

# **READING MATTHEW 15: 1-20 IN LIGHT OF MISHNAH (ZEVACHIM 13.2) FROM A FOOD SAFETY PERSPECTIVE:**

A Thesis Presented to the  
Faculty of Malua Theological College

In Partial Fulfilment of the  
Requirements for the Degree  
Bachelor of Divinity (with Honours)

by

Dominic Taeleipu

July 2021

## **Consent Form for the Retention and use of the Thesis**

I, **Dominic Tunupopo Taelipu**

agree that the thesis be accessible for the purpose of study and research in accordance with the normal conditions established by the Malua College Librarian for the care, loan and reproduction of the thesis.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_ (month and year)

## **Declaration of Authorship of Thesis**

I, **Dominic Tunupopo Taeleipu**

hereby declare that this submission is my own work and that, to the best of my knowledge, it contains no material previously published or written by another person nor material which to a substantial extent has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma at Malua Theological College or any other educational institution, except where due acknowledgement is made in thesis. Any contribution made to the research by colleagues with whom I have worked at Malua Theological College or elsewhere during my candidature is fully acknowledged.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_ (month and year)

## Abstract

The controversial debate of the Tradition of the Elders by the Pharisees and Jesus in the gospel of Matthew, is an interesting topic of discussion as it is about following rituals. To be specific, the practice that the Pharisees accused Jesus disciples was failing to wash their hands before eating. This gives rise to the issue whether handwashing was more a food safety practice too. In addition, food and especially food safety is a rare topic when it comes to the Bible. Lack of food safety has also contributed to the transferral of pathogens which have assisted in the growth of COVID-19. This killer virus has changed impacted on the world immensely. Therefore this is where my study derives from, reading Matthew 15:1-20 using a Food Safety hermeneutic and a Samoan *tūmamā* (hygienic) lens. The study also uses the Mishnah (Oral laws) to read the text, which aligns with Jewish background of the Pharisees.

I will attempt to appropriate my background as a Samoan Christian and previous experience as a Food safety consultant to dialogue with the selected text in Matthew 15:1-20. The selected method is Sociorhetorical criticism (SRC) in order to dialogue the text with other scriptures from the Old Testament and manuscripts.

This reading hopes to provide another perspective on the selected text, particularly food and food safety from a Biblical perspective. Thus, encourage readers to appropriate their own perspectives and experiences on daily food hygiene practices.

## **Declaration**

I declare that this work has not used without due acknowledgment of any material that has been previously submitted for a degree or diploma in another institution. I also declare that the work has not used any material, heard or read, without proper acknowledgment of the source.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to the memory of family members who have influenced and raised me, instilling the importance of having God as the centre of my life; *Rev Elder Taeleipu Aiono* (Grandfather); *Rev Elder Reupena Samuelu* (Uncle) and *Rev Elder Taeipo and Situaaua Malifa* (Uncle & Aunty) and *Taulesulu Malifa* (Aunty)

To my Spiritual parents *Rev Elder Viliamu* and *Nellie Finau* & EFKS Dandenong. Thank you for your prayers and support, this thesis is dedicated to you.

Also like to dedicate my Spiritual parents in Malua *Rev Olive* and *Maria* and my *Samuelu*. Thank you for never ending support and motivation throughout my journey in Malua.

To my parents *Leuluaialii Moesama* and *Katarina Taeleipu*, I cannot thank you enough for your support and motivating me to strive for the best in life. Hope this thesis does justice to your unconditional love.

Last but not least, I would like to dedicate this thesis to my brothers and their wives/partners (*Sebastian and Tolu, Malifa and Stacey, Tautalatasi and Olivia*) & my nephews (*Saul and Saint Joseph*) and nieces (*Alaynah, Sheyanna, Eliana and Haven*)

To all my family and friends, this thesis is dedicated to you all.

## Table of Contents

Consent Form for the Retention and use of the Thesis	ii
Declaration of Authorship of Thesis	iii
Abstract	iv
Declaration	v
Dedication	vi
Table of Contents	1
Acknowledgments	3
List of Illustrations	4
List of Abbreviations	5
I. Introduction	6
Limitations of this study	8
II. Chapter One Literature Review	9
2.1 The selected text	9
2.1.1 Summary	12
2.2 Clean and unclean in Matthew 15	13
2.2.1 Summary	15
2.3 Conclusion	16
III. Chapter Two Methodology & Method	17
Introduction	17
3.1 Sociorhetorical criticism	17
3.1.1 Inner Texture	19
3.1.3 Social and Cultural Texture	20
3.1.2 Inter texture	20
3.2 Food Safety as hermeneutics	25
3.2.1 Food Safety practices and Hand washing	27
3.2.2 Food safety and traditional practices	29
3.2.3 Samoan Food safety Hermeneutics- <i>Tumamā</i> lens	31
3.3. Conclusion	33
IV. Chapter Three Exegesis- Part 1	35
4.1 The text	35
4.1 Placement of the text	36
4.2 Inner Texture	37

4.1.2 Open, Middle End	37
4.1.2 Interaction of open, middle and end.	41
4.2 Social and Cultural Texture	41
4.2.1 Clean and unclean, Purity Laws	42
4.2.2 Handwashing practice in Tradition of the Elders	44
4.3 Conclusion	45
V. Chapter Four Exegesis- Inter texture	47
Introduction	47
5.1 Leviticus 11	47
5.2 Deuteronomy 4:2	50
5.3 Mishnah	51
5.4 Kosher dietary laws	54
5.5 Conclusion	55
Conclusion	56
Glossary	61
Bibliography	62



## Acknowledgments

First and foremost, all glory and praise to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, for His protection, love and wisdom that has made this opportunity possible.

I would like to acknowledge the guidance and support of my supervisor and Principal Rev Dr Vaitusi Nofoaiga; Thank you so much for continuous encouragement and endless supply of wisdom and knowledge. Thank You for your patience and motivation despite my shortfalls.

I would also like to thank the staff of Malua Theological College; thank you all for the support and academic guidance you have provided. This thesis would not have been possible without your resourceful insight shared during seminars and always willing to help when I come knocking on your doors.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank lecturer Esera Esera for your input and assistance in this study. Also to Dr Salā Siaosi Carter and cousin Eliorah Malifa for your great help and support in this thesis. *Faafetai tele lava!*

To my Spiritual Parents in Malua, Rev Olive and Maria and Samuelu auaiaga, for being my family away from home. *Fa'afetai lava le tapua'i.*

I would like to acknowledge my beloved aulotu, *Rev Elder Viliamu* and *Nellie Finau* & EFKS Dandenong, *faafetai i lo outou alofa, Faafetai i la outou tapuaiga!*

To my parents, *Leuluailii Moesama* and *Katarina Taeleipu*, *Fa'afetai tatalo*, Malo le tapua'i! To my brothers in Australia and your wives/ partners; thanks for all your prayers and support.

Special mention to the Samoa College class of 2002, thank you for support and love shown throughout my journey.

To everyone who contributed to this work in one way or another, whom are too many to be named; *fa'afetai, fa'afetai, fa'afetai tele lava!* God Bless you all.

## **List of Illustrations**

Figure 1:	Handwashing poster in Samoan
Figure 2-	Translation of Samoan Handwashing poster
Table 1	Intertextual table of Matthew 15:2 and Old Testament (Leviticus)
Table 2	Intertextual table of Matthew 15:2 and Old Testament (Deuteronomy)

## **List of Abbreviations**

CCCS	Congregational Christian Church of Samoa
EFKS	Ekalesia Faapotopotoga Kerisiano i Samoa
FAO	Food Agriculture Organisation
SRC	Sociorhetorical criticism
WHO	World Health Organisation

## I. Introduction

The motivation of this study is threefold; Firstly, my Faith as a Samoan Christian; Secondly, the pandemic COVID-19; and lastly, my experience as a Food Safety consultant. The immense impact of COVID19 in our world today has inspired me to revisit the Bible scriptures and research on the Bible's view of Food Safety and perhaps encourage Food safety practices from a Christian perspective.

Food is like faith – everyday necessity for nourishment of bodies. They are essential for survival. Food is a rare topic of discussion when it comes to the Bible; despite it being mentioned in the Old and New Testament. For example, food is mentioned in the food laws in Leviticus,<sup>1</sup> and Jesus feeding four thousand in the Gospels<sup>2</sup> just to name a few. In this study, the selected text focuses on the Jewish views of unclean and clean food, which have been treated religiously through the Jewish Purity Laws dating back to the Mishnah and the Torah. Their practices such as sacrifices, offerings, daily consumption; were prescriptive: meaning there were specific rituals and instructions the Jews had to adhere to.<sup>3</sup> These practices were due to traditions but was there any consideration of food safety as we see it today?

The aim of this thesis is to determine whether if there are any food safety implications on the two manuscripts: the Mishnah and Torah. If there are, what are they? What do they impose? Why were they imposed? The objective is to analyse and study the text from a food safety perspective in the context of Gospel of Matthew and the Mishnah, in comparison to the Food Safety view of today. In light of Jesus and

---

<sup>1</sup> Leviticus 11

<sup>2</sup> Matthew 15:32-39

<sup>3</sup> Jacob Neusner, "The idea of purity in ancient Judaism," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 43 (1975), 23-25.

characteristics of Discipleship, are these food safety practices seen as elements of discipleship?

It is a fact that unclean food poses severe hazards to human health which can be fatal, which also contributes to CO-VID19 pandemic.<sup>4</sup> In other words, poor hygiene protocols and food safety practices can allow us to be hosts who transmit the virus. We cannot ignore the ramifications COVID has inflicted upon the world today, where hundreds of thousands have died and have had their lives turned upside down. Despite COVID not claiming a life in Samoa, it has impacted on the livelihoods of people with interactions with families and friends overseas especially with the current border restrictions. Hence the importance of this undertaking is to gain an understanding of what the Bible has to say about food safety and COVID-19.

This thesis is divided into four chapters. Chapter one focuses on a review of some the relevant literature on the selected biblical text and on the concept of clean unclean food. The review is important information of where the scholarly debate currently lies, and therefore, provides a platform from which I shall include my contribution. Chapter two will discuss the selected method, Sociorhetorical criticism (SRC) with Food Safety as the selected hermeneutical concept. Additionally, there is also a discussion on a reading from a Samoan perspective through the '*tumamā* lens'. The exegesis will be divided into two chapters; Chapter three will focus on Inner texture and Social and Cultural texture. Chapter four will dwell on the last texture which is Inter texture. The final section of the thesis will be the drawing of conclusions and how the findings of the study can be applied to our lives and context today.

---

<sup>4</sup> Igor Pravst, Betty Pei Ing Chang, Monique M Raats. "Research topic: The Effects of COVID-19 Outbreak on Food Supply, Dietary Patterns Nutrition and Health", <https://www.frontiersin.org/research-topics/14033/the-effects-of-the-covid-19-outbreak-on-food-supply-dietary-patterns-nutrition-and-health#overview>

### **Limitations of this study**

I am well aware that the issue with food hygiene and scarcity is a global problem with an array of related issues. That is, the issue factors social, economic, political, and religious aspects that are individually complex and important. However, due to the limitations of this paper in time and space, this study focuses on the general problem of food safety, as highlighted earlier.

## II. Chapter One

### Literature Review

The purpose of this chapter is to research the academic literature on views and perspectives on the selected text (Matthew 15:1-20).<sup>1</sup> It will focus on the Matthean account has in common with other gospels, as well as the differences. In addition, this chapter will research the practice of Hand washing as debated in the text from a Food safety perspective, in retrospect of the ‘clean and unclean’ understanding/ concept.

#### 2.1 The selected text

The omission of “*Thus he declared all foods clean*”<sup>2</sup> in Matthew in contrast to the Markan account, Craig Evans comments as the omission potentially being controversial for the Jewish audience that Matthew prides on.<sup>3</sup> In other words, eating food or unclean food is not the main focus but rather handwashing representing the Tradition of the Elders. The tradition of the Elders was more a Jewish ritual that was a Jewish icon. Furthermore, Jesus saying in Matt 5:17 “I have come not to abolish but to fulfill”, would have contradicted because not all foods was clean during Jesus’ time. It wasn’t until the gentile mission was launched, that Jesus declared all foods were clean which is referenced later on in Acts 10, when Peter had his vision.

Craig Keener begins by identifying the audience of this narrative; as the Matthean account is written towards a Jewish audience.<sup>4</sup> The rhetorical nature is Jewish

---

<sup>1</sup> See section 4.1 The text- *Matthew 15:1-20* (New Revised Standard Version)

<sup>2</sup> Mark 7:19 (NRSV) since it enters, not the heart but the stomach, and goes out into the sewer?” (Thus he declared all foods clean.)

<sup>3</sup> Craig A Evans, *Matthew: New Cambridge Bible Commentary* (New York: Cambridge 2012), 298-302.

