").

Matthias Konradt advocates a "new perspective" on Matthew's Gospel, which regards the text as a thoroughly Jewish document that reflects a conflict of Christ believers *within* Judaism. He addresses an important aspect of this in his essay, "The Role of the Crowds in Matthew's Gospel," in which he advocates a more nuanced reading of the narrative role of the crowds. Konradt observes Matthew's strong tendency to clearly differentiate between the authorities and the crowds as well as the crowds' positive reactions to Jesus's ministry and their developing christological insight, which culminates in the acclamation of Jesus as the messianic son of David (21:9). But he also notes the distinction between the crowds and the disciples, in particular the role and the identity of the crowds in 27:11–26 and the relevance of this passage for the overall portrayal of the crowds in Matthew's Gospel. Konradt argues that those who had struck up the "Hosanna to the Son of David" a few days before (21:9) are *not* those who now cry σταυρωθήτω. Rather, in light of 2:3; 16:21; 21:10–11; and 23:37(–39), the crowds in 27:11–26 are to be identified as a crowd from Jerusalem. Finally, the essay discusses the conclusions that might be drawn from Matthew's presentation of the crowds with regard to the situation of the Christ-believing communities in Matthew's time and surroundings.

In "Whose King Is He Anyways? What Herod Tells Us about Matthew," Wayne Baxter acknowledges that while the Jewish nature of the First Gospel has long been recognized, determining its socioreligious implications remains hotly disputed. The apostle Paul has been understood as a Jew who appeared more than willing to violate Mosaic food laws for the sake of socio-ethnic harmony between Jews and gentiles in the (Galatian) churches. But it is not clear that this is the best framework in which to understand the Jewishness of Matthew. Moreover, Matthew in many respects thinks much more like a Jew inhabiting first-century Judaism than a Christ follower orbiting gentile Christianity. Baxter argues that Matthew's portrayal of Jesus in close juxtaposition to Herod demonstrates the evangelist's deep concern for the fulfillment of the national promise of a king for Israel. Further, when compared with Herod's depiction in the other Synoptic Gospels and in the writings of Josephus, it becomes evident, at least insofar as kingship is concerned, that Matthew thinks more closely along the lines of Josephus the Jew than Mark and Luke the Christ followers.

Loren T. Stuckenbruck's contribution is titled "The Function of Teaching Authority in the Dead Sea Documents and Matthew's Gospel." Based on a comparison of selected Dead Sea Scrolls that mention the Teacher of Righteousness with the presentation of Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew, the discussion of this chapter focuses on the anonymous authors who wrote about their respective ideal figures. The unique position attributed, respectively, to the Teacher of Righteousness and to Jesus in these sources suggests that their presentation of these figures functioned as a warrant for the writers about them to engage in the same kind of instructional activity. Anonymous authors thus lay implicit claim to authority for themselves and thus assume the mantle of those individuals who founded their movement. The writer of Matthew, as those who composed the pesharim and related compositions among the Dead Sea Scrolls, picks up and extends the revelatory mode of instruction that he has assigned to Jesus.

Part 4: Purity and Eschatology

In the case of ritual and moral purity, this section narrows down discussion of law to a single theme, but it is a theme that is of paramount importance for our understanding of the ritual and theological patterns of the text as a whole. Since purity/impurity is key for understanding the text's portrayal of the Jerusalem temple and its destruction, and the temple's destruction

itself is a theme interwoven with eschatological expectations, part 4 ends, appropriately, with discussion of things final: eschatology.

Cecilia Wassén brings her expertise on Qumran purity matters to bear on her essay, "Moral Impurity in the Gospel of Matthew." Whereas scholars commonly refer to the concepts of ritual and moral impurity (the view that certain sins are defiling) as if they were given concepts in the ancient Jewish world, this paper points out that these expressions are modern constructions that should be used carefully. The author highlights the diverse views on the relation between sin and impurity in biblical writings and early Jewish literature. From this perspective, she examines Matthew's concepts of purity to argue that notions of purity and impurity were given parts of the worldview of Matthew in which Jesus teaches law observance that includes ritual purity laws. Nevertheless, the picture of moral impurity is more ambiguous. Although Matthew retells Mark's account of Jesus's teaching about defiling sins, which emphasizes inner purity over outer (Mark 7:1–23 // Matt 15:1–20), this aspect does not appear in other contexts where sin and atonement are in focus. Wassén argues that the metaphors in Matt 23 that relate impurity and sin with each other do not, on closer examination, support the view that Matthew cared greatly about moral impurity. While sin is a great concern for Matthew, Wassén finds that he does not usually frame sin in terms of impurity, nor perceive of sin as a defiling force.