<sup>4</sup> Craig S Keener, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1999), 469-475.

predisposed, but also to an extent influenced the Greco-Roman audience too. This is important because it shines light on who the main influence was (i.e. - Jewish in the Pharisees, etc) and then to minorities (i.e. - Greco-Roman audience). The Pharisees claimed to have little status at the time due to the Greco-Roman influence however; they were highly influential with people. Therefore the disciples (in Simon Peter) rather supporting Jesus, he questioned why Jesus had publicly shamed the Pharisees but not reach out to them. Jesus was never concerned about any Elders and their traditions but rather the truthful relationship with God.

On a different note, Richard France dwells on ritual purity of Jesus as he has been in contact with gentiles not only that but casting demons into swine, touching a dead body, a woman with menstrual disorder, etc.<sup>5</sup> This puts Jesus into the category of tax collectors and sinners, in the eyes of Jewish traditions especially Pharisaic law. This is very compelling, it shows a judgmental side of the Pharisees who are tracking down Jesus. The isolation of the gentiles and the less fortunate shows the exclusiveness of the Jewish leaders. Again, the debate of Markan account being bold of declaring all food clean arises, where Matthean account pin points handwashing as the issue rather unclean and clean foods. From this perspective, France proposes that Matthew's main concern was about defilement, that it was from inside rather from the outside.

Supporting France, scholar Howard Clarke claims that handwashing was definitely a Jewish tradition as much an act of personal hygiene.<sup>6</sup> The act which represented ritual purification was rebutted by Jesus when challenged by the Pharisees. He continues by applying Jesus rebuttal to latter historical events such as Papal schism,

---

<sup>5</sup> Richard T France, *The new international commentary on the New Testament: The Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2007), 529-539.

<sup>6</sup> Howard W. Clarke, *The Gospel of Matthew and its readers: a historical introduction to the First Gospel* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2003), 136-137.



Reformation how the Catholic teachings were tradition rather scripture. Once again, the reference to “*He thus declared all foods clean*” in Mark is mentioned. It is interesting how Clarke uses history to support his argument, which I believe makes Jesus rebuttal as serious matter. On the other hand, Clarke makes it clear from his view that handwashing was not a food safety practice, but rather a Jewish practice.

On a separate note, David Turner focuses on the literary features of the text and states that the rhetorical unit is an *inclusio*<sup>7</sup>, as it begins and ends with the question of eating with unwashed hands.<sup>8</sup> The unit outline also proposed by Turner which supports the *inclusio*. He questions why the disciples were challenged by the Pharisees instead of Jesus. If it were directed to the disciples, it was always going to involve their master. Perhaps the Pharisees found it challenging to confront Jesus maybe due to his popularity at the time, hence the turning their focus on to the disciples who were under Jesus’ leadership. The Pharisees represented not only old Israel laws, but the oral traditions (Mishna, Talmud) which protected the written Law (Torah). Jesus made it clear in the latter verses of the text, true purity is a matter of how the heart influences what comes out of one’s mouth. Jesus changes the subject from a specific tradition about ritual hand washing to a general maxim about ethical purity.

On the contrary, Micahel Koplitz set an allegorical outlook on the unit and proposes to see the Pharisees reaction from another point of view.<sup>9</sup> Rather than looking at the Pharisees as blasphemous, the tradition verses scripture was more a debate that was incorporated in the spiritual life in their context. Rather the Jewish leaders trying to

---

<sup>7</sup> An *inclusio* is a literary device based on a concentric principle, also known as bracketing or an envelope structure, which consists of creating a frame by placing similar material at the beginning and end of a section. The purpose of an *inclusio* may be structural - to alert the reader to a particularly important theme - or it may be serve to show how the material within the *inclusio* relates to the *inclusio* itself.

<sup>8</sup> David L Turner, *Matthew: Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament* (Ada, MI: Baker Academic, 2008), 377-385.

<sup>9</sup> Michael Koplitz. *Tradition vs Scripture: Hebraic Analysis for Matthew 15: 1-14 (14-24)*

trap Jesus, Koplitz believes that the question was an educational one to see how Jesus viewed the Torah. This is an interesting point because the way the Pharisees confronted Jesus doesn't seem educational at all. If we look back at Jesus childhood the story about his missing and being found in the temple shows that Jesus was well aware of Jewish teachings from a young age. If the Pharisees were aware of this, perhaps Koplitz does have a point. Another interesting fact was that Koplitz agrees that the act of handwashing was not included in the Torah but a man-made tradition. This aligns with Clarke's claim that the handwashing a Jewish tradition. Koplitz reference to the Torah shows his awareness of the origin of the Jewish purity laws. Furthermore, his claim that handwashing practice was influenced or added by man, really challenges the validity of other practices in the Tradition of the Elders.

### **2.1.1 Summary**

From the above discussion it is apparent that Matthew targets a Jewish audience hence impacting on the omission of food, in contrast to Mark. There are signs of agreement amongst the scholars to insinuate that the Tradition of the Elders is rather a tradition, which was man-made. Another mention of food in bread is evident in Mark, but not in Matthew, perhaps Matthew was not interested in food but rather the handwashing ritual as in Tradition of the Elders. France and Clarke comment on ritual purity, where they impose Jesus was considered unclean because of previous encounters with gentiles and the less fortunate people (eg- sick, blind, etc). Clarke's comment of Jewish handwashing was rather a ritual not a hygiene procedure is also supported by Koplitz. This starts to enlighten that perhaps these rituals had no food safety implications at all. All the other scholars in the literature review also see the Jewish influence in the text, but the comment made by Evans in his comparison with the Markan account is interesting.

## 2.2 Clean and unclean in Matthew 15

Chang An examines Jesus' treatment of purity and impurity in accordance to the hand washing controversy in Matthew 15:1-20. The debate over hand washing before meals demonstrates that Matthew addresses his community as a Jewish group.<sup>10</sup> An carefully distinguishes Jesus as a Jew but also a representative of Israel by citing food laws in the Torah. An also distinguishes Jesus as the Christ and Messiah, by articulating a unique moral vision which further leads to the whole defilement discussion at the end of the text. Thus, this part of An's research focuses on revealing Jesus' attitude towards purity and the Jewish audience. It appears that An is aware of the best of both of Jesus' world; Jesus from the world of a Jew and a Christian. It also shows Jesus is fully aware of Jewish practices and also the Torah.

In retrospect to An, the book titled 'Purity and Danger'<sup>11</sup> written by Mary Douglas writes about secular defilement which is referenced in our text.<sup>12</sup> She refers to Mosaic dietary rules which highlight there is a possibility that Jews were strict with rule of washing (including raw carcasses).<sup>13</sup> This was to minimize any possible cross contamination of human and animals. Another hand practice that was noted was eating with the right hand only; left hand was used to make contact with other unclean utensils. Perhaps this practice did have a connection to hygiene and food safety, as it shows

---

<sup>10</sup> Chang Seon An., "Halakhic Controversy as Family Quarrel: Re-Considering Jesus' Hand Washing Debate with the Pharisees in Matthew 15: 1-20." *New Drug Research* 19 (2020): 283-313.

<sup>11</sup> Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (UK: Routledge, Taylor and Francis, 2003), 30-41.

<sup>12</sup> See Neyrey, Jerome H. "Clean/Unclean, Pure/Polluted, and Holy/Profane: The Idea and System of Purity." *The Social sciences and New Testament interpretation* (1996): 80-104.

<sup>13</sup> Mosaic rules dated 1841- 'It is probable that the chief principle determining the laws of this chapter will be found in the region of hygiene and sanitation. The idea of parasitic and infectious maladies, which has conquered so great a position in modern pathology, appears to have greatly occupied the mind of Moses, and to have dominated all his hygienic rules. He excludes from the Hebrew dietary animals particularly liable to parasites; and as it is in the blood that the germ or spores of infectious diseases circulate, he orders that they must be drained of their blood before serving for food.

awareness of clean and unclean contamination. The reference to the Mosaic rules shows demonstrates that Douglas' reference back to the Old Testament, which supports strong Israel ties in the Food laws. Another interesting point is that she presupposes that perhaps Moses had the idea of hygiene and sanitation behind the laws, but did not directly mention in the Mosaic laws.<sup>14</sup>

On the contrary, Peter Tomson refers to the handwashing as a dispute story which Origen had clarified.<sup>15</sup> Origen had claimed that handwashing and foods at stake was confused with dietary laws. He made it clear that forbidden foods did not make a person impure. Tomson continues to support Origen's claim by writing that Jewish purity laws and diet laws was taken out of context; and still confuses people today. Tomson makes it clear that handwashing, unclean food and dietary laws are three different matters. Therefore he makes it clear that there are no connections between the three, which supports the argument that there are no food safety implications clean and unclean.

Supporting that all foods are clean is De Silva<sup>16</sup> where he mentions the exclusion of "Thus he has declared all food clean" in Matthew. Aligning with Evans, De Silva goes further and makes the text less radical as opposed to the Markan version of this discourse.<sup>17</sup> The focus seems to shift from handwashing (in Matthew) now to broader topic of dietary regulations in Mark. True defilement comes from inside a persons' heart

---

<sup>14</sup> Passakos, Demetrios C. "Clean and Unclean in the New Testament: Implications for Contemporary Liturgical Practices." *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 47, no. 1-4 (2002): 277; According to Mary Douglas-"The Israelites were always in their history a hard-pressed minority. In their beliefs all the bodily issues were polluted; blood, pus, excreta, semen, etc. The threatened boundaries of their politic body would be well mirrored in their care for the integrity, unity and purity of the physical body... The anxiety about bodily margins expresses danger to group survival."

<sup>15</sup> Peter J. Tomson, "Jewish Food Laws in Early Christian Community Discourse." *Semeia-Missoula* (1999): 193-214.

<sup>16</sup> David A De Silva, *Honor, Patronage, Kinship & Purity: Unlocking New Testament Culture* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2012), 315- 321.

<sup>17</sup> See footnote 2 of this chapter; Evans, *Matthew*, 2012.

which makes unclean food or food washing pointless distractions. He then refers to Matthew 23: 25-28<sup>18</sup> to verify his claim.

### 2.2.1 Summary

The aforementioned scholars all agree about the dispute now being Jews (in the Pharisees) versus Jesus. The importance of cleanliness was rather hands and carcasses not clean rather impurity. De Silva makes note of this and argues that defilement is from the heart rather eating unclean food or handwashing. Douglas and An also support each other at how the Jewish leaders were not ready for Jesus' response; as Jesus answered their accusations with ancient Israel teachings and scriptures. This shows Jesus wisdom and His knowledge exceeds any man even supposed leaders of the Jewish religion.

In contrast, Douglas comments about hygiene in the form of cross contamination. The presupposition that maybe the ideal understanding behind the Mosaic laws perhaps was about pathogens and cross contamination. To me, this is very interesting because there could be many reasons to why this was not mentioned. Such factors such as dating of the Mosaic laws influenced on the lack of mentioning such hygiene claims; for example- technology and knowledge of cross contamination was not available at the time. Another interesting point Douglas makes is the role of each hand in the Jewish culture, where the left hand handles unclean food and the right handles the clean food. Only the right hand is used to eat with, perhaps this relates to the hand roles in the Jewish culture.

---

<sup>18</sup> Matthew 23: 25-28 (NRSV) "You clean the outside of the cup and of the plate, but inside they are full of greed and self-indulgence. You blind Pharisee! First clean the inside of the cup, so that the outside also may become clean. Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you are like whitewashed tombs, which on the outside look beautiful, but inside they are full of the bones of the dead and of all kinds of filth. So you also on the outside look righteous to others, but inside you are full of hypocrisy and lawlessness".

## 2.3 Conclusion

Overall, the majority of the literature references agree that the selected text is a debate against the Pharisees and Jesus. In regards to the gospels, it was evident the comparison of the Matthean account to the Markan account highlights that the focus in Matthew is about handwashing and defilement, where Mark adds a dimension in mentioning food. The Pharisees were most concerned about their Purity laws which they abided by religiously; in opposed to Jesus who was concerned about the spirituality and what came out of the persons' heart. There is mention of dietary laws but it was rejected by most scholars saying it was not the focus of discussion. Hand washing was a crucial practice in the Jewish purity laws as it represented true cleanliness. However, Douglas presupposes perhaps there was a glimpse of hygiene and sanitation behind the laws, but it was not documented. As a result, this thesis will explore if there were any elements of food safety practices in the text. What is the significance of food safety not only in Jewish Purity laws, in comparison to the beliefs and teachings of Jesus Christ? Is food safety reflected in the characteristics of Jesus and Discipleship? How about other food safety practices such cooking, processing, packaging, etc? This will be the focus of the next chapter.

## III. Chapter Two

### Methodology & Method

#### Introduction

This chapter details the methodology of Sociorhetorical criticism (SRC) utilised in this thesis to explore the reading Matthew 15:1-20. It will discuss what Sociorhetorical criticism is, including its characteristics and the reason it has been my preferred method of investigating the text. This will be followed by an explanation of what Food Safety is and how it will be used as my hermeneutical lens, to read the text in Matthew 15:1-20. In addition, a Samoan perspective of the text will be applied using 'tumamā' lens.

#### 3.1 Sociorhetorical criticism

What is Sociorhetorical Criticism? According to Vernon K Robbins<sup>1</sup>, it is a reading method that incorporates social science with more literary-based advances in biblical studies.<sup>2</sup> The objective of this method is to merge an approach that combines literary, social, cultural, and ideological issues in texts. It enables the implied reader(s) to dwell on the 'world in the text, behind the text, and in front of the text.'<sup>3</sup> Paul Ricoeur's three worlds of the text enable us to explore these dimensions of a text to reach a rich, satisfying and mature interpretation of the text.<sup>4</sup> As readers, we compare

---

<sup>1</sup> Vernon K. Robbins. *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse: Rhetoric, Society, and Ideology* (New York: Routledge, Chapman and Hall Inc, 1996), 1-10.

<sup>2</sup> Vernon K. Robbins, *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1996), 1.

<sup>3</sup> Robbins. *Exploring*, 1-2. See also Elaine M. Wainwright's explanation of this combination in her article, "Reading Matthew 3-4: Jesus—Sage, Seer, Sophia, Son of God," *JSNT* 77 (2000): 28-29.

<sup>4</sup> See Paul Ricoeur, "What is a text? Explanation and understanding." *In A Ricoeur reader* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016) 43-64. The Three worlds of a text: 1- The World Behind the Text: Historical Background; 2- The World Within the Text: Linguistic Concerns 3- The World in front of the Text: The Reader's Needs.

or contrast values and beliefs with the world in which we live, to shine more meaning within the text. Thus, sociorhetorical criticism provides tools for interpreters to explore how the language of the text evokes meanings that readers can relate to their own world – it is making meaning relevant<sup>5</sup>. Readers with different insights from different locations may interpret the same text with differing meanings.<sup>6</sup> In this way, sociorhetorical interpretation is not meant to nullify other methods and interpretations but to enter into dialogue with them, so that new meanings are produced and made relevant to other worlds and locations.

This part of the sociorhetorical approach allows this thesis to provide an important contribute to the methodology. In essence, it brings the Samoan the context into the reading interpretations through two important in two ways. First, it allows my understanding of food safety and Samoan *tumamā* lens to be part of the interpretation and analysis of the text. This is important because it provides a platform for me to appropriate the exegesis from my world of being a Samoan and from a Food safety background. Second, it affirms that my interpretation doesn't need to nullify traditional interpretations. It is not a reading exercise to impose the reader's location and situation on the text but to explore the text, seeking how the text can answer one's questions. In this way, attention is given to the text itself.

---

<sup>5</sup> Robbins, *Exploring*, 1. For an example, Vaitusi Nofoaiga in his works explains his use of Sociorhetorical criticism with his Samoan perspectives. See Vaitusi Nofoaiga, "Enacting Sociorhetorical Interpretation in the Island Nation of Samoa in Oceania," in *Welcoming the Nations: International Sociorhetorical Explorations*, ed. Vernon K. Robbins and Roy R. Jeal (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2020) 57-69; Vaitusi Nofoaiga, *A Samoan Reading of Discipleship in Matthew* (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017).

<sup>6</sup> Vernon K. Robbins, *The Invention of Christian Discourse Volume 1*, (Dorset UK: Deo, 2009) 5: "a socio-rhetorical interpretive analytic applies a politics of invitation, with a presupposition that the people invited into the conversation will contribute significantly new insights as a result of their particular experiences, identities, and concerns. In other words, a socio-rhetorical interpretive analytic presupposes genuine team work: people from different locations and identities working together with different cognitive frames for the purpose of getting as much insight as possible on the relation of things to one another."



To make this method more applicable, Robbins has categorised the contexts for reading into five stages:

1. Inner Texture,
2. Intertexture,
3. Social And Cultural Texture, and
4. Ideological Texture.
5. Sacred texture

Due to the nature of this paper, the stages more fitting that I will use will be Inner Texture, Inter texture; and Social and cultural texture. I do not wish to disregard, nor to undermine the essence of the other textures, but my selection will allow my focus to be on the layers from the text but also view it from the Social and cultural aspect of the Food safety and *tumamā* lens. Intertexture will allow dialoguing the chosen text with scriptures from the Old Testament and another manuscript in the Mishnah.

### **3.1.1 Inner Texture**

As Robbins has detailed, the goal of inner texture<sup>7</sup> is to explore the communication within the characters (subject, object) within the text. The reader must engage and activate the information that is not revealed within the text. This part of communication in the text is brought to life by the reader (eg- ability to speak, hear, act, smell, etc), in order to understand the text.

---

<sup>7</sup> According to Robbins Inner Texture is the inner texture of a text appears primarily among the implied author, the narrator and the characters, who work together to communicate a message. Various literary critics have displayed a horizontal diagram to exhibit this communication process, ‘the whole narrative-communication situation’, and this is the beginning point for building a socio-rhetorical model for interpretation.

### 3.1.3 Social and Cultural Texture

Social and Cultural texture deals with society and culture as well as societal behavior common to the general understanding. It also looks at how societal norms are treated within the text in relation to the various discourse, dominant and dominated. That is the debate of Jewish food laws, purity laws and traditions that relate to the text. This shall also be of great importance to this work as the societal concept of food safety and hygiene, whether it is was by the Jewish Elders in any way but also to their opposition in the text in Jesus and the disciples. This would be a good opportunity to look at the Jewish dietary laws during the Mishnah and also Jewish dietary laws today in their Kosher requirements; which allows to compare and contrast and bridge the gap.

### 3.1.2 Inter texture

According to Robbins<sup>8</sup>, the intertexture of a text is the interaction of the language in the text with the outside material, physical objects, historical events, texts, customs, values, roles, institutions and systems. It requires the exploration of other texts in order to interpret the aspects that are internal to the text. Intertexture covers the spectrums of (1) oral-scribal intertexture; (2) historical intertexture; (3) social intertexture; and (4) cultural intertexture. Robbins describes the intertextual analysis as showing how the interpreter works in the area between the implied author and the text, meaning that the interpreter thus looks at how other phenomena speaks through the selected texts and how these phenomena outside the text are encoded in the texts. According to Wainwright, inter texture can also develop a platform for literary features to provide a

---

<sup>8</sup> Robbins, *Exploring*, 1-2.

framework for listening to some of the multiple voices within the text, or multiple readings.<sup>9</sup>

In this section of my exegesis I have selected two texts from the Old Testament in Deuteronomy 4 and Leviticus 11; Mishnah in Zevachim 13.2 and Kosher Dietary Laws to highlight ancient Israel Food Laws and Jewish purity laws perspective of the handwashing debate. Furthermore, the reference to the Jewish Literature will also allow capturing the views of Pharisees and their confrontation with Jesus. For example, from the perspective of the Book of Leviticus, the overarching theme or issue addressed is Holiness. All the clean and unclean, purity and impurity laws are centered on this theme. Hence, the element of holiness in light of purity will be something to look for in the exegesis in chapter four.

The questions I will ask in this section are; how do the Old Testament scriptures encode the Handwashing practices (Traditions of the Elders) and the Jewish Food laws in the chosen text. How does the Mishnah encode the Handwashing practices and Food laws in the chosen text? Also, with the whole defilement issue in the text, are they encoded in the Old Testament and Mishnah?

### 3.1.2.1 Mishnah

Mishnah according to Jacob Neusner is also known as the “Oral Jewish Laws or Oral Law’.<sup>10</sup> It is a six part code of descriptive rules formulated, written towards the end of second century CE. The rules were developed by a small number of Sages, the

---

<sup>9</sup> Elaine Mary Wainwright, *Shall we look for another? A feminist rereading of the Matthean Jesus* (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1998), 28-29.

<sup>10</sup> Jacob Neusner, *The Mishnah: A New Translation* (New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 1988), 10. Neusner describes the Mishnah as a principal holy book of Judaism. The Mishnah has been and is now memorized in the circle of all those who participate in the religion, Judaism. Of still greater weight, the two great documents formed around the Mishnah and so shaped as to serve, in part, as commentaries to the Mishnah, namely, the Babylonian Talmud and the Palestinian Talmud, form the center of the curriculum of Judaism as a living religion. Consequently, the Mishnah is necessary to the understanding of Judaism.

forwarded to the constitution of the Judaism under the sponsorship of the Judah the Patriarch (also known as Rabbi Yehudah): who was the head of the Jewish community of Palestine at the end of the second century.<sup>11</sup> The word *Mishnah* comes from the Hebrew root שׁוּבָה, meaning “to repeat” (referring to the recitation of the oral tradition). The Mishnah was written in Hebrew even though the common language in Palestine at the time was Aramaic (a Semitic language similar to Hebrew). The Mishnah is also the foundation for two other renowned manuscripts in the Babylon and Palestinian Talmud, which were written later because of the Judaism diaspora, which is referred to as a commentary for the Mishnah.<sup>12</sup>

The purpose of the Mishnah was to document the interpretations of the Torah developed by the Sages. This manuscript allowed a more black and white interpretation of the Torah, but also keeping Rabbinic traditions that existed before Yehudah.<sup>13</sup>

The Mishnah is divided in to six (6) sections of tractates;

1. *Zera'im* (seeds)— agricultural laws, tithes, prayers, and blessings
2. *Mo'ed* (festival)— laws regarding the Sabbath and holidays
3. *Nashim* (women)— laws relating to marriage and personal status; also to vows and to the Nazirite
4. *Nezikin* (damages)— civil and criminal law
5. *Kodashim* (holy matters)— laws regarding the sacrifices and the Temple service
6. *Tohorot* (purity)— laws relating to ritual purity and impurity

The selected text from the Mishnah is from the fifth tractate the ‘Kodashim- holy matters’ which addresses holy practices that is enforced in the temple which sacrificial

---

<sup>11</sup> Neusner, *The Mishnah*, 10.

<sup>12</sup> Marc J Rosenstein, *The Oral law becomes literature: Turning Points in Jewish History*. (Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 2018), 138-140.

<sup>13</sup> Neusner, *The Mishnah*, 11

items. The reason why this particular section of the Mishnah was selected, is because of its specific distinguishing of clean and unclean of the holy things (ie- sacrificial carcass or meat), but also clean and unclean person. This I believe encompasses food practices and cross contamination of the person to another person, but also person and the product and vice versa.

The Zevachim 13.2 emphasises on who is eligible to eat holy things, highlighting unclean person versus clean person.<sup>14</sup> If an unclean person had made contact with a holy thing, therefore it is deemed unclean. This practice mimics the food safety practice of contamination whether physical, chemical or microbial. However, given in Judaism background and context, it suits the Pharisees and Scribes argument, which makes it more fitting for the Inter texture dialogue.

### 3.1.2.2 *Kosher dietary laws*

Some may argue that one of the limitations of the using the Mishnah and the Old Testament scripture is the fact it was written about 2000 years ago. It was written for a different purpose, a different audience (Israelites and Jews) and different time and space. Therefore I thought it would add value to this study, to incorporate a Jewish law which is practiced today through the Kosher Law.

Kosher in Hebrew כָּשֵׁר meaning 'fit', serves a purpose of meeting the Kashrut which is the Jewish dietary law (*Halaka*). The Kashrut halaka derives from the Old Testament food laws in Leviticus and Deuteronomy which relates back food laws in the Torah.<sup>15</sup> According to Blech<sup>16</sup>;

---

<sup>14</sup> Holy things can be referred to any carcass or food product that has been subjected to sacrificing within the Temple.

<sup>15</sup> Blech, Zushe Yosef. *Kosher food production* (Iowa: John Wiley & Sons, 2009), 10.

<sup>16</sup> Blech, *kosher food production*, xiii

Yet the laws of *Kosher* and their application in a modern industrial setting are often misunderstood. Kosher has nothing to do with a Rabbi blessing food, but rather that the ingredients and the procedures are in accordance with Kosher law. The laws of Kosher are to be found in the Bible (*Leviticus*) and the subsequent interpretive text of Jewish law. Kosher food production is complex and interesting, for it represents the nexus of Jewish law, food production, and economics. Kosher is additionally complex because of the counterpoint between ancient Torah law and modern food technology; between the esoteric and the mundane; between holy writ and commerce.

In other words, Kosher is not limited to a dietary regulation but more regulated by the Kosher law (Kahsrut). Its Jewish law origin has made me interested in to include it in this study. According to Garfunkel<sup>17</sup>

The kosher dietary laws and rules, known as kashrut (also spelled kashrus or kashruth), govern many aspects of food preparation, cooking, and consumption for observant Jews. They include instructions for the ritual slaughter of animals, which foods are permitted, and which are prohibited. Although the purpose of these laws may have had a positive effect on health, their original purpose was religious, an act of devotion and affirmation of faith that expressed spiritual and moral values. They provided a diet for the soul as well as for the body. The dietary laws imposed a type of self-discipline on one of the most basic elements of life—eating.

In Jewish teaching, eating is regarded as a hallowed act. The twentieth-century religious philosopher Martin Buber (1878–1965) wrote that kashrut hallowed the everyday by turning a natural function, eating, into something holy. Kashrut also teaches a reverence for all life. There are many admonitions in the Torah forbidding cruelty to animals, including the mandate not to “cause pain to any living creature.” The Torah preaches compassion and respect for all living things, going so far as to prohibit eating animals killed by hunters, adding that animals should not be killed for anything other than food or self-preservation.