In "Danielic Influence at the Intersection of Matthew and the Dead Sea Scrolls," Daniel M. Gurtner engages in a comparative analysis regarding the use of Daniel in the corpus of texts in the Dead Sea Scrolls over against its usage in the Gospel of Matthew. He shows that Daniel casts a long and influential shadow among the Qumran sectarians not only from the manuscripts preserved there or the pseudepigraphic material emerging around Daniel found only at Qumran, but perhaps most importantly its usage to bolster unique facets of Qumran sectarian ideologies. Although Daniel is not the most influential text from the Hebrew Bible on Matthew, it plays a decisive role in key eschatological facets of the First Gospel, especially judgment on the wicked and the deliverance of the righteous. But all this centers on the Danielic "son of man," whom Matthew identifies with Jesus and his ensuing authority. In his survey of this data in the Scrolls and Matthew, Gurtner shows a mutual reliance on apocalyptic eschatological features of Daniel that find expression in distinct ways in their respective traditions. At Qumran the decidedly sectarian nature of select texts is bolstered by Danielic citations and allusions that cumulatively bring

the Yaḥad to the forefront in terms of their identity as the eschatological people of God and the ones whom God's eschatological promises are for. In Matthew, however, the righteous and wicked—as well as their respective fates—are defined in Danielic terms but only through their identification with or against Matthew's conception of the Danielic son of man identified as Jesus. The former is communal and sectarian in nature, whereas the latter, while bearing communal and sectarian implications, is primarily christological in outlook. Despite their differences, Matthew, alongside the Scrolls, remains well within the framework of Judaism.

David C. Sim's contribution is "Life after Death? The Question of Immediate Life after Death in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Gospel of Matthew." In this essay he acknowledges that most scholars accept that the dominant view in ancient Judaism and early Christianity of the fate of the dead was that the body would lie lifeless in the ground until it was raised to life in the eschatological age. While this concept of the raising of the dead, which finds it earliest attestation in the book of Daniel, was common among both Jews and Christians, Sim observes that it was merely one view concerning the fate of the departed. Other concepts were common, including the notion that the dead would continue to exist immediately after death in a spiritual form. This idea could be held alone or in conjunction with the concept of eschatological bodily resurrection where the soul and the reanimated body would be rejoined. The Dead Sea Scrolls testify to a schema whereby the general resurrection of the body plays no major role, if any at all. The prevailing view in the Qumran community was that the righteous enjoyed even now an intimate relationship with the holy angels, and that after death the departed would continue this fellowship in the heavenly realm. By contrast, Sim argues that the Gospel of Matthew highlights the eschatological resurrection of the dead as a prelude to the final judgment. This is not unexpected, given that the resurrection of Jesus was one of the dominant Christians claims. But there are hints in Matthew's Gospel that he also accepted some form of immediate life after death and that the raised body at the *eschaton* would be rejoined to its spiritual counterpart.

A similar matter is taken up in "The Resurrection of the Saints as a Prolepsis of the Resurrection of Jesus: A Reassessment of Matthew's Portrayal of the Risen Jesus," by Lidija Novakovic. Here she seeks to offer a contribution to the ongoing discussion about the function of the resurrection of the saints in the Gospel of Matthew. Novakovic argues that the evangelist incorporated a traditional piece that reflects the earliest

Christian belief, derived from the expectation of the resurrection of the righteous in Second Temple Judaism, that Jesus's resurrection marked the beginning of the general resurrection of the dead. However, unlike Paul, who uses the link between the resurrection of Jesus and the universal resurrection to insist that Jesus's followers will be raised in the same way he was raised, Novakovic contends that Matthew uses it to demonstrate the distinctiveness of Jesus's resurrection. In his narrative, the resurrection of the saints functions as a prolepsis of the resurrection of Jesus, but its purpose is not to suggest that what happened to the saints also happened to Jesus but to indicate that his resurrection was superior to theirs. In this way, Matthew's peculiar chronological sequence upholds Jesus's messianic identity and underscores the universal authority that he received through his resurrection from the dead.

Part 5: Reception: Jewish and Gentile

The fifth and final section is dedicated to analyses of how Matthew's completed gospel was received in various settings.

John Kampen's essay is "The Problem of Christian Anti-Semitism and a Sectarian Reading of the Gospel of Matthew: The Trial of Jesus." Kampen observes that identifying and understanding the origins of anti-Semitism is a very complex question. While related, the issue of addressing it in the twenty-first century is equally complicated. While anti-Semitic claims can be identified already in pre-Christian "pagan" literature, they are of a different nature from the directions that anti-Semitism took as it developed in the Christian world. While at a theological level the issues of the continuing validity of the law and Judaism as a valid religious system were the major issues, within popular religion the most enduring charge against Jews was expressed in various versions of the blood libel, "His blood be upon us and upon our children" (Matt 27:25). Within the study of anti-Semitism the reading of Matthew has tended toward an *extra muros* perspective in which the work was composed by gentiles and directed against Jews, hence fostering anti-Semitism in its origins, or *intra muros*, in which case it was an argument within the Jewish world that was directed against Jews once Christianity becomes a gentile movement. Kampen's essay argues that the anti-Semitic *Tendenz* of the work is rooted in the sectarian nature of this composition, written within the Jewish community, but as a very vitriolic critique. A sociological analysis of Matthew as a sectarian composition is then advanced, in particular with regard to the trial and execution. This

treatment acknowledges that the historical event was primarily Roman but that Matthew's sectarian perspectives blamed the Jewish leadership for the destruction of the temple and Roman occupation. Thus, Kampen argues, Matthew focuses even more attention in that section of his composition on implicating the various leadership structures of the Jewish community and stressing the innocence of the Romans.