What is intriguing is that in our modern world today, other people that are of non-Jewish background have incorporated Kosher food in their lifestyle. Their preference of Kosher products due to the laws and restrictions all food products go through in manufacturing. Not only it is a dietary law, but today it has become one of the fastest

---

<sup>17</sup> Garfunkel, Trudy, *Kosher for Everybody: The Complete Guide to Understanding, Shopping, Cooking, and Eating the Kosher Way* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2004), 7.

growing trends in the food industry in countries like United States, the Kosher business in 2004 was worth \$7.5 billion and still climbing today.<sup>18</sup>

Why is Kosher a fast growing trend? Consumers are health conscious and Kosher has its stringent standards to abide. This gives them more confidence to conventional foods sold over the counter. Another reason is that Jews are more aware and paying more attention to the Kashrut laws especially with animals mentioned in the food laws such as meat and milk products.<sup>19</sup>

In Samoa, Kosher is not as popular in developed countries such as USA, Australia, etc. The majority of Samoans are of Christian background; this is probably the main reason why Kosher is not a popular trend. Perhaps the Jewish population in Samoa is too small to market Kosher products. However, Star Kist Co Ltd one of the largest tuna manufacturers in the South Pacific based in American Samoa, started processing Kosher certified tuna in 2018.<sup>20</sup> So potentially the Kosher market and accreditation might make it to the shores of Samoa one day, .

### 3.2 Food Safety as hermeneutics

‘Food Safety’ is defined by Australian Institute of Food safety<sup>21</sup>; *as the handling, preparing and storing food in a way to best reduce the risk of individuals becoming sick*

---

<sup>18</sup> Garfunkel, *Kosher for Everybody*, 1

<sup>19</sup> Garfunkel, *Kosher for Everybody*, 2

<sup>20</sup> Fili Sagapolutele, “Certified Kosher Tuna, will be produced at Star Kist Samoa’s Atuu plant next month” *Samoa News* October 28, 2018. <https://www.samoanews.com/local-news/certified-kosher-tuna-will-be-produced-star-kist-samoas-atuu-plant-next-month>

<sup>21</sup> The principles of food safety aim to prevent food from becoming contaminated and causing food poisoning. This is achieved through a variety of different avenues, some of which are: Properly cleaning and sanitising all surfaces, equipment and utensils; Maintaining a high level of personal hygiene, especially hand-washing; Storing, chilling and heating food correctly with regards to temperature, environment and equipment; Implementing effective pest control; Comprehending food allergies, food poisoning and food intolerance

from foodborne illnesses. Why is food safety important? Simply because foodborne pathogens are lethal to humans if food is not handled, treated and processed properly<sup>22</sup>.

According to Emiko Fukase and Will Martin; the demands of food production has increased over the years to meet population; and will continue to grow. It has been predicted by Fukase and Martin that in 1950, the global population and food demand will triple by 2050. This is an alarming figure because it means suppliers will have to be innovative and smart of how to mass produce more than what is made today.<sup>23</sup>

As demands increase, it cannot be ignored the importance of Food Safety as the livelihoods and health of the consumers lies within the hands of the producer. Food Safety in the world today is under scrutiny, because of poor food safety practices which has contributed in transmitting of COVID-19 to humans,<sup>24</sup> and good health in general. The Food safety bulletin of the International Food Technology addressed to the World Health Organisation (WHO) also stated;<sup>25</sup>

“The main concern here is protecting other workers in the operation,” says Martin Bucknavage, senior food safety extension associate, Pennsylvania State University. “As COVID-19 is spread mainly from person to person,” says Olga Padilla-Zakour, professor and director of the Cornell Food Venture Center, Cornell University, “the best ways to avoid the spread among workers is to have clear protocols [(standard operating procedures)] in place for each facility to minimize possible contamination. Farms and food facilities already have [good manufacturing practices] in place; thus, the additional measures needed are to protect workers.” These procedures include training all workers on how the COVID-19 virus is spread, social distancing, and good hygiene protocols: When a person who has

---

<sup>22</sup> AIF "Food Safety." <https://www.foodsafety.com.au/>.

<sup>23</sup> Emiko Fukase and Will Martin. "Economic Growth, Convergence, and World Food Demand and Supply." The World Bank, 2017.

<sup>24</sup> Sangha Han, et al. "Covid-19 Pandemic Crisis and Food Safety: Implications and Inactivation Strategies." *Trends in Food Science & Technology* (2021), 1-3.

<sup>25</sup> Toni Tarver, Food Safety during the COVID-19 Pandemic, *WHO Food technology Magazine*, [https://www.ift.org/news-and-publications/food-technology-magazine/issues/2020/may/features/food-safety-during-the-covid-19-pandemic?gclid=Cj0KCQjwraqHBhDsARIsAKuGZeFES5zYiZDd4z4WcTKF6DntQ2e8ytcDULWn\\_tzy8tPI9kNvkea4c1QaAvOPEALw\\_wcB](https://www.ift.org/news-and-publications/food-technology-magazine/issues/2020/may/features/food-safety-during-the-covid-19-pandemic?gclid=Cj0KCQjwraqHBhDsARIsAKuGZeFES5zYiZDd4z4WcTKF6DntQ2e8ytcDULWn_tzy8tPI9kNvkea4c1QaAvOPEALw_wcB)



COVID-19 coughs, sneezes, speaks, or breathes, he or she emits fluid particles that carry the virus.

Food safety protocols are critical public health tools not just in Samoa but worldwide, to reduce the spread of the fatal virus. We cannot ignore the fact that food safety standards around the globe differ because of the availability of resources and technology. In some less fortunate countries, access to clean potable water is insufficient and scarce; which means that handwashing requirements are inadequate. This is only the start of the problem; meaning if clean potable water is not available, then other food safety practices would be inadequate too. These factors will be taken into consideration in this study.

### **3.2.1 Food Safety practices and Hand washing**

To ensure that food is safe for human consumption, governing food bodies have put in place practices that have been validated to ensure food safety. Food Safety practices are implemented from the harvesting of food whether from sea, farm, etc.

The Samoa Food Act 2015 regulates food handling in the food chain to abide by; from growing/ harvest right to consumption.<sup>26</sup> A nationwide strategic plan in alliance with Food Agriculture Organisation (FAO) and World Health Organisation (WHO) was issued in 2017 to propose the plans to implement awareness food safety in Samoa. The main goal is to develop and implement more stringent food safety controls in all sectors of Samoa.<sup>27</sup> On Monday 7<sup>th</sup> June this year, the world food safety day was celebrated and

---

<sup>26</sup> Health, Ministry of. "Samoa Food Act 2015." edited by Health. Samoa: Ministry of Health, 2015.

<sup>27</sup> Samoa National Codex Committee, *Samoa National Codex Strategic Plan 2017-2021*, Samoa National Codex Committee, 2017.

Samoan Observer interviewed FAO Food Systems Officer, Mr Joseph Nyemah of his views of the progress of Food safety in Samoa.<sup>28</sup>

Food safety is everyone's responsibility, said Nyemah, adding that some may not be aware of what that actually means. One simple fact is that if you eat expired foods from shops, you are inviting poor health. If you come from the toilet and handle food without washing your hands, you are inviting a health crisis not only for you, but the entire population,

Food Safety systems in developed nations have adopted Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point (HACCP) to analyse and minimise the risks of food contamination<sup>29</sup>. Practices such as cleaning and sanitation, pest control, First in-First Out (FIFO), etc have been implemented as a result of the risk analysis to drive Food Safety. These practices have been communicated through all food handlers through instructions, which are verified through training<sup>30</sup>.

Handwashing is crucial in any food handling or processing because hands are known to be effective in spreading germs. We can easily spread in what we touch, hold and carry. In the context of COVID-19 today, various means of communicating handwashing has been implemented worldwide. For instance, posters posted in public of handwashing and commercials of how to wash hands properly nearly in every commercial break (Figure 1). Short videos have also been filmed of primary school students practicing handwashing according to food safety standards.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> Ueni Peauala Pauulu, Food Safety in Samoa: a long way to go, *Samoa Observer*, June 7 2021, <https://www.samoaoobserver.ws/category/samoa/85287>

<sup>29</sup> Jacques Trienekens and Peter Zuurbier, "Quality and Safety Standards in the Food Industry, Developments and Challenges." *International Journal of Production Economics* 113, no. 1 (2008): 107-22.

<sup>30</sup> Trienekens and Zuurbier, *Quality*, 115

<sup>31</sup> Ministry of Health Samoa, Ua fufulu ou lima/ Have you washed your hands, <https://www.facebook.com/watch/?v=426222961843947>

### 3.2.2 Food safety and traditional practices

Every country and culture has its own way of handling food, right from growing and harvesting up to consumption. Food is grown and processed differently in different contexts, it is part of culture. Different cultures have different cuisines for same food product, as they are processed differently. Food plays a vital part in traditions and festivals such as cultural festivities, holidays, etc. For example, the Samoan 'umu' or earth oven is where stones are heated up to when they are red hot then cook the food, with leaves covered to capture the heat. It is a similar same concept in Fiji and Tonga, but they are called differently and have minor differences. The stones are heated until they red hot, so that any microbes are killed in the cooking process<sup>32</sup>. In light of the selected text, I will attempt to read the text between the lines using Food Safety practice lens, considering the Jewish practices and Greco-Roman influence.

---

<sup>32</sup> Hardwicke Knight, "Umu-Ti." *The Journal of the Polynesian Society* 73 (1966): 332-47.



Figure 1- Handwashing poster in Samoan language<sup>33</sup>.

<sup>33</sup> Fufulu lima puipuia/ Handwashing poster, “<https://health.hawaii.gov/ola/files/2020/04/Hand-Washing-Samoan.pdf>”



Figure 2: Translation of Samoan Handwashing poster

### 3.2.3 Samoan Food safety Hermeneutics- *Tumamā* lens

According to the Allardice<sup>34</sup> the Samoan word *Tūmamā*<sup>35</sup> is translated in English as cleanliness, hygiene, tidy and hygienic. It is also a compound word; ‘tū’ and ‘mamā’; hence *tū* translated by Allardice<sup>36</sup> as stand, stand up, stand erect, be stationary, alight,

<sup>34</sup> Ron W Allardice, *A Simplified dictionary of modern Samoan* (Newton: Pasifika Press, 2013), 91.

<sup>35</sup> The macron ¯ on top of the ‘u’ and the ‘a’ (*tūmamā*) are pronunciation symbols. In the Samoan language, only vowels are assigned to have macrons on top them; the vowel is pronounced longer. For instance, the transliteration of *tūmamā* would be “toomamaah”

<sup>36</sup> Allardice. *A simplified dictionary*, 90.

pull up, stand in, stand by, be placed, firm, stable, existing, steep, sharp, customs, ways, posture, submerged rock<sup>37</sup>. *Mamā* is translated by Allardice<sup>38</sup> as clean, clear of rubbish, pure, innocent. A collective translation and meaning of the word *tūmamā* is ‘to stand for cleanliness, hygiene, pure and innocence. In other words it means to stand up, exist and be firm in cleanliness and hygienic practices; or simply- to be clean and hygienic.’<sup>39</sup>

*Tūmamā* relates to Food safety as it represents cleanliness and hygiene which is the purpose of having these practices in the first place. From a Samoan perspective, *tūmamā* is not restricted to food safety, but it does have a holistic meaning. It represents the person being personally hygiene; meaning they reflect hygiene practices such as showering, brushing their teeth, no body odour, etc. Also their personal space (eg- their homes and rooms) are clean and free of rubbish, reflecting their hygiene status. Also the way they interact and carry themselves out reflect cleanliness; for instance they wash hands frequently, cough with their hands blocking their mouth, wipe surfaces before eating, etc.

In the Samoan community, assigned women of villages form a committee who endorse and manage health programs through the village known as *Komiti Tumamā* (Village Health committees).<sup>40</sup> Their roles encompassed food handling, cooking, health, cleaning and sanitation, etc. Their roles were driven through the holistic concept of

---

<sup>37</sup> See Semisi Maia'i, *Tusiupu Samoa: Samoan Dictionary* (Auckland: Little Island Press, 2007), 132; *Tū* also is short form for *tula'i* or *laulaututū* which is translated as stand up in singular and be standing for plural. It can also be used in the context of encouraging someone or a group of people, as a means of motivation.

<sup>38</sup> Allardice. *A simplified dictionary*, 39.

<sup>39</sup> See George Pratt, *Samoan dictionary: English and Samoan, and Samoan and English, with a short grammar of the Samoan dialect*. (London: London Missionary Society Press, 1862) 514; *mamā* is translated as ‘to be clean, to be pure’

<sup>40</sup> Peggy Fairbairn-Dunlop, *Tamaitai Samoa: their stories* (Carson, California: Kin Publications, 1998), 10-19.

cleanliness; through maintain primary health standards within the village.<sup>41</sup> What these roles also resemble is their thoroughness in service, which relates to discipleship. It is believed in Samoan culture, to serve others with integrity and giving it your all. Giving your all also means that everything is clean and presentable in every way possible.

*Mamā* can also be implied by Samoans to their hearts or their ‘*loto*’.<sup>42</sup> Someone who is innocent and has no violence and comes across as a peacemaker is identified as someone who is *lotomamā*. This holistic approach would be one of the main focuses of the Samoan food safety lens *tūmamā*, where the exegesis of the text would be implied and analysed using the food safety hermeneutics and *tūmamā* lens.

### 3.3. Conclusion

This Chapter introduces the methodology used in this study. Sociorhetorical criticism with food safety hermeneutic will be used to explore the text. Food safety as explained emphasizes balance diet and clean food. Food safety also considers important preparation of food as not just a task to be done and completed. It is a relaxing activity where good health is obtained in and through enjoyment of preparation and cooking food. Thus, food safety is a physical, spiritual and mental practice. Additionally the *tūmamā* lens enables to dialogue the exegesis using the holistic approach which is not food safety on a physical level, but also mentally and how it influences us spiritually. These elements of the food safety as a hermeneutic will guide the analysis of the following interpretation of the selected text.

---

<sup>41</sup> See Penelope Schoeffel, “Dilemmas of modernization in primary health care in Western Samoa”. *Social Science Medicine*. 1984;19 (3):209-16 in regards of the importance of *Komiti Tumamā* role in the Samoan community.

<sup>42</sup> See Semisi Maia’i. Tusiupu Samoa: Samoan Dictionary. (Auckland: Little Island Press, 2007) 59; *Mamā* also is the root word for *loto mama* which means pure in heart and innocent. This aligns perfectly with the holistic approach as highlighted, where cleanliness physically does have an impact on the holistic approach (body, mind and soul)

In the next two chapters the Exegesis process will be conducted using the Sociorhetorical Criticism as the method with Food Safety hermeneutics and *Tumamā* lens. The next chapter, the chosen text will be interpreted using Inner texture and Social and Culture texture.



## IV. Chapter Three

### Exegesis- Part 1

The aim of this chapter is to firstly analyse the text using Inner texture to discover hidden literary features that are influenced by Jewish practices that in comparison to what Jesus had done with his disciples. It will take into consideration other minor characters and elements within the text. Secondly, I will be using Social and cultural texture to investigate the Jewish influence at the time, such as Purity laws and Jewish practices. The product of the exegesis will then be dialogued with Food Safety hermeneutics and *Tumamā* lens.

#### 4.1 The text

<sup>1</sup>Then Pharisees and scribes came to Jesus from Jerusalem and said, <sup>2</sup>“Why do your disciples break the tradition of the elders? For they do not wash their hands before they eat.” <sup>3</sup>He answered them, “And why do you break the commandment of God for the sake of your tradition? <sup>4</sup>For God said, ‘Honor your father and your mother,’ and, ‘Whoever speaks evil of father or mother must surely die.’ <sup>5</sup>But you say that whoever tells father or mother, ‘Whatever support you might have had from me is given to God,’ then that person need not honor the father. <sup>6</sup>So, for the sake of your tradition, you make void the word of God. <sup>7</sup>You hypocrites! Isaiah prophesied rightly about you when he said: <sup>8</sup>‘This people honors me with their lips, but their hearts are far from me; <sup>9</sup>in vain do they worship me, teaching human precepts as doctrines.’<sup>10</sup> Then he called the crowd to him and said to them, “Listen and understand: <sup>11</sup>it is not what goes into the mouth that defiles a person, but it is what comes out of the mouth that defiles.” <sup>12</sup>Then the disciples approached and said to him, “Do you know that the Pharisees took offense when they heard what you said?” <sup>13</sup>He answered, “Every plant that my heavenly Father has not planted will be uprooted. <sup>14</sup>Let them alone; they are blind guides of the blind. And if one blind person guides another, both will fall into a pit.” <sup>15</sup>But Peter said to him, “Explain this parable to us.” <sup>16</sup>Then he said, “Are you also still without understanding? <sup>17</sup>Do you not see that whatever goes into the mouth enters the stomach, and goes out into the sewer? <sup>18</sup>But what comes out of the mouth proceeds from the heart, and this is what defiles. <sup>19</sup>For out of the heart come evil intentions, murder, adultery, fornication, theft, false witness, slander. <sup>20</sup>These are what defile a person, but to eat with unwashed hands doesn’t defile.”

## 4.1 Placement of the text

According to Charles Talbert<sup>1</sup>, Matthew is divided into three main segments; firstly, ‘*The person of Jesus*’ (1:1- 4:16); secondly, ‘*The Proclamation of Jesus*’ (4:17- 16:20); and thirdly, ‘*The suffering of Jesus*’ (16:21- 28:20).<sup>2</sup> The division is sectioned by the repetition of Ἀπὸ τότε ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς (from then Jesus began), in 4:17 and 16:21. The text falls in the second segment of the gospel ‘*The Proclamation of Jesus*’; furthermore in Talbert’s outline<sup>3</sup>, the text falls under the section ‘Jesus focuses on His disciples: Narrative- Jesus’ disciples understand more’. So there is an importance of

---

<sup>1</sup> Charles H Talbert, *Matthew Paideia: Commentaries on the New Testament* (Ada, MI; Baker Academic, 2010), 7.

<sup>2</sup> There are various and different structures of Matthew as proposed by many other scholars of Matthew. For this study, I have chosen to use the structure emphasized by Charles H. Talbert. Other examples of other Matthew’s scholars’ structures see Jack Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 1; Charles H. Lohr, “Oral Techniques in the Gospel of Matthew,” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 23 (1961): 403-435.

<sup>3</sup> Talbert. *Matthew*, 8.

Birth narratives (1:1–2:23)

Jesus’s ministry begins (3:1–8:1)

Narrative: Jesus begins to fulfil all righteousness (3:1–4:17)

Discourse: Jesus calls disciples to seek God’s righteousness (4:18–8:1)

Jesus’s authority is revealed (8:2–11:1)

Narrative: Jesus’s authority is manifest in his mission (8:2–9:34)

Discourse: Jesus’s authority enables disciples’ mission (9:35–11:1)

Jesus’s Ministry Creates Division (11:2–13:53)

Narrative: Jesus encounters a divided response (11:2–12:50)

Discourse: Jesus reflects on the divided response (13:1–53)

Jesus focuses on his disciples (13:54–19:2)

Narrative: Jesus’s disciples understand more (13:54–16:20)

Narrative: Jesus’s disciples understand even more (16:21–17:23)

Discourse: Jesus tells disciples how to relate to insiders and outsiders (17:24–19:2)

Jesus and judgment (19:3–26:1a)

Narrative: Jesus teaches about household behaviour (19:3–20:34)

Narrative: Jesus pronounces about judgment in the present (21:1–24:2)

Discourse: Jesus teaches about final judgment (24:3–26:1a)

Passion and resurrection narrative (26:1b–28:20)

disciples within the text, as we see the shift of the gospel from Jesus who is proclaimed, to the disciples who wanted to understand Christ more.

## 4.2 Inner Texture

According to Robbins<sup>4</sup>, the goal of inner texture is to focus on the communication of the characters (subject, object) within the text. As the reader, the purpose is to activate the information that is hidden between the lines of the text. Certain aspects are brought to life by the reader (eg- speak, hear, act, smell, etc). Another feature expected to pinpoint, is the shift of dialogue between the characters, also the dynamics of the dialogues and conversations.

### 4.1.2 Open, Middle End

For open, middle, end; I have identified Matthew 15:1-20 as one single rhetorical unit. The rhetorical unit is categorised into 3 sections Opening; middle and end; Opening-Matthew 15: 1-9; Middle- Matthew 15: 10-14; End- Matthew 15: 15-20.

Overall, the flow of the narrative appears to be a dialogue of two conflicting sides (Pharisees vs Jesus), followed by a lesson which Jesus gives His disciples in the presence of the crowd.

#### 4.1.2.1 *Opening- Matthew 15: 1-9: Tradition of the Elders*

The unit starts with Pharisees accusing the disciples of eating without washing the hands first. What is significant here is the setting; the Pharisees have travelled all the way from Jerusalem. The last time the Pharisees had an encounter with Jesus and his

---

<sup>4</sup> Vernon K. Robbins, *Jesus the Teacher: A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of Mark* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984).

disciples was in chapter five.<sup>5</sup> The use of the Greek term *τοτε προσεπξονται* meaning ‘then they come’ also insinuates that the Pharisees had come with purpose<sup>6</sup>. It appears that they had one mission to find a way to confront Jesus and His disciples. The confrontation was not in a peaceful way but to hopefully contradict his teachings and healings they have heard of. In comparison with Mark, the Matthean account doesn’t state that the disciples ate with ‘unwashed hands’. However, it stresses the fact that they have broken the Tradition of the Elders. This shows that perhaps Matthew targets his Jewish audience referring to the conflict rather addressing the issue, but also highlights their breach of Jewish purity laws. This is interesting because there is a significant importance here about Jewish purity laws that about clean and unclean practices and in this case Handwashing.<sup>7</sup>

Jesus appears to not have taken the accusations lightly with the mention of the Tradition of the Elders. Rather than answering the question with an answer, He retaliates with a question. The language He uses is direct question with strong words to counter the Pharisees. The term *κακολογῶν* meaning cursing, is a participle present active which means worthless or waste product. This can be explicit as Jesus refers to the Tradition of the Elders as contradictory to the Law Moses that was handed down.

The term *ὑποκριταί* meaning hypocrites sums up Jesus retaliation to the Pharisees. This is the first time Jesus had used the term ‘hypocrites’, reflecting Jesus confrontational mood towards the Pharisees and Scribes<sup>8</sup>. Especially with their

---

<sup>5</sup> Clarke, Howard W, *The Gospel of Matthew and Its Readers: A Historical Introduction to the First Gospel*. (Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2003).

<sup>6</sup> John Nolland. *The Gospel of Matthew: The new international Greek Testament commentary* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Pub Co 2005), 616.

<sup>7</sup> Craig A Evans, *Matthew: New Cambridge Bible Commentary* (New York: Cambridge (2012).

<sup>8</sup> Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew*, 618.

characteristics of ‘honouring me with their lips’ in verse 9; which to Jesus is a reflection of the Pharisaic worship.

#### *4.1.2.2 Middle- Matthew 15:10-14: Jesus explains to His disciples*

In this section of the rhetorical unit Jesus approaches the crowd and disciples after being contradicted by the Pharisees and Scribes. The scene here now shifts from Pharisees and Scribes; now back to Jesus original audience in the crowd and disciples. (i.e.- the setting of Jesus vs Pharisees and Scribe, shifting back to Jesus and disciples). It appears Jesus shifts the focus on the crowd so He could shine some light on what has just happened within the vicinity<sup>9</sup>. This is where He addresses and brings to light the whole issue of ‘Defilement’. The term defilement in Greek is *κοινοί* meaning profane, unrefined, unspecialised and unholy; is a contrasting term when it comes to Jewish purity laws. The disciples show concern towards the Pharisees as they ask Jesus whether he noticed that they took offence to what His response was. Perhaps the Pharisees stature and position within the community was the main concern of the disciples, but to Jesus He had to do what He had to do; to correct their teachings and traditions.<sup>10</sup> The term ‘listen and hear the word and understand’, is illustrated by Jesus as seed on good soil. What is alarming here is that Jesus doesn’t hide behind his words, as he states in verse 14 that Pharisees are bad plants which represent blind guides. In other words, they cannot hear and listen to his words, which portray an evil imagery over the Pharisees.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 8-20: A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, Translated by James E. (Minneapolis, USA: Augsburg Fortress, 2001).

<sup>10</sup> Nolland, *The gospel of Matthew*, 620

<sup>11</sup> Daniel Patte and Graham Stanton, *The Gospel according to Matthew: A structural commentary on Matthew's faith* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), 230.

#### 4.1.2.3 End- Matthew 15:15-20: What is Defilement?

In the last section, Jesus makes his last comments on the whole defilement and handwashing issue, as contradicted by Pharisees and Scribes in verse 1. The shift is now from Jesus where he focuses entirely on His disciples. Peter starts the dialogue with Jesus asking to clarify his teaching as they did not understand. It reflects that even the disciples did not understand Jesus which is upsetting because the whole debacle was instigate by the disciples.<sup>12</sup> Jesus then explains that the point made by the opposition emphasizes that the origin of *"what comes out of the mouth," the origin of evil, is the heart.*

In this way, the only feature of Isaiah 29:13 that had not yet been fully accounted for-"their heart is far from me" (Matt. 15:8b) is used for interpreting the polemical dialogue between the Pharisees and Jesus. The way Jesus explains it is very clear that He uses body parts and their functions.<sup>13</sup> The focus of Matthew in this pericope is entirely on deeds rather than attitudes and deeds. Jesus in his own way heightens the demand for purity beyond what the Pharisees expected, but his approach involves strict moral purity. Personal sin, not food or eating with unwashed hands, is what now defiles, rendering them unfit for fellowship with God or other humans. The frame of the inclusion is complete here of how Matthew concludes referring back to the initial question of the Pharisees. It is these sort of activities, not eating with unwashed hands, that makes a person unclean.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Patte and Stanton. *"The Gospel according to Matthew*, 232.