"Israel and the Nations in the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies and Recognitions 1.27–72: Receptions of the Gospel of Matthew" is by Karin Hedner Zetterholm. In it she discusses the impact of the Gospel of Matthew on Rec. 1.27–71 (early third century) and the Homilies (early fourth century), two distinct texts included in the Pseudo-Clementine writings. Both of these works offer a history of the early apostolic period with a focus on James and Peter, respectively. Like the Gospel of Matthew, the author of Rec. 1.27–71 is mainly concerned with the mission to the Jews and the Messiah's significance for them, embracing the view that torah observance in combination with adherence to Jesus is Judaism correctly understood. Quite possibly, this text functioned within a (Jesus-oriented) Jewish setting. The author/redactor of the Homilies, on the other hand, focuses on the mission to the gentiles and Jesus's significance for them. Drawing heavily on the Gospel of Matthew, the Homilies' Peter demonstrates that Jesus is the authoritative interpreter of the torah and that his teachings and actions constitute the hermeneutical key for a correct understanding of God's revelation. In his view, the teachings of Jesus and the oral interpretive tradition among the Jews are two equivalent paths to salvation, and Jesus-oriented gentiles are now a part of God's people alongside Jews, both Jesus oriented and non-Jesus oriented. Although the Homilies is generally considered a Christian text with close affinities to rabbinic Judaism, the possibility that it belonged within the broader Jewish community where Jesus-oriented Jews and gentiles may have mixed with rabbinic Jews should not be dismissed out of hand.

Nathan Eubank's "Merit and Anti-Judaism in Matthew's Parables since Jülicher" explores the role that anti-Judaism and aversion to merit have played in the interpretation of Matthew's parables, both in scholarship devoted to the historical Jesus and in studies of the First Gospel. New Testament scholars have often dismissed premodern interpreters of the parables as fanciful allegorizers, pointing to Adolf Jülicher's seminal *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu* (1888–1899) as the advent of serious parable interpretation. Eubank contends that this description of the development of parable interpretation is almost exactly wrong: the theological commit-

ments of scholars since Jülicher have guided the treatment of the parables at least as much as their predecessors. According to Eubank, the overwhelming theological tendency of parable scholarship across a spectrum of approaches could be described as antimerit, which means prejudiced against the alleged Jewish hope to please God with good deeds and committed with varying degrees of self-consciousness to bringing Jesus and the gospels into conformity with a version of Christianity that excludes the salvific instrumentality of human action. For scholarship of this sort, Matthew's emphasis on obedience and eschatological sifting has often been understood as the evangelist's attempt to re-Judaize Jesus's parables, adding the principle of merit to protect against overconfidence among Jesus followers. In response, Eubank argues that the principle of merit is fairly ubiquitous in prior Jesus tradition. Matthew probably expanded its importance but did not create it.

Concluding Reflections

At the end of the book Amy-Jill Levine reflects on the implications of this volume for further research in a far-reaching essay: "Concluding Reflections: What's Next in the Study of Matthew?" Here Levine takes up many critical issues occasioned by the previous essays but by no means limited to them. First, she anticipates opposition to "Matthew within Judaism" in light of that already leveled against "Paul within Judaism," especially by readers intent on utilizing Paul and then Matthew to cast a negative shadow on ancient Judaism in order to present Jesus, and Paul, as correcting a toxic system. Second, for her, the essential Jewishness of Matthew is not only an exegetically warranted conclusion but also theologically and, indeed, homiletically necessary. Third, Levine flags several areas where the other contributions to the volume warrant further consideration. While important work has been done on the identification of the Jews (Ἰουδαῖοι) as well as the people (λαός) and the crowds (ὄχλοι), much of this has yet to be allocated into determining with more precision the function of these groups within Matthew, especially as they relate to other groups and those with authority (e.g., Pharisees, chief priests, elders, scribes). Similarly, the ongoing research on synagogues in antiquity needs to inform Matthew's view of the synagogue and whether "their synagogues" infers the antagonism typically attributed to it. There is also room to develop the function of gentile characters within Matthew. Furthermore, Levine encourages teasing out the relationship between the death of Jesus

and the loss of the temple, particularly in light of the lack of clear indications in other Jewish sources of the time that there was a consequential inability to accomplish atonement. Finally, she advocates further research on locating the precise Roman political situation in place at the time the First Gospel was written.