<sup>13</sup> Patte and Stanton. *"The Gospel according to Matthew*, 232.

<sup>14</sup> Witherington, Ben, *Matthew* (Macon: Georgia: Smyth & Helwys Publishers, 2006), 300.

#### **4.1.2 Interaction of open, middle and end.**

The dialogue shows a very heated encounter between Jesus and the Pharisees and Scribes. Jesus retaliated to their contradictions and also put their traditions to rest, which revealed a tradition, rather worship to glorify God. It doesn't take away the focus of how it all started- eating food without washing hands. It appears the issue goes beyond when Jesus addressed defilement, which aligned perfectly with their Jewish purity laws. Jesus sets the record straight that defilement (unholy, profane, unrefined, sin) is from the heart, not necessarily from what goes in our bodies.

From a Food safety perspective, Jesus claims what defilement rules are any unclean contamination going into our bodies. While the scripture doesn't detail, it would be important to visit the actual steps of the Tradition of Elders way of handwashing, so we can compare it with modern day handwashing. I would also like to visit defilement as a means of how we prepare our food in today's world as a Samoan, and also from a Jewish perspective with respect to their Kosher Dietary Laws.

The defilement aspect of the text resonates with the *tumamā* perspective because the whole heart versus handwashing/ eating unclean food is addressed. This means that all aspects of hygiene must be upheld and abided from a Jewish view. As *tumamā* means all holistic aspects are considered to be clean, defilement strengthens that fact that our hearts are crucial when it comes to our purity and cleanliness. We can get carried away focusing on the body (eg- handwashing, showering, etc) but the main cleanliness Jesus emphasises on is the heart.

## **4.2 Social and Cultural Texture**

In this section of the chapter, I will revisit the Purity laws during the time Matthew was written, to bring to life the context of the whole Purity concept during the time of Jesus, Pharisees and disciples. As mentioned in the inner texture section, this

thesis will also address any ancient handwashing practices in detail to see how it compares to today's practices. This will perhaps allow us to decide whether any aspect of food safety was considered as part of their purity laws.

#### 4.2.1 Clean and unclean, Purity Laws

According to Jacob Nuesner<sup>15</sup> Judaism Purity literature existed in the temple before its destruction around 70CE, purity was an important symbol according to predictable pattern and trends. To understand more about Purity and impurity it is important to know three settings and dates in Judaism calendar; Palestine before 70CE, the diaspora before 70CE and in Palestine after 70CE as a basis for moralistic allegory.<sup>16</sup>

The period known as Jeudo-Christian in the New Testament<sup>17</sup> is the period during Jesus time which is before the destruction of the temple around 70CE. According to David Rudolph<sup>18</sup> The purity laws are dated to the Torah but the principles Jesus takes away in this text that the validity of ritual purity laws are not undermined but need to be re-evaluated. The Torah emphasises on ritual purity led to internal defilement; Jesus argued otherwise. Menstruation, giving birth to a child, contract diseases resulted in ritual impurity not moral impurity. This shows that the Pharisees and Scribes were adamant that ritual uncleanness such as handwashing before eating was a breach of

---

<sup>15</sup> Jacob Neusner, "The idea of purity in ancient Judaism," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 43 (1975): 15-26.

<sup>16</sup> Neusner. "The idea of purity," 17.

<sup>17</sup> Peter J Tomson, "Jewish food laws in early Christian community discourse." *SEMEIA-MISSOULA* (1999): 196.

<sup>18</sup> David J Rudolph, "Jesus and the food laws: a reassessment of Mark 7: 19b." *Evangelical Quarterly: An International Review of Bible and Theology* 74 (2002): 294.



ritual impurity. Rudolph states that the ritual impurity systems do not concern itself with moral status or impurity<sup>19</sup>.

From a Food safety perspective as the ritual and moral differences have been stated in the context of Jewish laws, food handling practices is seen as a ritual that has an impact on the moral status of individual. Even though the Jewish laws have been corrected by Jesus, this research explores how food preparation and handling influences the morality of a person. For instance, clean food practices and safe food handling gives the confidence to the consumer that what they are eating is deemed safe. Therefore the consumer's minds and taste palates are put to ease once knowing the ritual side of food safety has been accomplished.

In addition, the *tumamā* lens enables us to see and compare the context of the Jews in the first century with Samoan hygiene today, moreover it looks at the importance of ritual purity in our surroundings. The mention of unclean nature in Gentiles such as menstruation and giving birth to name a few, highlights an opposing side or binary of cleanliness that must be avoided. Such attributes are considered not *tumamā* or *mamā*, and that's reality. These life events contain blood (which is unclean in Jewish practices) reflects unhygienic environment; however, it doesn't make them unclean events.

The same comparison can be applied to our Samoan traditional ovens before modern food utensils were introduced Samoans used what nature had provided. For example, banana leaves are still used to this day as plates, chopping boards, food covers, etc. The oven is placed on aluminium roofing, to prevent direct contact to the soil. Umu uses heated river rock – it is the hot temperatures the rocks reach that cook

---

<sup>19</sup> Rudolph. *Jesus and the food laws*, 295

and sterilise all the food. In the food safety world this is known at the ‘kill step’ where temperature is used as a *Critical Control point*<sup>20</sup>, to kill any pathogens or microbes.

The *tumamā* lies with what the process is when cleaning up. This is where *tūmamā* makes defilement more a ritual purity issue, because *tūmamā* can be applied to the event after to make it clean again. The cleanliness as promoted in *tūmamā* is practiced at umu sessions, when the cooking is done the *umukuka* or *tūnoa* (samoan kitchen must be cleaned up, ready for the next umu. In this process it is crucial that whoever prepared the *umu*, takes part in removing rubbish and sweeping, ensuring the *umukua* is always set for next cooking session.

#### **4.2.2 Handwashing practice in Tradition of the Elders**

This section explores how handwashing in the Jewish traditions carried from start to finish. What steps were involved in handwashing as part of the ritual? How are they compared to how we wash our hands today?

The ritual of handwashing is known as ידיים נטילת which means ‘lifting up of hands’.<sup>21</sup> A cup with two handles is filled up with portable water. Jewellery is removed then holding the cup with the left hand, water is poured twice over the right hand then vice versa. Before drying, hand are placed chest height and recital is done to bless the ritual and the food (commonly bread) that is about to be received. There are other recitals carried depending on what ritual practice is about to take place.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> See definition of Critical Control Point- A step at which control can be applied and is essential to prevent or eliminate a food safety hazard or reduce it to an acceptable level;” in World Health Organisation. *Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) System and Guidelines for its Application*. (Geneva: WHO Press, 2017), 12.

<sup>21</sup> For more prescriptive details of handwashing rituals see Yadayim 1.1 to 3.3 of Neusner, Jacob. *The Mishnah: A New Translation*. (Yale Univeristy Press, 1988), 1014-1018.

<sup>22</sup> Blech, Zushe Yosef, *Kosher food production* (Iowa, John Wiley & Sons, 2009), 185.

In comparison with Food handwashing practices, the ritual handwashing appears to have no hygiene requirements, no soap or disinfectant, no rubbing motion, no dryer or towels and no hand sanitizer. This confirms that the Traditions of Elders handwashing was more a ritual rather a hygiene protocol<sup>23</sup>. The *tumamā* view of the Jewish handwashing ritual is that the practice itself promotes regularity of washing hands; reflected in the text i.e. before eating bread. This is a good a practice from a food safety perspective as the idea is for it to become habitual eventually becoming second nature. Despite it not being a hygiene practice, the ritual becomes a habit in today's context, then further down the line we could introduce hygiene chemicals (eg- hand soap and sanitisers) and implement as part of the ritual. This will cover the *tumamā* views as it changes from a ritual to a habit.

### 4.3 Conclusion

To summarise this chapter, the interpretation of rhetorical unit using Inner texture reveals that Jesus did not abolish and undermine the Tradition of Elders. However, Jesus clarified the importance of obeying and abiding God's will through worship rather traditions and rituals. The language He uses and the mood shown in his words reflect a very confrontational Jesus, so He could get the message across to the Pharisees and Scribes.

The Social and Culture texture provided a more thorough look into defilement, when Jesus challenges the Jewish Leaders. Defilement was from the heart rather brought into our physical. Jesus makes a statement that ritual practices are different from moral purity that the Pharisees were more concerned about ritual practices rather

---

<sup>23</sup> See Howard W. Clarke, *The Gospel of Matthew and its readers: a historical introduction to the First Gospel* (Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2003), 136-137.

moral practices. This is why the handwashing was condoned due to the fact that it was more a ritual experience.

The lesson here is to focus more on moral aspects of life rather ritual. To view this from a *tumamā* lens, it provides a new approach to the whole holistic manner of Samoan Christians today. The importance of being clean physically which the Jewish Leaders were arguing about represented by their ritual requirements, must not be ignored. It is important to be hygienic and live a clean life. What *tumamā* tells us is that if we live a clean hygienic life, then our hearts reflect this same cleanliness being pure and innocent. This is the holistic approach, if our bodies are clean, this purity is reflected through our hearts which reflected through our actions. A clean heart enables us to accept one another and also accept Christ and His ministry. This is the whole idea of *tumamā* holistic approach.

## V. Chapter Four

### Exegesis- Inter texture

#### Introduction

To recap, this chapter is part two of the exegesis focusing on three main intertexture materials; two from the Old Testament and another being the Mishnah. The purpose of this chapter to engage the chosen text with these scriptures and instigate whether there is/are phenomena encoded with the chosen text.<sup>1</sup>

By exploring the chosen supplementary texts and manuscripts, Leviticus and Deuteronomy focus on the Old Testament which represents the Torah, laws enforced by Israelites handed down to Moses. On the other hand, the Mishnah focuses on the Oral Laws developed by Rabbis and Jewish Sages around second (2<sup>nd</sup>) century CE. So the idea is to capture Torah and the Oral Laws which spans over hundreds of years ago. This can also be a limitation to the study as these scriptures and the Mishnah were written for a different time and space and mentioned in chapter two.

#### 5.1 Leviticus 11

The chapter titled in the NRSV Bible as *Clean and unclean Food*, provides a prescriptive list of animals God had instructed Moses and Aaron, for Israelites are forbidden to consume. The law starts with what meat can and cannot be eaten because of cud,<sup>2</sup> then fish, reptiles and crawlers (eg- snake, insects, etc) concluded by birds.

---

<sup>1</sup> Vernon K. Robbins, *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-rhetorical Interpretations* (Harrisburg: Trinity International Press, 1996), 50.

<sup>2</sup> Cud is partly digested food returned from the first stomach of ruminants to the mouth for further chewing.

Table 1: *Intertextual table of Matthew 15:2 and Old Testament (Leviticus)*

Matthew 15:2	Leviticus 11:8	Leviticus 11:39
Why do your disciples break the tradition of the elders? For they do not wash their hands before they eat	Of their flesh you shall not eat, and their carcasses you shall not touch; they are unclean for you	If an animal of which you may eat dies, anyone who touches its carcass shall be unclean until the evening
διὰ τί οἱ μαθηταί σου παραβαίνουσιν τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων; οὐ γὰρ νίπτονται τὰς χεῖρας [αὐτῶν] ὅταν ἄρτον ἐσθίωσιν.	ἀπὸ τῶν κρεῶν αὐτῶν οὐ φάγεσθε καὶ τῶν θνησιμαίων αὐτῶν οὐχ ἅψεσθε ἀκάθαρτα ταῦτα ὑμῖν	ἐὰν δὲ ἀποθάνῃ τῶν κτηνῶν ὃ ἐστὶν ὑμῖν τοῦτο φαγεῖν ὁ ἀπτόμενος τῶν θνησιμαίων αὐτῶν ἀκάθαρτος ἔσται ἕως ἑσπέρας
	מִבְשָׂרָם לֹא תֹאכְלוּ וּבְנִבְלָתָם לֹא עוֹטְמֵאִים הֵם לָכֵם:תג	וְכִי יָמוּת מִן־הַבְּהֵמָה אֲשֶׁר־הֵיאֵל לָכֵם לֹא־כֹלֶה הַנֶּגֶעַ בְּנִבְלָתָהּ יִטְמָא עַד־הָעֶרֶב:

There is a phenomena of unclean and clean food encoded in these texts; Matt 15:2 and Leviticus 11:8 and 11:39, in regards to touching and handwashing. A person is deemed unclean when a hand touches a carcass of an animal that consumes cud and has hoofs. This feature of uncleanliness also reflects that the person is no longer holy and cannot participate in the ritual. The key ritual implied here are hands and the act of touching. Despite the two texts not being exact in recitation<sup>3</sup>, there is a correlation of these two texts in which a person is deemed unclean and requires handwashing to remove the uncleanliness. These food laws in the Torah have influenced the Traditions of the Elders and subsequently the Mishnah as these are Oral laws were an interpretation of these laws. Holiness being a serious matter in the temple rituals, it is clear to say that unclean person is no longer fit to have any role, unless cleansed.

<sup>3</sup> Recitation is a feature of Intertexture when same/ similar wording are present in corresponding texts or manuscripts.

In accordance to Jesus point of view of defilement and holiness, the unclean hands are a ritual impurity, rather a moral impurity. We can ask the question from a food safety perspective, if we touch these unclean carcasses are we at risk of contaminating other foods or other people? Do we pose a threat to others through microbial contamination? This appears to be an issue of contamination when looking at it from a food safety point of view. Hands are one of the main means of microbial transfer<sup>4</sup> which enables transmitting of microbes from one person to another, or from a person to a surface.

Another textual finding in the Septuagint is evident in verse 8, is the verb φάγεσθε translated at 'to eat'. When parsed, the verb is a future indicative<sup>5</sup>; these features make this verb significant, as something that expected to happen is believed to happen for sure. The indicative makes the verb factual; the future tense makes the verb something that will happen. The significance of this verb in the text shows that the act of eating unclean food must not happen. If there is any possibility that someone was to expecting to eat the unclean product, then they would have to reconsider as the food laws in Leviticus have instructed not.

This command can be applied to food hygiene and food safety. It enforces people not to consume food that is deemed unsafe. There is a food safety saying when it comes to eating food that is not quite right, or food that is unsure to be safe for consumption. 'When in doubt, throw it out'. This practice is important as it eliminates any possibility of falling sick to getting food poisoning.

---

<sup>4</sup> World Health Organisation. WHO estimates of the global burden of foodborne diseases: Foodborne disease burden epidemiology reference group 2007-2015, (Geneva, WHO Press, 2015)

<sup>5</sup> The future indicative describes things that will happen or things that it is believed will happen.

## 5.2 Deuteronomy 4:2

The Tradition of the Elders stems from the Torah and Deuteronomy confirms this claim. This particular verse is very important in the Old Testament known as the ‘shema’. It is central to the Torah and in all laws that have been passed on to Israel. In this argument, the Pharisees refer to the Old Testament as a reference to Jesus and his disciples not to breach the ritual that has been in existence for more than 2000 years. This supports Jesus argument of the Pharisees keeping to their traditions rather misinterpreting the whole concept of God’s law in the Torah.

Table 2: *Intertextual table of Matthew 15:2 and Old Testament (Deuteronomy)*

Matthew 15:2	Deuteronomy 4:2
"Why do your disciples break the tradition of the elders?"	You must neither add anything to what I command you nor take away anything from it, but keep the commandments of the LORD your God with which I am charging you.
διὰ τί οἱ μαθηταί σου παραβαίνουσιν τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων; οὐ γὰρ νίπτονται τὰς χεῖρας [αὐτῶν] ὅταν ἄρτον ἐσθίωσιν.	οὐ προσθήσετε πρὸς τὸ ῥῆμα ὃ ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαι ὑμῖν καὶ οὐκ ἀφελεῖτε ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ φυλάσσεσθε τὰς ἐντολὰς κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν ὅς σα ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαι ὑμῖν σήμερον
	לֹא תוֹסֵף עַל־הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר אֶנְכִּי מְצַוֶּה אֶתְכֶם וְלֹא תִגְרֹעַ מִמֶּנּוּ לְשֹׁמֵר אֶת־מִצְוֹת יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם אֲשֶׁר אֶנְכִּי מְצַוֶּה אֶתְכֶם:

The Hebrew word תוֹסֵף is in a causative form (hiphil)<sup>6</sup> of the verb ‘to add’ translated as ‘to cause to add or to enhance or increase’. The significance of the verb in the text is that it caused by God who is represented by אֶנְכִּי which is translated as ‘I’ referring to God (Yahweh) who has given the command. The other verb מְצַוֶּה also significant as it mentioned twice in the verse, is translated as ‘command’. The piel

<sup>6</sup> The **Hipihil** actively *causes the event* expressed by the verbal root. The *object* of the verb is caused to take part in the action, to be “active” as a *secondary subject*, and the event tends to be *occasional* or *one-time*. Walker A Jones, *Hebrew for Biblical Interpretation*, Steven L McKenzie, ed. (Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2003) 116



form<sup>7</sup> of the verb makes it a continuous or habitual act implied on the verse. Therefore, the command given by God in the shema, which emphasises to the Israelites and Jews to hear, listen and obey. The shema is caused by God, for His people, not as a one off command but must be abided and followed continuously; must become habitual.

So how does this align with the Tradition of Elders<sup>8</sup>? The tradition of Elders was an unwritten law practiced by Jews which derived from Torah. As argued in the previous chapter (Chapter 3), handwashing was more a ritual practice introduced the Tradition of the Elders. Rather being straight from the laws, it was more a practice enforced by Jewish Leaders.

However, the habitual sense of *tumamā* lens, aligns perfectly with regular handwashing. This is beneficial as such practices enhances and promotes the production of safe food. The obeying and abiding of handwashing and food safety practice must be followed like a command, to ensure safe food production. This is crucial not only as a command, but when a good practice becomes habitual, it becomes second nature. This is the whole idea of food safety practices, to become second nature. In other words, if handwashing at a restaurant

### 5.3 Mishnah

The Kodashim tractate takes great accountability of activities which take place in the temple. Zevachim<sup>9</sup> instructs how sacrificial items such as animals are processed and handled by the temple staff.

---

<sup>7</sup> The **Piel** brings about the state expressed by the verbal root, “walking” in the example. An *object* of the verb tends to be a “passive” *secondary subject*. The state tends to be *habitual* or *ongoing*. Walker, *Hebrew for Biblical Interpretation* (2003) 116

<sup>8</sup> See Tradition of the Elders by Neusner, *The Mishnah: A New Translation*. (New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 1988), 13. The body of detailed, unwritten, human laws regarded by the scribes and Pharisees to have the same binding force as that of the Mosaic law. According to the law, priests were to wash their hands before offering a sacrifice

<sup>9</sup> Jacob Neusner, *The Mishnah: A New Translation*, (New Haven, London: Yale Univ. Press, 1988), 663.

## Zevachim 13.2

בין קדש טמא ובין קדש טהור, חֵיב. רבי יוסי הגלילי אומר, טמא נשאכל, טמא נשאכל  
אמרו לו, אף טמא. טהור, חֵיב. וטמא נשאכל טמא, פטור, שלא אכל אלא דבר טמא  
נשאכל טהור, כיון שנגע בו, טמאהו. וטהור נשאכל טמא, פטור, שאינו חֵיב אלא על  
טמאת הגוף

*Translation*

An unclean person who ate either unclean Holy Things or clean Holy Things, is liable.

R. Yose the Galilean says, —An unclean person who ate clean [Holy Things] is liable. But an unclean person who ate unclean [Holy Things] is free [of liability].

For he ate only something [of Holy Things] which [in any event] is unclean.

[They A] said to him, —Also: The unclean person who ate clean [Holy Things], since he touched it, has rendered it unclean.

E And a clean person who ate unclean [Holy Things] is free, for he is liable only on account of the contamination of the body.

We can see the phenomenon with touching as highlighted in Leviticus, *the unclean person who ate clean [Holy Things], since he touched it, has rendered it unclean*. So the question is, what is an unclean person in the view of the Mishnah? Unclean person is someone who has not taken part in the rituals, or is deemed unclean because the Mishnah requirements are not met.<sup>10</sup>

The Hebrew adjective טָמֵא<sup>11</sup> translated as unclean, impure is an absolute adjective which means, that there is no grey area. In other words, you can either be clean or unclean, there is no middle point. Furthermore, the meaning in Hebrew refers to unclean ritually, ethically or religiously. This is quite substantial because all these meanings are a mirror image of what the Jews represented. Perhaps the Jewish only knew cleanliness

<sup>10</sup> Neusner. *The Mishnah*, 220.

<sup>11</sup> The Hebrew adjective טָמֵא parsed as masculine, singular absolute

via rituals and religions, hence not understanding the moral importance of being clean and pure.

Another Hebrew word טמא which is a verb translated as ‘to become unclean or become defiled’ is a piel intensive active verb. As it is an intensive active of the root word טמא to be unclean. In regards to Zevachim, in this case the subject is the person who is not permitted to come into contact with unclean things. In other words, the focus is on the person not to become unclean. The piel stem can also be translated as ‘to be pronounced unclean’ as the verb is intensified. This means that the becoming unclean is intensified and can be serious matter within this verse.

Another observation is the Zevachim has no reference to God or Moses, but rather an interpretation of the laws by Rabbis. Rabbi Yose from Galilee has interpreted the Zevachim 13.2 as distinguishing an unclean person can’t have any affiliation with clean Holy things. There is no action or instruction caused by God neither initiated by God.

From a food safety perspective, the Mishnah perhaps mimics the concept of food safety from a cross contamination practice (ie- unclean unwashed hands will contaminate the food product). This creates a phenomenon between the two concepts, despite the Zevachim having no food safety implications at all. The labelling and separation of clean and unclean reflects a food safety practice, used in cleaning and sanitation processes. This is where colour labelling is used for instance, during my food safety consulting career, one of my clients used red coloured storage equipment (eg- buckets, trays, etc) that have direct contact with the floor; and blue coloured equipment for food contact utensils. This visual segregation made practices easier and proficient, for production but also for food hygiene.

The whole idea of separating clean and unclean personnel and holy things (in this case food), reflects hygiene and *tumamā*. The relation to *tumamā* is that the

identification of clean and unclean equipment and personnel reduces the risk of cross contamination.

#### 5.4 Kosher dietary laws

The purpose of referring to Kosher dietary laws because it is practiced today in countries with a reputed Jewish population. The Kosher regulations are just prescriptive as the Mishnah,<sup>12</sup> that all elements of food production must be Kosher; right from ingredients, packaging, labelling right to distribution. Blech<sup>13</sup> has published a book which has been certified by Jewish community in America, that has listed every Kosher requirement including accreditation and product identification. Another purpose of his book is to keep up with the new technology that is currently used in the Food industry.<sup>14</sup>

So how is this relevant to our chosen text? According to Blech, ritual handwashing is still a requirement for Kosher standards,<sup>15</sup> so as the many other processing steps which is outlined in his book.

To meet the Kosher standards, it is crucial for every manufacturer and producer to abide the halakah. From a food safety perspective we can propose that we cannot ignore the ritual practices however they do influence on the end product which must be a safe edible product. Food safety requirements boxes are ticked, then it gives our minds peace knowing that all Kosher and food safe protocols were carried out.

---

<sup>12</sup> Yanklowitz Shmuly, *Kashrut and Jewish food ethics* (Brighton, MA: Academic Studies Press, 2019), 174.

<sup>13</sup> Zushe Yosef Blech, *Kosher food production* (Iowa: John Wiley & Sons, 2009), 1- 15.

<sup>14</sup> Blech, *Kosher food production*, 160

<sup>15</sup> Blech, *Kosher food production*, 165

## 5.5 Conclusion

Leviticus and Deuteronomy reveal the correlation of hands and touching, which is. This supports the interpretation as a result from the social and culture exegesis. The phenomena lies within the hands hence separate as a source of cross contamination from a food safety view. The Tradition of the Elders stems from the Old Torah Food laws, which is also supported by Deuteronomy.

In light of the Mishnah, the emphasis on unclean person not coming in contact with Holy things mimics the concept of cross contamination in food safety. Despite not having any information to indicate it was developed from a food safety framework, it definitely reflects features of *tūmamā*, cleanliness from not mixing clean and unclean. The Hebrew adjective טָמֵא also depicts that there is no state of being in the middle; you are either clean or unclean. This reveals the prescriptive nature of the Mishnah which reflects in the Jewish rituals and traditions. This prescriptiveness can be a major enhancement in handwashing from a *tūmamā* view. It promotes people to become clean and stay clean, not to fall in to unclean ways. It promotes food safety practices but also other cleaning practices required to remain clean.

## Conclusion

This thesis explores and determines what the Bible says about food and links to food safety. This study is vital more than ever, in the link of food safety in the current context of the COVID-19 era. It is a platform to practice Biblical interpretation of a selected text that addresses a crucial food safety practice in handwashing, using SRC. The advantage of using SRC as an exegesis method, it allows the implied reader to visit other texts from the Bible and also manuscripts that are interconnected to the text. Therefore, as the handwashing stems from a Jewish ritual mentioned in the Matthew as Tradition of the Elders. Furthermore, this research revisits the Oral laws written by the Jews in the Mishnah but also the Food laws in the Old Testament which the Mishnah derives from. I have also chosen Kosher dietary laws as a means to bridge the gap; because of the time difference of when these manuscripts were written. It derives from Leviticus and Deuteronomy, but more importantly it still exists today. In addition my identity as a Samoan Christian and experience as a Food Safety consultant, motivates my hermeneutics as Food Safety reading, using *tumamā* lens.

The thesis was divided into four chapters. Chapter one is a brief overview of what some scholars have commented on about the text in Matthew 15:1-20. From the literature review, the text was a debate against the Pharisees and their Purity laws with Jesus. Jesus clarifies the true meaning of purity, as he challenges rituals in Tradition of the Elders to be man influenced. Jesus emphasizes the focus of purity- is the heart. True defilement is from our hearts, our intentions and thoughts are all influenced from what comes out of our hearts. Hand washing was a crucial practice in the Jewish purity laws as it represented ritual cleanliness. There was a glimpse of hygiene and sanitation behind the laws, but it was not documented.

The Pharisees were most concerned about their Purity laws which they abided by religiously; in opposed to Jesus who was concerned about the spirituality and what came out of the persons' heart. There is mention of dietary laws but it was rejected by most scholars saying it was not the focus of discussion.

Chapter two is the selected exegesis method in SRC and the hermeneutics used to read and interpret the text. Food safety is not just about food, but also considers important preparation of food as not just a task to be done and completed. It is a relaxing activity where good health is obtained in and through enjoyment of preparation and cooking food.. Additionally the *tūmamā* lens enables to dialogue the exegesis using the holistic approach which is not food safety on a physical level, but also mentally and how it influences us spiritually.

Chapter three is the first of two chapters in the Exegesis. Inner texture reveals that Jesus did not abolish or undermine the Tradition of Elders however: the importance of obeying and abiding God's will through what come out of our hearts rather traditions and rituals. Social and culture texture reveals defilement was about their hearts rather what we they consumed. Ritual practices are different from moral purity that the Pharisees were more concerned about ritual practices rather moral practices. This is why the handwashing was condoned due to the fact that it was more a ritual experience. From a *tumamā* lens, we dialogue it with whole holistic concept of *tumamā*. The holistic approach is if we take food safety seriously, our bodies are clean and we know what put on our plates are clean. This purity or essence of being clean is reflected through our hearts which shows through how we perform ourselves. Inter texture determined that there is a phenomenon between the touching and handwashing within the text. The common elements here are the hands; the act of touching unclean and handwashing.

Chapter four was the second part of the Exegesis focusing on Inter texture in Old Testament, Mishnah and Kosher dietary law. The Old Testament scriptures revealed a phenomena within the hands hence separate as a source of cross contamination from a food safety view. The Mishnah, mimics the concept of cross contamination in with regards to the Holy things against then unclean. Even though we cant prove any food safety origin, it definitely reflects features of *tūmamā*, cleanliness from not mixing clean and unclean. The Hebrew adjective טָהוֹר reveals that you can only be clean or unclean; not in between. This can promote safe handwashing from a *tūmamā* view, promoting people to become clean and stay clean, not to fall in to unclean ways. It promotes food safety practices but also other cleaning practices required to remain clean; not just physically but also morally and spiritually.

So were there any food safety implications within the Mishnah and Food laws in in the Old Testament? The exegesis shows correlation of the texts in clean and unclean from a purity perspective, perhaps not as a food safety concept. It would be difficult to provide evidence that and testing was done to validate such practices, due to the lack of technology and resources. The emphasis of handwashing was more a ritual to separate the clean from the unclean.

So what can we gain from this interpretation? In relation to COVID-19 it has been validated that poor hygiene and handwashing increases the possibility of transmitting microbes. Can handwashing and adequate food safety practices cure COVID-19? Perhaps not however; it can reduce the risk of transmitting and transferral of the virus. From a food safety perspective, WHO and other Food governing bodies have shown initiative of promoting these practices (as shown in Figure 1).





Figure 1- Handwashing poster in Samoan language.

From a *tumamā* lens Samoan cooking and food hygiene practices, our traditional ways of cooking perhaps is not ideal in the western world. However, the cooking methods over the years have been a tradition. In addition, I have witnessed first-hand characteristics of *tumamā* where everything in Samoan cooking preparation is cleaned after it is used; everything has a home meaning every utensil has its place. The holistic feature of *tumamā* is something important I have discovered in this study. Another finding is that food safety is not only about hygiene, but it also about how it impacts on our bodies, minds and spirit. There is a rewarding sensation when we finishing cooking

meals to a hygienic standard, but also serving it to our families and friends. This holistic approach towards *tumamā* in this study, knowing we have prepared food as hygienic and food safe to the best of our ability, it definitely reveals the purity of our hearts.

I would also like to raise awareness through this study and promote adequate food safety practices, in our homes, churches, workplaces, communities, and where ever we go. I will not nullify our traditional and western food preparation methods however, to fight pandemics and killer viruses such as COVID-19, it must be in our best interest to fulfil food safety practices.

As a Malua Theological college student, this study cannot be complete without addressing our beloved Congregational Christian Church of Samoa (CCCS) / Ekalesia Faapotopotoga Kerisiano Samoa (EFKS). I am not undermining the involvement of CCCS in Food Safety as hygienic practices are evident in church environments. The *tumamā* lens has broadened my views on food safety especially with its holistic approach. Defilement is from our hearts, in saying that; if we can cook and prepare food safely from pureness of our hearts it will reflect in the end product that we share with others. There is no difference in the discipleship, if we have been called to serve other in the name of Christ, we must do it from the pureness of our hearts.

## Glossary

<i>Mamā</i>	clean, hygienic
<i>Tū</i>	stand, stand up,
<i>Tumamā</i>	to be clean, hygienic, pure.
<i>Umu</i>	traditional Samoan earth oven; Samoan cooking method
<i>Komiti Tumamā</i>	Village Health Committee

## Bibliography

- AIFS. "Food Safety." <https://www.foodsafety.com.au/>.
- Allardice, Ron W. *A simplified dictionary of modern Samoan*. Newton: Pasifika Press, 2013.
- An, Chang Seon. "Halakhic Controversy as Family Quarrel: Re-Considering Jesus' Hand Washing Debate with the Pharisees in Matthew 15: 1-20." *New Drug Research* 19 (2020): 283-313.
- Blech, Zushe Yosef. *Kosher food production*, Iowa: John Wiley & Sons, 2009.
- Clarke, Howard W. *The Gospel of Matthew and its readers: a historical introduction to the First Gospel*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2003.
- De Silva, David A. *Honor, Patronage, Kinship & Purity: Unlocking New Testament Culture* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2012), 315- 321
- Douglas, Mary. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. UK: Routledge, Taylor and Francis, 2003.
- Evans, Craig A. *Matthew: New Cambridge Bible Commentary*. New York: Cambridge 2012.
- France, Richard T *The new international commentary on the New Testament: The Gospel of Matthew*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2007.
- Fukase, et al. "Economic Growth, Convergence, and World Food Demand and Supply." The World Bank, 2017.
- Han, Sangha et al. "Covid-19 Pandemic Crisis and Food Safety: Implications and Inactivation Strategies." *Trends in Food Science & Technology* (2021) 1-3.
- Hardwicke, Knight. "Umu-Ti." *The Journal of the Polynesian Society* 73 (1966): 332-47.
- Health, Ministry of. "Samoa Food Act 2015." edited by Health. *Samoa: Ministry of Health*, 2015.
- Jones, Walker A, *Hebrew for Biblical Interpretation*, Edited by Steven L McKenzie, Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.
- Keener, Craig S. *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1999.
- Kingsbury, Jack. *Matthew as Story*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988).
- Koplitz, Michael. *Tradition vs Scripture: Hebraic Analysis for Matthew 15: 1-14* (14-24).

- Lohr, Charles H. "Oral Techniques in the Gospel of Matthew," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 23 (1961): 403-435.
- Luz, Ulrich ed. *Matthew 8-20: A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew, Translated by James E.* (Minneapolis, USA: Augsburg Fortress, 2001).
- Maia'i, Semisi. *Tusiupu Samoa: Samoan Dictionary*. Auckland: Little Island Press, 2007.
- Ministry of Health Hawaii, Fufulima lima puipua/ Handwashing poster, "https://health.hawaii.gov/ola/files/2020/04/Hand-Washing-Samoan.pdf"
- Neusner, Jacob. "The idea of purity in ancient Judaism." (*Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 43 (1975): 15-26.
- Neusner, Jacob. *The Mishnah: A New Translation*, New Haven, London: Yale Univ. Press, 1988.
- Neyrey, Jerome H. "Clean/Unclean, Pure/Polluted, and Holy/Profane: The Idea and System of Purity." *The social sciences and New Testament interpretation* (1996): 80-104.
- Nofoaiga, Vaitusi. "Enacting Sociorhetorical Interpretation in the Island Nation of Samoa in Oceania." In *Welcoming the Nations: International Sociorhetorical Explorations*. Edited by Vernon K. Robbins and Roy R. Jeal. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2020.
- Nofoaiga, Vaitusi. *A Samoan Reading of Discipleship in Matthew*. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017.
- Nolland, John. *The gospel of Matthew: The new international Greek Testament commentary*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Pub Co, 2005.
- Patte, Daniel and Stanton, Graham. *"The Gospel according to Matthew: A structural commentary on Matthew's faith."* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.
- Pauulu, Ueni Peauala. "Food Safety in Samoa: a long way to go" *Samoa Observer*, June 7 2021. <https://www.samoabserver.ws/category/samoa/85287>
- Pratt, George. *Samoa dictionary: English and Samoan, and Samoan and English, with a short grammar of the Samoan dialect*. London: London Missionary Society Press, 1862.
- Pravst, Igor., Chang, Betty and Raats, Monique. "Research topic: The Effects of COVID-19 Outbreak on Food Supply, Dietary Patterns Nutrition and Health", <https://www.frontiersin.org/research-topics/14033/the-effects-of-the-covid-19-outbreak-on-food-supply-dietary-patterns-nutrition-and-health#overview>
- Ricoeur, Paul "What is a text? Explanation and understanding." In *A Ricoeur reader*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016.

- Robbins, Vernon K. *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1996.
- Robbins, Vernon K. *Jesus the Teacher: A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of Mark*. Philadelphia: For-tress Press, 1984.
- Robbins, Vernon K. *The Invention of Christian Discourse Volume 1*, (Dorset UK: Deo, 2009)
- Robbins, Vernon K. *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse: Rhetoric, Society, and Ideology*. New York: Routledge, Chapman and Hall Inc, 1996.
- Rosenstein, Marc J. *The Oral law becomes literature: Turning Points in Jewish History*. (Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 2018) 138-140.
- Rudolph, David J. "Jesus and the food laws: a reassessment of Mark 7: 19b." *Evangelical Quarterly: An International Review of Bible and Theology* 74 (2002): 294.
- Sagapolutele, Fili "Certified Kosher Tuna, will be produced at Star Kist Samoa's Atuu plant next month" *Samoa News* October 28, 2018.  
<https://www.samoanews.com/local-news/certified-kosher-tuna-will-be-produced-star-kist-samoas-atuu-plant-next-month>
- Samoa National Codex Committee, "Samoa National Codex Strategic Plan 2017-2021", *Samoa National Codex Committee*, 2017.
- Talbert, Charles H. *Matthew Paideia: Commentaries on the New Testament* (Ada, MI; Baker Academic, 2010).
- Tarver, Toni. Food Safety during the COVID-19 Pandemic, *WHO Food technology Magazine*, [https://www.ift.org/news-and-publications/food-technology-magazine/issues/2020/may/features/food-safety-during-the-covid-19-pandemic?gclid=Cj0KCQjwraqHBhDsARIsAKuGZeFES5zYiZDd4z4WcTKF6DntQ2e8ytcDULWn\\_tzy8tPI9kNvkea4c1QaAvOPEALw\\_wcB](https://www.ift.org/news-and-publications/food-technology-magazine/issues/2020/may/features/food-safety-during-the-covid-19-pandemic?gclid=Cj0KCQjwraqHBhDsARIsAKuGZeFES5zYiZDd4z4WcTKF6DntQ2e8ytcDULWn_tzy8tPI9kNvkea4c1QaAvOPEALw_wcB)
- Tomson, Peter J. "Jewish food laws in early Christian community discourse." *SEMEIA-MISSOULA*- (1999): 193-214.
- Trienekens, Jacques and Zuurbier, Peter. "Quality and Safety Standards in the Food Industry, Developments and Challenges." *International Journal of Production Economics* 113, no. 1 (2008): 107-22.
- Turner, David L *Matthew: Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament*. Ada, MI: Baker Academic, 2008.
- Wainwright, Elaine M. "Reading Matthew 3–4: Jesus—Sage, Seer, Sophia, Son of God," *JSNT* 77 (2000): 28–29.
- Wainwright, Elaine M. *Shall we look for another? A feminist rereading of the Matthean Jesus*, Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1998.

- Waters, Robert. *“Did Jesus contradict, disagree with change, or break the Law of Moses”* (Truth Magazine XVII, 1972)
- Witherington, Ben. *Matthew*. Macon: Georgia: Smyth & Helwys Publishers, 2006.
- World Health Organisation. *Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) System and Guidelines for its Application*. Geneva: WHO Press, 2017.
- World Health Organisation. *WHO estimates of the global burden of foodborne diseases: Foodborne disease burden epidemiology reference group 2007-2015*, Geneva: WHO Press, 2015.
- Yanklowitz, Shmuly. *Kashrut and Jewish food ethics*, Brighton, MA: Academic Studies Press, 2019.